Degree Outcomes Statement - 2021

Institutional Degree Classification Profile

As a large globally connected Russell Group institution, the University of Liverpool is committed to providing a consistently high-quality academic environment, enabling our students to succeed academically and personally as well-rounded, enquiring global citizens prepared for life beyond graduation. Through carefully designed programmes of study and rich extra-curricular opportunities students develop as knowledgeable, adaptable and skilled contributors to the local and global society.

At the heart of our curricula is a focus on intellectual enquiry, rigour and challenge.

Over the past five years, on average 79% of students at the University of Liverpool have achieved good honours awards (Class I and II:1). This overall position and the distribution across classes have remained largely stable over that period, despite a significant increase in the overall qualifying student body and a general increase in the entry qualifications presented by our intake. The breakdown across classes is summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Two Division One</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Two Division Two</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Three</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Non-Honours</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed analysis of the overall institutional position in relation to particular student cohorts has been undertaken and reviewed. These include, but are not limited to, analysis by ethnicity, age, sex, socioeconomic measures (including POLAR) and students with any registered disability. The following headlines are noted:

- Students with a disability achieve a high percentage of Class I and II:1 degrees - with an average of 82.5% over the last five years, compared to 79.7% of students without a disability. Although the proportion of Class I degrees is higher amongst students without a recorded disability, the number of graduating students with a registered disability has increased year on year.

- A difference in the level of attainment between sexes is evident over the last five years, with a lower percentage of students identifying as males consistently achieving Class I and II:1 degrees. Female student attainment recorded a decrease in 2018-19 however levels rose to their highest in 2019-20.

- The upper POLAR groups, representing a higher likelihood of participation in higher education across the UK, outperform those in lower groups with regards attainment of Class I and II:1 degrees. There is a consistent and significant gap between the highest and lowest groups, however this gap has reduced in the most recent year to its lowest level across the five reported years.

- There is disparity in the percentage of Class I and II:1 degrees being awarded to Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) students when compared to white students, however the attainment gap dropped to its lowest level of 11.5% in 2019-20.

- The increase in Class I degrees awarded. This has been discussed institutionally and there are several factors that may have led to an increase: enhanced teaching and learning activities; more diversity in assessment; better support for disabled students and students whose first language is not English; more students taking up our increased provision of study resources and support via KnowHow and the English Language Centre.

Institutional data are also interrogated at the more granular level of subject in relation to the key student groups. A Faculty level breakdown of main features is provided below.
The University has introduced a learner data dashboard and scorecard at discipline level which prompts programme and department teams to analyse their student cohorts by main characteristics (such as domicile, ethnicity, age and gender). This dashboard also enables detailed consideration of combinations of characteristics and features such as entry qualifications, partner entry route and specific disability types.

Action planning at subject level based on these data then addresses priorities in relation to the performance of our student groups. Through the process described below, annual subject-level action planning is undertaken as part of our regular quality assurance activity, with Faculty and institutional oversight through Academic Quality and Standards Committee and Senate. Student input is initially via Staff Student Liaison Committees and then via Student Voice Coordinator attendance at the Faculty level stage and Guild Officer attendance at institutional level.

Identified sustained attainment gaps are being addressed through both the emerging Student Success Framework and via targeted work linked to our Access and Participation Plan. Utilising granular data, trend analysis and comparisons to externally benchmarked metrics, the University is able to better understand where targeted activity is required to address gaps and ensure maximum levels of support for student attainment.

Please note, the summary table and headlines noted above exclude non-classified degrees in Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Science, MBChB, BDS, BVSc. However, all areas of the University consider and report on the performance of their students with respect to continuation and achievement through the standard quality assurance process.

Faculty and Department Profiles
Trends in degree classifications over time across Faculty and department areas are detailed below. Headlines are raised in the context of relevant features of the student population, including changes in the volume of students and relevant characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities and Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Headlines**
- The proportion of Class I degrees increased by 6.4% in 2019-20, to its highest point recorded over the five year period.
- II:1 levels also increased, by just 0.9% however II:2s recorded a drop of 5.2% from the previous year, to their lowest levels.
- This is reflective of the overall institutional profile.

**Department Level Considerations**
- The Management School is the only area in which Class I degrees have recorded higher levels than II:1 – 43.6% compared to 41.4%.
- The lowest levels of Class I were recorded in Communication and Media (8.1%) and highest in the Management School – however the population of graduating cohorts is much smaller within Communication and Media (148 compared to 1,272).
- Just 1.19% of students in the Faculty graduated with a Class Three degree, however this level rises to 2.2% in Architecture and 2% in Communication and Media.

**Ethnicity**
- BAME students marginally outperformed white students (0.4%) at recording Class I degrees, however white students obtained 15.1% more II:1 degrees in 2019-20.
- 14.1% more BAME students received II:2 and Class Three degrees compared to their white peers.

**Domicile**
- 90% of home students recorded a Class I or II:1 degree, compared to 76.7% of overseas students.
- The levels of Class Three degrees recorded by overseas students in 2019-20 was 2.4%, compared with just 0.4% for home students, which is reflective of the differences recorded at an institutional level.

**Gender**
- 88.1% of females obtained Class I and II:1 degrees in 2019-20, representing the highest level and biggest gap compared to male students (8.3%) recorded across five years.
- 79.8% of males obtained this higher class of degree, which also represents the highest levels recorded over this time period.
- This is reflective of the overall institutional profile.

**Disability**
- The rate of attainment of Class I and II:1 degrees is 4.2% higher for students with a disability compared to those without, however the rate of Class I alone is 2% lower.
- 88.7% of students with disabilities obtained a Class I or II:1 degree in 2019-20, which is 2.8% higher than the institutional profile.

**Considerations**
As with the institutional data, these HSS data should be considered in light of the move to online teaching and assessment and the implementation of the Major Disruption policy, the Safety Net and other mitigations introduced during the first few months of the pandemic. The overall upward trend of Class 1 awards seen in the last two years has continued this year alongside a small increase in the number of II:1 awards. This rise is most marked in the Management School where, as in the rest of the Faculty, online assessments replaced traditional invigilated examinations, leading to higher achievement levels in quantitative subjects. In the more qualitatively based Humanities subjects, whilst there was a rise, it was not so marked and in Modern Languages and Culture (now renamed Languages, Cultures and Film) the proportion of Class 1 awards remained consistent but there was a rise in the number of II:1 awards, raising the overall proportion in these higher classifications by 10.5% on the previous year and 11% above the institutional average. The increasing difference in overall achievement when viewed by gender might also have been affected by the type of assessment and this warrants further investigation.
We continue to work to address the discrepancies in achievement of BAME students. This cohort had access to the Undergraduate Research Scheme and this may have had an effect on performance. However, it is difficult to disentangle the effects on an upward trend in achievement of any such initiative from the changes and mitigations necessitated by Covid 19.
The proportion of Class I degrees increased by 5.8% in 2019-20, to its highest point recorded over the five year period – overtaking II:1 levels for the first time.

II:2s recorded a drop of 2.5% from the previous year, to their lowest levels.

The increase in Class I degrees and drop in II:2 is broadly reflective of the institutional profile, however this is the only Faculty in which Class I degrees are the most common award.

Class I degrees have recorded higher levels than II:1 in Computer Science, Electrical Engineering and Electronics, Mathematical Sciences, Physics and the School of Engineering.

The lowest levels of Class I were recorded in Geography and Planning (19.6%) and highest in Computer Science (55.2%).

Just 1.6% of students in the Faculty graduated with a Class Three degree, however this level rises to 3.8% in Electrical Engineering and Electronics and 2.8% in Mathematical Sciences.

BAME students outperform their white peers at Class I by 8% within the Faculty, which is reflective of the impact of performance of overseas students.

48% of white students obtain II:1s, compared to 34% of BAME students.

BAME students make up 5.8% more of the II:2 and Class Three qualifications.

85.8% of home students recorded a Class I or II:1 degree, compared to 82.2% of overseas students – the lowest gap recorded across all Faculties.

The levels of Class Three degrees recorded by overseas students in 2019-20 was 1.9%, compared with 1.2% for home students, thus the attainment gap for these students is much smaller than that of the institution as a whole.

89.6% of females obtained Class I and II:1 degrees in 2019-20, representing the highest level recorded across five years.

80.7% of males obtained this higher class of degree, which also represents the highest levels recorded over this time period and the lowest gap between female peers recorded since 2015-16.

The percentage of females obtaining Class I and II:1 is marginally higher than the institutional profile as a whole.

The rate of attainment of Class I and II:1 degrees is 1.2% lower for students with a disability compared to those without, however this gap increases to 11.8% when looking solely at Class I.

82.8% of students with disabilities obtained a Class I or II:1 degree in 2019-20, which is 3.1% lower than the institutional profile.
Over the period analysed, entrance requirements have been altered, e.g. the requirement for an A grade in A-level mathematics to enter mathematics programmes; addition of a mathematics test for students with BTEC to ensure that they can cope with their programmes in other disciplines. We have conducted a Student Success Innovation Project: An investigation into ethnicity awarding gaps within the School of Physical Sciences, the recommendations and findings of which have been presented to the Academic Success Board. In the last year analysed, the implementation of online assessments and examinations with longer-than-usual time periods for completion necessitated by the pandemic is thought to account for the uptick in first class outcomes, in line with reports from other Russell Group STEM subject leaders.

**Health and Life Sciences**

Note this data does not include clinical subjects with classifications of Pass or Pass with Honours/Commendations/Distinction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class Two Division One</th>
<th>Class Two Division Two</th>
<th>Class Three</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Headlines**
- The proportion of Class I degrees decreased by just 1% in 2019-20, however this continues the downward trend starting after 2016-17.
- II:1 levels increased by 5.1% however II:2s recorded a drop of 2.4% from the previous year, closer to levels seen in years prior to 2018-19.
- This is not fully reflective of the overall institutional profile however it must be considered that this is not reflective of all student awards.

**Department Level Considerations**
- 80% of students in the Schools of Health Sciences and Life Sciences obtained a Class I or II:1, with 93.2% obtaining these levels in the School of Psychology.
- The lowest levels of Class I were recorded in Psychology (17.1%) and highest in the School of Health Sciences (34.9%).
- Just 0.8% of students in the Faculty graduated with a Class Three degree, none of which were in the School of Psychology.

**Ethnicity**
- BAME students obtained Class I degrees at a rate 13.2% lower than white students within the Faculty and 12.4% at II:1.
- 31.6% of BAME students recorded a Class II:2 degree, compared to just 9.4% of white students, with rates of Class Three degrees also 2.9% higher.

**Domicile**
- 86.9% of home students recorded a Class I or II:1 degree, compared to 67.3% of overseas students however it must be noted that much smaller cohorts of overseas students in this area make further analysis and conclusions unstable.

**Gender**
- 87.9% of females obtained Class I and II:1 degrees in 2019-20, representing the highest level since 2017-18 and the and biggest gap compared to male students (12.1%) recorded across five years.
75.8% of males obtained this higher class of degree, which again is the highest level since 2017-18 but lower than the five year average.

The percentage of males obtaining Class I and II:1 is 4% lower than the institutional profile as a whole.

The rate of attainment of Class I and II:1 degrees is 2% lower for students with a disability compared to those without, however this gap increases to 8.3% when looking solely at Class I.

83.3% of students with disabilities obtained a Class I or II:1 degree in 2019-20, which is 2.5% lower than the institutional profile.

Faculty will specifically ask schools to comment on the variations in degree outcomes between BAME students and white students particularly 1st class degrees in the Annual Subject Action Plans (ASAP).

The gap between female students (87.9%) and males students obtaining Class I and II:1 (12.1%) degrees is significant and needs closer examination. Schools will therefore be asked to review any variations between male and female within programmes to identify where the variations lie.

The percentage reduction of graduates exiting with a First Class Honours Degree in Health Sciences was identified in the ASAP for 2019-20. Changes to their marking criteria, upfront moderation, development of ‘Best Practice Marking Principles’ and alteration of weighting for clinical placement assessments had resulted in a marginal increase of 1% across all programmes. However, the overall trend data over the last 3 years indicates a reduction on First Class Honours Degrees. Only 0.8% of students in the Faculty graduated with a Class Three degree, none of which were in the School of Psychology. Again a reflection on the data from the Schools, and in particular, Psychology will be useful in the ASAPs to ensure there is nothing significant.

We note the slight variation on degree outcomes in relation to disability which are lower than the Institutional profile and there is a larger gap when just looking at 1st class degrees. Again we will expect Schools to comment and look at rates of 1st class degrees and disability.

All Schools adjusted and pivoted their teaching and assessment for online learning successfully during the pandemic. This was with a limited lead in time. The Major Disruption policy was implemented and so in large part led to no major variation in degree outcomes.

Action planning at subject level based on these data then addresses priorities in relation to the performance of our student groups. Through the process described in ‘Identifying good practice and actions’ below, annual subject-level action planning is undertaken as part of our regular quality assurance activity, with Faculty and institutional oversight through Academic Quality and Standards Committee and Senate.

Please note, the summary table and headlines noted above exclude non-classified degrees in Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Science, MBChB, BDS, BVSc. However, all areas of the University consider and report on the performance of their students with respect to continuation and achievement through the standard quality assurance process.

**Assessment and Marking Practices**

The University assures itself that assessment criteria meet sector reference points through the key processes outlined below.

The University has an agreed process for programme approval which is published as part of the wider Framework for Quality and Standards. Consideration of external reference points is part of this process, e.g. Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.

During the design phase of programme approval, programme teams work with colleagues from the Centre for Innovation in Education (CIE) who support the development of the curriculum using the principles of the
Liverpool Curriculum framework (C2021) which includes the hallmark of Authentic Assessment. The curriculum design process is underpinned by a constructive alignment approach.

The University has a published Code of Practice on Assessment and a number of associated appendices. The Code and appendices are reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure appropriateness and alignment and due consideration of any internal and external requirements:

- **Appendix A** - University Marks Scale, Marking Descriptors and Qualification Descriptor
- **Appendix F** - Assessment Appeals Procedure for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate Programmes
- **Appendix H** - External Examiner System for Taught Provision
- **Appendix K** - Policy on Adjustments and Assessment to Examination Arrangements for Disabled Students including Annex 1: Guidelines for marking and feedback for students with specific learning difficulties (SpLDs)
- **Appendix M** - Policy on Extenuating Circumstances in Relation to Performance in Assessments and Examinations.

The University has a published framework for quality and standards assurance that quality management processes are effective is built into oversight at all levels within the University. Oversight of standards in relation to assessment is maintained at local level by Module Review Boards and Boards of Examiners, Faculty oversight is at Faculty Quality Committees and institutional oversight is undertaken by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee. In addition, quality and standards at programme level are overseen via subject reporting, which is received at Faculty and University level. The delegation of activities to various levels within the University ensures that activities remain effective.

The Module Review Board has oversight of any changes to marking practices and any impact this might have on grade profiles with external examiner approval. Boards of Examiners are also made aware of any module level changes to marking practices in order to be able to consider the overall impact on student grades. Finally, the University’s process of Internal Periodic Review provides opportunities for additional assurance in this area and highlights any departmental changes to marking practices and associated impacts on grades.

**Academic Governance**

The University has both a robust governance structure and effective quality assurance processes in place to ensure that the value of qualifications awarded over time is protected. Senate is the University’s senior academic committee and has responsibility for the University’s awards, the quality and standards of the academic programmes and approving any changes to the regulatory Code of Practice on Assessment. An annual report on the outputs of the quality assurance processes and confirming the continuing quality and standards of provision across the University and its collaborative partners is submitted to Council following endorsement by Senate and Education Committee.

Academic Quality and Standards Committee has delegated authority from Senate to approve operational matters in relation to quality and standards matters. Ongoing oversight and evaluation of assessment procedures is maintained by the Assessment and Feedback Working Group. This group regularly (five meetings per year) reviews policies and procedures to ensure they remain fit for purpose and that sector wide best practice is used to inform any changes and developments.

The University has a fair, accessible and timely appeals process for handling academic appeals. The OIA Annual Statements routinely confirm that we have a below median number of cases subsequently found justified or partially justified by the OIA so we retain confidence in the appropriateness of our appeal procedures and decision-making.

Externality in the preparation of the Degree Outcomes Statement has been incorporated by the use of a report from the University’s External Examiner.
Classification Algorithms

The University’s classification algorithms are contained within the documents below:

- System for the Classification of Three-Year Non-Clinical Undergraduate Degrees
- Classification of Four-Year and Five-Year Non-Clinical Undergraduate Degrees

The University has a single algorithm for all 3 year undergraduate non clinical programmes and a single algorithm for all 4 year undergraduate non clinical programmes that include a year in industry or a year abroad. Profiling (automatic uplift) is detailed in the documents above. Information regarding resits is also within these documents. A recent mapping exercise against the QAA Quality Code, Assessment Advice and Guidance Section, indicated that the University’s approach to reassessment is in line with sector norms and expectations.

The philosophy and rationale for the algorithms is contained in the following document: Code of Practice on Assessment. All regulatory information is published on the Academic Quality and Standards Division web site with full public access. All students are provided with a University Handbook. This provides a summary of the requirements for achieving a degree.

Other stakeholders (e.g. academic and professional services staff involved in marking or servicing Boards of Examiners) are made aware of the relevant regulations through staff inductions, general training and annual updates. External Examiners receive the relevant information via appointment documentation and induction activity. Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies also have access as relevant and are consulted appropriately during any review activity.

The University does not plan on any immediate change to its algorithms, but regularly reviews appropriate evidence to ensure they remain fit for purpose. There have been no changes to the algorithms since 2010.

Teaching Practices and Learning Resources

The University of Liverpool has established a dedicated unit to promote and enable teaching excellence through the strategic development of the staff at the University. The Academy provides opportunities for colleagues to develop their teaching practice at all stages of their academic career.

The Academy has a fully accredited Advance HE, UKPSF scheme (ULTRA) which has seen the University increase its fellowship numbers over the past few years. The Academy work closely with the Centre for Innovation in Education (CIE) in supporting staff to develop teaching practice and support curriculum design aligned to our curriculum framework.

The Academy has also been at the forefront of external involvement with AdvanceHE regarding the training of external examiners. Following participation in the pilot in 2017, three iterations of the Advance HE Professional Development Course (PDC) for External Examiners have been delivered at the University of Liverpool by the Academy. Participants who complete the PDC go on to an Advance HE register which qualifies them to be External Examiners for other universities.

Developments in the curriculum have been underpinned by significant investment in the digital infrastructure and estate, including state-of-the-art teaching and learning spaces, such as new music practice rooms, architecture studios, language laboratories and specialist PC hubs. All these improvements were triggered by student feedback on their learning spaces. The Central Teaching Laboratory, established in 2012, was the UK’s first shared teaching laboratory for physical, environmental and archaeological sciences, designed to enhance student experience through high-quality, contemporary learning facilities and promote inter-disciplinary learning. It has been internationally acclaimed for its innovation in UG science education. A CTL-based team of academics won the HEA’s Collaborative Award for Teaching Excellence in 2016, recognising their role in promoting student success. The CTL was judged to have had an impact on departments across the University, supporting new pedagogies improving employability skills, and introducing cross-disciplinary modules and multi-disciplinary dissertation projects.

In addition to investing in the physical estate the University has continued to invest in digital infrastructure and resources to support learning and teaching, such as an in-house lecture capture system and e-portfolio
To support the effectiveness and efficiency of assessment and feedback, we have implemented electronic management of assessment (EMA) across all courses. Students are supported at all stages of their journey with the University of Liverpool and we continue to invest in this, such as increased mental health support as well as a sector-leading careers and employability service which puts students at the heart of this support model with the Career Studio.

Our library provision shows consistently high student satisfaction and we continue to invest. The library hosts the University’s central academic support unit, KnowHow, which offers a range of face to face and on-line opportunities including student workshops and one-to-one writing development tutorials, and a suite of on-line interactive resources developed in-house for Liverpool students.

Since the launch of KnowHow activity on-line in 2017, engagement with KnowHow has dramatically increased across the student body. Access to the KnowHow on-line module via the University’s VLE ensures that students can engage whenever they need with academic support on topics as diverse as academic integrity, dissertation preparation, groupwork, presentation skills and preparing for examinations.

Identifying good practice and actions

Our approach to monitoring programme data and progress against targets has been significantly enhanced by the availability of datasets and scorecards for subject-level analysis and action planning. Oversight of our performance with respect to continuation, year averages and overall degree attainment and related subject-level action planning is evaluated via the Academic Success Board and oversight maintained through our Academic Quality and Standards Committee and Education Committee. Developments in access to data in a manipulable form has enabled more detailed interrogation of gaps in relation to the overall student body, by discipline and by student characteristic group, evaluation of the impact of actions and dissemination of effective practice.

Actions in response to performance over the period of this statement include the development of transition support for mature learners and those with non-standard entry qualifications, targeted in course skills development activity, peer-based academic and social learning initiatives and the developments in the inclusive curriculum. An example of action to address transition is our work to align curricula with partner institutions. With respect to one local college, continuation among articulating students has increased to 91%, closing a gap relative to the cohort as a whole. A specialist transition programme of support put in place for the BTEC students in year 1, covering additional study skills, exam preparation and workshops on underpinning subject theory resulted in bringing down the first-year attainment gap compared to A level students to 5%. The pilot has now been rolled out to other subjects with students with BTECs and NTQs and an attainment gap. In support of our under-represented groups, including mature students, those with disabilities, and with mental health issues, we have introduced a number of initiatives to support continuation and attainment, including funding for assistive technologies and transcribing services for disabled students, running KnowHow workshops to support the use of these technologies, and promoting positive approaches to mental health such as through our well-attended Wellbeing Week activities.

Over the last three years curriculum development under the banner of Curriculum 2021 has delivered considerable change in the student learning experience, in particular through the focus on active learning, digital fluency and authentic assessment. This has led to the diversification of task types and outputs, a rebalancing of formative and summative assessment and broadening of student digital skills. Assessment redesign has been supported by the TESTA methodology (testa.ac.uk) particularly in Humanities and Social Sciences programmes, where significant enhancements have been made to the clarity and student understanding of rubrics, assessment formats and improvements to feedback. Innovations in assessment design include the introduction in Life Sciences of a two-stage testing model to address issues with respect to automatically marked on-line tests. This involved introducing a formative stage giving feedback for incorrect answers, before a summative part accessed only once a threshold standard in the first part had been achieved. The new model has led to increased attainment at all ability levels, with the mean exam mark up from 58% to 65%. Dentistry has developed an award-winning initiative called LIFTUPP, a competence-based learning-tracking/management system used by academic and clinical staff to provide individualised and timely feedback to students and report on their learning. LIFTUPP is now commercially available and is being used at other universities across the UK.
The Degree Outcomes Statement will be reviewed and refreshed annually and formally approved by Council.

Risks and challenges

Regular review of our data, action planning and progress through our committees at University, Faculty and subject level provides relevant opportunities to review our risks and challenges.