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**ATTRITION, PROGRESSION AND SUCCESS DATA 2017/18**

1. **Attrition**

At the meeting of the Collaborative Partnerships Forum (CPF) on 21 September 2016 it was agreed that a benchmark of 10% attrition be set for HE Foundation Degree programmes, with a benchmark of 20% for Access to HE Diplomas. These benchmarks were reaffirmed by members at the meeting of the Forum on 4 October 2017 (Min 17.51 refers).

The tables below provide an update on attrition rates by College for HE Foundation Degree and Access Diploma provision following the Supplementary Boards of Examiners in August/September 2018. 2Y3S statistics are not included in this report as there is no supplementary examination period in this mode.

**Attrition Rates: Run date 1 November 2018.**

**Figures in brackets are from the June boards.**

**Table 1.1: HE Provision Attrition Rates 2017/18: Full-Time**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Yr**  **1** | **Yr**  **2** |
| BMC | 18.6 (15.1) | 17.1 (17.1) |
| CAFRE | 8.0 (6.6) | 6.1 (6.1) |
| NRC | 13.6 (13.0) | 16.4 (16.4) |
| NWRC | 24.4 (20.4) | 18.8 (18.2) |
| SERC | 11.8 (10.9) | 21.7 (20.4) |
| SRC | 18.2 (16.7) | 16.1 (16.1) |
| SWC | 14.9 (13.5) | 9.8 (9.8) |

**Table 1.2: HE Provision Attrition Rates 2017/18: Part-Time**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Yr**  **1** | **Yr**  **2** | **Yr**  **3** |
| BMC | 22.9 (24.7) | 21.6 (20.6) | 13.3 (11.7) |
| CAFRE | 40.0 (40.0) | 13.3 (13.3) | 3.6 (3.6) |
| NRC | 18.5 (17.4) | 12.9 (12.9) | 15.9 (14.5) |
| NWRC | 14.0 (11.8) | 18.5 (15.4) | 6.8 (6.8) |
| SERC | 21.6 (15.7) | 20.4 (20.4) | 13.9 (13.9) |
| SRC | 20.2 (19.7) | 17.4 (16.3) | 18.5 (20.4) |
| SWC | 14.7 (14.7) | 16.7 (16.7) | 12.5 (12.5) |

**Table 1.3: Access Provision Attrition Rates 2017/18**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **% Full-Time** | **% Part-Time** |
| BMC | 31.8 (31.8) | 27.3 (27.3) |
| NRC | 22.5 (21.3) | 19.2 (17.8) |
| NWRC | 32.0 (32.2) | 14.6 (13.5) |
| SRC | 34.5 (33.8) | 26.5 (24.9) |
| SWC | 34.0 (34.0) | 26.8 (23.7) |

The data shows that with regard to HE provision only CAFRE met the benchmark for attrition in both Years 1 and 2 for full-time programmes and only SWC met the target for Year 2. Attrition data for Access provision was also disappointing in that only CAFRE and NWRC met the benchmark for part-time programmes.

Members are asked to consider what actions need to be taken to address poor retention in both HE and Access provision.

1. **Progression and Success**

The tables below provide detailed information on Success rates, based on year of study and mode of study.

Members are reminded that the University has two success measurements:

**Success 1: (Proceed + Award) / (Total – (Early Leavers + LOA + Non-Returners))**

**Success 2: (Proceed + Award) / (Total)**

Partner institutions only consider Success 2 in line with University practice.

At its meeting on 23 January 2018 members agreed that for HE provision a benchmark for Success 2 be set at 75% in Year 1 and 80% in Year 2. For Access provision a benchmark of 70% was agreed (Min 18.15 refers).

**Figures in brackets are from the June boards.**

**Table 2.1: Full-Time HE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Year 1** | | **Year 2** | |
| **Success 1** | **Success 2** | **Success 1** | **Success 2** |
| BMC | 91.2 (70.3) | 76.3 (59.5) | 95.9 (74.0) | 80.1 (61.8) |
| CAFRE | 93.2 (69.2) | 90.5 (67.2) | 95.3 (77.8) | 83.0 (66.7) |
| NRC | 91.1 (69.9) | 82.1 (63.0) | 88.8 (75.2) | 76.0 (64.4) |
| NWRC | 78.0 (54.7) | 65.2 (46.3) | 96.0 (71.1) | 79.0 (58.6) |
| SERC | 90.7 (61.1) | 81.5 (55.5) | 93.3 (80.7) | 73.0 (63.2) |
| SRC | 91.6 (66.1) | 76.8 (56.1) | 96.9 (87.6) | 80.4 (72.7) |
| SWC | 88.7 (74.6) | 81.1 (68.0) | 93.0 (81.4) | 82.4 (71.6) |

**Table 2.2: Part-Time HE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Year 1** | | **Year 2** | | **Year 3** | |
| **Success 1** | **Success 2** | **Success 1** | **Success**  **2** | **Success**  **1** | **Success**  **2** |
| BMC | 97.3 (95.3) | 74.3 (71.2) | 95.7  (78.3) | 68.0 (55.7) | 88.0 (94.0) | 73.3 (78.3) |
| CAFRE | 82.4 (64.7) | 46.7  (36.7) | 95.7 (73.9) | 73.3 (56.7) | 100  (76.2) | 75.0 (57.1) |
| NRC | 97.3 (87.1) | 80.3 (71.9) | 89.0 (56.2) | 69.9 (44.1) | 94.6 (85.7) | 76.8 (69.6) |
| NWRC | 97.4 (87.0) | 79.6 (72.0) | 91.7  (73.5) | 67.7 (55.4) | 92.5 (81.0) | 83.1 (73.4) |
| SERC | 92.7 (65.9) | 74.5 (56.9) | 92.5  (72.5) | 75.5 (59.2) | 86.7 (73.3) | 72.2 (61.1) |
| SRC | 98.8 (90.0) | 76.6 (70.2) | 93.0 (77.5) | 71.7 (59.8) | 88.1 (87.8) | 68.5 (66.7) |
| SWC | 93.0 (88.4) | 78.4 (74.5) | 94.4 (83.3) | 70.8 (62.5) | 100  (77.8) | 75.0  (58.3) |

It is pleasing to note that in the majority of cases the Success 2 benchmark for full-time HE provision was met. However, the significant increase in Success between the June Boards and the resit boards is worth noting and action still needs to be taken to address poor first sit performance.

**Table 2.3: Access Courses**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Full-Time** | | **Part-Time** | |
| **Success 1** | **Success 2** | **Success 1** | **Success 2** |
| BMC | 93.3 (86.7) | 63.6 (59.1) | 83.3 (79.2) | 60.6 (57.6) |
| NRC | 91.5 (74.1) | 67.5 (53.8) | 95.1 (77.6) | 69.7 (57.2) |
| NWRC | 88.0 (70.3) | 54.0 (43.0) | 92.5 (80.5) | 71.3 (62.2) |
| SRC | 80.6 (69.7) | 53.4 (46.6) | 85.8 (71.8) | 58.6 (50.2) |
| SWC | 88.2 (76.5) | 56.6  (49.1) | 76.4 (70.3) | 56.7 (53.6) |

It is worrying to note that of those Colleges offering Access Diplomas none met the Success 2 benchmark for either full-time or part-time mode of study.

Members are asked to provide an explanation as to why performance was so poor on Access programmes and suggest what actions need to be taken to address this problem.