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Differential student outcomes

HEFCE historical work in area

• Differences observed in non-continuation, degree outcomes and employment rates;
• Multilevel approach;
• English sector;
• Historically used a tracking approach;
• More recent publications examining outcomes from a graduating cohort;
Differences in employment outcomes

Report comparing employment outcomes for graduates at 6 and 40 months for two cohorts of graduates.

• Latest report published August 2016.
• Interactive data available at hefce.ac.uk
• It builds on the analysis of a single cohort published in October 2015.
Differences in degree outcomes

Report analysing differences in the rates with which students from different groups are likely to attain a first or upper second class degree.

• Latest report published September 2015.
• It builds on the evidence base previously published in 2013 and 2014.
Comments on tentative conclusions from Bristol study

- Prior attainment (A level tariff and GCSE scores) were found to be statistically significant in predicting degree outcomes.
- These groups were typically found to perform less well than other students:
  - Students privately educated,
  - disabled,
  - with non-white ethnicity or
  - parents without higher education
Accounting for prior attainment is critical

- “How” you account for it is just as important
- Early 2000’s only had raw score based on A-levels with AAA (or higher) = 30 pts
- Combined tariff available in mid-2000’s
- Now A-level qualification by subject available (i.e. A grade in Chemistry)
- Considerations:
  - Truncation at higher levels
  - Volume vs level of achievement
  - Equivalence between A-level subjects
  - Equivalences to A-level (e.g. BTEC, Internal Bacc)
  - Institutional studies normally restricted to a narrow range of prior attainment due to admission conditions
Richer data – Same message

Source: HEFCE 2003/32
“Schooling effects in higher education”

Source: HEFCE 2015/21
“Differences in degree outcomes”
Degree outcomes for different groups

Percentage of students achieving an first or upper second by school type

Source: HESA Student Record 2013-14. Note: Full-time UK-domiciled first degree entrants at HEFCE-funded HEIs only.
Degree outcomes for different groups

Percentage of students achieving an first or upper second by ethnicity

Source: HESA Student Record 2013-14.
Note: Full-time UK-domiciled first degree entrants at HEFCE-funded HEIs only.
Degree outcomes for different groups

Percentage of students achieving an first or upper second by disability

Source: HESA Student Record 2013-14. Note: Full-time UK-domiciled first degree entrants at HEFCE-funded HEIs only.
Why differential outcomes?

There is clear evidence that the outcomes for some student groups are less good than those for others. But less good evidence on why.

HEFCE-commissioned report “Causes of differences in student outcomes” identified four types of explanatory factors:

• Curricula, learning and teaching practices
• Staff-student relationships (belonging)
• Differences in social, cultural and economic capital (hidden curriculum)
• Psychological and identity factors
What next for HEFCE analysis?

Improve understanding of differences and of causes

HEFCE work includes:

• Do some groups consistently make worse choices? A report on graduate satisfaction with HE choices coming soon.

• What role do pathways though HE play? Is it easier for some groups to transfer academic credit? Which students are more likely to return to HE after leaving?

• The importance of spatial mobility in achieving employment outcomes.
Potential lines of enquiry for Bristol study

• Use of richer A-level information available at the sector level, particularly with regard to subject combinations
• Does the raw data provide any information or pointers on the atypical lines/institutions in the random slopes for prior attainment relationships?
• Further breakdowns of ethnicity into finer non-white groups
• Does the picture change when focus is on firsts only, or wider outcome measures?
• Differences between Bristol departments that are atypical to the sector patterns
• Low performance school vs School type – Bristol only or across sector. Historical analysis indicates School Type is the dominant effect.
• Further local qualitative and soft intelligence from within the university to understand patterns in the data – local knowledge is key to gaining a better understanding of the drivers for observed differences
• Policy implications of GCSE relationships – is this just mopping up unrecorded/unaccounted for A-level differences? Or is there additional information not captured in A-level performance?
How to find out more

email hefce@hefce.ac.uk
Twitter http://twitter.com/hefce
website www.hefce.ac.uk

governance-hefce email distribution list
HEFCE update
monthly e-newsletter
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