



UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICHESTER

CELEBRATING  
180 YEARS  
OF HIGHER  
EDUCATION

---

# DEGREE OUTCOMES STATEMENT

---

The purpose of this Statement is to articulate how the University of Chichester meets the expectation that “The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards”. The principal authority rests with the Academic Board, with operational implementation overseen by the Academic Standards Committee, primarily through its oversight of the programme approval and annual monitoring procedures, and through oversight of external examiners’ reports.

## Teaching practices and learning resources

Dr Ray Bachan (University of Brighton), in “The drivers of degree classifications” (UUK 2018) notes that a rise in the proportion of upper degrees is accompanied by improvements in university efficiency, such as the introduction of better learning and teaching methods and curriculum developments that produce high-achieving graduates. The University of Chichester has invested heavily in learning and teaching and in its curriculum, building on its high TEF Silver rating and continuing to situate student experience and satisfaction, welfare and wellbeing at the heart of what we see as a transformational educational and personal journey. Improvements in learning and teaching, and in resources have supported an increase in the award of Firsts and 2:1s.

As the number of HEA Fellows has increased at the University, so have the number of Firsts and 2:1s awarded. In 2015, the University had seven HEA Fellows, while now it has 87 (2019), including a Principal Fellow and nine Senior Fellows. We believe this demonstrates our commitment to highly professionalised teaching staff as well as evidence for teaching quality excellence, which supports the classification profile of the University. In addition, we continue to prioritise enhancements to teaching practices, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) is leading various initiatives designed to refresh staff awareness of institutionally-agreed threshold expectations and best practice in specific key areas during 2019/20 including for example, assessment practice. This includes consideration of feedback to students on their work, and approaches to marking – which builds upon the University’s work on online submission, grading, feedback and return of work in response to observations from students and the University’s external examiners. Further detail is contained within the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Strategy 2018-2025 (<https://www.chi.ac.uk/about-us/mission-and-vision/university-chichester-strategic-plan-2018-2025/core-strategies>).

Bachan (2018) further observes that “There is a positive relationship between university spending on staff and student facilities and upper degrees, with both variables increasing over time.” Since 2010, the University has invested over £50m on new teaching spaces, sports facilities, and learning resources, including a new Learning and Resource Centre at the Bognor Regis Campus, a new Music building at the Bishop Otter Campus, and new academic buildings – including a HEFCE/LEP supported industry-standard creative/digital technologies, engineering, design and business facility on the Bognor Regis campus. We have also invested significantly in staffing, reducing the staff:student ratio from 18.4 in 2010 to 15.1. We have targeted expenditure where most needed by students, with additional funding going to supporting students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties, to the hardship fund, to additional staffing to support students with mental health difficulties, to appointing academic skills advisers, to supporting students' transition to University, to developing a peer mentoring scheme, and to enhancing the academic adviser system.

We completely refurbished the Learning Resource Centre at our Chichester campus to include a café plus opportunities for social learning spaces. The same theme runs through our Tech Park at our Bognor campus, in that we incorporated social learning spaces to encourage and respond to this style of teaching. We introduced social learning spaces in other buildings, with the aim of increasing the “stickiness” of spaces for students to improve dwell time in our University facilities. This was a deliberate policy to make spaces more attractive and comfortable to encourage community and social learning.

## Assessment and marking practices

Our programmes are designed and approved taking account of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, the relevant subject benchmark statements, and the appropriate elements of the UK Quality Code for HE (Quality Code). The approval process itself was designed taking account of the European Standards and Guidelines (2015) and the appropriate elements of the Quality Code.

Approvals panels are guided to comment upon intended learning outcomes, whether assessment tasks enable students to demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes, and whether assessment criteria enable tutors to discern whether the outcomes have been achieved. The University then uses grading criteria to identify how well a student has achieved those outcomes. To ascertain this, approval panels are provided with the student programme handbook, containing detailed module descriptors. The University is reviewing its grading descriptors to ensure they are in line with expectations set out in QAA's "Outcome classification descriptions" (2019).

The University's Director of Quality and Standards was a member of the QAA's writing group for the section of the Quality Code on "External expertise" and the University is confident it meets the requirements and coheres with the expectations articulated in its use of external expertise. All approval panels have at least one academic external to the University with appropriate subject expertise, and draw in colleagues from Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies and/or industry fora where required. Criteria for appointment include a requirement for expertise in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, the sector-recognised standard.

The University employs a system of moderation (where a moderator samples the marking of the tutor), which is then subject to external examining, before grades are confirmed by the Board of Examiners. We believe our approach to be effective, as confirmed by our external examiner reports. Quality management activities including annual monitoring and periodic review provide other sources of evidence for the effectiveness of the University's approach. External examiners confirm that sector-recognised standards are met, and that standards set for awards are appropriate, and that standards of student achievement are comparable with those elsewhere. This ensure consistency in marking, alongside the use of anonymous marking, where possible.

The Director of Quality and Standards participated in the pilot for the AdvanceHE Professional Development for external examiners and has completed their 'develop the developer' training. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) is also undertaking these activities, enabling the University to offer its own AdvanceHE Professional Development Course to its own staff. This supports the development of the University's academic staff, alongside a wide-ranging professional development programme, as well as the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching, leading to HEA Fellowship.

In terms of resit limits (noting that some programmes are directly impacted by specific PSRB requirements in this regard) students are permitted one further sit at the discretion of the Board of Examiners. In some instances, students may be permitted an exceptional third sit at the discretion of the Board of Examiners, where there is no opportunity to take an alternate module, for example. Where claims for mitigating circumstances have been accepted, a new first sit is set. Claims are only allowable in the case of failure, and cannot be used to improve grades. Consistency is assured through detailed processes and decisions made by the Board of Examiners. Appeals are dealt with consistently through the use of a single point of contact, and through all appeals being Chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, and through the use of experienced Chairs of Boards of Examiners acting as members of appeals panels.

## Academic governance

In regard to partnerships, the University's liaison tutors work closely with each academic partner on their marking practices, and moderate a sample of work. The outcomes of this moderation exercise are reported to the Academic Partnerships Forum. Where the University franchises a programme to a number of partners, calibration activities are undertaken, and we believe this to be an area of good practice. University and partner staff meet to exchange samples of work and to ensure marking is consistent across the University and its partners.

All new academic partnerships are approved by the Academic Board. Reporting is extensive, and includes commentary on aims and outcomes, curriculum, assessment, learning resources, learning and teaching strategies, and student support. The commentary is accompanied by checklists confirming that the partner is cognisant of the University's Academic Regulations.

The Academic Standards Committee (ASC), chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, has delegated authority (from the Academic Board) for the appointment of external examiners. Applications are screened initially by the ASC Scrutiny Group, which will only allow such to proceed if they meet the criteria for appointment and have no conflict of interest. Consideration at the ASC adds a further layer of security to the appointment of external examiners of high quality.

Similarly, the ASC has delegated authority (from the Academic Board) for the approval and re-approval of programmes of study. A panel presents its conclusion with conditions and/or recommendations to the ASC Scrutiny Group. As with external examiner applications, the Scrutiny Group carefully considers whether the identified conditions and/or recommendations have been fully met, before forwarding on to the ASC for formal and final approval.

The Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee (LTSEC) is responsible for the implementation of the University's Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Strategy. This includes a commitment to disseminating good practice in relation to assessment through a cross-institutional conference and discussion and review of this strategy.

Prior to this Degree Outcomes Statement being reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee, the Academic Board and then the Board of Governors, it was reviewed by the Chief External Examiner for the University.

## Classification algorithms

The Director of Quality and Standards was involved with the initial work undertaken by UUK and GuildHE on "Understanding degree algorithms" in 2017, which prompted the commencement of a review of the University's Academic Regulations. Although these are reviewed and refreshed each year, this allowed a comprehensive review of the algorithm used in the classification of degrees, and specifically the University's approach to 'automatic uplifts'.

The University recognised that the 'automatic uplift' regulation was contributing to an artificial change in graduate attainment through, in effect, lowering grade boundaries. The University further considered the consultation: Degree classification – transparent, consistent and fair academic standards (Bachan, 2018) and a Technical report: The drivers of degree classifications (Bachan, 2018) in this specific area, and concluded that the 'automatic uplift' rule should be removed from the Academic Regulations for entry from September 2019. Research into sector practice evidenced this as the most commonly-adopted approach. Modelling demonstrates that this will reduce the number of Firsts and 2:1s awarded by 5%.

The algorithm for all undergraduate students is based upon a 40/60 weighting (i.e. the second year/Level 5 provides 40% of the outcome, and the third year/Level 6, 60% of the outcome). The higher weighting we give to the final year of study reflects 'exit velocity' and also reflects the notion that as students progress through their programme of study it becomes more difficult. Similarly, we do not weight the first year of study – as a University with a remit for widening participation, we focus on a transition to higher education during this year. All marks are included in the calculation from Level 5 and Level 6. There remains a 'rounding-up' rule for students the very edge of the boundary of the classification (a student with 69.6% will have their mark rounded up to 70% for a First). The Academic Regulations are available to all students on the University website and referenced in student programme handbooks.

In relation to The drivers of degree classifications publication (2018), Bachan points out that "In the case of all universities, a 10% rise in the percentage of females in the graduating cohort leads to a 1.2 percentage-point increase in upper degrees". The University has a significant proportion of female students in relation to male (63% versus 37%).

Bachan also comments on well-established literature that asserts prior entry qualifications (A-levels, BTECs, Scottish Highers, for example) are significant determinants of classification outcomes, while a 10% increase in the proportion of SET (science, engineering, technology) subjects studied reduces upper degrees in the model by about 0.2

percentage points. Although the University has recently introduced engineering, no students as yet have graduated from the programmes, so it is not possible to ascertain any effect the subject may have on overall achievement. We attract students with a significant range of entry qualifications.

## Identifying good practice and actions

We believe that calibration activities undertaken in specific areas, such as in Early Childhood, set examples of good practice. This particular programme is offered by five of our partner colleges as well as by the University itself. Colleagues from the colleges meet with colleagues from the University to share samples of student work and ensure that all are marking consistently to ensure comparability of standards in marking and assessment across the programmes. There may be opportunity to extend this to other areas within the University itself.

Some disciplines use a number of Associate Lecturers and to ensure consistency in marking and to ensure appropriate differentiation in grading, a statement bank as a starter for evaluating grading and writing feedback has been created. This might usefully be shared with other disciplines in the University.

## Risks and challenges for the next 12 months

- I. The University is reviewing its grading descriptors to ensure they are in line with expectations set out in QAA's "Outcome classification descriptions";
- II. The University will continue to identify measures regarding the positive effects of teaching quality and investment;
- III. The University will further consider the use of calibration activities;
- IV. The University will use its annual monitoring procedure to consider variation in awards across the University;
- V. The University will continue to consider BAME achievement and male achievement and will progress understanding of awarding gaps and identify mechanisms to support achievement, where required and in accordance with our Access and Participation Plan.

We anticipate that this Degree Outcomes Statement will be reviewed and refreshed annually by the Academic Board and Board of Governors, and see this first iteration as the start of a continuing scrutiny by the University into an extraordinarily complex area.

Katie Akerman MA (Exon) PgCert Dip.Q FAUA PFHEA FRSA

Director of Quality and Standards

## Institutional degree classification profile

Data from the Office for Students indicates that for the University overall:

	Percentage of Firsts/2:1s overall	Percentage of Firsts
2017/18	74.9	17.1
2016/17	71.1	15.4
2015/16	73.3	13.9

For the Business School, the lowering of entry qualifications coincides with 67.7% of students gaining a First or 2:1, which is below the University average.

For the Conservatoire, entry qualifications are higher than the University average, and 78% of students are female, with 87.5% of students gaining a First or 2:1.

For Creative and Digital Technologies, 84.4% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; above the University average. This is not explained by entry qualifications or gender, and requires further consideration.

For Arts and Humanities, 80.4% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; above the University average. 83.3% of BAME students achieve a First or 2:1 compared to 80.2% of white students.

For Education, Health and Social Sciences, 81.7% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; above the University average. This is partly explained by gender but not by entry qualifications.

For Sport, 61.5% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; below the University average. This can partly be explained by gender.

## Changes in graduate attainment - number and percentage of Firsts/2:1s

		2014/15	2014/15	2015/16	2015/16	2016/17	2016/17	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19
Grouping	Value	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
<b>Business School</b>											
Age	Under 21	49.0%	47	68.0%	87	59.4%	48	61.6%	53	67.4%	32
	21-24	23.5%	4	26.1%	12	45.9%	18	45.5%	10	70.0%	7
	25-29	100.0%	2	80.0%	4	75.0%	3	100.0%	4	75.0%	3
	30-39	33.3%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	-	0	75.0%	3
	40-49	-	0	100.0%	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	0
	50+	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0
	Disability	Not Disabled	46.7%	50	57.2%	96	56.3%	67	61.2%	63	67.2%
Dyslexic		44.4%	4	75.0%	9	25.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	2
Other Disability		0.0%	0	66.7%	2	83.3%	5	75.0%	3	75.0%	3
Ethnicity	BAME	34.3%	12	27.5%	13	42.9%	21	38.1%	16	47.1%	8
	White	56.5%	39	77.4%	89	68.1%	51	72.9%	51	76.6%	36
	Unknown	21.4%	3	25.0%	5	19.0%	1	100.0%	1	40.0%	1
Gender	Male	32.2%	19	49.5%	46	61.0%	44	42.3%	22	55.7%	17
	Female	59.3%	35	67.9%	61	50.9%	29	75.4%	46	77.8%	28
Tariff	-	45.8%	54	58.5%	107	49.1%	27	47.2%	17	59.6%	14
	000-047	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	-	0
	048-095	-	0	-	0	51.6%	16	54.8%	17	60.0%	9
	096-143	-	0	-	0	74.2%	23	66.7%	18	73.3%	11
	144-191	-	0	-	0	75.0%	6	78.6%	11	83.3%	10
	192-239	-	0	-	0	50.0%	1	100.0%	3	100.0%	1
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Conservatoire</b>											
Age	Under 21	88.8%	151	83.2%	164	81.5%	192	83.6%	247	87.3%	258
	21-24	89.5%	17	100.0%	9	78.6%	11	71.4%	5	87.8%	18
	25-29	88.9%	2	100.0%	1	66.7%	2	60.0%	2	100.0%	2

	30-39	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	1	-	0
	40-49	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	3	-	0	100.0%	1
	50+	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	-	0
Disability	Not Disabled	87.5%	140	84.1%	154	80.5%	171	83.8%	204	88.7%	225
	Dyslexic	95.2%	20	94.1%	16	87.0%	20	76.7%	33	78.4%	20
	Other Disability	88.9%	10	70.0%	7	86.4%	19	86.4%	19	85.2%	35
Ethnicity	BAME	57.1%	4	65.7%	6	100.0%	19	81.8%	23	83.7%	21
	White	89.4%	163	84.8%	168	80.1%	191	83.1%	234	87.6%	255
	Unknown	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	-	0	-	0	100.0%	4
Gender	Male	80.9%	35	89.2%	42	75.2%	41	76.6%	48	85.3%	58
	Female	90.6%	135	82.8%	135	83.3%	169	84.6%	209	88.0%	221
Tariff	-	88.4%	170	84.2%	177	87.5%	7	80.0%	8	85.7%	15
	000-047	-	0	-	0	80.0%	4	100.0%	2	100.0%	3
	048-095	-	0	-	0	88.0%	22	72.2%	26	76.3%	23
	096-143	-	0	-	0	76.3%	90	77.7%	89	85.0%	117
	144-191	-	0	-	0	85.2%	72	89.3%	108	90.9%	90
	192-239	-	0	-	0	85.7%	12	100.0%	20	96.6%	28
	240-287	-	0	-	0	100.0%	3	60.0%	3	100.0%	4
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Creative &amp; Digital Technologies</b>											
Age	Under 21	81.4%	18	84.1%	19	88.8%	32	90.1%	32	84.3%	30
	21-24	100.0%	1	60.0%	2	75.0%	3	-	0	80.0%	2
	25-29	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
	30-39	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0
	40-49	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	50+	-	0	-	0	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0
Disability	Not Disabled	80.5%	17	80.9%	19	87.4%	28	88.5%	27	87.5%	25
	Dyslexic	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	83.3%	5	100.0%	4	57.1%	2
	Other Disability	100.0%	2	-	0	75.0%	3	100.0%	2	85.7%	6
Ethnicity	BAME	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	66.7%	2	55.6%	3	60.0%	2
	White	81.4%	18	83.3%	20	89.1%	33	95.3%	31	86.1%	31
	Unknown	-	0	-	0	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0



Gender	Male	75.0%	6	78.6%	11	83.2%	20	81.1%	15	83.3%	20
	Female	86.7%	13	85.7%	9	88.9%	16	100.0%	18	86.2%	13
Tariff	-	82.6%	19	81.6%	20	65.2%	4	-	0	85.7%	3
	000-047	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0
	048-095	-	0	-	0	77.8%	7	82.6%	10	86.7%	7
	096-143	-	0	-	0	88.2%	15	91.7%	17	76.9%	15
	144-191	-	0	-	0	100.0%	8	100.0%	5	100.0%	6
	192-239	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	2
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Institute of Arts &amp; Humanities</b>											
Age	Under 21	77.0%	158	73.0%	126	76.9%	105	78.8%	119	81.1%	183
	21-24	87.0%	20	87.1%	14	73.2%	13	84.6%	11	69.2%	9
	25-29	63.2%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	80.0%	4	50.0%	1
	30-39	77.8%	4	100.0%	4	85.7%	6	100.0%	4	85.7%	6
	40-49	100.0%	7	100.0%	4	70.0%	7	80.0%	4	100.0%	3
	50+	100.0%	6	77.8%	7	77.8%	7	88.2%	8	75.0%	6
	Disability	Not Disabled	78.4%	153	76.9%	131	77.6%	115	80.4%	119	81.0%
Dyslexic		85.2%	23	82.4%	14	78.6%	11	80.0%	12	72.7%	16
Other Disability		76.1%	22	60.0%	12	71.4%	15	78.3%	18	81.6%	36
Ethnicity	BAME	54.8%	9	82.8%	12	62.5%	5	77.8%	7	83.3%	10
	White	80.1%	185	75.0%	144	77.7%	134	79.9%	139	80.2%	195
	Unknown	100.0%	4	100.0%	1	72.7%	2	100.0%	3	85.7%	3
Gender	Male	71.3%	59	72.4%	53	74.0%	49	72.8%	54	80.0%	82
	Female	82.6%	138	77.4%	105	78.6%	92	84.9%	96	80.7%	126
Tariff	-	78.9%	197	75.7%	157	77.0%	26	88.2%	15	74.3%	13
	000-047	-	0	-	0	75.0%	3	50.0%	3	66.7%	6
	048-095	-	0	-	0	63.6%	28	72.8%	38	72.9%	43
	096-143	-	0	-	0	81.9%	59	83.6%	77	81.0%	103
	144-191	-	0	-	0	83.0%	22	93.8%	15	91.7%	33
	192-239	-	0	-	0	100.0%	3	50.0%	2	100.0%	7
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	3

	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Institute of Education, Health &amp; Social Sciences</b>											
Age	Under 21	69.4%	120	78.2%	147	77.7%	143	84.5%	147	87.2%	136
	21-24	80.6%	29	71.4%	35	78.4%	29	65.8%	25	71.4%	25
	25-29	76.2%	16	79.3%	23	69.2%	9	67.9%	19	73.1%	19
	30-39	54.5%	12	82.6%	19	66.7%	16	88.5%	23	87.0%	20
	40-49	75.0%	18	94.4%	17	83.3%	25	90.9%	20	80.0%	16
	50+	80.0%	4	85.7%	6	66.7%	2	83.3%	5	75.0%	9
Disability	Not Disabled	72.4%	165	79.1%	208	78.5%	186	82.5%	198	83.0%	181
	Dyslexic	57.6%	19	75.0%	21	68.8%	22	77.1%	27	82.8%	24
	Other Disability	75.0%	15	78.3%	18	72.7%	16	73.7%	14	80.0%	20
Ethnicity	BAME	44.4%	8	70.6%	12	76.2%	16	58.8%	10	57.9%	11
	White	72.5%	187	79.0%	233	77.0%	204	82.6%	228	84.5%	213
	Unknown	80.0%	4	100.0%	2	80.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
Gender	Male	61.4%	27	75.0%	30	77.5%	31	79.4%	27	79.3%	23
	Female	72.6%	172	79.2%	217	76.9%	193	81.5%	212	83.1%	202
Tariff	-	70.8%	199	78.7%	247	74.7%	59	75.3%	73	71.6%	68
	000-047	-	0	-	0	83.3%	5	85.7%	6	100.0%	4
	048-095	-	0	-	0	69.8%	44	76.3%	45	81.3%	39
	096-143	-	0	-	0	80.7%	71	89.4%	76	89.0%	65
	144-191	-	0	-	0	80.4%	37	83.3%	35	93.6%	44
	192-239	-	0	-	0	100.0%	7	100.0%	4	100.0%	5
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	288-335	-	0	-	0	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0
<b>Institute of Sport</b>											
Age	Under 21	61.0%	192	63.2%	194	54.4%	162	55.6%	145	59.4%	164
	21-24	38.2%	13	42.9%	12	52.4%	11	59.3%	16	73.1%	19
	25-29	77.8%	7	100.0%	2	75.0%	3	66.7%	2	100.0%	4
	30-39	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%	1	75.0%	3	100.0%	1
	40-49	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0
	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0

Disability	Not Disabled	60.9%	190	62.0%	183	53.7%	153	57.2%	143	61.2%	159
	Dyslexic	52.9%	18	58.1%	18	73.3%	22	48.6%	18	60.5%	23
	Other Disability	40.0%	6	62.5%	10	30.0%	3	62.5%	5	66.7%	6
Ethnicity	BAME	34.8%	8	60.0%	9	19.0%	4	33.3%	7	41.2%	7
	White	60.9%	206	61.8%	202	57.2%	174	58.5%	159	62.6%	181
	Unknown	-	0	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Gender	Male	53.9%	123	56.3%	117	48.1%	104	48.9%	90	53.1%	103
	Female	68.4%	91	70.1%	94	67.9%	74	68.5%	76	75.2%	85
Tariff	-	59.3%	214	61.7%	211	36.8%	7	63.2%	12	52.4%	11
	000-047	-	0	-	0	75.0%	6	62.5%	5	33.3%	2
	048-095	-	0	-	0	51.4%	37	60.0%	39	65.1%	41
	096-143	-	0	-	0	57.9%	62	55.8%	53	65.7%	69
	144-191	-	0	-	0	53.2%	58	52.0%	53	58.2%	64
	192-239	-	0	-	0	80.0%	8	66.7%	4	0.0%	0
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0