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**Executive summary**

This paper provides a brief overview of the use of extenuating circumstances procedures by students in the academic year 2011-12. Data and analysis on equal opportunities monitoring are included.
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1. **Introduction**
	1. This report covers the operation of extenuating circumstances procedures for the year 2011-12. All the data shown is for this institution only, as collaborative partners manage their own extenuation claims.

1.2 There were no changes to our procedures for extenuating circumstances in 2011-12, although we did introduce some additional guidance materials to help students understand and engage with our procedures. In October 2012 we added a short video produced by UELSU to our online guidance notes, in order to provide students with a clear and concise introduction to the extenuation process. We also introduced a generic feedback system. When students apply for extenuation but are unsuccessful they are issued with a feedback code, accessible via UEL Direct, which points students to some general guidelines about why the claim was unsuccessful.

1. **Summary of Claims**

2.1 Students must make a separate claim for each component of assessment for which they seek to have their extenuating circumstances considered. Table 1 overleaf provides a short summary of extenuation claims by component, received over Semesters A, B and the reassessment period in 2011-12.

**Table 1: Number of component claims by school 2011-12**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | ACE | ADI | CASS | HSB | LLS | PSY | RDBS | Total |
| Sem A | 56 | 104 | 90 | 162 | 178 | 104 | 93 | 787 |
| Accept | 27 | 62 | 42 | 99 | 125 | 62 | 57 | 474 |
| Reject | 29 | 42 | 48 | 63 | 53 | 42 | 36 | 313 |
| Sem B | 94 | 155 | 80 | 172 | 166 | 114 | 65 | 846 |
| Accept | 58 | 86 | 56 | 103 | 91 | 71 | 44 | 509 |
| Reject | 36 | 69 | 24 | 69 | 75 | 43 | 21 | 337 |
| Resit | 21 | 26 | 38 | 22 | 42 | 30 | 26 | 205 |
| Accept | 7 | 7 | 15 | 4 | 19 | 12 | 13 | 77 |
| Reject | 14 | 19 | 23 | 18 | 23 | 18 | 13 | 128 |
| **Total** | **171** | **285** | **208** | **356** | **386** | **248** | **184** | **1838** |

Having risen year on year since 2005, the number of claims peaked in 2009-10, and has fallen slightly in recent years (see Chart 1a below).

**Chart 1a: total number of extenuation claims since 2005**

Although enrolments have fallen by about 4.5% since 2009-10, the 20% fall in the number of claims has been proportionately greater, with no obvious explanation for this.

2.2 Academic schools typically show distinctive patterns of extenuation activity. Table 2a overleaf shows the percentage of students from each school who made at least one claim for extenuation in 2011-12:

**Table 2a: extenuation activity by academic school**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Students who applied | Enrolments | %Students who applied |
| ACE | 94 | 2696.3 | 3.5% |
| ADI | 138 | 3012.1 | 4.6% |
| CASS | 111 | 3004.3 | 3.7% |
| HSB | 182 | 2615.9 | 7.0% |
| LLS | 184 | 2377.8 | 7.7% |
| PSY | 121 | 2127.6 | 5.7% |
| RDBS | 96 | 2858.5 | 3.4% |

Under the old school structure, Law and Psychology students tended to be most likely to apply for extenuation, while CITE and AVA students were least likely to apply. The same trends can be detected in the above figures although, unusually, HSB students generated a larger proportion of claims than Psychology students in 2011-12.

2.3 In 2011-12 the overall percentage of successful claims was 57.7%

**Table 2b: % Accepted claims by semester**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | % Accept |
| Sem A | 60.2% |
| Sem B | 60.2% |
| Resit | 37.6% |
| Total | 57.7% |

 As modules are capped if not passed on the first attempt, claims for reassessment are more likely to result in a technical reject. When the reassessment period is taken out of the calculation, the average success rate for 2011-12 is 60.2**%** (see Table 2b).

Success rates for semesters A and B in previous academic years are years are shown in Chart 2c below:

**Chart 2c: % claims accepted annual comparison**

1. **Feedback for Rejected Claims**

3.1 In 2011-12 a new system was introduced to give students a generic feedback code for rejected claims. Previously, students had not been given any official feedback on their claims, although it was possible for students to seek feedback from the Students Union Advice and Information Service on an individual basis.

Of the claims which were rejected, the breakdown of feedback codes was as follows:

**Table 3a – Reasons for rejection**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feedback Code | Sem A | Sem B | Sem R | Total |
| R1 - module capped | 8 | 5 | 56 | 69 |
| R2 - fourth attempt | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| R3 - coursework on time | 18 | 10 | 8 | 36 |
| R4 - failed another component | 0 | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| RC - did not meet criteria | 23 | 56 | 9 | 88 |
| RE - evidence insufficient | 181 | 213 | 47 | 441 |
| RL - late without good reason | 7 | 15 | 0 | 22 |
| RM - multiple | 63 | 16 | 5 | 84 |
| RN - not extenuation | 10 | 17 | 1 | 28 |
| B - failed evidence check | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

The largest category of rejected claims occurred where students had failed to supply adequate evidence for their claim. There was also a fairly substantial number of technical rejects (codes R1 – R4), most of which were submitted during the resit period.

A more detailed explanation of the feedback codes can be found on the extenuation website, <http://www.uel.ac.uk/qa/extenuation.htm>

1. **Mode of Study**

4.1 Since 2010-11 we have analysed claims by undergraduate and postgraduate status, and also noted the number of claims from home and international students.

As with last year’s report, we found that claims from home students were slightly more successful than claims from international students, but that there were no significant discrepancies (Table 4a overleaf). This year, postgraduate claims were on average slightly more successful than undergraduate claims (Table 4b overleaf)

**Table 4a: Number of claims accepted for Home / Overseas students 2011-12**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total** | **Accept** | **Reject** | **% Accepted** | **No. Students who applied** | **No. Enrolments** | **% Students who applied** |
| Home | 1725 | 1001 | 724 | 58.0% | 868 | 16829.84 | 5.2% |
| International | 113 | 60 | 53 | 53.1% | 57 | 2302 | 2.5% |
| **Total** | **1838** | **1061** | **777** | **57.7%** | **926** | **19131.84** | **4.8%** |

4.2 Home students were more likely to apply for extenuation than international students. This may be at least partly because some extenuation outcomes, such as repeating a module uncapped, are less useful to students whose visas only allow them to stay in the UK for a limited period.

Table 4b below illustrates that postgraduate students are much less likely to apply for extenuation than undergraduate students:

**Table 4b: Number of claims accepted for UG / PG students 2011-12**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total** | **Accept** | **Reject** | **% Accepted** | **No. Students who applied** | **No. Enrolments** | **% Students who applied** |
| Postgraduate | 145 | 98 | 47 | 67.6% | 79 | 4110 | 1.9% |
| Undergraduate | 1693 | 963 | 730 | 56.9% | 847 | 15021.84 | 5.6% |
| **Total** | **1838** | **1061** | **777** | **57.7%** | **926** | **19131.84** | 4.8% |

1. **Equality and Diversity Monitoring**

5.1 All equal opportunities monitoring data for this report was obtained from DELTA.

5.2 In order to maintain the fairness of our processes, all claims are considered anonymously by the extenuation panel. No data relating to the claimant’s gender, age, ethnicity or disability is included on the form or available to the panel members.

5.3 **Gender**

Our annual reports consistently demonstrate that female students are more likely to apply for extenuating circumstance than male students, and are also more likely to have their claims accepted. Table 5a below displays information about both the number of assessment components applied for by gender and the actual number of students who applied for extenuation by gender in 2011-12:

**Table 5a: Extenuation statistics for 2011-12 by gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **Component claims** | **Accepted** | **Rejected** | **%Accept** | **No. students who applied** | **No. students enrolled** | **%Students who applied** |
| Female | 1219 | 747 | 472 | 61.3% | 598 | 11071 | 5.4% |
| Male | 619 | 314 | 305 | 50.7% | 328 | 8056 | 4.1% |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 5 | 0.0% |
| Total | 1838 | 1061 | 777 | 57.7% | 926 | 19132 | 4.8% |

Female students accounted for over 66% of all claims (747 out of 1838), and over 70% of the successful claims (747 out of 1061). Nevertheless the figures illustrate that fewer students made applications for extenuation this year than in 2010-11, when 7.9% female students and 4.9% male students applied.

5.4 **Ethnicity**

Table 5b overleaf provides a breakdown by ethnicity of the number of extenuation claims received during 2011-12, and the number of students who submitted these claims:

**Table 5b: extenuation claims by ethnicity 2011-12**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Component claims | Accepted | Rejected | % Accept | No. students who applied | No. students enrolled | % Students who applied |
| ASIAN |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ASIAN OTHER | 65 | 42 | 23 | 64.6% | 36 | 941 | 3.8% |
| BANGLADESHI | 160 | 99 | 61 | 61.9% | 61 | 1165 | 5.2% |
| CHINESE | 7 | 5 | 2 | 71.4% | 5 | 193 | 2.6% |
| INDIAN | 59 | 44 | 15 | 74.6% | 31 | 1067 | 2.9% |
| PAKISTANI | 88 | 41 | 47 | 46.6% | 47 | 870 | 5.4% |
| subtotal | 379 | 231 | 148 | 60.9% | 180 | 4236 | 4.2% |
| BLACK |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| BLACK AFRICAN | 509 | 283 | 226 | 55.6% | 259 | 4367.67 | 5.9% |
| BLACK CARIBBEAN | 206 | 113 | 93 | 54.9% | 106 | 1353.67 | 7.8% |
| BLACK OTHER | 46 | 20 | 26 | 43.5% | 21 | 349 | 6.0% |
| subtotal | 761 | 416 | 345 | 54.7% | 386 | 6070.34 | 6.3% |
| WHITE |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| WHITE - BRITISH | 245 | 153 | 92 | 62.4% | 124 | 4256 | 2.9% |
| WHITE - IRISH | 19 | 14 | 5 | 73.7% | 9 | 293 | 3.1% |
| WHITE - SCOTTIS | 7 | 3 | 4 | 42.9% | 5 | 68 | 1.5% |
| OTHER WHITE | 84 | 48 | 36 | 57.1% | 45 | 1441.5 | 3.1% |
| subtotal | 355 | 218 | 137 | 61.4% | 183 | 6058.5 | 3.0% |
| MIXED |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| WHITE & AFRICAN | 30 | 15 | 15 | 50.0% | 21 | 245 | 8.6% |
| WHITE & ASIAN | 28 | 15 | 13 | 53.6% | 12 | 185 | 6.5% |
| WHITE & CARIBBE | 29 | 15 | 14 | 51.7% | 14 | 290 | 4.8% |
| OTHER MIXED | 51 | 40 | 11 | 78.4% | 25 | 417 | 6.0% |
| subtotal | 138 | 85 | 53 | 61.6% | 72 | 1137 | 6.3% |
| OTHER | 121 | 62 | 59 | 51.2% | 66 | 1184 | 5.6% |
| Unknown | 84 | 49 | 35 | 58.3% | 39 | 446 | 8.7% |
|  Total | 1838 | 1061 | 777 | 57.7% | 926 | 19131.84 | 4.8% |

As usual, there was an increased likelihood of applying through white (3.0%), asian (4.2%), and black or mixed race students (6.3%), although the fairly consistent success rate for all groups again attested to the equity of our system.

5.4 **Disability**

Table 5c below provides a breakdown of claims by disability:

**Table 5c: extenuation claims by disability 2011-12**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Component claims | Accepts | Reject | % Accept | No. Students who applied | No. Students enrolled | % Students who applied |
| No disability | 1392 | 794 | 598 | 57.0% | 717 | 17560.84 | 4.1% |
| Known disability | 446 | 267 | 179 | 59.9% | 209 | 1571 | 13.3% |
| Total | 1838 | 1061 | 777 | 57.7% | 926 | 19131.84 | 4.8% |

As we have seen in most previous years, students with a declared disability were more likely to apply for extenuation (13.3% of enrolments) than students with no known disability (4.1% enrolments). Claims for students with a known disability were also slightly more likely to be successful.

Table 5d below provides further information about the disability type of the applicants.

**Table 5d: Breakdown of claims by disability type**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disability type | component claims | Accept | Reject | %Accept | No. Students who applied | No. Students enrolled | % Students who applied |
| learning difficulty | 205 | 120 | 85 | 58.5% | 98 | 863 | 11.4% |
| mental health | 77 | 53 | 24 | 68.8% | 28 | 149 | 18.8% |
| multiple disabilities | 49 | 39 | 11 | 79.6% | 19 | 86 | 22.1% |
| physical impairment or mobility  | 23 | 8 | 15 | 34.8% | 13 | 81 | 16.0% |
| visual impairment | 9 | 4 | 5 | 44.4% | 4 | 24 | 16.7% |
| hearing impairment | 4 | 3 | 1 | 75.0% | 3 | 42 | 7.1% |
| health condition | 43 | 26 | 17 | 60.5% | 26 | 263 | 9.9% |
| communication impairment | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0% | 1 | 27 | 3.7% |
| other disability | 33 | 14 | 19 | 42.4% | 17 | 36 | 47.2% |
| **Total** | **446** | **267** | **179** | 59.9% | **209** | 1571 | 13.3% |

The high proportion of students with mental health issues or multiple disabilities making an extenuation claim in 2011-12 was fairly typical, and reflects the often unpredictable nature of such conditions. It should be borne in mind that the small number of students with some disabilities can lead to swings in the proportion of successful claims.

1. **Conclusions**

6.1 This year’s equal opportunities monitoring data indicates that our processes for extenuating circumstances operated with equity and consistency during the 2011-12 academic year.

6.2 The fall in the overall number of extenuation claims was surprising. We could speculate about a number of factors that might be behind this phenomenon – for example, the increased use of electronic submission for assessment, the use of more consistent submission procedures across schools, the improved quality of our student guidance materials, or perhaps even the rescheduled academic calendar of 2011-12, which changed the timing of assessments. Although it is too early to draw any conclusions, we will continue to monitor this trend over the next academic year.

**7. Recommendations**

7.1 Following the successful implementation of the feedback code system, we would recommend that IT Services implement the remainder of the online system for extenuation which has been in development since 2010-11. Currently, inaccurate assessment data provided by students can lead to the following outcomes:

 (i)     The claim is a technical reject due to lack of clear information

(ii)    The student may claim for some components of a module and forget to claim for others – resulting in a technical reject if the other components are not submitted

(iii)   The student may claim for the wrong module or component entirely.

At the moment, we expect students to supply detailed module and assessment information at a time when they may be ill or experiencing stressful situations. This may jeopardise their chance of success. Using the planned online application system, students could view their current student record and select the assessments they wished to apply for from this list, making errors far less likely.
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**Executive summary**

Academic Board requested additional comparative data in relation to the extenuating circumstances annual report 2011-12 presented at its meeting on 7 November 2012. This paper provides the requested statistical data.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1. **Introduction**
	1. This report provides additional comparative equality and diversity monitoring data, comparing the outcomes for 2011-12 with that for the 2 previous years. All the data shown is for this institution only, as collaborative partners manage their own extenuation claims. All equal opportunities monitoring data for this report was obtained from DELTA.
2. **Equality and Diversity Monitoring**

2.1 In order to maintain the fairness of our processes, all claims are considered anonymously by the extenuation panel. No data relating to the claimant’s gender, age, ethnicity or disability is included on the form or available to the panel members.

**2.2 Gender**

Our annual reports consistently demonstrate that female students are more likely to apply for extenuating circumstance than male students, and are also more likely to have their claims accepted. Fewer students made applications for extenuation this year than in both previous years. Acceptance rates, whilst variable across the three years, are broadly proportionate between male and female students.

Table 1: Success rates by gender over the past 3 years

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 |
|  | **Component claims** | **Accepted** | **% Accepted** |
| Female | 1219 | 1330 | 1563 | 747 | 778 | 966 | 61.3% | 58.5% | 61.8% |
| Male | 619 | 538 | 763 | 314 | 251 | 400 | 50.7% | 46.7% | 52.4% |
| Total | **1838** | **1868** | **2326** | **1061** | **1029** | **1366** | **57.7%** | **55.1%** | **58.7%** |

**2.3 Ethnicity**

Acceptance rates across the three years 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 show that ethnicity totals remain broadly similar, with Asian students at around 61%, black students 51-56%, white students 60-64%, mixed students at 62%. The average acceptance rate varies between 55-59%. Whilst there are variances by ethnic group within each of the three years, the fairly consistent success rate for all groups attests to the equity of our system.

Of the groups identified as outliers in terms of acceptance rates in the 2011/12 report (Indian, Pakistani, Black Other, Other Mixed), the table demonstrates that there is no particular pattern identified by these ethnic groups. For example, acceptance rates for Indian students have ranged from 55.1% to 74.6%, Pakistani students from 46.6% to 65.3%, Black Other 43.5% to 66.7% and Other Mixed 54.2% to 82.8%. There are similar disparities in relation to other groups in other years in the table below.

Table 2: success rates by ethnicity over the last 3 years

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 |
|  | **Component claims** | **Accepted** | **% Accepted** |
| Asian total | **379** | **395** | **397** | **231** | **244** | **240** | **60.9%** | **61.2%** | **60.5%** |
| Asian other | 65 | 81 | 79 | 42 | 52 | 47 | 64.6% | 64.2% | 59.5% |
| Bangladeshi | 160 | 103 | 135 | 99 | 62 | 85 | 61.9% | 60.2% | 63.0% |
| Chinese | 7 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 71.4% | 66.7% | 80.0% |
| Indian | 59 | 78 | 80 | 44 | 43 | 52 | 74.6% | 55.1% | 65.0% |
| Pakistani | 88 | 124 | 98 | 41 | 81 | 52 | 46.6% | 65.3% | 53.1% |
| Black total | **761** | **780** | **1057** | **416** | **396** | **597** | **54.7%** | **50.8%** | **56.5%** |
| Black African | 509 | 532 | 655 | 283 | 279 | 345 | 55.6% | 52.4% | 52.7% |
| Black Caribbean | 206 | 185 | 336 | 113 | 80 | 208 | 54.9% | 43.2% | 61.9% |
| Black other | 46 | 63 | 66 | 20 | 37 | 44 | 43.5% | 58.7% | 66.7% |
| White total | **355** | **350** | **378** | **218** | **210** | **244** | **61.4%** | **60.0%** | **64.6%** |
| White - British | 245 | 253 | 294 | 153 | 148 | 192 | 62.4% | 58.5% | 65.3% |
| White - Irish | 19 | 22 | 20 | 14 | 15 | 12 | 73.7% | 68.2% | 60.0% |
| White - Scottish | 7 | 0 | 7 | 3 |  | 6 | 42.9% |  | 85.7% |
| Other white | 84 | 75 | 57 | 48 | 47 | 34 | 57.1% | 62.7% | 59.6% |
| Mixed total | **138** | **114** | **204** | **85** | **71** | **128** | **61.6%** | **62.3%** | **62.7%** |
| White & African | 30 | 16 | 60 | 15 | 7 | 42 | 50.0% | 43.8% | 70.0% |
| White & Asian | 28 | 10 | 26 | 15 | 6 | 16 | 53.6% | 60% | 61.5% |
| White & Caribbean | 29 | 30 | 46 | 15 | 10 | 31 | 51.7% | 33.3% | 67.4% |
| Other mixed | 51 | 58 | 72 | 40 | 48 | 39 | 78.4% | 82.8% | 54.2% |
| Other  | **121** | **91** | **120** | **62** | **37** | **64** | **51.2%** | **40.7%** | **53.3%** |
| Not known | 84 | 138 | 170 | 49 | 71 | 93 | 58.3% | 51.4% | 54.7% |
| Grand total | **1838** | **1868** | **2326** | **1061** | **1029** | **1366** | **57.7%** | **55.1%** | **58.7%** |

In relation to the different acceptance rates, it is notable that there is a much larger number of applications from black students that the Asian and white ethnic groups:

Table 3: Application rates as a proportion of total student numbers in each category:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 |
| Asian  | 4.2% | 5.1% | 4.8% |
| Black  | 6.3% | 7.8% | 9.3% |
| White  | 3% | 3.5% | 4% |
| Mixed  | 6.3% | 6.3% | 8.6% |
| Other  | 5.6% | 4.7% | 5.4% |

**2.4 Disability**

In two of the last three years, students with known disabilities were slightly more successful in claiming extenuation. The high proportion of students with mental health issues or multiple disabilities making a successful extenuation claim in 2011-12 was fairly typical, and reflects the often unpredictable nature of such conditions. The small number of students with some disabilities can lead to swings in the proportion of successful claims.

Table 4: Success rates for students with a disability

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 |
|  | **Component claims** | **Accepted** | **% Accepted** |
| No disability | 1392 | 1508 | 1798 | 794 | 839 | 1040 | 57.0% | 55.6% | 57.8% |
| Known disability | 446 | 339 | 528 | 267 | 176 | 326 | 59.9% | 51.9% | 61.7% |
| Total | 1838 | 1847 | 2326 | 1061 | 1015 | 1364 | 57.7% | 55.1% | 58.7% |

Table 5: success rates by disability type over the last 3 years

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 | 2011/12 | 2010/11 | 2009/10 |
|  | **Component claims** | **Accepted** | **% Accepted** |
| Learning difficulty | 205 | 150 | 265 | 120 | 72 | 162 | 58.5% | 48.0% | 61.1% |
| Mental health | 77 | 47 | 55 | 53 | 33 | 37 | 68.8% | 70.2% | 67.3% |
| Multiple disabilities | 49 | 43 | 34 | 39 | 27 | 29 | 79.6% | 62.8% | 85.3% |
| Physical impairmnt or mobility | 23 | 30 | 23 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 34.8% | 33.3% | 52.2% |
| Visual impairmnt | 9 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 44.4% | 0.0% | 33.3% |
| Hearing impairmnt | 4 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 75.0% | 85.7% | 40.0% |
| Health condition | 43 | 25 |  | 26 | 11 |  | 60.5% | 44.0% |  |
| Communication impairmnt | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0.0% |  |  |
| Other disability | 33 | 34 | 136 | 14 | 17 | 81 | 42.4% | 50.0% | 59.6% |
| Total | 446 | 339 | 528 | 267 | 176 | 326 | 59.9% | 51.9% | 61.7% |

Note: The higher proportion of other for 2009/10 relates to the way in which the reporting from Delta was carried out