

The  
Guardian  
University Guide 2021

TOP 30  
UK UNIVERSITY



UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICHESTER

# DEGREE OUTCOMES

## STATEMENT 2019/20

#CHIUNI      CHI.AC.UK

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.

### Update on actions (2018/19)

- I. The University is reviewing its grading descriptors to ensure they are in line with expectations set out in QAA’s “Outcome classification descriptions”.

This has been completed, and is addressed within the University’s Academic Regulations.

- II. There is significant variation across the University, with Firsts awarded ranging from 5.3% through to 64.3%, and further review activity is being undertaken to understand this.

This is ongoing. COVID-19 necessitated that the University adopt a policy to ensure no student was disadvantaged academically by the pandemic. This required the introduction of temporary academic regulations and a revised approach to the calculation of classifications for awards. It is, therefore, problematic to review data which is not consistent with the prior year, because of differences to the calculation of classification.

- III. Further consideration of BAME achievement and male achievement is in progress to understand any awarding gaps and identify mechanisms to support achievement, where required.

This is ongoing. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) is leading on a project to embed the ‘inclusive curriculum’ as outlined in the commitments made in the University’s Access and Participation Plan.

### Teaching practices and learning resources

The University of Chichester has invested heavily in learning and teaching and in its curriculum, continuing to situate the student learning experience and wellbeing at the heart of what we see as a transformational educational and personal journey.

The following will have had a positive impact on improving student attainment:

- Our ongoing commitment to continuing professional development for academic and professional services staff, which evidences our assurance on highly professionalised teaching staff as well as teaching quality excellence, including the AdvanceHE-accredited PgCert in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education
- An increased number of HEA Fellows at the University. In 2019, the University had 87 HEA Fellows, including a Principal Fellow and nine Senior Fellows. By 2020, the University had 131, including a Principal Fellow and 13 Senior Fellows.
- The University has refreshed its academic career progression advice and guidance, enabling the recognition and promotion of academic staff to professorial level in learning and teaching.
- Staff continue to contribute to the learning and teaching agenda nationally and internationally, through publications, including, Ritchie, L & Hall, B (2019). *Transitions: Becoming A Professional (Musician): Space for Performance*. In Bilham, T., Hamshire, C.,

Hartog, M., & Doolan, M. A. (Eds). Reframing Space for Learning: Excellence and Innovation in University Teaching. UCL IOE Press.: London; Cooper L, Reavey D (2021) Making change happen – civic engagement in practice. In Morley D, Jamil G (eds) Applied pedagogies for higher education. Real world learning and innovation across the curriculum, Palgrave Macmillan and <https://ponderinghe.podbean.com/e/first-person-writing/> (Rob Warwick and David Goodman).

- There is a positive relationship between university spending on staff and student facilities and upper degrees, with both variables increasing over time – in the last year, The University has invested over £500,000 on PC replacements, AV equipment, new astro turf, a gas analyser, Finopress, climbing mats and a Tobi eye tracker, for example.
- Teaching quality is evidenced by the National Student Survey on “The Teaching on my Course” and in the south-east we are ranked third out of 18. For Modern universities we are 1<sup>st</sup> in the south-east. Nationally we are 33<sup>rd</sup> for this indicator.
- We feature in The Guardian’s Top 30 and the Sunday Times’ Top 50.

## 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 following will have had a positive impact on improving student attainment:

- 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.
- The introduction of the UKSCQA degree classifications descriptions: grading criteria are designed to help students understand what is expected of them. The University has common university-level grading criteria with descriptors that provide comparability of standards across all taught programmes. The University criteria are used as a basis for subject-specific criteria that are relevant to the discipline and the forms of assessment used and these are shared with the students.
- Our Code of Practice for Assessment articulates our approach to assessment at the University.
- Improvements to assessment practice, including a more structured method of feedback has been developed and implemented successfully in Psychology. Through this method students receive 3-4 points of feedback for each of the assessment criteria for the assignments. In addition, the students are also provided a “feed-forward” for each of the assessment criteria. This has resulted in an increased engagement with feedback and has contributed to students using feedback from modules in a cross-sectional manner.

## Academic governance

The University’s Academic Board has responsibility for assuring the value of awards over time, including those delivered in partnership with others. To do this it receives an annual report on the outcome of the University’s quality review activities, which is subsequently submitted to the Office for Students to show how we are continuing to meet our conditions of registration.

The following will have had a positive impact on improving student attainment:

- In their annual report on the quality and standards of programmes, external examiners are asked to check and comment upon the standards of the qualification and of student performance is comparable with national frameworks and with the standards of similar programmes in other UK higher education institutions.

- External advisers are also employed as a key member of the University's periodic review process that considers and advises upon the academic standards of education provision, and enhancements to curricula and the student academic experience. This process is employed on a cyclical basis for departments/institutes.
- In regard to partnerships, the University's link 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.

The Degree Outcomes Statement was considered by the Academic Standards Committee, the Academic Board and then the Board of Governors.

## Classification algorithms

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 reflects the notion that as students progress through their programme of study it becomes more challenging and 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 is an automatic uplift rule for students the very edge of the boundary of the classification (for example, a student with 69.6% will have their mark rounded up to 70% for a First).

## Identifying good practice and actions

There are examples of good practice at both Institute and institutional level. For example, the Institute of Sports Generic MAF feedback template has been in circulation for a whole year and has been very positively received by the students, staff and the external examiners. The IOS continues to use this and will adapt some language for Masters provision as an enhancement. With greater consistency of its use, this should see further improvements in feedback scores and positive comments.

In International English Studies, individual non-assessed written work is regularly shared online by individuals with the group. Students are encouraged to upload their own video contributions via ChiPlayer. They can, for example, share self-made films of their accommodation & cities, or their views on a topic. Other students are encouraged to comment on the contributions. These are significant in forming a virtual community.

The University signed up as an 'early adopter' to the AdvanceHE work on degree standards and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) and Director of Quality and Standards will be leading the Professional Development Course for staff on external examining, which focusses on the maintenance of standards in assessment policy and practice and mechanisms for doing so, such as calibration activities.

The Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee is leading on a number of activities directly relating to the maintenance of standards, including moderation, and consistency in marking.

## Actions for 2020/21

- We will research “exit velocity” to inform any further development of the Academic Regulations and the degree classification algorithm;
- There is significant variation across the University in the number of Firsts awarded, and further review activity will be undertaken to understand this.
- Further consideration of BAME achievement and male achievement in in progress to understand any awarding gaps and identify mechanisms to support achievement, where required.
- 

## Risks and challenges

The sector has operated to a presumed theory of “exit velocity”, that students do better in their final year of study as they have learned more of their subject and have learned more about learning, and subsequently the classification of the award has been weighted in favour of the final year of study. However, there is limited evidence in this regard, and the University intend to research this area and any potential impact upon the algorithm in use to calculate classification.

This is the second annual iteration of our Degree Outcomes Statement and it will be reviewed and refreshed annually and see this second publication as the continuation 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  
2019/20 82.6  
2018/19 76.2  
2017/18 74.9  
2016/17 71.1

For the Business School, 61.7% of students gaining a First or 2:1, which is below the University average. This is a decrease on last year although qualification on entry has increased.

For the Conservatoire, entry qualifications are slightly lower than the University average, and 79% of students are female, with 91.1% of students gaining a First or 2:1.

For Creative and Digital Technologies, 95.7% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; above the University average. This is not explained by entry qualifications (lower than the University average or gender (only 40% of students are female), and requires further consideration.

For Arts and Humanities, 88.1% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; higher than the University average for 2019/20.

For Education, Health and Social Sciences, 90.7% 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, 66% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; below the University average. This can partly be explained by gender. Qualifications on entry are higher than the University average.

	Year	2015/16	2015/16	2016/17	2016/17	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2019/20
<b>Business School</b>											
Age	Under 21	68.0%	87	59.4%	48	61.6%	53	67.4%	32	69.4%	43
	21-24	26.1%	12	45.9%	18	45.5%	10	70.0%	7	35.3%	6
	25-29	80.0%	4	75.0%	3	100.0%	4	75.0%	3	0.0%	0
	30-39	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	-	0	75.0%	3	100.0%	1
	40-49	100.0%	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	-	0
	50+	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	-	0
Disability	Not Disabled	57.2%	96	56.3%	67	61.2%	63	67.2%	40	66.2%	45
	Dyslexic	75.0%	9	25.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	2	37.5%	3
	Other Disability	66.7%	2	83.3%	5	75.0%	3	75.0%	3	40.0%	2
Ethnicity	BAME	27.5%	13	42.9%	21	38.1%	16	47.1%	8	55.6%	15
	White	77.4%	89	68.1%	51	72.9%	51	76.6%	36	66.0%	35
	Unknown	25.0%	5	19.0%	1	100.0%	1	40.0%	1	0.0%	0
Gender	Male	49.5%	46	61.0%	44	42.3%	22	55.7%	17	46.9%	23
	Female	67.9%	61	50.9%	29	75.4%	46	77.8%	28	84.4%	27
Tariff	-	58.5%	107	49.1%	27	47.2%	17	59.6%	14	58.3%	14
	000-047	-	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	-	0	0.0%	0
	048-095	-	0	51.6%	16	54.8%	17	60.0%	9	69.2%	9
	096-143	-	0	74.2%	23	66.7%	18	73.3%	11	69.0%	20
	144-191	-	0	75.0%	6	78.6%	11	83.3%	10	45.5%	5
	192-239	-	0	50.0%	1	100.0%	3	100.0%	1	100.0%	2
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	<b>Conservatoire</b>										
Age	Under 21	83.2%	164	81.5%	192	83.6%	247	87.3%	258	91.0%	213
	21-24	100.0%	9	78.6%	11	71.4%	5	87.8%	18	91.3%	21
	25-29	100.0%	1	66.7%	2	60.0%	2	100.0%	2	-	0
	30-39	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0
	40-49	100.0%	1	100.0%	3	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0
	50+	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	-	0	-	0

Disability	Not Disabled	84.1%	154	80.5%	171	83.8%	204	88.7%	225	92.5%	186
	Dyslexic	94.1%	16	87.0%	20	76.7%	33	78.4%	20	86.4%	19
	Other Disability	70.0%	7	86.4%	19	86.4%	19	85.2%	35	85.3%	29
Ethnicity	BAME	65.7%	6	100.0%	19	81.8%	23	83.7%	21	80.0%	16
	White	84.8%	168	80.1%	191	83.1%	234	87.6%	255	91.9%	217
	Unknown	100.0%	3	-	0	-	0	100.0%	4	100.0%	1
Gender	Male	89.2%	42	75.2%	41	76.6%	48	85.3%	58	92.9%	39
	Female	82.8%	135	83.3%	169	84.6%	209	88.0%	221	90.7%	195
Tariff	-	84.2%	177	87.5%	7	80.0%	8	85.7%	15	90.0%	18
	000-047	-	0	80.0%	4	100.0%	2	100.0%	3	80.0%	4
	048-095	-	0	88.0%	22	72.2%	26	76.3%	23	76.0%	19
	096-143	-	0	76.3%	90	77.7%	89	85.0%	117	91.0%	91
	144-191	-	0	85.2%	72	89.3%	108	90.9%	90	94.2%	81
	192-239	-	0	85.7%	12	100.0%	20	96.6%	28	100.0%	19
	240-287	-	0	100.0%	3	60.0%	3	100.0%	4	100.0%	2
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Creative &amp; Digital Technologies</b>											
Age	Under 21	84.1%	19	88.8%	32	90.1%	32	84.3%	30	98.1%	51
	21-24	60.0%	2	75.0%	3	-	0	80.0%	2	100.0%	4
	25-29	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	66.7%	1
	30-39	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0
	40-49	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0
	50+	-	0	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0	-	0
Disability	Not Disabled	80.9%	19	87.4%	28	88.5%	27	87.5%	25	94.0%	39
	Dyslexic	100.0%	1	83.3%	5	100.0%	4	57.1%	2	100.0%	10
	Other Disability	-	0	75.0%	3	100.0%	2	85.7%	6	100.0%	7
Ethnicity	BAME	0.0%	0	66.7%	2	55.6%	3	60.0%	2	80.0%	4
	White	83.3%	20	89.1%	33	95.3%	31	86.1%	31	97.1%	51
	Unknown	-	0	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Gender	Male	78.6%	11	83.2%	20	81.1%	15	83.3%	20	94.3%	33



	Female	85.7%	9	88.9%	16	100.0%	18	86.2%	13	97.9%	23
Tariff	-	81.6%	20	65.2%	4	-	0	85.7%	3	57.1%	2
	000-047	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	2
	048-095	-	0	77.8%	7	82.6%	10	86.7%	7	100.0%	13
	096-143	-	0	88.2%	15	91.7%	17	76.9%	15	96.2%	25
	144-191	-	0	100.0%	8	100.0%	5	100.0%	6	100.0%	13
	192-239	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	1
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Institute of Arts &amp; Humanities</b>											
Age	Under 21	73.0%	126	76.9%	105	78.8%	119	81.1%	183	87.9%	123
	21-24	87.1%	14	73.2%	13	84.6%	11	69.2%	9	90.0%	9
	25-29	100.0%	3	100.0%	3	80.0%	4	50.0%	1	57.1%	2
	30-39	100.0%	4	85.7%	6	100.0%	4	85.7%	6	100.0%	2
	40-49	100.0%	4	70.0%	7	80.0%	4	100.0%	3	100.0%	5
	50+	77.8%	7	77.8%	7	88.2%	8	75.0%	6	100.0%	4
Disability	Not Disabled	76.9%	131	77.6%	115	80.4%	119	81.0%	156	91.7%	94
	Dyslexic	82.4%	14	78.6%	11	80.0%	12	72.7%	16	68.2%	15
	Other Disability	60.0%	12	71.4%	15	78.3%	18	81.6%	36	90.0%	36
Ethnicity	BAME	82.8%	12	62.5%	5	77.8%	7	83.3%	10	77.8%	7
	White	75.0%	144	77.7%	134	79.9%	139	80.2%	195	88.7%	137
	Unknown	100.0%	1	72.7%	2	100.0%	3	85.7%	3	100.0%	1
Gender	Male	72.4%	53	74.0%	49	72.8%	54	80.0%	82	87.0%	47
	Female	77.4%	105	78.6%	92	84.9%	96	80.7%	126	88.7%	98
Tariff	-	75.7%	157	77.0%	26	88.2%	15	74.3%	13	95.2%	10
	000-047	-	0	75.0%	3	50.0%	3	66.7%	6	66.7%	2
	048-095	-	0	63.6%	28	72.8%	38	72.9%	43	87.9%	29
	096-143	-	0	81.9%	59	83.6%	77	81.0%	103	85.5%	65
	144-191	-	0	83.0%	22	93.8%	15	91.7%	33	90.9%	30
	192-239	-	0	100.0%	3	50.0%	2	100.0%	7	100.0%	8
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	3	100.0%	1

	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Education</b>											
Age	Under 21	78.2%	147	77.7%	143	84.5%	147	87.2%	136	88.6%	117
	21-24	71.4%	35	78.4%	29	65.8%	25	71.4%	25	97.7%	42
	25-29	79.3%	23	69.2%	9	67.9%	19	73.1%	19	86.7%	13
	30-39	82.6%	19	66.7%	16	88.5%	23	87.0%	20	95.2%	20
	40-49	94.4%	17	83.3%	25	90.9%	20	80.0%	16	94.1%	16
	50+	85.7%	6	66.7%	2	83.3%	5	75.0%	9	80.0%	4
Disability	Not Disabled	79.1%	208	78.5%	186	82.5%	198	83.0%	181	93.7%	177
	Dyslexic	75.0%	21	68.8%	22	77.1%	27	82.8%	24	73.9%	17
	Other Disability	78.3%	18	72.7%	16	73.7%	14	80.0%	20	85.7%	18
Ethnicity	BAME	70.6%	12	76.2%	16	58.8%	10	57.9%	11	80.0%	12
	White	79.0%	233	77.0%	204	82.6%	228	84.5%	213	92.0%	196
	Unknown	100.0%	2	80.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	80.0%	4
Gender	Male	75.0%	30	77.5%	31	79.4%	27	79.3%	23	92.1%	35
	Female	79.2%	217	76.9%	193	81.5%	212	83.1%	202	90.8%	177
Tariff	-	78.7%	247	74.7%	59	75.3%	73	71.6%	68	95.2%	60
	000-047	-	0	83.3%	5	85.7%	6	100.0%	4	100.0%	4
	048-095	-	0	69.8%	44	76.3%	45	81.3%	39	86.2%	50
	096-143	-	0	80.7%	71	89.4%	76	89.0%	65	94.8%	73
	144-191	-	0	80.4%	37	83.3%	35	93.6%	44	85.7%	24
	192-239	-	0	100.0%	7	100.0%	4	100.0%	5	33.3%	1
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
	288-335	-	0	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Institute of Sport</b>											
Age	Under 21	63.2%	194	54.4%	162	55.6%	145	59.4%	164	64.2%	138
	21-24	42.9%	12	52.4%	11	59.3%	16	73.1%	19	69.6%	16
	25-29	100.0%	2	75.0%	3	66.7%	2	100.0%	4	100.0%	2
	30-39	50.0%	2	100.0%	1	75.0%	3	100.0%	1	100.0%	2
	40-49	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	2
	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0

Disability	Not Disabled	62.0%	183	53.7%	153	57.2%	143	61.2%	159	68.6%	131
	Dyslexic	58.1%	18	73.3%	22	48.6%	18	60.5%	23	39.4%	13
	Other Disability	62.5%	10	30.0%	3	62.5%	5	66.7%	6	80.0%	16
Ethnicity	BAME	60.0%	9	19.0%	4	33.3%	7	41.2%	7	35.3%	6
	White	61.8%	202	57.2%	174	58.5%	159	62.6%	181	67.8%	154
	Unknown	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	-	0
Gender	Male	56.3%	117	48.1%	104	48.9%	90	53.1%	103	57.0%	90
	Female	70.1%	94	67.9%	74	68.5%	76	75.2%	85	81.4%	70
Tariff	-	61.7%	211	36.8%	7	63.2%	12	52.4%	11	82.4%	14
	000-047	-	0	75.0%	6	62.5%	5	33.3%	2	0.0%	0
	048-095	-	0	51.4%	37	60.0%	39	65.1%	41	57.7%	30
	096-143	-	0	57.9%	62	55.8%	53	65.7%	69	63.6%	56
	144-191	-	0	53.2%	58	52.0%	53	58.2%	64	69.4%	50
	192-239	-	0	80.0%	8	66.7%	4	0.0%	0	88.9%	8
	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	50.0%	1