



UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICHESTER

The  
Guardian  
University Guide 2022

TOP 25  
UK UNIVERSITY

DEGREE OUTCOMES

STATEMENT 2020/21

#CHIUNI      

CHI.AC.UK

## Degree Outcomes Statement, 2020/21

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.

Prior to this Degree Outcomes Statement being considered by the Board of Governors, it was reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee, and the Academic Board.

### Update on actions (2019/20)

- We researched “exit velocity” and a paper was presented to the Academic Board; however, data will have been affected by the amended, new and temporary Regulations, and we will continue to analyse and monitor this data;
- There is significant variation across the University in the number of Firsts awarded, and further review activity will be undertaken to understand this. Individual departments and institutes have been asked to comment upon outcomes as a feature of annual monitoring;
- Further consideration of BAME achievement and male achievement is in progress to understand any awarding gaps and identify mechanisms to support achievement, where required. Again, individual departments and institutes have been asked to comment upon outcomes as a feature of annual monitoring.

### Teaching practices and learning resources

The University of Chichester has invested heavily in the quality of teaching, 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, with an increased number of HEA Fellows at the University. In 2020, the University had 131, including a Principal Fellow and 13 Senior Fellows. By 2021 the University had 49 Associate Fellows, 145 Fellows, 16 Senior Fellows, and one Principal Fellow.
- 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. This resulted in the appointment of 11 Professors and 17 Readers.
- Staff continue to contribute to the learning and teaching agenda nationally and internationally, through publications, including, Mike Holley and Rams Singh acting as consultants for Pearson’s Esports Btec; Crisp, Philippe (2021) *Community engagement, extending higher education student learning and raising aspirations of primary school children: initial reflections*. Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning, 23 (1). pp. 169-177. ISSN 1466-6529; Turner, D. (Ed) (2021) *Social Work and Covid 19: Lessons for Education and Practice*, Critical Publishing, Foreword by Dr Ruth Allen; Khan, T. and Mikuska, E. (2021) *Impact of COVID-19 on educators in England: online teaching and learning, and the challenges of detecting safeguarding issues amid school closures*. Social Science and Humanities Open. Vol.3 (1); Edwards, B. and Lyndon, S. (2021) *From adversity to university – the transformational power of a bespoke bridging module to support those affected by*

homelessness into higher education. *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, 23(1): 102-122; Lyndon S, Edwards B.(2021) Beyond listening: the value of co-research in the co-construction of narratives. *Qualitative Research*; Buckley, C, Farrell, L., & Tyndall, I. (2021). Brief stories of successful female role models in science help counter gender stereotypes regarding intellectual ability among young girls: A pilot study. *Early Education and Development*; Vipin Nadda, Ian Arnott, Wendy Sealy & Emma Nolan (2022). *Employability and Skills Development in the Events, Sports, Tourism and Hospitality Industry*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global; Professor Bev Hale is the RSS Council representative on the Teaching Statistics special interest group (SIG) which considers teaching statistics in school, FE as well as HE.

- 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 £1m on items such as a new website, PCs for a new IT suite, enhanced cyber security, equipping the new building for Nursing, upgrading remote access VM ware and a new Cloud back-up, a new Learning Management System, Surface Pros for Psychology, Sports Performance Analysis Software, Sport Performance MacBooks
- Teaching quality is evidenced by the National Student Survey on “The Teaching on my Course” and in the south-east we are ranked 1<sup>st</sup> out of 18. For Modern Universities we are 1<sup>st</sup> in the south-east and 3<sup>rd</sup> nationally. Overall, we are 17<sup>th</sup> for this indicator.
- We feature in The Guardian’s Top 25.

## Assessment and marking practices

Assessment strategies take 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.
- A task and finish group convened by the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee worked to provide additional guidance on moderation, to ensure consistency and transparency in assessment and marking practices.

## 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 assessment activities, evidences 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 programme approval and periodic review process that considers and advises upon the academic standards of education provision, and enhancements to curricula and the student academic experience.

- 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.

## 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

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience) and Director of Quality and Standards presented the AdvanceHE Professional Development Course to 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 Director of Quality and Standards contributes to national debates, including to the work of the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment, and is a member of the QAA's Expert Advisory Group on external examining, enabling the University to contribute to national policy and practice in the area of academic standards.

Individual departments and institutes are developing increasingly significant approaches to feeding back to students on their assessed work; for example, Psychology have developed a template to enable consistent and transparent feedback across the department.

From Adversity to University, a toolkit by UPP and the University of Chichester demonstrates how higher education can be part of an innovative solution. Ability and education are not synonymous and it is often aspirational rather than economic poverty that is a barrier to success, so the course aims to build academic skills and to rebuild self-belief and self-esteem. Homelessness is a pervasive societal issue that demands innovative, long- term solutions, which this course aims to address.

The Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee is continuing a strategic approach to Enabling Student Success through aggregating its overview of projects contributing to this, such as embedding employability within the curriculum.

## Actions for 2021/22

- **Annual monitoring will focus on final awards and attainment for students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds and from black and ethnic minorities;**
- **The University is seeking to develop an internal teaching awards scheme as a precursor to enabling applications to the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme.**

## Risks and challenges

This is the third annual iteration of our Degree Outcomes Statement and it will be reviewed and refreshed annually as the continuation of investigation 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*

2020/21 81.9

2019/20 82.6

2018/19 76.2

2017/18 74.9

2016/17 71.1

For the Business School, 72% of students gained a First or 2:1, compared to 61.7% in the previous year.

For the Conservatoire, 90.9% of students gained a First or 2:1, compared with 91.1% of students in the previous year.

For Creative Industries, 96.8% of students gained a First or 2:1, compared with 95.7% of students in the previous year.

For Arts and Humanities, 85.9% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; compared with 88.1% for the previous year.

For Education, Life and Social Sciences, 85.8% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; compared with 90.7% for the previous year.

For Engineering, 64.3% of students gained a First or 2:1; there is no previous comparison.

For Sport, 58.2% of students were awarded a First or 2:1; compared with 66% for the previous year.

Institutes have been asked to comment upon changes in graduate attainment in their annual monitoring reporting.

	Year	2016/17	2016/17	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2019/20	2020/21	2020/21
	Value	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
<b>Business School</b>											
Age	Under 21	59.2%	63	61.8%	68	72.5%	50	72.1%	49	80.6%	58
Age	21-24	45.8%	19	43.5%	10	75.0%	9	40.9%	9	58.6%	34
Age	25-29	75.0%	3	100.0%	4	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	50.0%	2
Age	30-39	100.0%	3	-	0	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	6
Age	40-49	50.0%	1	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	2
Age	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Disability	Not Disabled	57.0%	82	61.1%	77	74.0%	57	68.4%	54	71.4%	90
Disability	Dyslexic	16.7%	1	37.5%	3	66.7%	2	44.4%	4	33.3%	1
Disability	Other Disability	87.5%	7	75.0%	3	80.0%	4	40.0%	2	85.7%	12
Ethnicity	BAME	42.6%	23	35.4%	17	57.1%	12	55.2%	16	57.7%	30
Ethnicity	White	68.6%	66	72.7%	64	80.3%	49	69.8%	44	84.6%	66
Ethnicity	Unknown	13.3%	1	100.0%	2	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	53.8%	7
Gender	Male	61.7%	56	42.2%	27	57.1%	20	49.1%	26	66.3%	53
Gender	Female	50.7%	34	75.7%	56	86.0%	43	85.0%	34	79.4%	50
Tariff	-	49.2%	30	47.5%	19	72.0%	18	62.1%	18	70.4%	50
Tariff	000-047	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Tariff	048-095	50.0%	22	51.3%	20	63.6%	14	68.8%	11	75.0%	18
Tariff	096-143	76.3%	29	67.6%	23	78.9%	15	70.0%	21	81.5%	22
Tariff	144-191	80.0%	8	78.9%	15	82.4%	14	53.8%	7	62.5%	10
Tariff	192-239	50.0%	1	100.0%	4	100.0%	2	100.0%	3	100.0%	3
Tariff	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Tariff	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Conservatoire</b>											

Age	Under 21	78.3%	260	80.6%	303	84.3%	323	89.8%	255	91.0%	305
Age	21-24	83.3%	15	75.0%	9	84.6%	22	92.9%	26	88.0%	22
Age	25-29	50.0%	2	66.7%	2	100.0%	2	-	0	100.0%	1
Age	30-39	100.0%	1	66.7%	2	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Age	40-49	100.0%	3	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0
Age	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Disability	Not Disabled	76.5%	225	80.8%	249	85.1%	268	91.3%	221	92.2%	249
Disability	Dyslexic	85.7%	30	75.4%	46	78.4%	29	88.5%	23	83.3%	30
Disability	Other Disability	90.0%	27	85.2%	23	85.0%	51	84.1%	37	89.5%	51
Ethnicity	BAME	100.0%	26	82.4%	28	79.3%	23	76.0%	19	84.0%	21
Ethnicity	White	76.9%	256	80.1%	290	84.7%	320	91.3%	261	91.2%	302
Ethnicity	Unknown	-	0	-	0	100.0%	5	100.0%	1	100.0%	7
Gender	Male	67.6%	48	71.2%	52	85.4%	70	89.6%	43	89.6%	69
Gender	Female	81.3%	234	82.4%	266	84.2%	278	90.2%	238	91.3%	261
Tariff	-	80.0%	8	84.6%	11	82.6%	19	91.3%	21	90.3%	28
Tariff	000-047	75.0%	6	100.0%	3	100.0%	4	80.0%	4	100.0%	2
Tariff	048-095	87.5%	28	71.4%	30	75.7%	28	76.7%	23	81.4%	35
Tariff	096-143	73.1%	122	72.9%	113	81.7%	138	90.1%	109	87.7%	128
Tariff	144-191	82.1%	96	87.3%	131	86.9%	119	91.5%	97	96.6%	113
Tariff	192-239	85.0%	17	100.0%	26	94.6%	35	100.0%	25	100.0%	22
Tariff	240-287	100.0%	5	57.1%	4	100.0%	5	100.0%	2	100.0%	2
Tariff	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Creative &amp; Digital Technologies</b>											
Age	Under 21	89.0%	33	90.0%	36	83.8%	31	98.1%	51	97.9%	46
Age	21-24	75.0%	3	-	0	66.7%	2	100.0%	4	91.7%	11
Age	25-29	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	50.0%	1	100.0%	1

Age	30-39	-	0	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Age	40-49	-	0	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0	-	0
Age	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Disability	Not Disabled	87.7%	29	88.2%	30	86.7%	26	92.9%	39	98.0%	48
Disability	Dyslexic	83.3%	5	100.0%	4	50.0%	2	100.0%	10	100.0%	2
Disability	Other Disability	75.0%	3	100.0%	4	85.7%	6	100.0%	7	90.9%	10
Ethnicity	BAME	66.7%	2	60.0%	3	50.0%	2	80.0%	4	85.7%	6
Ethnicity	White	89.3%	34	94.6%	35	86.5%	32	96.2%	51	98.1%	52
Ethnicity	Unknown	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	2
Gender	Male	83.7%	21	81.0%	17	84.0%	21	94.3%	33	97.6%	40
Gender	Female	88.9%	16	100.0%	21	81.3%	13	95.8%	23	95.2%	20
Tariff	-	69.2%	5	-	0	75.0%	3	50.0%	2	66.7%	2
Tariff	000-047	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	2	100.0%	1
Tariff	048-095	77.8%	7	84.6%	11	87.5%	7	100.0%	13	94.1%	16
Tariff	096-143	88.2%	15	90.5%	19	76.2%	16	96.2%	25	100.0%	27
Tariff	144-191	100.0%	8	100.0%	6	100.0%	6	100.0%	13	100.0%	13
Tariff	192-239	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
Tariff	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Tariff	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Engineering &amp; Design</b>											
Age	Under 21	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	69.2%	9
Age	21-24	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0
Age	25-29	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Age	30-39	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Age	40-49	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Age	50+	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0



Disability	Not Disabled	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	54.5%	6
Disability	Dyslexic	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	2
Disability	Other Disability	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Ethnicity	BAME	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0
Ethnicity	White	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	69.2%	9
Ethnicity	Unknown	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Gender	Male	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	61.5%	8
Gender	Female	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Tariff	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	0.0%	0
Tariff	000-047	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Tariff	048-095	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	50.0%	3
Tariff	096-143	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	83.3%	5
Tariff	144-191	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Tariff	192-239	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Tariff	240-287	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Tariff	288-335	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Institute of Arts &amp; Humanities</b>											
Age	Under 21	75.3%	110	79.4%	123	80.9%	195	88.0%	125	86.4%	114
Age	21-24	70.3%	13	84.6%	11	69.2%	9	90.0%	9	76.9%	10
Age	25-29	100.0%	3	80.0%	4	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	75.0%	3
Age	30-39	87.5%	7	100.0%	4	87.5%	7	100.0%	2	80.0%	4
Age	40-49	70.0%	7	83.3%	5	100.0%	3	100.0%	5	100.0%	2
Age	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	7
Disability	Not Disabled	76.2%	120	80.8%	122	80.9%	165	91.3%	95	88.7%	102
Disability	Dyslexic	78.6%	11	81.3%	13	70.8%	17	69.6%	16	71.4%	10

Disability	Other Disability	69.6%	16	80.0%	20	83.0%	39	90.0%	36	82.4%	28
Ethnicity	BAME	62.5%	5	77.8%	7	84.6%	11	77.8%	7	66.7%	6
Ethnicity	White	76.5%	140	80.6%	145	80.2%	206	88.5%	139	86.7%	130
Ethnicity	Unknown	57.1%	2	100.0%	3	80.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	4
Gender	Male	72.7%	52	73.3%	55	78.4%	87	87.3%	48	88.0%	44
Gender	Female	77.2%	95	85.5%	100	81.7%	134	88.4%	99	85.0%	96
Tariff	-	76.7%	28	88.9%	16	75.0%	15	90.9%	10	82.4%	14
Tariff	000-047	75.0%	3	50.0%	3	70.0%	7	66.7%	2	60.0%	3
Tariff	048-095	65.2%	30	73.1%	38	71.4%	45	87.9%	29	85.4%	35
Tariff	096-143	78.2%	61	84.4%	81	81.5%	110	85.9%	67	89.3%	67
Tariff	144-191	81.5%	22	93.8%	15	91.9%	34	90.9%	30	85.7%	18
Tariff	192-239	100.0%	3	50.0%	2	100.0%	7	100.0%	8	66.7%	2
Tariff	240-287	-	0	-	0	100.0%	3	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
Tariff	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
<b>Institute of Education, Health &amp; Social Sciences</b>											
Age	Under 21	77.7%	143	84.5%	147	87.2%	136	88.6%	117	82.1%	110
Age	21-24	78.4%	29	65.8%	25	71.4%	25	97.7%	42	85.0%	34
Age	25-29	69.2%	9	67.9%	19	73.1%	19	86.7%	13	95.8%	23
Age	30-39	66.7%	16	88.5%	23	87.0%	20	95.2%	20	88.0%	22
Age	40-49	83.3%	25	90.9%	20	80.0%	16	94.1%	16	95.8%	23
Age	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	13
Disability	Not Disabled	78.5%	186	82.5%	198	83.0%	181	93.7%	177	87.4%	173
Disability	Dyslexic	68.8%	22	77.1%	27	82.8%	24	73.9%	17	75.0%	12
Disability	Other Disability	72.7%	16	73.7%	14	80.0%	20	85.7%	18	87.0%	40
Ethnicity	BAME	76.2%	16	58.8%	10	57.9%	11	80.0%	12	71.4%	5

Ethnicity	White	77.0%	204	82.6%	228	84.5%	213	92.0%	196	87.2%	218
Ethnicity	Unknown	80.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	80.0%	4	66.7%	2
Gender	Male	77.5%	31	79.4%	27	79.3%	23	92.1%	35	78.1%	25
Gender	Female	76.9%	193	81.5%	212	83.1%	202	90.8%	177	87.7%	200
Tariff	-	74.7%	59	75.3%	73	71.6%	68	95.2%	60	91.4%	85
Tariff	000-047	83.3%	5	85.7%	6	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	1
Tariff	048-095	69.8%	44	76.3%	45	81.3%	39	86.2%	50	72.5%	29
Tariff	096-143	80.7%	71	89.4%	76	89.0%	65	94.8%	73	86.4%	70
Tariff	144-191	80.4%	37	83.3%	35	93.6%	44	85.7%	24	86.1%	31
Tariff	192-239	100.0%	7	100.0%	4	100.0%	5	33.3%	1	100.0%	6
Tariff	240-287	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	2
Tariff	288-335	50.0%	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1
<b>Institute of Sport</b>											
Age	Under 21	54.4%	162	55.6%	145	59.4%	164	64.2%	138	58.4%	108
Age	21-24	52.4%	11	59.3%	16	73.1%	19	69.6%	16	63.2%	12
Age	25-29	75.0%	3	66.7%	2	100.0%	4	100.0%	2	-	0
Age	30-39	100.0%	1	75.0%	3	100.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	1
Age	40-49	100.0%	1	-	0	-	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0
Age	50+	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0
Disability	Not Disabled	53.7%	153	57.2%	143	61.2%	159	68.6%	131	58.6%	92
Disability	Dyslexic	73.3%	22	48.6%	18	60.5%	23	39.4%	13	57.5%	23
Disability	Other Disability	30.0%	3	62.5%	5	66.7%	6	80.0%	16	60.0%	6
Ethnicity	BAME	19.0%	4	33.3%	7	41.2%	7	35.3%	6	23.8%	5
Ethnicity	White	57.2%	174	58.5%	159	62.6%	181	67.8%	154	62.2%	115
Ethnicity	Unknown	-	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	-	0	100.0%	1
Gender	Male	48.1%	104	48.9%	90	53.1%	103	57.0%	90	47.0%	54

Gender	Female	67.9%	74	68.5%	76	75.2%	85	81.4%	70	72.8%	67
Tariff	-	36.8%	7	63.2%	12	52.4%	11	82.4%	14	33.3%	5
Tariff	000-047	75.0%	6	62.5%	5	33.3%	2	0.0%	0	25.0%	1
Tariff	048-095	51.4%	37	60.0%	39	65.1%	41	57.7%	30	56.4%	22
Tariff	096-143	57.9%	62	55.8%	53	65.7%	69	63.6%	56	63.8%	44
Tariff	144-191	53.2%	58	52.0%	53	58.2%	64	69.4%	50	58.7%	44
Tariff	192-239	80.0%	8	66.7%	4	0.0%	0	88.9%	8	100.0%	4
Tariff	240-287	-	0	-	0	100.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	1
Tariff	288-335	-	0	-	0	-	0	50.0%	1	-	0