

City, University of London: Undergraduate Degree Outcomes Statement 2020/21

This degree outcome statement was originally approved and published in July 2022.

Appendix 2 was subsequently added in December 2022 in response to Universities UK's statement of July 2022 setting out its plan to address the increase in degree outcomes.

1. Introduction

City's tradition of providing high-quality education relevant to business and the professions dates back 160 years. Today we welcome approximately 20,000 students each year to study with us. International students, representing some 160 countries, and students from backgrounds under-represented in Higher Education form City's two majority cohorts. On average over 70% of our home Undergraduate students come from London and over 65% of our home undergraduate students come from widening participation backgrounds.

2. Institutional Degree Classification Profile

The degree classification profile contained in this Statement provides an overview of degree attainment data for City Undergraduate (UG) students from 2016/17 - 2020/21. City has powers to award degrees for programmes designed and delivered by other institutions. As of 2020/21 this includes 72 undergraduate degree programmes delivered by City and 2 undergraduate degree programmes awarded by City but delivered by other institutions.

The proportion of 1st and 2:1 degrees increased by 4.4 percentage points from 82.3% to 86.7%, between 2019/20 and 2020/21. The increase in the proportion of 1st and 2:1 degrees has now put City above the sector average of 82.5%.

The table below presents the classifications of degrees awarded by the University to all its Undergraduate students between 2016/17 and 2020/21. (UK domiciled and International students)

Year of Award	Total Awards	3 rd	2:2	2:1	1 st	2:1 & 1 st combined
2016/17	2577	6.7%	24.1%	48.9%	20.3%	69.2%
2017/18	2580	5.7%	23.3%	48.3%	22.7%	71.0%
2018/19	2763	4.9%	22.4%	49.0%	23.6%	72.6%
2019/20	2547	1.6%	16.1%	53.0%	29.3%	82.3%
2020/21	2998	2.4%	10.9%	50.2%	36.5%	86.7%

Over the past five years, but particularly during 2019/20 and 2020/21, there has been an upward trend in the number of 1st and 2:1s awarded by the University.

Analysis within the university identifies a number of reasons for this, including changes made during the pandemic to accommodate students. Please see Section 4, for details on the 'Mitigation Packages' the University implemented in 2020/21. It was acknowledged at the time that some mitigations may increase the proportion of higher classifications, in particular the introduction of a safety net policy in 2019/20 and discounting of lowest credit module from classification in 2020/21. By removing the risk that assessments completed during the COVID-19 pandemic could lower a student's year average marks, an upward

shift across the cohort was to be expected. This being understood, the main impetus was to deliver fairness for students, therefore the potential consequences were seen as acceptable given the circumstances. We are actively monitoring the degree classification distributions in our internal annual programme evaluation process. If concerns are raised, programme level action plans are then drafted and implemented.

Across City, we continue to put in place initiatives to improve our teaching and learning to give our students the best opportunity to succeed on their programme. We continue to diversify our assessment methods whenever possible to require writing, independent research, presentations, analysis, etc. so that all learning styles are accommodated. We are also moving to a blended approach of teaching and assessment, with many assessments now taking place online.

3. Degree Awarding Gap

City's Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic student population is its most substantial accounting for 53.8% of UG graduating students in 2020/21. The degree-awarding gap for 1st class and 2.1 degrees between White and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students varies across City's undergraduate degrees. The overall attainment gap for the academic year 2020/21 decreased overall from 5.9% to 4.1%. This reduction in the overall student degree-awarding gap is the second in a row since 2019/20. However, it is likely linked to an overall increase in the awards of good degrees and therefore may not be representative of a longer-term trend.

Over the five-year period, the undergraduate degree-awarding gap of 1st class and 2.1 degrees awarded between Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic and White students, significantly reduced across all Schools from 2019/20 and ranged in 2020/21 from 2% to 6% across Academic Schools (Please see Table 1 below).

Please Note: The degree awarding gap between White and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students has in some cases, at programme level, been due to Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students performing better than White students. Although this is not the case overall.

City is committed to empowering students from all backgrounds to achieve their full potential. Over the past five years we have enhanced our efforts to address the degree awarding gaps for underrepresented groups, especially Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students. Our most recent [Access and Participation Plan](#), submitted to the Office for Students, sets out how we will continue to address degree awarding gaps in partnership with students. Our Student Attainment Project, designed to identify, understand and address degree-awarding gaps impacting on particular groups of students remains a priority for City.

Table 1: Degree Awarding Gap by Year (2016/17 – 2020/21) and by School (2020/21)

Undergraduates White v BAME Students (White students perform better than BAME students) The degree-awarding gap below relate to 1sts and 2.1s degrees only	
Degree-awarding Gap by Year between White and BAME Students (2016/17 – 2020/21)	Degree-awarding Gap by School between White and BAME Students (2020/21)

Year	Degree-awarding Gap	School	Degree-awarding Gap
2020/21	4.1%	BAYES Business School	6%
2019/20	5.9%	City Law School	4%
2018/19	11%	School of Art and Social Sciences	2%
2017/18	11%	School of Mathematics, Computer Science and Engineering	2%
2016/17	17%	School of Health and Social Sciences	6%

More information on the Institutional degree classification profile for all undergraduate students for the past five academic years (2016/17 – 2020/21) is set out in Appendix 1.

4. Assessment and marking practices

All programmes that lead to a City award operate in accordance with [Senate Regulation 19: Assessment Regulations](#). The Regulations cover all aspects of the conduct of assessment, how students' progress and how Awards are made. They set out provisions for Extenuating Circumstances, appointments and role of external examiners, functions of Assessment Boards and rules around academic conduct and integrity. Separate Regulations are in place to govern the [Conduct of Examinations](#).

Our [Assessment and feedback Policy](#) outlines the principles on which assessment is based including the use of assessment criteria, grade-related criteria, marking and moderation processes. Independent scrutiny of the assessment process for each programme is undertaken by at least one External Examiner appointed according to the criteria set out in the [External Examiners Policy](#). Several staff have undertaken the Advance HE external examiner programme and the developer programme.

On behalf of the University's Senate, Assessment Boards for each programme oversee student progress between years and degree classifications. They safeguard the consistency, fairness and standards of City's awards and the application of the Assessment Regulations from which its decisions are made.

City's academic regulations, policies and procedures are robust and reviewed regularly. Sanctions for academic misconduct are set out in the [Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy](#). Academic appeals for taught and research programmes are governed by [Senate Regulations 20 and 21](#) respectively. Academic Appeals for Validated taught and research programmes are governed by [Senate Regulations 20b and 21b](#) respectively. Reports on appeals, extenuating circumstances and academic misconduct are considered on an annual basis by Senate and its sub- committees, ensuring a transparent and consistent approach for all students.

In response to the national lockdowns in December 2020 as a result of the continuing pandemic and the exacerbated the pressure on students, the University convened a new Student Attainment and Assessment Group to consider whether mitigations were required to ensure that students results were not impacted unfairly as a result of the pandemic.

To mitigate the impact on of Coronavirus (COVID-19) on students, the Group developed two types of mitigation approaches for students, the '**Main Mitigation Package**' and the '**School-**

Specific Package'. These measures were intended to build on the work that was already done in redesigning our programmes, to both support students and to protect their interests by ensuring barrier-free access to learning, fairness of students' results and maintaining the rigour of City's academic standards in line with the Office for Students' expectations.

The **'Main Mitigation Package'** provided support for students in a proportionate manner without compromising on the underlining standards, learning outcomes or overinflating grades. The package which applied to most programmes consisted of the following four points, each of which is intended to target a different aspect of the possible impact on the pandemic on students:

- Relaxed rules on evidence for Extenuating Circumstances claims.
- Ensured Interim Assessment Panels reviewed marks and identified where scaling was required as well as where individual students needed additional support.
- Extended the scope for compensation more widely by increasing the range of compensatable modules where possible.
- Introduced (where relevant) discounting to the lowest credits of modules from that stage's contribution to the final classification.

The **'School-Specific Package'** was designed to meet PSRB requirements or meet the specific nature of the programmes offered by the relevant Schools. These were designed to mitigate specific issues and were considered as the best options for these programmes

5. Academic governance

Senate is the primary body with responsibility for the regulation, governance and quality assurance of City's programmes, including those delivered in partnership. Senate reports and provides assurance to Council, the governing body, on academic quality and standards through regular reports. Additional assurance is provided to Council through independent internal audits and the requirements of external regulators and assessors.

The Educational Quality Committee is a sub-committee of Senate and oversees the implementation of the quality assurance framework. Assessment Boards are sub-committees of Senate with delegated authority to approve Awards and degree classifications.

The quality and standards of validated programmes delivered by partner institutions are governed through Assessment and Course Boards, chaired by City. Course Boards report to City's Collaborative Provision Committee, a sub-committee of Senate. Assessment Boards have a direct reporting line to Senate.

In line with QAA UK Quality Code independent scrutiny and externality is core to City's governance arrangements and provides assurance that our practices are sound and that the expected FHEQ and professional standards are met.

Our framework includes:

- i. independent scrutiny during the approval of new programmes and the periodic programme reviews.
- ii. independent scrutiny of assessments and assessment criteria through External Examiners. External Examiners Reports which are responded to by Schools and reported to Senate and its sub-committees via an Annual Report.

6. Classification algorithms

As set out in Senate Regulation 19: Assessment Regulations, classifications are determined according to the overall aggregate mark achieved in modules, with the credit value of each module determining its weighting in the aggregation of marks. The weighting of each year in

the calculation of the overall aggregate mark is determined during the approval of a programme in accordance with [Senate Regulation 15: Undergraduate Programmes](#). For Bachelor's Degrees at least 50% of the overall aggregate mark must come from Year 3 assessment and not more than 15% can come from Year 1. This flexibility is to accommodate disciplinary differences. The typical weighting for Bachelor's programme is:

- Year 1: 10%
- Year 2: 30%
- Year 3: 60%

Some programmes operate with approved variations to the standard classification algorithm due to specific professional body requirements, because they are delivered in partnership with another institution and for other legitimate reasons such as, market standard within subject disciplines.

Students are normally permitted a maximum of two attempts at an assessment unless there are extenuating circumstances or specific professional body requirements. Marks for assessments passed at the second attempt are capped at the pass mark. Compensation, if not prevented by PSRB, is available for failed modules in certain circumstances and in accordance with strict criteria to ensure that the learning outcomes of the programme have been met.

7. Teaching practices and learning resources

Our Education & Student Strategy commits to enhanced support, development and recognition of teaching excellence. This is delivered through a partnership between our academic Schools and our central Learning Enhancement & Development directorate (LEaD), and with input from the Students' Union.

Each academic School has its own Learning & Teaching Strategy and LEaD encourage and support staff to enhance their teaching excellence via a range of workshops aligned to the priorities of academic Schools alongside 1-2-1, support, drop-in sessions, online support and modules provided as part of the MA Academic Practice Programme. Additionally, there is an accredited CPD programme for staff to gain recognition at the appropriate level of HEA Fellowship linked to their role.

City's academic staff contribute a breadth and depth of teaching, professional and research expertise which, in combination, allow us to fulfil our institutional mission of academic excellence for business and the professions.

Over the summer of 2020 considerable work was undertaken to redesign all programmes as a result of the pandemic for delivery during the 2020/21 academic year. In particular, methods of teaching and assessment were redesigned to support students who would largely be studying remotely with only limited face to face activity. City also necessarily reviewed its policies and regulations, including Senate Assessment Regulations, Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy to ensure students were fully supported throughout the year.

8. Identifying good practice and actions

Recognising and sharing areas of excellence and good practice is a proud and long-standing tradition at City.

It takes place through various platforms including our Annual Programme Evaluation (APEs) process, and since 2018/19, through the City Learning and Teaching (CLT) Forum.

Institutionally, over the last five academic years we have received recognition and praise for our robust and varied teaching practices, the academic support we provide to our students and our learning resources. Evidence of this can be found from our student body, via the NSS written feedback, as well as our External Examiners in their annual reports.

In 2020/21 all APEs were received by the published deadline and the overall quality was high. The majority of completed APE forms provided an effective and robust overview of the health of programmes, including good practice items and comprehensive action plans mapped against the University's KPIs.

Common themes of Good Practice included:

- High quality of the online induction activities and staff flexibility;
- Good range of mentoring opportunities and extra support;
- Good variety of robust distance learner pathways;
- High quality work placements and summer internships;
- Enhancements in embedding employability in curriculum via work-based learning modules and micro-placements;
- Development of new revision tutorials, pastoral tutorials and bootcamps.

Enhancement activities included:

- Ongoing work to address issues of collusion and poor academic practice and to educate and deter students from academic misconduct;
- Ongoing engagement with University initiatives on student employability following positive student feedback. Initiatives were focused on placement/practice experience, progression and networking events;
- Where appropriate, implementing and ensuring the use of varied assessment methods which were supportive and inclusive;
- Ongoing work to analyse feedback provided within the Annual Programme Evaluations, which reflected the impact that remote working had had on learning and teaching.

9. Monitoring and Review

To ensure progress, the Degree Outcomes Statement will be reviewed and published annually.

Appendix 1: Degree Outcome Classification Profile

The information contained within this Institutional degree classification profile provides an overview of degree attainment data for Undergraduate City students from 2016/17 – 2020/21. The Report contains data on degree outcomes broken down by Age, Disability, Ethnicity, Gender and Schools.

			2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	
University (All)			1st	20.3%	22.7%	24.0%	29.3%	36.5%
			2.1	48.9%	48.3%	48.7%	53.0%	50.2%
			2.2	24.1%	23.3%	23.1%	16.1%	10.9%
			3rd	6.7%	5.7%	4.9%	1.6%	2.4%
Age	Young (<21)	1st	20.0%	22.8%	23.3%	29.0%	37.0%	
		2.1	50.5%	49.3%	49.7%	57.0%	54.6%	
		2.2	23.5%	22.9%	23.2%	13.2%	7.9%	
		3rd	5.9%	4.9%	3.7%	0.6%	0.3%	
	Mature (>21)	1st	21.4%	21.8%	27.5%	29.6%	36.0%	
		2.1	42.1%	43.4%	43.3%	49.8%	46.1%	
		2.2	26.5%	25.1%	22.5%	18.4%	13.7%	
		3rd	10.1%	9.7%	6.7%	1.1%	1.6%	
Disability	No Disability	1st	20.8%	23.0%	23.8%	29.5%	36.9%	
		2.1	48.5%	48.3%	49.0%	53.0%	50.1%	
		2.2	24.3%	22.9%	23.1%	16.1%	10.7%	
		3rd	6.4%	5.8%	4.1%	0.9%	0.9%	
	Disability	1st	13.0%	17.9%	27.6%	27.6%	32.4%	
		2.1	55.8%	48.2%	43.7%	52.6%	51.2%	
		2.2	20.1%	28.6%	23.6%	16.3%	12.9%	
		3rd	11.0%	5.4%	5.2%	1.0%	1.6%	
Ethnicity	BAME	1st	15.5%	18.5%	21.1%	27.4%	33.3%	
		2.1	47.9%	48.7%	48.2%	53.2%	52.3%	
		2.2	28.2%	26.1%	25.8%	17.7%	11.7%	
		3rd	8.4%	6.7%	4.9%	0.9%	1.1%	
	White	1st	27.8%	31.9%	32.0%	34.4%	45.4%	
		2.1	52.4%	46.4%	48.5%	52.7%	45.3%	
		2.2	16.1%	17.4%	17.0%	12.1%	8.6%	
		3rd	3.7%	4.3%	2.5%	0.8%	0.7%	
	Other	1st	28.2%	20.6%	23.9%	22.6%	30.6%	
		2.1	42.0%	52.8%	50.3%	53.2%	52.8%	
		2.2	24.1%	23.1%	21.8%	21.0%	16.7%	
		3rd	5.7%	3.5%	4.0%	3.2%	0%	
Gender	Female	1st	17.9%	20.6%	24.5%	28.4%	34.5%	
		2.1	51.3%	49.6%	50.8%	54.9%	50.6%	
		2.2	23.8%	23.7%	21.3%	15.1%	11.6%	
		3rd	3.1%	3.2%	2.1%	0.8%	1.5%	

			2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	Male	1st	23.3%	25.3%	23.5%	30.5%	39.5%
		2.1	45.9%	46.7%	45.9%	50.4%	49.5%
		2.2	24.5%	22.7%	25.4%	17.4%	10.0%
		3rd	6.3%	5.2%	5.2%	1.0%	0.2%
Schools	SHS	1st	19.0%	26.2%	27.9%	33.5%	32.8%
		2.1	40.3%	36.6%	43.9%	48.2%	37.7%
		2.2	25.4%	23.1%	21.7%	14.7%	20.5%
		3rd	15.3%	14.1%	6.5%	2.2%	4.7%
	Law	1st	5.4%	6.4%	7.7%	15.1%	29.7%
		2.1	47.9%	51.1%	51.3%	68.1%	59.4%
		2.2	39.7%	37.0%	35.2%	16.2%	9.6%
		3rd	6.9%	5.5%	5.7%	0.5%	0.2%
	Bayes Business	1st	25.8%	26.5%	25.4%	28.7%	33.8%
		2.1	54.5%	51.1%	51.1%	50.8%	55.2%
		2.2	17.1%	19.8%	21.9%	19.7%	9.8%
		3rd	2.6%	2.6%	1.6%	0.3%	0.3%
	SASS	1st	17.4%	18.5%	22.8%	22.3%	35.1%
		2.1	58.8%	58.1%	57.7%	60.6%	55.8%
		2.2	21.0%	20.6%	17.4%	16.2%	8.7%
		3rd	2.9%	2.8%	2.1%	0.3%	0.1%
	SMSCE	1st	27.0%	29.5%	31.9%	47.7%	53.8%
		2.1	39.8%	41.5%	34.7%	37.4%	37.0%
		2.2	25.8%	22.9%	26.0%	12.1%	7.3%
		3rd	7.4%	6.1%	7.4%	1.7%	0.2%
IMD Quintiles (Home students) Note not all student postcodes are valid thereby do not have a quintile and they were excluded from the calculation.	Q1 (most disadvantaged)	1st	17.8%	18.7%	22.2%	28.6%	34.1%
		2.1	43.8%	45.9%	44.5%	51.4%	49.6%
		2.2	30.4%	27.4%	27.5%	17.3%	11.7%
		3rd	8.0%	8.0%	5.8%	2.0%	2.2%
	Q2	1st	16.4%	19.7%	22.3%	30.2%	33.7%
		2.1	47.7%	50.5%	48.5%	52.8%	48.2%
		2.2	26.0%	22.8%	24.1%	15.4%	14.5%
		3rd	9.9%	7.0%	5.1%	1.2%	0.9%
	Q3	1st	16.9%	23.9%	23.4%	30.5%	39.0%
		2.1	54.1%	44.1%	51.0%	53.6%	49.1%
		2.2	21.3%	27.0%	21.8%	14.6%	9.6%
		3rd	7.7%	5.0%	3.8%	0.5%	0.8%
	Q4	1st	19.7%	23.2%	26.5%	31.0%	42.3%
		2.1	50.0%	48.2%	49.7%	55.8%	50.2%
		2.2	22.7%	24.1%	21.4%	12.2%	6.1%
		3rd	7.6%	4.4%	2.4%	0.3%	1.1%
	Q5 (most advantaged)	1st	25.9%	32.4%	31.0%	36.2%	42.1%
		2.1	49.7%	45.7%	54.0%	49.4%	47.2%
		2.2	19.5%	16.0%	12.1%	12.6%	7.9%
		3rd	4.9%	5.9%	2.9%	0.6%	1.9%
Fees (Student fees status)	Home (Home and EU Student Fees)	1st	20.4%	24.0%	24.9%	31.0%	37.7%
		2.1	49.6%	47.3%	48.0%	53.7%	48.8%
		2.2	23.8%	23.4%	22.5%	13.8%	10.6%

			2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21
	Overseas	3rd	6.2%	5.3%	4.6%	0.8%	1.1%
		1st	19.5%	19.1%	19.8%	24.7%	32.3%
		2.1	49.5%	51.3%	49.8%	50.8%	54.8%
		2.2	26.7%	25.3%	26.3%	22.7%	11.8%
		3rd	4.2%	4.3%	3.4%	1.1%	0.6%
Entry Qualification (Home Students / excludes EU and Overseas)	No tariff	1st	24.4%	30.0%	30.9%	25.4%	33.0%
		2.1	38.2%	31.4%	36.4%	51.0%	49.4%
		2.2	24.0%	25.0%	23.0%	21.8%	13.2%
		3rd	13.4%	13.6%	9.7%	0.5%	1.1%
	Tariff points 10 to 160	1st	0.0%	0.0%	32.0%	28.2%	36.9%
		2.1	28.6%	20.0%	36.0%	57.5%	51.3%
		2.2	57.1%	60.0%	28.0%	13.5%	10.4%
		3rd	14.3%	20.0%	4.0%	0.5%	1.0%
	Tariff points 170 to 230	1st	6.3%	17.6%	0.0%	33.2%	44.1%
		2.1	43.8%	52.9%	50.0%	52.6%	47.5%
		2.2	43.8%	23.5%	50.0%	13.4%	7.8%
		3rd	6.3%	5.9%	0.0%	0.4%	0%
	Tariff points 240 to 290	1st	10.5%	13.0%	15.2%	33.8%	40.0%
		2.1	39.5%	47.8%	51.5%	43.2%	42.9%
		2.2	42.1%	23.9%	27.3%	20.3%	8.6%
		3rd	7.9%	15.2%	6.1%	2.7%	2.9%
	Tariff points 300 to 350	1st	19.3%	23.9%	24.3%	36.4%	10.5%
		2.1	49.4%	46.6%	51.5%	43.0%	42.1%
		2.2	27.7%	27.3%	18.4%	16.5%	31.6%
		3rd	3.6%	2.3%	5.8%	3.3%	0%
	Tariff points 360 to 420	1st	20.3%	31.1%	19.3%	35.4%	37.5%
		2.1	50.0%	41.9%	55.7%	42.7%	37.5%
		2.2	24.3%	20.3%	18.2%	19.8%	12.5%
		3rd	5.4%	6.8%	6.8%	2.1%	0%
	Tariff points >420	1st	19.6%	40.8%	42.4%	42.4%	14.3%
		2.1	45.7%	28.6%	35.6%	34.8%	35.7%
		2.2	26.1%	20.4%	22.0%	14.1%	21.4%
		3rd	2.2%	2.0%	0.0%	5.4%	7.1%

Appendix 2: City's response to Universities UK statement of July 2022

1. As seen in section 2 of City's Degree Outcome Statement, there has been an upward trend in the number of 1st and 2:1s awarded by the University. This is particularly evident during 2019/20 and 2020/21 academic years which were significantly impacted by COVID-19. However, this increase has occurred at the same time as achievements have been made in reducing the BAME awarding gap (see section 3).
2. While the University is committed to addressing any areas where there is unexplained inflation, this should not impact upon the progress being made in addressing inequalities.
3. Section 4 of City's Degree Outcome Statement provides detail on the 'Mitigation Packages' the University implemented in 2020/21 due to COVID-19. It was acknowledged at the time that some mitigations may increase the proportion of higher classifications but these potential consequences were seen as acceptable given the extreme circumstances that our students faced. [HESA](#) itself has recognised that the National picture relating to degree classifications in 2020/21 is overlaid within a context of continuing application of mitigation policies and changed assessment practices.
4. The upward trajectory in outcomes at City reported since 2019/20 may also be partly as a result of initiatives put in place to improve our teaching and learning, some of which are outlined in section 2 and in the table below.
5. In 2021/22, City returned to its standard assessment regulations and policies and we are monitoring degree classification distributions. Initial data from 2021/22 HESA return shows a reduction in our overall good degree rate (combined 1st and 2:1) of 8% from 2020/21 to 81.05%: a reduction of first class degrees also by 8% year on year to 2020/21, and an increase in lower second degrees by 7%.
6. We will also continue to use our annual programme evaluations process to monitor degree outcomes at this level. If concerns are raised, programme level action plans are then drafted and implemented.
7. We have agreed principles for learning and teaching to inform planning for 2023-24 with additional clarity on assessment. We will ensure that all assessments are led by learning outcomes, are authentic and appropriate to the students' graduating discipline.
8. It remains the case that robust processes are in place to ensure that assessment and marking practices operate in accordance with sector-supported principles outlined in, for example, [Subject Benchmark Statements](#), [Degree Classification Descriptors](#) and Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) standards.
9. Our degree classification algorithms are in line with the principles for [effective degree algorithm design](#) developed by the UK Standing Committee for Quality Assessment (UKSCQA) and compliance with these expectations can be directly linked with the avoidance of degree inflation.

December 2022

Appendix 3: Progress against actions set out in Degree Outcome Statements 2018/19 – 2020/21

Commitments made in Degree Outcome Statements:	Progress noted to Date:
<p>Enhanced our efforts to address the degree awarding gaps for underrepresented groups, especially Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students.</p> <p><i>Statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018/2019 • 2019/2020 • 2020/2021 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree-awarding gap for 1st class and 2.1 degrees between White and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students varies across City’s undergraduate degrees. • The overall attainment gap for the academic year 2019/20 decreased overall from 11% to 5.9% and decreased again further in 2020/21 from 5.9% to 4.1%. • This reduction in the overall student degree-awarding gap is however, likely linked to an overall increase in the awards of good degrees and therefore may not be representative of a longer-term trend. • Our Student Attainment Project - designed to identify, understand and address degree-awarding gaps impacting on particular groups of students remains a priority of City’s Education & Student Strategy. • Please Note: The degree awarding gap between White and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students has in some cases, at programme level, been due to Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students performing better than White students. Although this is not the case overall.
<p>City is committed to empowering all students from all backgrounds to achieve their full potential.</p> <p><i>Statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018/2019 • 2019/2020 • 2020/2021 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Between 2014/15 and 2018/19, the proportion of 1st and 2:1 degrees increased by 3.7 percentage points from 69% to 72.7%, which remained below the sector average by 4 percentage points. • Between 2015/16 and 2019/20, the proportion of 1st and 2.1 degrees increased by 10.9 percentage points from 70.9% to 81.8%, which put City in line with the sector average. • Between 2019/20 and 2020/2, the proportion of 1st and 2.1 degrees increased again, by 4.4 percentage points from 82.3% to 86.7%. The increase put City above the sector average of 82.5%. Section 2 discusses the possible reasons for this upward trend.
<p>Our Education & Student Strategy commits to enhanced support, development and recognition</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each academic School has its own Learning & Teaching Strategy and LEaD encourage and support staff to enhance their teaching excellence via a range of

of teaching excellence. This is delivered through a partnership between our academic Schools and our central Learning Enhancement & Development directorate (LEaD), and with input from the Students' Union.

Statements:

- 2018/2019
- 2019/2020
- 2020/2021

workshops aligned to the priorities of academic Schools alongside 1-2-1, support, drop-in sessions, online support and modules provided as part of the MA Academic Practice Programme.

- Additionally, there is an accredited CPD programme for staff to gain recognition at the appropriate level of HEA Fellowship linked to their role.
- During 2018/2019, the educational technology team have seen increased engagement due to the emphasis on the integration of technology to enhance teaching. In total, 594 staff attended workshops on a range of educational technologies.
- During 19/20 the Covid -19 Pandemic brought about widespread change across the sector with all teaching, learning and assessment activity except some essential health focused teaching all moving online. Staff in LEaD provided support with a range of workshops, individual advice and provided a range of online guidance which presented not only the technical aspects of moving to online learning, but the pedagogical considerations. A teaching toolkit was also developed to support the ongoing changes that were needed.
- This experience has led many staff to review their practice around blended and online learning which will continue to enhance the students' education experience in the future.
- Over the summer of 2020 considerable work was undertaken to redesign all programmes as a result of the pandemic for delivery during the 2020/21 academic year. In particular, methods of teaching and assessment were redesigned to support students who would largely be studying remotely with only limited face to face activity. City also necessarily reviewed its policies and regulations, including Senate Assessment Regulations, Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy to ensure students were fully supported throughout the year.

Across City, we continue to put in place initiatives to improve our teaching and learning to give our students the best opportunity to succeed on their programme. Where

- We continue to diversify our assessment methods whenever possible to require writing, independent research, presentations, analysis, etc. so that all learning styles are accommodated. We are also moving to a blended approach of teaching and assessment, with many assessments now taking place online.

<p>appropriate, implementing and ensuring the use of varied assessment methods which were supportive and inclusive.</p> <p><i>Statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020/2021 	
<p>Ongoing work to address issues of collusion and poor academic practice and to educate and deter students from academic misconduct.</p> <p><i>Statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020/2021 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) has recognised that academic misconduct is a growing problem within the sector both in the UK and globally. Academic misconduct cases at City have had a significant increase across the Institution during the 2019/20 and 2020/21 academic years compared to previous years. • An Academic Integrity & Misconduct Working Group was formed as a medium-term group whose purpose was to identify and implement creative solutions to better embed academic integrity within City, to educate and deter students from academic misconduct and to support staff who are managing these cases. • Actions completed by the Group in 2021/22 included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Student & Staff communications regarding expectations around academic integrity, managing group collusion cases (particularly with regards to online assessments), preventing contract cheating and providing links to City online AIM resources. ○ Template letters with regards to academic misconduct investigations and outcomes, have been drafted and shared with the relevant staff in each School. ○ The development and publication of a dedicated AIM Student Hub Page. ○ Supporting the running of and publication of the City SU AIM Campaign. • In addition to the work outlined above, the Group are also in the process of reviewing City's Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy/Guidance (AIM), Regulations, Sanctions and process to ensure it is clear and fit for purpose.
<p>University initiatives on Student Employability, focused on placement/practice experience and progression.</p> <p><i>Statements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2020/2021 	<p>The implementation of the Career Activation Programme has meant that all UG programmes now have career focus education and professional experience as core elements. This strategy has been in the implementation phase since 2019 and was fully implemented for students starting in 22/23. Current second and final year students have had access to these modules as electives.</p>

