

University of Huddersfield Degree Outcomes Statement

December 2021

1. Institutional degree classification profile

Table 1: Profiles institutional degree outcomes over the last 5 years by total population and by split characteristics or School as indicated and as available. The data includes student outcomes at level 6. The primary source is the HESA student record of full-time, first degree students. Actual numbers are presented per outcome and as % of total population. Unknown refers to where characteristics are undeclared, of which there are fewer than 30 in total each year. Overseas contains all international students including EU. ABMO includes students who identify as Asian, Black, Mixed or Other non-white. EIMD is the English Index of Multiple Deprivation, a multifactorial measure of socio-economic wellbeing where EIMD1 indicates high levels of economic hardship, and 5 low levels of economic hardship.

First class	16/17		17/18		18/19		19/20		20/21	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Population										
Total	1176	33.3%	1250	33.0%	1183	33.3%	1371	39.5%	1317	40.5%
Female	715	35.8%	771	36.2%	776	38.4%	854	43.9%	795	45.3%
Male	461	30.2%	479	28.8%	407	26.6%	516	33.9%	520	34.9%
White (UK)	840	42.5%	849	46.7%	815	45.6%	858	50.1%	772	49.1%
ABMO (UK)	187	25.5%	203	25.7%	199	25.5%	287	35.8%	298	36.1%
Unknown and Overseas	149	18.2%	198	16.7%	169	17.1%	226	23.6%	247	29.1%
U21	815	32.9%	901	35.0%	850	34.5%	992	40.7%	997	41.3%
O21	361	34.5%	349	28.7%	333	30.6%	379	36.6%	320	38.3%
EIMD 1 or 2	457	32.8%	454	31.9%	461	33.0%	551	39.4%	523	40.2%
EIMD 3,4 or 5	554	43.0%	583	49.7%	535	47.0%	585	52.3%	549	49.6%
Disability	137	33.3%	147	38.1%	167	39.3%	175	41.4%	172	40.8%
No known disability	1039	33.3%	1103	32.4%	1016	32.5%	1196	39.3%	1145	40.5%
A-level	491	44.7%	477	48.0%	445	48.3%	505	54.6%	481	55.0%
BTEC	125	23.0%	146	26.8%	161	26.4%	162	30.3%	143	29.1%
Other	560	29.7%	627	27.8%	577	28.6%	704	35.0%	693	36.8%

Upper second class	16/17		17/18		18/19		19/20		20/21	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Population										
Total	1454	41.2%	1582	41.7%	1520	42.8%	1500	43.2%	1350	41.6%
Female	849	42.5%	900	42.2%	852	42.2%	794	40.8%	682	38.9%
Male	604	39.6%	682	41.1%	668	43.6%	706	46.4%	666	44.7%
White (UK)	837	42.4%	710	39.1%	697	39.0%	654	38.2%	589	37.4%
ABMO (UK)	321	43.8%	353	44.7%	340	43.6%	342	42.7%	342	41.5%
Unknown and Overseas	296	36.1%	519	43.8%	483	49.0%	504	52.6%	419	49.3%

U21	1103	44.5%	1098	42.6%	1050	42.6%	1046	43.0%	990	41.0%
O21	351	33.5%	484	39.8%	470	43.2%	454	43.9%	360	43.1%
EIMD 1 or 2	602	43.2%	633	44.5%	597	42.7%	580	41.5%	522	40.1%
EIMD 3,4 or 5	543	42.2%	422	36.0%	430	37.8%	413	36.9%	413	37.3%
Disability	188	45.7%	152	39.4%	160	37.6%	177	41.8%	176	41.7%
No known disability	1266	40.6%	1430	42.0%	1360	43.5%	1323	43.4%	1174	41.5%
A-level	476	43.4%	394	39.6%	377	40.9%	342	37.0%	317	36.3%
BTEC	255	46.9%	242	44.5%	258	42.4%	238	44.5%	201	40.9%
Other	723	38.4%	946	42.0%	885	43.8%	920	45.8%	832	44.2%

Lower second class	16/17		17/18		18/19		19/20		20/21	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Population										
Total	755	21.4%	803	21.2%	721	20.3%	518	14.9%	489	15.1%
Female	364	18.2%	397	18.6%	338	16.7%	256	13.1%	237	13.5%
Male	391	25.6%	406	24.4%	383	25.0%	261	17.2%	252	16.9%
White (UK)	254	12.9%	215	11.8%	232	13.0%	170	9.9%	181	11.5%
ABMO (UK)	186	25.4%	198	25.1%	192	24.6%	153	19.1%	155	18.8%
Unknown and Overseas	315	38.5%	390	32.9%	297	30.1%	195	20.4%	153	18.0%
U21	470	19.0%	479	18.6%	472	19.1%	341	14.0%	352	14.6%
O21	285	27.2%	324	26.6%	249	22.9%	177	17.1%	137	16.4%
EIMD 1 or 2	278	19.9%	279	19.6%	284	20.3%	222	15.9%	211	16.2%
EIMD 3,4 or 5	160	12.4%	135	11.5%	139	12.2%	104	9.3%	124	11.2%
Disability	72	17.5%	73	18.9%	82	19.3%	60	14.2%	58	13.7%
No known disability	683	21.9%	730	21.4%	639	20.4%	458	15.0%	431	15.3%
A-level	106	9.7%	110	11.1%	92	10.0%	65	7.0%	69	7.9%
BTEC	139	25.6%	113	20.8%	148	24.3%	113	21.1%	123	25.1%
Other	510	27.1%	580	25.7%	481	23.8%	340	16.9%	297	15.8%

Third class	16/17		17/18		18/19		19/20		20/21	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Population										
Total	107	3.0%	115	3.0%	97	2.7%	44	1.3%	65	2.0%
Female	56	2.8%	46	2.2%	37	1.8%	23	1.2%	28	1.6%
Male	51	3.3%	69	4.2%	60	3.9%	21	1.4%	37	2.5%
White (UK)	31	1.6%	28	1.5%	31	1.7%	14	0.8%	18	1.1%
ABMO (UK)	30	4.1%	29	3.7%	36	4.6%	15	1.9%	23	2.8%
Unknown and Overseas	46	5.6%	58	4.9%	30	3.0%	15	1.6%	24	2.8%

U21	65	2.6%	68	2.6%	69	2.8%	27	1.1%	48	2.0%
O21	42	4.0%	47	3.9%	28	2.6%	17	1.6%	17	2.0%
EIMD 1 or 2	41	2.9%	41	2.9%	43	3.1%	22	1.6%	31	2.4%
EIMD 3,4 or 5	22	1.7%	19	1.6%	23	2.0%	8	0.7%	12	1.1%
Disability	9	2.2%	12	3.1%	11	2.6%	7	1.7%	10	2.4%
No known disability	98	3.1%	103	3.0%	86	2.8%	37	1.2%	55	1.9%
A-level	17	1.5%	9	0.9%	6	0.7%	6	0.6%	3	0.3%
BTEC	18	3.3%	30	5.5%	30	4.9%	10	1.9%	13	2.6%
Other	72	3.8%	76	3.4%	61	3.0%	28	1.4%	49	2.6%

Pass	16/17		17/18		18/19		19/20		20/21	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Total	35	1.0%	42	1.1%	31	0.9%	37	1.1%	27	0.8%

Good Outcomes	16/17		17/18		18/19		19/20		20/21	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Applied Sciences	137	63.4%	118	54.4%	85	57.8%	105	72.4%	159	77.2%
Arts and Humanities	747	77.4%	746	81.3%	652	78.4%	726	82.1%	656	78.6%
Computing and Engineering	330	80.7%	335	74.9%	324	75.9%	393	84.9%	442	84.4%
Education and Professional Development	166	84.3%	169	84.9%	195	81.3%	169	84.1%	142	86.1%
Huddersfield Business School	567	59.6%	819	66.7%	799	71.1%	862	81.2%	695	82.9%
Human and Health Sciences	683	86.7%	645	82.4%	648	82.9%	616	86.2%	573	84.3%

2. Assessment and marking practices

The [Regulations for Awards](#) specify University policy on the design, assessment and marking practice of undergraduate programmes. The regulations are reviewed annually and presented to the University Teaching and Learning Committee (UTLC) for scrutiny, and they are mapped to the UK Quality Code.

All programmes undergo a rigorous validation process before being approved for delivery, and as part of that process they are explicitly mapped to the relevant QAA Subject Benchmark Statements, QAA guidance on Course Design and Development, and on Assessment, and engage external advisors in alignment with the expectations of the QAA guidance on External Expertise. Assessment strategy is specified at validation and any subsequent changes to assessment design have to be approved through formal validation process.

Staff and students are expected to comply with the University Assessment and Feedback Strategy which sets out our vision that assessment will inspire and challenge students to achieve, with a strong emphasis on personalised feedback and support. Good degree outcomes have improved since 2016/17 and in the three subsequent years stabilised at around 75. This is a result of initiatives designed to improve teaching quality, the calibre of our teaching staff, and assessment and feedback practice, working with external advisors including AdvanceHE. The University has also developed initiatives to resolve differential attainment, including more recently the use of an OfS catalyst funded project "Intervention for Success".

An important part of the quality assurance process for awards is the external examiner system, where they are appointed to all programmes and are expected to undertake University training in order to fulfil their role effectively, and those new to the role are provided with a mentor drawn from the wider external examiner cohort.

3. Impact of Covid-19 pandemic on degree outcomes

In 2019/20 the University implemented [emergency regulations](#) to take account of the impact of the pandemic. The national lockdown in March coincided with a major assessment and examination period and where necessary assessments¹ were amended to allow for online submission, including the use of open book exams. A safety net approach was taken to ensure students were not disadvantaged, and that where students had completed and passed their final year assignments, their degree award would at least match the classification indicated by second year grades. External examiners were consulted throughout in regard to changed assessments and student performance.

Disruption to teaching and learning continued throughout 2020/21, and in anticipation of restrictions to campus access, the University approved a Grade Safety Policy (GSP), an enhanced moderation and standardisation framework to mitigate the potential effect on student performance.

The safety net approach from the previous year was not appropriate for finalists in 20/21 as there was not a clean baseline of unaffected marks from which expected individual performance could be inferred. Instead, a module-based approach was devised. Module marks were scrutinised to determine whether the distribution of current marks on a given module were statistically significantly different from the distribution of marks in previous years. Where a difference arose, an algorithm was applied to propose a scaled mark for each student that would bring the distribution in line with previous years. Analysis of the application of the GSP confirmed that the distribution of marks was generally consistent with previous years, but that in a small number of cases the potentially negative effect on marks due to the pandemic was effectively mitigated by the policy.

4. Academic Governance

Award decisions are made by a Course Assessment Board (CAB) at School level. The School Board is responsible to Senate through UTLC for the CAB's implementation of the assessment regulations with respect to academic courses within the school. Student attainment is considered by UTLC. The committee receives an annual report of outcomes achieved by different demographic groups of students, external examiner reports, and reports from the Collaborative Provision Committee which has oversight of awards delivered through UK and international partnership arrangements. Summaries from UTLC are sent to Senate for consideration, and Senate in turn reports strategic items to University Council. The membership of all formal University committees includes student representation, in alignment with the expectations of the [revised UK Quality Code](#).

We have more than 100 different institutions providing us with 118 external examiners who rigorously scrutinise our assessment practice, and any concerns raised in their reports are flagged for consideration by UTLC and for action by the Dean of School. Actions are monitored by UTLC through the presentation of Annual Evaluation Reports from Schools.

5. Classification algorithms

Over the period since 2010, the algorithm used to calculate degree classification has not altered, and is set out in the [Regulations for Awards \(Taught Courses\)](#). There is one algorithm with

¹ In one area the PSRB required formally sat exams which were rearranged as soon as campus access was possible

exceptions for top up degree programmes and sandwich programmes to take account of the different routes to level 6 study.

6. Teaching practices and learning resources

There is a Teaching and Learning Strategy which aligns with the University Strategic Plan, which sets as a KPI Differential Attainment of zero. All our academic staff undertake research or scholarly activity, 76% of our academic staff have PhDs with the remainder working towards one, and 94% hold teaching qualifications. All academic staff are Fellows of the Higher Education Academy (now AdvanceHE) or working towards this within 12 months of appointment. We have a vibrant community of National Teaching Fellows and University Teaching Fellows who act as mentors, trainers and facilitators for innovation in teaching practice. To facilitate the operational and organisational aspects of our delivery of teaching and learning, all senior managers are accredited by the CMI. Our staff base is highly professionalised, and this provides a strong base for delivery of excellence in teaching and learning and consequent outcomes across a diverse student population.

7. Identifying good practice and actions

The University has a well-established history of intervention through teaching and learning to improve student attainment, with numerous projects, all of which are taken to UTLC where good practice is shared. Examples of this is “Flying Start” and “Ready, Steady, Study” transitions initiatives to increase confidence in all newly arrived first year students which has had the impact of improving retention and success across all student groups. The Differential Attainment Project analyses performance of students with recognised characteristics through module attainment marks. This provides a granular level of student attainment detail which Schools use to plan innovative and inclusive teaching and learning practices which aim to reduce the attainment gap to zero and meet one of the KPIs on the current Strategic Plan (2019-2025). The Project has identified areas for targeted interventions, including reimagining assessment methodologies. Drawing on data from this project, the School of Computing and Engineering, in the Department of Information Technology, has restructured its curriculum, assessment and student support and has already impacted on differential attainment which is not statistically significant.

There is a dedicated Strategic Teaching and Learning Senior Leadership Team which supports school-level initiatives, and which organises annual Teaching and Learning conferences which encourage innovation and offer space for sharing good practice across the academic disciplines. To support staff in transitioning to online teaching and learning methodologies in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, this team developed a dedicated training programme “Moving Your Module Online” which guided staff through the technologies and techniques of distributed learning, with very positive feedback from participants.

8. Risks and challenges

Although delivering a positive direction of travel, the Differential Attainment Project continues to be challenging particularly during the pandemic. However, it is supported through strategic enabling projects, and progress towards the KPI is monitored via UTLC, SLT and Council as well as through Annual Evaluation processes.