**SCHOOL PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE SUMMARY REPORT**

**Reporting on year:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **School** |  |
| **Faculty** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Completed by (name):** |  | | |
| **Role:** |  | **Date:** |  |

**Purpose and scope**

*At the start of each academic year, Heads of School (or nominee) should analyse the performance of the school’s portfolio from the previous academic year, in order to assess whether courses are meeting their stated objectives and whether students are achieving the intended learning outcomes.*

*Analysis should focus on the impact of activity undertaken from the previous academic year to address specific areas of concern within the portfolio. As well as confirm the schools short-, medium- and long-term strategies to address areas where further intervention and enhancement is needed. Where necessary, reports should indicate if further support from Faculty and the University is required to ensure these strategies can be achieved.*

*Reports should use outcomes from Boards of Studies, Course Continuous Improvement Plans (CCIPs) as well as course and University data, including student surveys.*

*Heads of Schools may wish to share the content of this report with course teams in the first Boards of Study of the academic year in order to establish individual course and school priorities for the forthcoming year.*

**Submission**

*Final drafts should be submitted to the Faculty Director of Quality (FDQ) for consideration by Faculty Quality Committees (FQC) no later than end of October of each academic year.*

*The reports will be considered by FQCs and the University’s Quality Monitoring Review Sub-Committee (QMRSC) where outcomes will be communicated back to Heads of School where necessary.*

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Portfolio Performance**  *This section is designed to enable Heads of School to carry out a performance analysis of their portfolio to determine whether courses are meeting their stated objectives and that students are achieving the intended learning outcomes.* |
| **1a. Based on outputs from Boards of Study, CCIPs and course data from last year, analyse the impact of activity taken by course teams to improve priority areas of concern within the school’s portfolio.** *Impact should focus on whether the work undertaken by course teams and the school as a whole has been effective in improving outcomes, which have been identified as an area of concern.* |
|  |
| **1b. Reflecting on your response in part 1a, confirm the short-, medium- and longer-term enhancement strategies that are either currently, or will be employed by the school to address the areas of concern where current improvement activity is having little to no impact.**  *Strategies can include medium to longer-term changes and efficiencies to be made carried out through periodic review or the University’s FPPE process. Please also identify how you will measure the impact of these strategies.* |
|  |
| **1c. Identify areas of strong performance which has directly impacted on improving the school’s priority areas within its portfolio.** *This can include successful school-wide initiatives (e.g. assessment and feedback policy) or relevant examples of innovative/good practice by colleagues. These examples will be shared with the University’s Learning, Teaching Assessment Working Group to ensure dissemination across the wider University and inform future TEF case studies. (Please list)* |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No |
| **2. Additional support from the Faculty and University**  Are there any elements of the school's enhancement strategies that may require further support from the faculty and wider University? *This information will be considered by the Faculty Quality Committee to identify areas of faculty support and communicated to the University’s Quality Monitoring and Review Sub-Committee accordingly. If ‘yes,’ please provide details below.* |  |  |
|  | | |