

## PRIMARY MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE

### AN OUTSTANDING STUDENT EXPERIENCE

	SUCCESS CRITERIA	PRIMARY MEASURE
1.	To increase high levels of student satisfaction as evidence by measures such as the National Student Survey and internal surveys.	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual scores in National Student Survey</li> <li>• Rates of retention and progression including HEFCE PIs</li> <li>• Rates of Student Achievement (i.e. proportion of good degrees)</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual report on exit interviews/questionnaire</li> <li>• Annual ASQEC report on quality and standards</li> <li>• Annual student feedback report (work in progress)</li> </ul>
2.	To achieve external recognition of our excellent in learning and teaching and support for students.	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcome of external inspections, e.g.:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ofsted</li> <li>- QAA Institutional Audit</li> <li>- External Accrediting Bodies (BPS, NMC, etc)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Number of externally funded learning and teaching projects</li> <li>• Income from externally funded learning and teaching projects</li> <li>• Number of publications/presentations on learning and teaching (including textbooks, e-resources etc)</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u> Departmental learning and teaching reports
3.	To establish an effective framework of	<u>Quantitative</u>

	market research to ensure that new courses meet the needs of their target population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications data</li> </ul> <p><u>Qualitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual student feedback report (work in progress)</li> <li>• Quality of market information presented with new course proposals to Academic Portfolio Committee</li> </ul>
4.	To introduce structured opportunities for greater employer involvement in course development, validation and review and to greatly improve work based learning opportunities	<p><u>Quantitative</u></p> <p>Number of employers involved in course development /review processes Number of employers involved in advisory groups and boards</p> <p><u>Qualitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report of Business Development Office</li> </ul>
5.	To increase participation by students in learning opportunities that promote employability, enterprise and entrepreneurial skills, especially through the introduction of opportunities for students to gain work experience.	<p><u>Quantitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of courses that include work placements/work based learning/ work experience</li> <li>• Number of students taking a work placement etc</li> <li>• Number of student engaged in extra-curricular enterprise and employability initiatives</li> </ul> <p><u>Qualitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow-up survey of graduates to establish relevance and usefulness of work based learning opportunities</li> <li>• Statements of 'Employability relatedness for each programme</li> <li>• Report on implementation of University student employability and community engagement strategy</li> </ul>
6.	To support an active Students' Union, which provides opportunities for students to participate in a broad range	<p><u>Quantitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of clubs and activities</li> <li>• Proportion of students with membership of club/activity</li> </ul>

	<p>of activities, in support of their academic studies, including student representation at all levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proportion of vacancies for student representatives filled/ known to the University/SU</li><li>• Proportion of student representatives trained</li><li>• Promotion of learning development activities</li></ul> <p><u>Qualitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Feedback from student representatives on their experience of the role</li><li>• Feedback from academic departments on the effectiveness of student representation.</li></ul>
--	---	--

## GENERATING KNOWLEDGE AND PROMOTING ENTERPRISE

	Success Criteria	Primary Measure
1.	To double income from consultancy and enterprise contacts by 2012	<u>Quantitative</u> Year on year increase in income over base year, 2006/2007
2.	To further improve research achievement and effective support for research students and to achieve 200 research degree completions by 2012	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of postgraduate research students</li> <li>• Number of MPhil and PhD completions each academic session.</li> <li>• Results of RTP Module Assessment</li> <li>• Number of training events for staff and for students</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of student feedback and of annual reports submitted by individual research students and their supervisor.</li> <li>• Analysis of feedback and evaluation of training events</li> <li>• Annual report of the Graduate Research School</li> </ul>
3.	To develop a strong culture of enterprise and knowledge transfer, making a significant contribution to society and the economy	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Institutes to combine their separate research and knowledge transfer strategies into a fully integrated RKT strategy.</li> <li>• Product portfolios completed for all Research centres.</li> <li>• Other income: total, growth and as % of income</li> <li>• Promotion of academic time on “O” activity from TRAC</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report of Business Development Office</li> <li>• Outcomes of the Higher Education Business Community Interaction Survey</li> </ul>
4.	To secure research degree awarding powers	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor the progress and outcome of the University’s application to the Privy Council.</li> </ul>

5.	Through staff development and review, to ensure that all academic staff are engaged in advanced scholarship/research and/or knowledge transfer	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Annual report from Head of Institute on number of their staff who are “active”</li><li>• Data derived from Annual Research reports on research and related outputs (publications, membership of learned bodies etc)</li><li>• Data derived from Report of Business Development office on staff engaged in BDO activities.</li><li>• Annual TRAC survey results</li></ul>
----	--	--

## A FIRST CLASS UNIVERSITY FOR THE REGION

	<b>Success Criteria</b>	<b>Primary Measure</b>
1.	To complete the development of the City Centre Campus and Joint Library and History Centre with Worcestershire County Council by 2012, thereby creating the Worcester Learning Quarter and contributing to the regeneration of the St Clement's Gate area.	<u>Quantitative/Qualitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor progress through regular reports to VCAG and governors, of these two major strategic capital developments.</li> </ul>
2.	To achieve the planned growth in student and staff numbers by 2012, thereby making a substantially increased contribution to the regional economy	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year-on-year growth in student numbers, using 2006/2008 number as a baseline against which to measure and monitor growth</li> <li>• Year-on-year growth in numbers of staff, using 2006/2007 number as a baseline</li> <li>• Year-on-year increase in potential spend/contribution to regional economy based on estimate of student and staff expenditure</li> </ul>
3.	To establish a vibrant Herefordshire and Worcestershire Lifelong Learning Network, with a shared credit framework with the University of Birmingham and the Open University by 2009	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress against milestones for number of students studying LLN courses</li> <li>• Number of course developments with university and college partners.</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u> Information derived from LLN annual reports on progress with progression agreements and underlying credit framework.
4.	To perform above our benchmark for attracting students from under-represented groups	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual PIs produced by HEFCE</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u> An established progression framework with local schools. Research into the student experience including progression into higher education.
5.	To work on partnerships to provide	<u>Quantitative</u>

	significant support to encourage business start-up for the region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No of partnerships</li> <li>• No of start up businesses year-on-year arising out of partnerships</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information n this activity from the report of the Business Development Office</li> </ul>
6.	To open a commercially successful allergy and aerobiology test centre	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual turnover of the centre from its opening (scheduled for summer 2009), monitoring year-on-year growth.</li> </ul>
7.	To ensure the successful commercial operation and development of the Motion Analysis Research and Rehabilitation Centre	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual income (from commercial and other sources) of the Centre, using 2007/2008 as the baseline year.</li> </ul>

## HIGH ACHIEVING STAFF IN A WELL LED UNIVERSITY

	<b>Success Criteria</b>	<b>Primary Measure</b>
1.	To increase the number of students studying for University awards to 12000 by 2012	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year on year growth of student numbers, using 2006/2007 numbers as a baseline year.</li> </ul>
2.	To double annual income to £80m by 2012 and to maintain a balanced revenue budget through the period.	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of annual income and expenditure accounts to monitor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- growth in income</li> <li>- surplus/deficit</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3.	To develop a integrated, capital development programme for the University's two sites, sporting facilities and residences.	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The integrated capital development programme was prepared as part of the application for loan funding and HEFCE consent to borrow. It will be subject to annual review through VCAG and the Board of Governors</li> </ul>
4.	To introduce a new Career Development, Achievement and Review Scheme, and staff development framework	<u>Qualitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New appraisal scheme introduced in 2007/2008</li> <li>• Staff development framework to be agreed and launched in first part of 2009</li> <li>• Monitor impact of both, through staff feedback and appropriate measures of success (e.g. student retention and achievement; research outputs; etc)</li> </ul>
5.	To embed a culture of high performance by 2009	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of research outputs</li> <li>• Indicators of improved levels of student satisfaction and success; retention rates; NSS scores, proportion of good degrees awarded</li> <li>• Number of external awards</li> <li>• Results of annual academic promotions, support staff scheme, professorial appointments</li> </ul> <u>Qualitative</u>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of outcomes of any staff surveys</li> <li>• Annual Report of Director of Personnel, including information arising out of exit interviews, rates of staff turnover, etc</li> </ul>
6.	To complete in 2007, a review of the effectiveness of Academic Board and its sub-committees, to reduce the burden of internal regulation and to enhance the Board's effectiveness	<p>Complete: Review of effectiveness complete and quality assurance processes have been reviewed.</p> <p><u>Quantitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor through annual review undertaken by Academic Governance Committee, effectiveness of new committee structure</li> <li>• Monitor, through Audit and Review Committee, impact of new validation and annual monitoring procedures</li> </ul>
7.	To establish a reputation with external regulating bodies for excellent corporate governance	<p><u>Quantitative/Qualitative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal and External Audit reports</li> <li>• Outcome of HEFCE Review(s)</li> </ul>

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, EXCELLENT FACILITIES

	<b>Success Criteria</b>	<b>Primary Measures</b>
1.	To raise the capital needed to fund the substantial building development programme	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding raised through various sources, including loans</li> </ul>
2.	To open the City Campus and the Joint Library and Public Library and History Centre	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor progress against milestones</li> </ul>
3.	To continue the progressive development of facilities at the St John's campus	<u>Quantitative/Qualitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual summary of refurbishments at St John's and of new builds, monitored against the integrated capital development programme and the revised Estates Strategy (which will integrate all sites and be agreed in 2009/10)</li> <li>• Proportion of modernised teaching rooms</li> <li>• Space costs derived from HEFCE published benchmark data</li> </ul>
4.	To set and achieve demanding environmental targets	<u>Quantitative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement against targets in Carbon Management Programme</li> <li>• Achievement against targets in the Environmental Strategy</li> <li>• Number of "excellent"/"very good" in environmental assessments associated with new builds.</li> <li>• Continued progress through the stages of the EcoCampus environmental assessment programme</li> <li>• Performance in the HEFCE sponsored 'Universities that Count' Environmental index for the HE sector</li> </ul>

## Overall Institutional Sustainability and Profile

	<b>PMP</b>	<b>Definition/measurement</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	Return on assets	<p>CE/CP ratio</p> <p>Cost of equity over cost of production</p> <p>(use insured asset value over income as an easy proxy)</p>	<p>Measures the amount of asset value used by the institution to create each £ of income</p> <p>CE/CP values vary widely across the sector – usually in the range of 0.5-5. Research-intensive and specialist institutions tend to have higher ratios. Other things being equal, institutions with higher CE/CP will find it harder to create enough surpluses to service their assets and invest for the future. But if CE/CP is too low, it may indicate under-capitalisation.</p> <p>These ratios can readily be derived from sector statistics (e.g. EMS) and benchmarked against peer institutions</p>
2	Income growth, diversity and security	Growth and spread of income sources and perceived security of these and opportunities to grow net income	In the current funding climate (where cost inflation is higher than increases in unit funding) most institutions need to grow their income to be sustainable. Institutions vary widely in their dependence on funding council grant. The scope for diversification of income, and the risks and benefits associated with this should be considered by each institution as part of its financial strategy.
3.	Strategic relationships and reputation	Feedback on quality of reputation and relationship with key stakeholders and partners	Every institution should identify its key stakeholders and partners i.e. those which make a significant contribution to its sustainability. For

			<p>most there will be a small number of these (e.g. funding council, Teacher Development Agency, Department of Health, QAA and Accrediting Professional Bodies, Research Councils, other major research funders, RDA and partner institutions).</p> <p>Governors should ensure they have access to feedback from these key stakeholders (e.g. by client satisfaction surveys and feedback). If any top ten clients see the university's contribution as less than very good or good, governors should request an explanation and proposed action.</p>
4.	Balance of opportunities and risks	Assessment	<p>Does the institution face significant strategic risks? Does it have strategies to deal with these, including developing room to manoeuvre and strategic options to pursue? Can it attract extra funding or significantly improve its academic reputation and position? Has it reviewed strategic options, e.g. for collaboration?</p>
5	Evidence of academic distinctiveness	Assessment of coherence and achievement of chose positioning	<p>Governors might wish to request a statement of how the institution is positioning itself academically, its specific appeal to students and academic partners, and evidence of achievement of this.</p>
6.	Position in peer group and league tables	Placings in Times guide for teaching/student experience, and for research	<p>Some leagues tables may be inappropriate. The institution should define for itself how it wishes to be compared, and should present these KPIs for governors. If published league tables are</p>

			considered unsatisfactory, further benchmarking should be undertaken to provide equivalent assurance
7.	Contribution of strategic academic relationships	Most significant academic strategic alliances listed by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partner</li> <li>• Purpose</li> <li>• Health and contribution</li> </ul>	Academic collaboration is a central part of higher education, and is important to the reputation and performance of the institution. Governors will wish to be aware of the health and vitality of these partnerships, their cost to the institution, and the opportunities they offer. A periodic view would be appropriate.
8.	Integration of academic and strategic planning	Assessment of effectiveness of process	Governors need to know how well the academic and financial strategies are linked. Do academic needs inform financial and estate plans? Do academic objectives take account of financial and market realities?
9	Medium-term academic ambitions	Statement	Governors need to understand the academic vision for the institution? Does it make sense to governors? Is it exciting, achievable, relevant and affordable? Has it been well-communicated?