

Section 1 - Appendix 1 Academic Governance Policy

Implementation Guidelines & Support for Reviews of Academic Senate and its committees

Overview

These guidelines are for those involved in designing and delivering major structural reviews of the University's Academic Senate and its committees. A major structural review is the addition or deletion to the governance structure or a review of the Academic Senate.

The guidelines are based on a detailed study of the most efficient and productive approaches to undertaking academic reviews in a wide range of Australian and overseas universities. They have also been specifically benchmarked with the guidelines used with panel chairs, panel members and review support officers by the Australian University Quality Agency and a range of equivalent agencies internationally.

The guidelines bring together the practical advice of people experienced in each role on how to successfully deliver the key steps in the University's Academic Governance Review process (these are summarised in Appendix 2 of the Academic Governance Policy) and implement the review consistent with the provisions of the University's Reviews Policy.

- (1) There are specific guidelines for each of the following roles:
 - a. The Sponsor of the review who will normally be the Chair of Academic Senate but may be the Chancellor or Deputy Chancellor
 - b. The Review Panel Chair
 - c. Review Panel members
 - d. The Review Manager
- (2) It is recommended that everyone involved in an Academic Senate structural review is not only clear on their role but what all the other members of their team are to contribute.
- (3) This is the framework by which reviews of Academic Senate and its committees are to be conducted. The Senate is assisted by the University's Office of Quality and Performance in the planning, preparation and conduct of such reviews. For further information and support please don't hesitate to contact the University's Office of Quality and Performance on (02) 96787452 or your specific Review Manager

Chair

Academic Senate

Part A - Sponsor for the Review

- (4) The Review Sponsor will normally be the Chair of Academic Senate. The Sponsor will:
 - a. Be thoroughly familiar with the University's Academic Governance Policy, the University's Reviews Policy and the University's Review Process (Appendix 2 of the Academic Governance Policy).

- b. With assistance from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education), produce a document for consideration by the Audit and Risk Management Committee (the Committee) of the Board of Trustees, under Charter clauses 3.1.10 and 3.1.11 that relate to special reviews. The document would normally be produced for consideration by the Committee 12 months in advance of the review and outline:
 - i. the need for and proposed scope of the review;
 - ii. terms of reference consistent with the Academic Governance Policy and the University's Reviews Policy; and
 - iii. any proposal for external reviewers.

(5) If the review is initiated by the Audit and Risk Management Committee of the Board of Trustees, the Sponsor will work with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) to:

- a. Determine who will chair the review and the membership of the review panel. In some cases an honorarium may be relevant. If so, an honorarium may be paid to an external chair with the agreement of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice President (Academic).
- b. Identify the Review Manager and, if necessary, additional support staff.
- c. In consultation with the Review Chair, clarify the nature of the self-assessment documentation to be delivered to the review panel, as well as who will produce it and the data necessary to inform it.
- d. Establish the timetable, interview schedule and other activities (if relevant) for the site visit.
- e. Produce and endorse the note calling for submissions to the review.

The outcomes of the above steps will be considered by the Chair of Audit and Risk Management Committee and reported to the Audit and Risk Management Committee.

(6) Oversee the work of the Review Manager with a view to ensuring that the whole review process operates efficiently and effectively (including promotion of the review, confirmation of venue, accommodation and travel for external members, production of the self-assessment portfolio, delivery of any supplementary information requested by the panel, assistance for the panel chair and follow up on the review).

(7) Check the draft review report for errors of fact or emphasis and provide a copy of the draft report to Senate for information and a response.

(8) Present the corrected final review report and Senate response to the Audit and Risk Management Committee for consideration and that recommendations arising from the report are made by the Audit and Risk Management Committee to the Board of Trustees for approval.

(9) Ensure that those recommendations made by the Audit and Risk Committee arising from the review and endorsed by the Board are followed up promptly, wisely and effectively. To ensure that follow up is effective the sponsor will work with the Deputy Vice Chancellor and Vice President (Academic) to develop an implementation and reporting plan consistent with the provisions under Clause 3.1.11 of the Audit and Risk management Committee Charter. This plan will include - for each commendation, affirmation or recommendation - targets, timelines, success indicators and accountabilities for delivery.

(10) Provide reports to Academic Senate and the Audit and Risk Committee on the Review progress and findings and actions.

(11) Provide an annual progress report on the implementation of the actions being taken to address the commendations, affirmations and recommendations to the Chair of the Audit and Risk Management Committee until all have been addressed.

Part B - Review Panel Chair

(12) It is expected that the Review Panel Chair will:

- a. Be thoroughly familiar with the Academic Governance Policy, the University's Reviews Policy and the University's Reviews Process (Appendix 2 of the Academic Governance Policy).
- b. Inform the Review Manager if s/he has any conflict of interest.
- c. Read the review self-assessment portfolio and all the submissions to the review.
- d. Chair the pre-visit meeting/teleconference with panel members on the review's self-assessment portfolio and submissions. The focus of this meeting is to identify:
 - i. Any supplementary information to be provided to the panel prior to the site visit;
 - ii. The potential commendations, affirmations and recommendations to be tested during the site visit and panel interviews;
 - iii. Which members of the panel will be responsible for interview questions in particular areas;
 - iv. How the panel will test the veracity of the claims made in the self-assessment portfolio during the interviews.

(13) With the Review Manager, ensure that all supplementary information requested by the panel is delivered to it prior to the site visit and confirm the key panel member responsibilities during the site visit, including which specific questions/tests each panel member will pursue across different interview groups.

(14) Ensure panel members are clear on how the site visit interviews will operate; their specific role, and the expected ways of behaving during them. This would include emphasising the importance of creating a collegial, trusting and professional atmosphere; along with the importance of avoiding making personal judgments on the responses given and ensuring that conclusions drawn from interviews are evidence-based and align with data from other sources.

(15) Chair the interviews undertaken during the site visit. For each interview group to:

- a. Welcome the interviewees, introduce the panel, explain the purposes of the review and outline how their time with the panel will be handled;
- b. Confirm that what individuals say will remain confidential and that what is referred to in the final report will be aggregated and consistent views, not individual ones;
- c. Coordinate questioning by each panel member, ensuring that this process remains generally on target and that responses are succinct enough to enable all planned questions for each interview session to be addressed;
- d. Allow some new, unexpected lines of inquiry to be pursued.

(16) During the period set aside between meeting each interview group (normally about 15 minutes):

- a. Determine the key outcomes from the previous set of interviews against the key questions being pursued;
- b. Identify any new areas for follow up;
- c. Ensure that the Review Manager has accurately and succinctly recorded the points made;
- d. Review the progress being made and identify any aspects of questioning that require enhancement;

(17) At the end of the interview process:

- a. Confirm the key commendations, affirmations and recommendations with the panel.
- b. Confirm the reasons that will be used to justify them.

(18) With the Review Manager, produce a draft review report against the agreed Terms of Reference including a set of commendations, affirmations and recommendations; it is important to ensure that these are consistent with the tested conclusions of the panel and take into consideration a triangulated analysis of the self-assessment portfolio, submissions, interviews and other data generated during the review process.

(19) After feedback from the panel on the draft report, finalise it with the Review Manager.

(20) Test the final draft with the Review Sponsor for errors of fact or emphasis. The final draft will be provided to Senate for response in addition to Review Sponsor tests.

(21) Then forward the completed report to the Chair of the Audit and Risk Management Committee for consideration by the Committee and development of Committee recommendations arising to the Board of Trustees.

(22) Return all materials provided during the review to the Review Manager at the end of the process.

(23) If appropriate, provide feedback to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) on the overall review process, including how the operation of similar reviews in the future might be further enhanced.

Part C - Review Panel Member

(24) It is expected that each member of the review panel will:

- a. Be thoroughly familiar with the University's Academic Governance Policy, the University's Reviews Policy and the University's Reviews Process (Appendix 2 of the Academic Governance Policy).
- b. Inform the Review Manager if s/he has any conflict of interest.
- c. Read the review self-assessment portfolio and all the submissions to the review.
- d. Participate in the pre-visit meeting/teleconference on the review's self-assessment portfolio and submissions. The focus of this meeting is to identify:
 - i. Any supplementary information the panel wishes to be provided with prior to the site visit;
 - ii. The potential commendations, affirmations and recommendations to be tested during the site visit and panel interview phase;
 - iii. Which members of the panel will be responsible for interview questions in particular areas;

- iv. How the panel will test the veracity of the claims made in the self-assessment portfolio during the interviews.

(25) Study the supplementary information prior to the site visit and confirm with the Chair/Review Manager your responsibilities during the site visit, including which specific questions/tests you will pursue across different interview groups.

(26) Make sure you are clear on how the site visit interviews will operate, including your specific role, and the expected ways of behaving during them.

(27) During the interview phase please apply the following guidelines:

- a. Seek to create a collegial, trusting and professional atmosphere;
- b. Approach interviewees with tact and diplomacy;
- c. Target your agreed question to the person(s) best positioned to respond. Then ask if others wish to provide additional information;
- d. It is quite appropriate to pursue briefly an unexpected but directly relevant issue, should this arise. The Panel Chair will oversee the time given to this process;
- e. Avoid making value judgements on the responses provided.

(28) During the period set aside between meeting with interview groups (normally about 15 minutes) assist the Chair to:

- a. Determine the key outcomes from the previous set of interviews against the key questions being pursued;
- b. Identify any new areas for follow up;
- c. Ensure that the Review Manager has accurately and succinctly recorded the points made;
- d. Review the progress being made and identify any aspects of questioning that require enhancement.

(29) At the end of the interview process assist the Chair to:

- a. Confirm the key commendations, affirmations and recommendations in the light of the evidence presented in both the written materials submitted and the interviews or other aspects of the site visit;
- b. Confirm the reasons that will be used to justify them.

(30) Evaluate the draft review report against the review's agreed Terms of Reference, returning comments to the Review Chair within the agreed timeframe for providing feedback. This would normally include assessing the set of commendations, affirmations and recommendations in the draft for their consistency with the tested conclusions of the panel; taking into consideration a triangulated analysis of the self-assessment portfolio, submissions, interviews and other data generated during the review process.

(31) Return all materials provided during the review to the Review Manager at the end of the process.

(32) If appropriate, provide feedback to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) on the overall review process, including how the operation of similar reviews in the future might be further enhanced.

Part D - Review Manager

(33) It is expected that the review manager will:

- a. Be thoroughly familiar with the University's Academic Governance Policy, the University's Reviews Policy and the University's Review Process (Appendix 2 of the Academic Governance Policy).
- b. Ensure the smooth operation and delivery of all of the following organisational elements associated with the review:
 - i. Production of its Terms of Reference, panel member list, self-assessment portfolio, and any supplementary information requested by the panel;
 - ii. Confirm that all those involved in the review are familiar with the University's Review Policy, Review Process and this set of guidelines;
 - iii. Deliver all the organisational elements for the review including travel and accommodation for any external panel members; confirmation of interview times and locations with those concerned and their briefing on what will happen; food, booking and set up of the interview rooms for the site visit etc

(34) Take notes on and, under the direction of the panel chair, action the outcomes of the pre-site visit teleconference.

(35) Take notes on the outcomes of each set of interviews during the site visit under the direction of the Panel Chair.

(36) Assist the panel chair to produce the draft review report and ensure this is distributed with clear guidelines for review to the panel and that timely feedback is received.

(37) Assist the panel chair to produce the report and ensure that it is promptly forwarded to the Chair, Panel members and Sponsor of the review.

(38) Ensure all materials produced for the review are returned and are disposed of appropriately.

(39) Seek and consolidate feedback from the Sponsor, panel chair and panel on how to further enhance the University's Reviews process and forward this to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education).

Interviewee Support

(40) It is the responsibility of the Review Manager to ensure that all of those interviewed:

- a. Are clear on the purposes of the review – that, for example, the main objective is to improve the quality of what University's is doing in the area being studied.
- b. Understand that, during the site interviews, they are to respond to questions when they are directed to them and to do so authentically and honestly from their perspective; that there are no right or wrong answers; that what they say is confidential and that they will be informed of the review's outcomes.

Section 2 - Appendix 2

University's Academic Governance Review Process

Stage 1

(41) Structural reviews of Academic Senate and/or its committees will normally be nominated at least 12 months ahead, except at the discretion of the Chair of the Board of Trustees Audit and Risk Management Committee.

(42) The need for a structural review of Academic Senate and/or its committees will be initiated by the sponsor; and a short, evidence based case to justify it is produced for submission to the Audit and Risk Management Committee of the Board of Trustees.

(43) The Office of Quality and Performance will, together with the review sponsor, develop and monitor the Review Timetable.

(44) The Sponsor for the Review presents the case for a review to the Chair of the Audit and Risk Management Committee under the provisions of Clause 3.1.10 of the Committee charter and notifies the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education).

(45) If the Audit and Risk Management Committee choose to initiate a special review under provisions of Clause 3.1.10 of their charter following the Sponsor submission, a draft proposal and terms of reference are submitted to Academic Senate and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) for comment in accordance with the Implementation guidelines.

(46) Senate and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) comments will be forwarded to the review sponsor who will finalise the proposal and submit to the Audit and Risk Management Committee for endorsement and advice to the Board of Trustees that a special review has been initiated and, where external reviewers are involved, commissioned.

(47) The Audit and Risk Management Committee has the delegation to initiate special reviews. For the purpose of the University's Academic Governance Review process a structural review of senate and/or its committees is considered a special review.

(48) The review will be logged on the register of reviews maintained by the Office of Quality and Performance.

(49) The Office of Quality and Performance will provide advice and guidance to the relevant review secretariat on available data and necessary documentation and guidelines.

Stage 2

(50) The Pro Vice -Chancellor (Education) will provide advice to shape the process for review, consistent with the requirements of the University's Academic Governance Policy and the University's Reviews Policy.

(51) Documentation will include:

- a. the chair and composition of Review Panel
- b. the nature of the self-assessment and other relevant documentation
- c. the interviews to be undertaken during Review Panel visit
- d. A call for submissions.

Stage 3

(52) The agreed portfolio is provided to the members of the Review Panel

(53) The Review Panel will have a minimum of two full weeks to review the portfolio, request any follow up documentation and agree to a schedule of interviews. The Review Panel may convey via the Office of Quality and Performance any relevant information or comment to the sponsor and chair of the review panel at this time.

Stage 4

(54) The interview process is completed and the report and its key recommendations are finalised by the panel chair and the sponsor.

(55) The review report is signed off by Review Panel.

(56) The report is submitted to Senate for response.

(57) The Report and Senate response is then presented to the Audit and Risk Management Committee for consideration and if so determined by the Committee, recommendations arising from the review will be made by the Committee to the Board of Trustees.

Stage 5

(58) Following Board of Trustees endorsement of Audit and risk Committee recommendations arising from the review, the review sponsor develops a draft implementation plan.

(59) This is forwarded to the Audit and Risk Management Committee for comment and if appropriate endorsement.

Stage 6

(60) The sponsor provides an annual progress report on the implementation of the report's recommendations to the Audit and Risk Management Committee of the Board of Trustees consistent with provisions of Clause 3.1.11 of the Committee Charter until all recommendations have been addressed.