

## University Reviews Guidelines

---

<b>Approving authority</b>	Executive Group
<b>Approval date</b>	September 2010
<b>Advisor</b>	Rosemary Marson   Manager, Organisational Reviews Unit <a href="mailto:R.Marson@griffith.edu.au">R.Marson@griffith.edu.au</a>   (07) 373 56468
<b>Next scheduled review</b>	2014
<b>Document URL</b>	<a href="http://policies.griffith.edu.au/pdf/University_Reviews_Guidelines.pdf">http://policies.griffith.edu.au/pdf/University Reviews Guidelines.pdf</a>
<b>TRIM document</b>	2017/0000262
<b>Description</b>	These guidelines provide the framework for the University's organisational review activity, covering the five key phases involved. These guidelines should be read in conjunction with the University Reviews Policy.

### Related documents

---

[University Reviews Policy](#)

[Framework for Quality Assurance](#)

[Staffing Delegations - Academic Groups](#)

[Research Centres and Institutes Policy](#)

Griffith University - Adopting a benchmarking-driven approach to quality assurance and improvement (2009 AUQA Good Practice Database submission)

---

[\[Introduction\]](#) [\[Overview\]](#) [\[Preparing for the Review\]](#) [\[Self-Review\]](#) [\[Preparing and Submitting the Review Portfolio\]](#) [\[The Review Visit\]](#) [\[Post-Review Visit Processes\]](#) [\[Appendix A\]](#) [\[Appendix B\]](#)

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines apply to reviews of academic, division or thematic areas, with the exception of reviews of Research Centres\*, and are designed to provide a clear and simple framework for review activity, including the preparation and submission of the review portfolio.

In addition to setting out the processes involved and the sections to be included in the review portfolio, this document also sets out the review processes and the standard data sets available to elements under review, prepared by the Office of Planning Services (OPS), including benchmarking performance with national and international partners.

Academic Reviews are overseen by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) and Division reviews may be overseen by the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor. The Vice Chancellor has final approval over the arrangements for each review.

Professional advice and support is available at all stages of the review process with links to useful information and templates available in the Griffith Portal > Reviews site.

\* Reviews of Research Centres are undertaken in accordance with the Research Centres and Institutes Policy.

---

## 2. OVERVIEW

There are five key phases to the review process:

- Preparing for the Review
- Self-Review
- Preparing and Submitting the Review Portfolio

- The Review Visit
- Post-Review Visit Processes.

These guidelines have been prepared around the key phases. A detailed timeline is included as Appendix A.

---

### **3. PREPARING FOR THE REVIEW**

The Vice President (Corporate Services) will appoint a Secretary to support the review. The Secretary should not be a staff member of the element under review. The roles and responsibilities for the Secretary are outlined in the Guidelines for University Review Committees.

The Secretary will initiate the review process for the element under review by inviting the relevant Deputy/Pro Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Head of Element, to submit proposals for:

- Modification of, or the inclusion of additional element-specific terms of reference;
- Review committee membership (internal/external); and
- Identifying key stakeholders.

The standard terms of reference and committee membership requirements are detailed in the University Reviews Policy.

While reviews are normally held over three or four working days, the duration of the review will be determined by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic).

#### **3.1 Terms of Reference**

In consultation with the Head of Element, the relevant Deputy/Pro Vice Chancellor may propose additional, modified or more focused terms of reference for the element under review.

The terms of reference can be shaped to fit the strategic objectives of the review, the context, and stage/s of development, circumstances, and/or the strengths and weaknesses of the element being reviewed. Staff performance issues are not to be the subject of specific terms of reference as such issues are to be dealt with as part of on-going management activity.

The relevant Deputy/Pro Vice Chancellor will forward the terms of reference to the Secretary for approval by the Vice Chancellor, through the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic). The Vice Chancellor may add to or modify these terms of reference.

In the case of a thematic review, the terms of reference will be developed as outlined in the University Reviews Policy.

#### **3.2 Review Committee Members**

In consultation with the Head of Element, the Deputy/Pro Vice Chancellor is invited to propose the composition of the review committee via the Secretary for approval by the Vice Chancellor, through the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic).

Review committee members normally consist of both external experts and internal Griffith staff members. External members are considered to be leaders in the relevant field and are selected for their objectivity, expertise and advice on performance and directions of the relevant disciplinary / administrative areas. Internal committee members are selected on the basis of their objectivity, expertise, breadth of knowledge and understanding of appropriate internal University processes.

The Vice Chancellor will appoint a review committee in accordance with the University Reviews Policy.

Early steps to secure external committee members will be taken to give the element the maximum notice possible of the exact timing of the review. Invitations to take part in the review process are sent out on behalf of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) and, once availability is established, the final dates for the review are determined.

### 3.3 Identifying Key Stakeholders

In consultation with the Head of Element, the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor is asked to identify key stakeholders internal and external to the University. Nominations are to be forwarded to the Secretary and will be considered when preparing the review schedule, inviting written submissions from interested persons (including students), and/or organising joint sessions for stakeholders during the review visit (see 6.0 The Review Visit).

### 3.4 Communication

The Deputy/Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element will be advised of the timing and duration of the review, review committee members, and the approved terms of reference for the review and are expected to address these as part of the self-review and when preparing the Review Portfolio for submission to the Review Committee.

The Secretary will arrange to meet with the relevant staff of the element to advise of review processes and to provide an opportunity to ask questions. As part of this process, the Secretary will provide the element with a detailed timeline (see Appendix A) to assist with the planning and preparations for the review.

All staff members of the element being reviewed will be formally advised about the review, including the composition of the review committee, the terms of reference and the timing of the review. The Secretary will arrange a time for the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) to lead a briefing session for the Head of Element and element staff on the purpose of the review, terms of reference, committee composition and review processes. Element staff will have an opportunity to ask questions.

Where applicable, students will be formally advised about the review, including the terms of reference, timing of the review, and will be invited to provide feedback about the element's performance. Students will be invited to submit a written submission and/or to meet with the Review Committee.

Elements are encouraged to begin self-review exercises shortly after the scheduled date of the review is announced, or approximately 12 months before the expected review date. Heads of Element are also encouraged to:

- Consult their Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor about the review portfolio;
- Peruse copies of portfolios from recently reviewed elements (provided by the Secretary); and
- Approach Heads of Elements that have recently been reviewed to discuss the activities that they conducted and the most efficient and effective methods of undertaking these tasks.

---

## 4. SELF-REVIEW

The preparation of the review portfolio provides an opportunity for critical self-review by the element and enables the identification of achievements and areas of weakness since the previous review (if applicable). The process of self-review also provides an opportunity to review and report on progress towards the implementation of Group/Division-level Strategic and Operational plans, achievement of the local KPI targets, and outcomes/future plans relating to specific improvement/enhancement projects within the element.

Heads of Element are encouraged to approach the review process as an opportunity to consider issues that might otherwise be overlooked in the routine day-to-day operation of the area; reviews should be viewed as a performance improvement activity encompassing a comprehensive performance audit and planning exercise.

Heads of Element will determine the most appropriate self-review activity for the element, which may involve one or more of the following: strategic planning exercise/s, all staff retreat, establishment of a review working party, planning day/s, meetings, engaging a consultant to assist with self-review etc. Self-review should be engaged as a learning and development exercise which facilitates a shared participation and ownership by staff. It is recommended that all staff be encouraged to participate in

the self-review process from the outset in recognition of their knowledge and expertise, and contributions to the improved performance and quality of the element.

A review is more extensive than an audit, since it seeks not only to assess the element's processes and performance against its goals but also to assess the appropriateness of those goals in the prevailing context, and the plans for the future. Self-review focuses on current and future performance and is a critical examination of how the element under review can contribute most effectively to the University's strategic directions.

The self-review considers performance in relation to the terms of reference of the review, drawing on appropriate benchmarking data, including staircase and other data provided by the Offices of Planning Services (OPS), Research (OR), Human Resource (OHR), Marketing and Communications (OMC), the University's strategic plan, Group / Division Plans and key performance indicators, and should also be responsive to national and international contexts, as appropriate.

The self-review process culminates in the preparation and submission of a Review Portfolio. It is the responsibility of the element being reviewed to prepare the Review Portfolio.

There are three types of data expected in the Review Portfolio: core data, extended data-specific to the element, and benchmark data. Data requirements are detailed below.

Heads of Element are encouraged to determine benchmarking partners as early as possible to enable the gathering of identified data for use during the self-review process and for comment in the Review Portfolio. The Office of Planning Services (OPS) is primarily responsible for providing standard sets of benchmark data via the staircase with Elements being responsible for the costs associated with other benchmarking activity.

The Secretary will advise elements the date by which the core and staircase benchmarking data will be available and facilitate direct discussions between the Element and the Office of Planning Services (OPS) on the availability of additional information that may be required.

---

## **5. PREPARING AND SUBMITTING THE REVIEW PORTFOLIO**

### **5.1 Preparing the Review Portfolio**

The relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Head of Element, is responsible for the preparation and submission of the review portfolio in accordance with the detailed timeline provided by the Secretary. In the case of a thematic review, responsibility will be determined in accordance with the University Reviews Policy.

The aim of the review portfolio is to provide an accurate and frank appraisal of the performance of the element, the opportunities and constraints being faced and a clear statement of strategic directions and plans to enhance future performance. It is expected that the preparation of the portfolio will be a consultative and collaborative process within the element.

The draft review portfolio is to be provided to the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor prior to submission to the Secretary.

The terms of reference should be used as a guide to issues which will be of interest to the review committee, and the element should develop their portfolio in a way that will enable the review committee to focus on these issues. The review portfolio should include a self-review of performance to date with a view to focussing on future performance through an analysis of the element's areas of strength and those requiring development; indicate the element's future directions and goals, and should detail strategies to achieve those goals.

The review portfolio should not normally exceed 30 pages. Appendices, if any, should not normally exceed 10 pages, and may include, where appropriate, a list of supporting reports, strategic and operational plans, and other publications which are available to review committee members upon request.

While the structure of the review portfolio is at the discretion of the element, the element may, for example, choose to devote a section to each term of reference. At minimum, the review portfolio must include:

- An overview / summary of the element;

- A brief history of the element;
- The recent performance and current context of the element, particularly in relation to the University's Key Performance Indicators and other relevant measures of performance;
- The future plans for the element for development and improvement; and
- Relevant appendices, such as the local strategic and operational plans.

Expectations regarding the main sections of the review portfolio are detailed in the Review Portfolio template.

## 5.2 Data Requirements

The three types of data expected in the review portfolio are described below:

### 5.2.1 Core Data

The use of historical information and data is an important means of characterising the nature of the element over the five-year period prior to a review. The Office of Planning Services (OPS) is responsible for the production of data to support the review process and will provide the bulk of the standard sets of data to assist elements with self-review. The Offices of OR, HR and OMC will provide other standard data sets. Core data for academic, divisional and thematic reviews is listed in Appendix B.

Most of the core data will relate to the University's Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), reflecting to some degree the element's contributions to the University's goals. The core data will be presented for a five-year period, enabling the element and the review committee to identify relevant trends.

While the centralised Office areas provide the bulk of the core data, the review portfolio should interpret and reflect on the data, commenting (for example) on apparent strengths and weaknesses, the element's performance against its own aspirations, and areas in need of improvement.

### 5.2.2 Extended data-specific to the Element

The element may wish to illustrate its particular context and performance by providing data additional to that provided as core data above. Such data may be quantitative or qualitative, and may include:

- Evidence of particular strengths of the element that are not covered by the staircase or core data;
- Data on established, nationally or internationally recognised, discipline or service-specific markers of performance;
- national and other key surveys;
- Collaborative arrangements with other institutions or agencies;
- Systems of measurement developed by the institution;
- Professional accreditation requirements;
- Accreditation from international agencies, associations or institutions; and
- Drilling down in specific areas of focus, for example at program or sub-discipline levels, where appropriate.

### 5.2.3 Benchmark Data

Elements should attempt to benchmark their performance against one or two appropriate national institutions with respect to data that is publically accessible, such as the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) Survey and the Graduate Destination Survey (GDS).

It is optional, but desirable, for elements to benchmark performance in other key areas, in line with the terms of reference, in comparison to national data-sets, and against at least one national and one international institution relevant for their reputation in the field (where appropriate). If the element takes this option, it is to identify appropriate benchmarking partners and ascertain their willingness to participate in benchmarking activity, prior to seeking approval from the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor.

Benchmarking enables a comparative analysis of the performance and direction of the element in the national and international context. Benchmarking should assist the element to answer key questions about its current and future directions, and in the case of international partners, to sharpen consideration of the future direction of the discipline and the quality of scholarship, or the service/s provided.

Benchmarking is an ongoing collaborative effort that will develop over time, and elements are to attempt to build ongoing relationships with partner institutions beyond the confines of the review process. Elements should choose benchmarking partners whose reputation they aspire to, and which have a similar mix of disciplines / organisational arrangements.

In the context of the review, it is understood that data comparisons may yield only approximate indicators of performance. It is acknowledged that it can be difficult to secure meaningful benchmark data because of major differences in the operating environments of Australian and international universities. However, where undertaken, every effort should be made to secure benchmark data, and the review committee may look for evidence that the element has made a genuine attempt.

Examples of indicators that could be used in a benchmarking exercise, as part of an academic review include:

- University-level student statistics;
- Equivalent full-time staff;
- Operating income and expenditure; and
- Space resources, and

*With an Australian University:*

- Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) scores for similar disciplines on the Good Teaching Scale, Generic Skills Scale and Overall Satisfaction, retention and progression, research income, publications, HDR enrolments, HDR completions (all per FTE staff);
- Some universities make use of the same common item/s in the Student Evaluation of Courses (SEC) and Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) and publish this at a discipline level. These data sets can be used for benchmarking purposes using an equivalent scale.

*With an International University:*

Publications, HDR enrolments, HDR completions (all per FTE staff).

### **5.3 Submission of the Review Portfolio**

Heads of Element, via the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor are required to submit hard and electronic copies of the review portfolio at least two months prior to the review committee visit (key dates are included in the Detailed Timeline). As the element under review is responsible for the cost of printing copies of their review portfolio, the Secretary will advise the number of hard copies required.

The Review Portfolio is provided to the review committee at least one month prior to the scheduled review. The review committee, via the Secretary, may request that the element provide additional or supplementary information.

---

## **6. THE REVIEW VISIT**

The Secretary will undertake a range of activities to prepare for the review committee's visit.

### **6.1 The Review Schedule**

The schedule for the review visit is developed by the Secretary in consultation with the Chair, Review Committee and in accordance with the duration determined by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic). A draft schedule is circulated to all review committee members for feedback on arrangements. The Chair, Review Committee and the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) approve the review schedule.

The Secretary constructs a timetable that takes into account the element's campus/es of operation and the importance of interviewing relevant persons ensuring that adequate opportunity is provided in the early part of the review visit for all sectors of the element - for example, academic, research and general staff, students, key client groups etc - to be interviewed by the review committee. Interviews with key external stakeholders, such as representatives of professional, employer groups or other external bodies, may also be conducted.

The review schedule may include:

- A review committee dinner, hosted by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) and/or relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor, on the evening prior to the commencement of the review to enable members to meet one another and to discuss the review in a preliminary way;
- The first interview is allocated to the Vice Chancellor, followed by members of the University executive to identify critical issues and expectations in respect of the element under review;
- The relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor is interviewed separately;
- Members of the senior executive, as required;
- The Head of Element will be interviewed on the first day;
- The final day of the review visit will be set aside for the presentation of broad findings to the Vice Chancellor, senior executive and relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor at which the review committee verbally reports on both areas for commendation and areas where concerns have been identified and discusses the feasibility of its broad findings. The Secretary will assist the Committee to prepare for this presentation;
- A separate presentation of the broad findings is provided to the Head of Element; and
- Following the meeting with the Vice Chancellor, senior executive and Head of Element, a separate presentation of the broad findings may be provided to all staff of the element. It is expected that the Head of Element will attend this presentation.

Some limitations may be placed on the number of people interviewed in order to avoid repetition. The review schedule will include a number of opportunities for the review committee to distil the information provided, to invite those already interviewed back for further discussion/s, to meet with element staff on an individual basis (where requested), to review progress and/or consideration of new issues, and to develop affirmations and commendations (where appropriate), along with a set of broad findings (including suggested timelines for implementation).

The review schedule is normally finalised two to four weeks prior to the review committee's visit. A Review Schedule template is available.

The Secretary will make early contact with prospective interviewees to give them adequate notice of interview arrangements.

## **6.2 Submissions to the Review**

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) invites stakeholders and interested persons to make written submissions to the review committee. Written submissions close approximately six to eight weeks prior to the review committee's visit.

The Secretary also arranges for:

- Placement of a notice in Griffith News Online and/or other appropriate forums advising of the review and inviting written submissions from interested persons;
- Advice to the element regarding the review and inviting written submissions from all staff and students (if applicable);
- Notice to members of the University community;
- Invitations to the University executive inviting written submissions; and
- Invitations to key external stakeholders regarding the review and inviting written submissions.

Written submissions to the review committee remain confidential and are held on a confidential file, however, the review report will include a list of such persons.

Persons who make a written submission to the review committee will be advised of the outcomes of the review (Refer Section 7.0 Post-Review Visit Processes).

### **6.3 Review Committee Briefings**

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) will brief the Chair, Review Committee at least 3-4 weeks prior to the review. The briefing may include information and discussions about the University's approach to organisational reviews, responsibilities of the Chair, and any issues or concerns about the element under review.

The review committee dinner on the evening prior to the commencement of the review will provide an opportunity for the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) / relevant Deputy/Pro Vice Chancellor to brief all review committee members about the University's approach to organisational reviews, their roles and responsibilities, issues or concerns about the element under review, and is also an opportunity for review committee members to raise concerns and ask questions.

Heads of Element and review committee members are provided with the Guidelines for University Review Committees outlining their roles and responsibilities.

### **6.4 Review Visit**

The review committee will conduct the review of the element in line with the approved terms of reference and the review schedule.

On the basis of information provided in the review portfolio, submissions to the review and the information gathered during the review visit, the review committee will provide an objective assessment of the element's recent performance, future directions and strategies, and either confirm or recommend changes to those plans. This will include identifying areas for affirmation or commendation (where appropriate) and recommendation; including detailed feedback on how and where the element's perceptions and plans fall short in key performance areas or in its capacity to meet key targets.

In determining the recommendations, the Review Committee are aware that reviews are conducted within the current budget allocation of the element being reviewed and that the review process is not an opportunity to seek or bid for additional resources.

The review committee will broadly present their findings on the final day of the review and will advise the Secretary of the information to support a more detailed set of recommendations that are to be included in the Review Report.

---

## **7. POST-REVIEW VISIT PROCESSES**

### **7.1 Finalising the Review Report**

The Secretary will prepare a draft report for the Chair's consideration approximately two to four weeks after the review visit. The draft will be considered by the Chair and then forwarded to all committee members for comment. Once the review report is finalised, the Secretary forwards the report to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) for consideration. A Review Report template is available.

The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) may liaise with the Chair, Review Committee and/or Secretary about the detail included in the report. The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) will then forward the report to the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element who are asked to correct any factual errors in the report. Anticipated challenges toward the implementation of any recommendations should be discussed with the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic).

The review report is then returned to the Chair, Review Committee for final endorsement. Approximately one month after the review visit, the final copy of the review report is forwarded to Executive Group for approval.



The relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Heads of Element are provided with a final copy of the review report and invited to prepare a response, in consultation with relevant senior members of the element, within one month in the form of a draft implementation plan. A Draft Implementation Plan template has been prepared to assist.

The review report and draft implementation plan are then considered confidential at this stage, and will remain so until issued in the relevant Academic Committee agenda papers. Copies of the review report and implementation plan are distributed by the Secretary as instructed by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic).

## **7.2 Approving the Review Report**

Executive Group considers the review report together with the element's draft implementation plan, and will invite the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element to discuss the review report.

The review report and implementation plan, along with Executive Group's comments, are forwarded to Academic Committee for endorsement to University Council.

Persons who made a written submission to the review committee, staff of the element, and other interested parties (for example, those that were interviewed), will be advised of the outcomes of the review.

On behalf of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), the Secretary will prepare correspondence advising review committee members of the University's decision on the review report.

## **7.3 Implementing Review Recommendations**

After University Council approval, the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element are advised and given responsibility for implementing review recommendations.

The Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element are required to report on implementation progress 18 months after the review visit. A process for 18-month reporting will be initiated by the Secretary.

The 18-month review progress report is to be submitted to the Secretary through the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor for approval by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic). The 18-month review progress report will be more detailed than the implementation plan and must address all recommendations. An 18-month Review Progress Report template is available. The 18-month review progress report will be considered by Executive Group, Academic Committee and University Council.

The review report, implementation plan and 18-month review progress reports are available in the Griffith Portal > Reviews site.

## APPENDIX A – DETAILED TIMELINE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Key Phase	Timeline	Activity	Responsibility
Preparing for the Review	Normally 18 months prior to the scheduled review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appointing a Secretary to the review;</li> <li>▪ Finalising Terms of Reference and Review Committee membership;</li> <li>▪ Determining duration of the review;</li> <li>▪ Notification of the review by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic);</li> <li>▪ Determining data requirements (including benchmarking partners where considered relevant);</li> <li>▪ Provide a list of key stakeholders (external and internal).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Vice Chancellor and Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic);</li> <li>▪ Secretary to invite relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor to propose additional terms of reference and committee membership;</li>   <li>▪ Benchmarking partners are to be approved by the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor;</li> <li>▪ Head of Element, in consultation with Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor.</li> </ul>
Self-Review	Normally commences 12 months prior to the scheduled review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Determining the process/es for self-review;</li> <li>▪ Determining level of stakeholder engagement (including the involvement of element staff);</li> <li>▪ Identifying key stakeholders;</li> <li>▪ Analysing data and trend data, including benchmarking data;</li> <li>▪ Interpreting data, identifying strengths, areas for improvement and strategies to achieve the element's goals;</li>   <li>▪ Briefing element staff about the review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Secretary will meet with the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element to commence process;</li> <li>▪ Secretary to liaise with the Office of PFS about the element's standard data requirements;</li> <li>▪ Relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element to interpret data and determine strategies;</li> <li>▪ The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) will brief staff of the element on purpose of review, terms of reference, committee composition and review processes.</li> <li>▪ Head of Element conducts self-review, strategic discussions with element staff.</li> </ul>
Preparing and Submitting the Review Portfolio	Review Portfolio submitted at least 2 months prior to the scheduled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Review Portfolio is submitted to the Secretary; <u>A Review</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Head of Element is responsible for preparing the Review Portfolio;</li> </ul>

Key Phase	Timeline	Activity	Responsibility
	<p>review visit</p> <p>Review Portfolio is provided to the Review Committee at least 1 month prior to the scheduled review.</p>	<p><u>Portfolio template</u> is available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Review Portfolio is forwarded for consideration;</li> <li>The Review Committee advises if any additional items / data, or amendments are to be made to the Review Schedule.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Head of Element, approves the Review Portfolio to be submitted;</li> <li>Secretary forwards to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic);</li> <li>Secretary forwards Review Portfolio to the Review Committee</li> <li>Secretary undertakes additional follow-up as directed by the Review Committee.</li> </ul>
Communicating about the Review	Communications are normally sent 6 – 8 weeks prior to the scheduled review visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informing the University community about the review;</li> <li>Calling for written submissions from internal and external stakeholders and interested persons.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretary prepares communications on behalf of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic).</li> </ul>
The Review Visit	Preparations for the review visit are normally initiated 2 – 6 months prior to the scheduled review visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review visits are normally conducted over 3 – 5 working days; A <u>Review Schedule template</u> is available;</li> <li>Broad findings of the review are presented on the final day of the visit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Secretary, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic);</li> <li>Review Committee</li> </ul>
Post-Review Visit Processes	One month after the scheduled review visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Review Report is finalised and forwarded to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic);</li> <li>The relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element are provided with the review report to correct any factual errors and to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Committee</li> <li>Relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element</li> </ul>

Key Phase	Timeline	Activity	Responsibility
	<p data-bbox="591 331 972 392">Two months after the scheduled review visit</p> <p data-bbox="591 724 972 785">2 - 6 months after the scheduled review visit</p> <p data-bbox="591 1165 898 1225">Eighteen months after the scheduled review visit</p>	<p data-bbox="1079 236 1323 264">prepare a response;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1034 300 1518 418">▪ The relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element are invited to prepare and submit draft Implementation Plan.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="1079 450 1420 510">A <u>Draft Implementation Plan template</u> is available;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1034 545 1496 635">▪ The Review Report and draft Implementation Plan are submitted for approval;</li> <li data-bbox="1034 667 1505 785">▪ The Review Report, draft Implementation Plan and Executive Group comments are forwarded for approval;</li> <li data-bbox="1034 817 1505 970">▪ Feedback will be provided to the Review Committee, staff members of the element being reviewed, and other interested persons following University Council endorsement;</li> <li data-bbox="1034 1002 1505 1062">▪ The review recommendations will be implemented and a report will be prepared on their progress.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="1079 1098 1447 1158">An <u>18-month Review Progress Report template</u> is available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1545 331 2045 392">▪ Relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element (in consultation)</li> <li data-bbox="1545 555 1787 584">▪ Executive Group</li> <li data-bbox="1545 683 2024 743">▪ Academic Committee and University Council</li> <li data-bbox="1545 807 2045 896">▪ The Secretary will initiate feedback on behalf of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic)</li> <li data-bbox="1545 896 2045 1015">▪ The Secretary will initiate the reporting requirements with the relevant Deputy / Pro Vice Chancellor and Head of Element.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX B – STANDARD DATA SETS

The Office of Planning Services (OPS) will provide the bulk of the standard sets of data to support academic and/or division reviews. Other standard data sets are provided by the Offices of Research, Human Resource, Griffith Graduate Research School, Marketing and Communications and Griffith Enterprise and are indicated below.

For thematic reviews, the Senior Reviews Officer, Organisational Reviews Unit and the Office of Planning Services (OPS) and relevant Offices will determine the most useful data sets in consultation with the staff member assigned responsibility for the review.

Domain	Source	Indicator	National Comparative Data Available	Definition	Group	Element
Learning and Teaching	PFS Staircase KPI	Good Teaching Scale (Course Experience Questionnaire)	Yes	Good Teaching scale is determined by looking at the percentage agreement of bachelors degree respondents. Percentage agreement is calculated as the ratio of the number of responses with an average answer (on a scale of 1 to 5) of 3.5 or above, as a proportion of the total number of responses. Where respondents provide information for two majors, both responses are included. Responses with less than 4 completed items are excluded.	✓	✓
		Overall Satisfaction (Course Experience Questionnaire)	Yes	The Overall Satisfaction Index (OSI) is determined by looking at the percentage agreement for bachelors degree respondents. Percentage agreement is calculated as the ratio of the number of responses with an answer of 4 (agree) or 5 (strongly agree) on a scale of 1 to 5, as a proportion of the total number of responses. Where respondents provide information for two majors, both responses are included.	✓	✓
		Retention	Yes	The retention rate is the proportion of non-graduating bachelor students enrolled in trimester 1 who are also enrolled in any Griffith program in trimester 1 the next year.	✓	✓
		Graduate Success	Yes	GS is the proportion of all bachelor graduates who reported in the Graduate Destination Survey that they were in full-time study or full-time work, as a proportion of all those who were in full-time study or available for full-time work (seeking full-time work or in full-time work).	✓	✓
		Student Evaluation of Courses	No	Overall satisfaction at course level. Includes courses where there are 10 or more respondents	✓	✓
		# GU T&L awards	No	Number of Griffith Learning and Teaching awards and Blended Learning Fellowships awarded to academic staff employed within the element over the past 3 years.	✓	✓

Domain	Source	Indicator	National Comparative Data Available	Definition	Group	Element
Learning and Teaching continued		OLT* awards	No	Number of OLT awards, fellowships, grants and citations awarded to academic staff within the Element over the past 3 years with weightings applied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Citations for outstanding contribution to learning is assigned 1 point.</li> <li>○ Awards for: Programs that enhance learning, Teaching Excellence, Teaching Fellows, OLT Grants are assigned 3 points each.</li> <li>○ National Teaching Fellows = 4 points</li> <li>○ Prime Minister's Award = 5 points.</li> </ul> <p>*previously ALTC</p>	✓	✓
		% Domestic Coursework PG load	Yes	Domestic coursework postgraduate teaching load divided by total teaching load.	✓	✓
	PFS Staircase Contextual	Student load	No	Student load (EFTSL) by School and EFTSL by program and program level (UG, PG, RHD).		✓
			No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ International EFTSL by program group (number and % of total load)</li> <li>○ International EFTSL by program level (number and % of total load)</li> <li>○ Domestic EFTSL by program group (number and % of total load)</li> <li>○ Domestic EFTSL by program level (number and % of total load)</li> </ul>		✓
Students	PFS - QTAC data	OP 1 to 8 and median OP level	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Median OP level for students by undergraduate program</li> <li>○ Percent of OP 1-8 by undergraduate program</li> </ul>		
Competitor Analyses	ER		Yes	Provide a 2 page summary / commentary on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Demand for programs</li> <li>○ Market share</li> <li>○ OP entry level by program, including campus breakdowns</li> <li>○ Program pricing</li> </ul> <p>at the local level and nationally where applicable.</p>		

Domain	Source	Indicator	National Comparative Data Available	Definition	Group	Element
Research	PFS - Staircase KPI	HDR Commencements	No	HDR commencements are taken from the annual Higher Education Student Data Collection.	✓	✓
		HDR Completions	No	HDR completions are taken from the annual Higher Education Student Data Collection.	✓	✓
	GGRS	HDR Candidature	No	Average length of candidature for PhD graduates over the last 3 years.	✓	✓
	Office for Research	Research Performance	Yes	Provide a 1 page summary / commentary on research performance drawing on currently available national and international benchmarking data		
		Research – Various	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comparative Citation analyses</li> <li>○ Proportion of publications involving students as primary and/or co-authors</li> </ul>		
		Creative & Performing Arts	TBC	Other agreed indicators for the creative and performing arts		
		Research Staff	No	Research Centre memberships		✓
	Griffith Enterprise	Commercialisation of Research Activity	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Patents generated by staff members</li> <li>○ Involvement in spin-off companies</li> </ul>	✓	✓
	Academic Element	National research	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Involvement in national research centres</li> <li>○ Level of support routinely provided to HDR students</li> </ul>		✓
	Office of HRM	Research Staff	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adjunct and honorary research staff</li> </ul>	✓	✓

Domain	Source	Indicator	National Comparative Data Available	Definition	Group	Element
Research continued	PFS – Staircase KPI	Research Active FT/Fractional FT Research Only and Teaching & Research academics	No	<p>To be considered Research Active, an academic staff member must be employed on a Griffith work profile that includes research and produce a minimum of 6 research outputs for each rolling 6 year period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research Outputs</li> <li>○ Qualifying outputs include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ (i) Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) categories A1 (books, authored research), B1 (book chapters), or C1 (refereed journal articles) for all disciplines but with category A1 outputs assigned a weighting of 5 relative to other outputs; and/or</li> <li>▪ (ii) HERDC category E1 (refereed conference publications) plus any of the outputs in (i) above for researchers in engineering or ICT academic elements; 1 and/or</li> <li>▪ (iii) ERA categories for creative works, provided these outputs have been subject to a formal verification process and are recorded in My Research Publications.(Does not exist at this point in time. Will be progressively introduced when data becomes available.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Six research outputs</i> refer to outputs, not publication points.  <i>Multi-authored papers:</i> All multi-authored papers will count as one full ROU for each of the multiple authors.  <i>Research outputs not restricted to Griffith outputs:</i> Qualifying research outputs may include outputs produced at another institution if the staff member has joined Griffith during the relevant six year period.  <i>Special provisions for Early Career Researchers (ECRs):</i> ECRs will be defined as a Lecturer A or B only, who have been awarded their PhD within the last five years To be considered Research Active, an ECR must have, on average, at least one qualifying output per year since award of their PhD.</p>	✓	✓



Domain	Source	Indicator	National Comparative Data Available	Definition	Group	Element
Research continued		External Research Income & Income per FTE	Pending ERA	<p>External competitive research income (as reported in the annual Australian Government Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) for the base year divided by staff FTE as at 31 March of the base year.</p> <p>All income <u>will be split equally</u> between all Griffith named investigators of a project.</p> <p>Income by school:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Australian competitive grants</li> <li>○ Other public sector income</li> <li>○ Industry income</li> <li>○ CRC income</li> <li>○ Total</li> </ul>	✓	✓
		Int'l Peer reviewed Research Income	Pending ERA	International Peer Reviewed Research Income	✓	✓
		Publication Points per FTE	Pending ERA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Research output is calculated as 'Publication Points' divided by staff FTE per annum. Publication Points are reported in the annual Australian Government HERDC for the base year divided by staff FTE as at 31 March. All research output <u>will be split equally</u> between all GU named contributors.</li> <li>○ Publications by School by DISR points, Books, Book Chapters, journal articles, refereed conference papers.</li> </ul>	✓	✓

Domain	Source	Indicator	National Comparative Data Available	Definition	Group	Element
Equity	PFS – Uni Consolidated KPIs	% of Female Staff Level D & E	Yes at University level	The proportion of female FTE to male full-time/fractional full-time academic staff FTE level D and E as a percentage of total level D and E staff FTE.	✓	✓
		Low Socio-economic Participation rate	Yes at University level	Socio-economic status background: The socio-economic status of an applicant is measured by applying the Australian Bureau of Statistics SEIFA Index of Education and Occupation to the postcodes of applicants' permanent address. The Participation rate is the percentage of all students who are from low SES backgrounds.	✓	✓
		Low Socio-economic Retention rate	Yes at University level	Socio-economic status background: refer above. The Retention rate is the proportion of all non-graduating students enrolled in the base year who are also enrolled in any Griffith program in the next year.	✓	✓
		Low Socio-economic Success rate	Yes at University level	Socio-economic status background: refer above. The Success rate is the EFTSL of units passed as a percentage of all EFTSL of units attempted. Attempted EFTSL comprises units passed, failed and withdrawn.	✓	✓
		Indigenous students' Participation rate	Yes at University level	Indigenous persons: Persons who identify themselves as being of Aboriginal and / or Torres Strait Islander descent. The Participation rate is the percentage of <u>all students</u> who have identified as Indigenous.	✓	✓
		Indigenous students' Retention rate	Yes at University level	Indigenous persons: refer above. The Retention rate is the proportion of all non-graduating students enrolled in the base year who are also enrolled in any Griffith program in the next year.	✓	✓
		Indigenous students' Success rate	Yes at University level	Indigenous persons: refer above. The Success rate is the EFTSL of units passed as a percentage of all EFTSL of units attempted. Attempted EFTSL comprises units passed, failed and withdrawn.	✓	✓
	PFS – Staircase Contextual	Staffing	n/a	Student-staff ratio (EFTSU/FTE)		✓
			No	Academic staff by School and/or Faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Equivalent full-time FTE</li> </ul>	✓	✓
	Office of HRM	Staffing – Indigenous	No	% of indigenous staff and comparison with University target	✓	✓

Domain	Source	Indicator	National Comparative Data Available	Definition	Group	Element
International	Griffith International	International Partnerships	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Student exchanges, with participation data</li> <li>○ Number or proportion of students with an offshore experience</li> </ul>	✓	✓
	Academic element	International Partnerships	No	Active partnerships in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff exchanges</li> <li>○ Curriculum and program collaboration</li> <li>○ Research activity, with data on participation, output and impact</li> <li>○ International affiliations of staff</li> <li>○ List of courses with specific international perspective.</li> </ul>		✓
Staffing	Office of HRM	Staffing	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Number of general staff located in academic areas of the University</li> <li>○ % of staff with Doctorate qualifications</li> </ul>	✓	✓
	Academic element	Staffing	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Contact hours /FTE staff</li> <li>○ Proportion of teaching staff with a formal qualification in teaching</li> </ul>		✓
Budgeting & Resourcing	PFS	Organisational Resources	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budget data depends on outcome of budget discussions. Budget for current and last 2 years, showing major categories of income and expenditure and salaries as % of income.</li> <li>○ Projected budget for next 3 years, in same format as above.</li> </ul>	✓	✓