Review of University Institutes and Centres Procedure

Section 1 - Purpose and Objectives

(1) This Procedure enacts the Organisational Structure Policy.

Section 2 - Definitions, Terms, Acronyms

Term	Definition
ABSC	Academic Board Standing Committee (also known as Standing Committee)
Composition	The positions that together form a review committee.
Membership	The persons appointed to those positions that compose a review committee.
President	President of the Academic Board
Supervisor	The Senior Manager to whom the Director of the Institute or Centre is responsible, as follows: • Executive Dean • Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) • Provost
Unit	A generic term encompassing, in this instance, University Institutes and University Centres.

Section 3 - Procedure Scope/Coverage

(2) This Procedure applies to the review of University Institutes and Centres at The University of Queensland. The Institute for Teaching and Learning Innovation (ITaLI), the Institute of Continuing and TESOL Education (ICTE), the Institute of Modern Languages (IML) and the Centre for Integrated Resource Management (CIRM) are not within the scope of this Procedure.

Section 4 - Procedure Statement

(3) Academic Board, through its Academic Board Standing Committee, conducts reviews of University Institutes and Centres on a septennial basis. Reviews involve self-analysis, benchmarking and an external assessment of the Unit's strategic and operational plans with a view to attaining outstanding performance by international standards.

(4) The review considers the Unit's relationships with other organisational units. The review also considers resourcing, resource management and organisational structure and whether these allow the Unit to fulfil its goals and objectives and reach its potential.

(5) The review committee's task is to provide an objective view of the Unit's plans developed through the self-assessment process, and to comment on the appropriateness of those plans. Although the majority of reviews are

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

expected to result in incremental changes, reviews provide an opportunity for Units to embrace significant change and development.

Section 5 - Procedures

Scheduling the Review

(6) Each year ABSC prepares a tentative schedule for reviews to be held in the next seven years, and in consultation with the Units' Supervisors, and subject to approval by the Vice-Chancellor's Committee, prepares the review timetable for a particular year no later than the end of first semester in the preceding year to give Units adequate time to plan for the review including preparing the Unit's submission.

(7) In each case, the Director of the Unit and their Supervisor identify a range of dates for the review. Invitations to join the review committee are sent out by the President as early as possible in order to give the Unit maximum notice of the exact timing of the review. Once availability is established, the final dates for the reviews are determined.

(8) The normal duration of a review will be three days. In some cases, a longer (maximum five-day) review may be appropriate. This should be decided, in consultation with the Unit's Supervisor or at the instance of the Director of the Unit (supported by the Supervisor), and following endorsement by the Vice-Chancellor's Committee, in conjunction with the approval of the terms of reference for the review, bearing in mind that the standard terms of reference may be modified in order to direct the attention of the Unit and/or the review committee to particular matters of special importance in relation to the Unit's performance or its future.

Composition and Membership of Review Committees

(9) Proposed membership of a review committee is presented to the President by the Director of the Unit via their Supervisor. Following consideration by the ABSC, the President and Director present the proposed membership to a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor's Committee for advice. The membership of the committee is then confirmed by ABSC. It is important, in considering membership, to avoid conflicts of interest, perceived or potential. Significant collaboration with the Unit or with its individual members or research groups would normally be disqualifying.

(10) The composition of a review committee is:

a. University Institutes:
    i. three external members with nationally/internationally recognised expertise and knowledge in the area of the institute, one of whom will normally be from an international institution;
    ii. a member of ABSC, or equivalent; and
    iii. a senior researcher from a cognate Institute, nominated by the Provost.
b. University Centres:
    i. two to three external members (depending on the size of the centre) with nationally/internationally-recognised expertise and knowledge in the area of the centre, one of whom will normally be from an international institution;
    ii. a member of ABSC not closely associated with the Centre, or equivalent;
    iii. an Associate Dean (Research), from a relevant faculty; and
    iv. a Director/senior researcher from a cognate centre.

(11) On the recommendation of the President and subject to approval by the Vice-Chancellor's Committee, ABSC appoints one of the external members to chair the review committee. The President considers:

a. discipline expertise;

b. impartiality;
c. experience in managing organisational units of a comparable size; and
d. experience in the conduct of similar reviews.

(12) The overall membership of a review committee provides as broad a coverage as possible of the major research areas of the Unit.

(13) Where it is relevant to the core functions of the Unit, one of the external members should have strong industry links.

(14) A Deputy Director (Operations) or equivalent from a cognate institute or centre normally serves as the secretary to the review committee.

Terms of Reference

(15) Standard terms of reference for the review of a University Institute or Centre are provided, for guidance, at Section 10 below.

(16) The terms of reference for the review provide the framework in which the Unit, through its "self-assessment", and the review panel, through its enquiries, can analyse the Unit's performance and plans in relation to appropriate and attainable future objectives. Accordingly, the standard terms of reference are guidelines and suggestions for modification may be made, in advance of the development by the Unit of review documentation, on the initiative of the Vice-Chancellor's Committee or the unit Director's Supervisor, or the Director of the Unit (with the approval of their Supervisor) in order to direct the attention of the unit and/or the review committee to particular matters of special importance in relation to the Unit's performance or its future. It will be relevant to how the terms of reference are framed whether the Unit and/or one or more of its key activities has recently been or will soon be subject to external review, as, for example, by an external stakeholder.

(17) Proposed final terms of reference are presented by the Director of the Unit via their Supervisor to the President of the Academic Board. Following consideration by the ABSC, the President and the Director present the proposed terms of reference to a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor's Committee. The terms of reference are then confirmed by ABSC.

(18) Where the Unit is also subject to major external review, e.g., by government, the Academic Board review will have access to the outcomes of the external review and will focus its attention on those terms of reference not addressed by the external review.

Review Process

Pre-review Process

(19) The pre-review period includes the time between notification of the review and the review itself.

(20) Units are given the approved terms of reference together with a set of guidelines regarding the review approximately 12 months in advance of the review, at which time the Director and other senior members of the Unit attend a workshop presented by the President. Units are encouraged to begin self-assessment exercises at this time.

(21) The ABSC member briefs the Unit's staff on the review procedure at an open meeting approximately six months prior to the review. Before the visit, the Director of the Unit:

a. issues an invitation to all Unit staff, including academic and professional staff, to attend the briefing; and
b. briefs the ABSC member on any recent developments in the Unit.

(22) The Unit prepares a submission to the review committee (see Section 9 below). Units are provided with detailed

guidelines to ensure that submissions supply review committees with information about the Unit that is accurate, focused, comprehensive and consistent; and review committees are urged to use these same guidelines to assess the Unit.

(23) The Unit will provide its submission at least one month before the scheduled date for the commencement of the review, and it will be made available to the review committee, the President of the Academic Board, the Provost; and upon request, to other University units. The Unit submission will also be made available, upon request and at the discretion of the Director of the Unit, to individual University staff members and persons external to the University.

(24) The President of the Academic Board invites interested parties (including all Unit staff and students) to make written submissions to the review.

(25) Submissions received from the following sources will be made available to the review committee, the President of the Academic Board and the Provost:

a. the heads of University units, e.g., Heads of Schools, Executive Deans of faculties, heads of administrative units (and therefore written on behalf of those units);
b. other individual University staff members;
c. individuals external to the University; and
d. students.

(26) At the same time, all submissions will be released to the Unit, and after approval of the review committee's report by the Vice-Chancellor, also to any enquirer; under the following conditions:

a. in the case of students' submissions, all identifying details will be removed from the submission prior to release, as standard practice; and
b. if an individual University staff member or a person external to the University requests confidentiality (by completing the Request for Confidentiality Form), identifying details will be removed from their submission prior to release.

(27) The ABSC representative and internal members of the review committee meet approximately two weeks prior to the review to decide on interviews and the structure of the review.

Timetable

(28) The timetable for the review is developed by the Secretary to the review committee in consultation with the Chair and the President of the Academic Board.

(29) A summary of review events and suggested days for these to occur and a timeline of the entire review process are available in Review of University Institutes and Centres Guideline.

(30) While noting the importance of interviewing relevant persons with respect to issues arising in the review, some limitation should be placed on the number of people interviewed so that repetition is avoided. Interviews should not crowd the program so that insufficient time is available for discussion by the committee. Scheduled opportunities to discuss issues that arise during interviews should be incorporated into the review program. It is not necessary that discussion occur only at the beginning and end of the day. There should also be sufficient time available in the program to enable further discussion with those already interviewed, if required.

(31) Notwithstanding, the review timetable should ensure that adequate opportunity is provided in the early part of the review week for all sections of the Unit - academic, research and professional staff, postgraduate and undergraduate students - to express their views candidly to the full committee or to individual committee members if desired.

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

(32) Interviews with representatives of professional and other external bodies should be arranged. There will also be an opportunity to hold informal discussions with employer and other professional groups in a joint session at the stakeholder dinner during the review.

Stakeholder Dinner

(33) A stakeholder dinner will be held on the evening of the first or second day of the review. Members of the review committee and the supervisor will attend. Representatives of industry, government, professional bodies, and employer groups, as well as alumni will be considered as relevant to Unit's activities in research, learning, and engagement.

(34) A draft invitation list must be prepared well in advance by the Director of the Unit for consideration by the Supervisor and the President of the Academic Board, who will vet it to ensure that those attending from the community will be able to offer insight into the Unit's activities that are relevant to the terms of reference for the review. The secretariat will also vet the approved list of invitees to determine whether protocol need play a role. Invitations will be issued three months prior to the date of the dinner.

Conduct of the Review

(35) The review committee's task is to provide an objective view of the Unit's perceptions and plans developed through the self-assessment process, and either confirm or recommend changes to those plans. The review committee is expected to give detailed feedback to the Unit on how and where its perceptions and plans fall short in meeting performance targets.

Initial Briefings

(36) On the first day of the review, the President of the Academic Board welcomes members and clarifies their roles. In addition, the committee will meet with the Vice-Chancellor and the Provost to discuss specific issues relevant to the Unit. The first day also includes interviews with the Supervisor and Director of the Unit about the issues in relation to the Unit under review and the strategic directions.

(37) The second day of the review will include interviews with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation), Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Indigenous Engagement), other Deputy Vice-Chancellors as relevant, Deputy Provost (if relevant) and Dean, Graduate School.

Committee Deliberations

(38) The review committee considers the submission prepared by the Unit, together with other submissions made by interested persons and organisations, and consults with University staff, students and other persons as deemed appropriate, through interviews.

(39) Following perusal of the Unit submission and interviews with the Senior Executive officers, the committee should determine whether there are additional questions to be asked relevant to the review so that the terms of reference are addressed fully. The committee should also identify those areas where answers to relevant questions are not to be found within the submitted material and determine how best to obtain that information (e.g. interviews, visits, records, direct requests to the Unit, etc.).

(40) A sample of questions that the review committee might consider is available in Review of University Institutes and Centres Guideline.

Visits to Facilities

(41) Brief visits to, and inspection of, Unit facilities should be included in the program to provide the opportunity to clarify or to illustrate points made in the submissions.

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

(42) Where Units are multi-sited, the use of technologies such as teleconferencing should be considered. An alternative is for the internal members to visit the facilities and include a report to the full committee if required.

Section 6 - The Review Report

Structure of the Report

(43) The review report is prepared by the members of the review committee with support from the Secretary. The Chair should discuss with members the division of responsibility for drafting individual sections of the report.

(44) It is anticipated that the review committee will develop commendations and recommendations progressively throughout the review. It is expected that a penultimate draft of the report will be completed prior to the departure of the external committee members from the University.

(45) Commendations should be made in those areas where the Unit has achieved outstanding outcomes, or has made significant progress towards doing so.

(46) In formulating its recommendations, the review committee should take account of the resource constraints facing the University and its collective goals and objectives, as expressed in its Strategic Plan and as advised by the President of the Academic Board and members of the Senior Executive. Every effort should be made to ensure that statements in the report are factually correct. Recommendations should not be directed toward senior officers of the University or to the University itself. They must be directed toward the Director of the Unit so that it is clear how the Unit should proceed.

(47) A case, supported by facts and evidence, is to be made for all review recommendations, particularly those proposing significant change or that impact on other organisational units, University rules or policies.

(48) Review committees are encouraged to include time-frames for the implementation of recommendations.

(49) The report consists of the following sections:

a. Membership of the Review Committee;
b. Terms of Reference;
c. Procedures;
d. Summary of Commendations and Recommendations; and
e. Report of the Review Committee.

(50) There is no mandatory format for the section 'Report of the Review Committee'. One possible format is to organise the report around the major themes on which the committee wishes to make recommendations. Another option is to arrange the contents as follows:

a. Education;
b. Discovery;
c. Engagement;
d. Internationalisation;
e. Equity and Diversity;
f. Governance;
g. Space and Facilities; and
h. Business and Finance.

(51) A review report template based on this second format option is available: Review of University Institutes and Centres - Report Template.

(52) Appendix 1 to the review report should contain a list of names of all individuals who made written submissions to the review and Appendix 2 will list all those interviewed by the review committee. An exception to this requirement is for students - names are not listed for either postgraduate or undergraduate students. The number of students in each category who were interviewed or made a submission is sufficient. Written submissions are not included in the report. Other appendices follow, if required.

Presentation of the Findings

(53) Prior to the finalisation of the recommendations:

a. the Director of the Unit meets with the review committee so that the Director has the opportunity to respond to the recommendations before they are made public; at the same time, the Director should be advised to communicate with individual staff who might be significantly affected by individual recommendations; and
b. the recommendations are presented to the President of the Academic Board and the Provost, usually over lunch on the final day of the review.

(54) The draft final recommendations are presented to a full meeting of the Unit on the last day to provide a general overview of the findings from the review and an outline of the recommendations.

(55) The presentation needs to take account of the fact that Unit staff are likely to be anxious to receive the report at the culmination of a possibly stressful week. The Chair needs to ensure that the Unit is not alienated, and that concerns are allayed, and not aroused, by a willingness to clarify issues but not enter into a debate.

(56) At the same time, the ABSC member will take the opportunity to inform the Unit staff about the process subsequent to the departure of the review team; touching on the time-frame for completion of the report; opportunity for the Unit's consideration and response; the deliberative process in the Academic Board Standing Committee and the passage of the report through the Academic Board to the Vice-Chancellor; and the implementation and follow-up process.

(57) All review committee members should attend the Unit presentation and, wherever possible, visual aids should be used to facilitate the presentation.

Finalising the Report

(58) Following the period of the review, the report will be finalised by the Chair in consultation with the Secretary and the other members of the review committee. The report will be finalised as soon as possible, but normally within two weeks after the conclusion of the review.

Post-review Process

(59) Initially, copies of the review report are given to:

a. members of the Senior Executive;
b. the relevant Supervisor;
c. the Director of the Unit;
d. members of the Unit reviewed; and
e. members of ABSC.

(60) ABSC will request an initial post-review response immediately after the review, which the Director of the Unit will

prepare. This response, which must include implementation strategies, is to be submitted within four weeks of having received the final report, via the office of the Supervisor, to both:

a. ABSC; and
b. the Provost, who may refer it to the Vice-Chancellor's Committee for comment.

(61) Anticipated challenges for the implementation of any recommendation will be included in the Director's response to the review recommendations. Academic Board Standing Committee, augmented by the Provost, will discuss the final report together with the written response. As part of its deliberations, Academic Board Standing Committee, augmented by the Provost, will interview the Director of the Unit and the Supervisor, together with other members of the Senior Executive as required.

(62) Academic Board Standing Committee, with the assistance and subject to the approval of the Provost, prepares a report on its deliberations for to the Academic Board, setting out the Committee's comments on the recommendations.

(63) The review report, the Unit's response, and the report from Academic Board Standing Committee, will be considered by Academic Board for forwarding to the Vice-Chancellor.

(64) Following approval by the Vice-Chancellor, the review report, together with a composite statement from the Academic Board, is distributed to the Unit and to the Senate for noting.

Section 7 - Implementation

(65) The Director and their Supervisor are responsible for implementation of the adopted recommendations.

(66) ABSC is responsible for monitoring the implementation.

12-month and Three-year Implementation Reports

(67) The Director of the Unit and their supervisor must prepare an implementation report on progress made on all of the recommendations, to be submitted to the President of the Academic Board within 12 months of the Vice-Chancellor's approval of the review report. It is expected that all stakeholders, including students, are consulted and involved in the implementation of the recommendations.

(68) The implementation report allows Academic Board Standing Committee to compare the response to each recommendation over the 12-month time-frame and assess more effectively the extent to which review recommendations have been implemented. Academic Board Standing Committee, augmented by the Provost will meet with the Director of the Unit and their Supervisor to discuss the 12-month implementation report. The Academic Board Standing Committee representative on the review committee will introduce the discussion.

(69) A similar report will be prepared for the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor's Risk and Compliance Committee within thirty-six months of the Vice-Chancellor's approval of the review report.

Section 8 - Roles of Review Committee Members and Secretariat

Chair

(70) The role of the Chair is to:

a. liaise with the President of the Academic Board, Provost/Executive Dean and the Director of the Unit in preparation for the review, to discuss issues such as special terms of reference, break-up of review committee to address specific terms of reference, etc. (this will be done via email with the President of the Academic Board) or if this is possible, during a preliminary visit to the campus;
b. liaise with the Secretary prior to the review week, to finalise the review week timetable and determine the list of interviewees;
c. delegate report-writing tasks to each of the review committee members;
d. ensure the penultimate draft report is complete prior to departure;
e. present the review committee's draft recommendations to the Director, Provost/Executive Dean, President of the Academic Board, and all Unit staff;
f. ensure completion of the final version of the report within two weeks of the review; and
g. approve the review report before its submission to the President of the Academic Board.

ABSC Representative

(71) The role of the ABSC representative is to:

a. host the initial dinner for the review committee, on behalf of the President of the Academic Board;
b. host the stakeholder dinner, on behalf of the President of the Academic Board;
c. chair the meeting of internal review committee members, which is conducted prior to the review;
d. represent the broader interests of the University in the review;
e. provide guidance to the review committee on University policies, procedures and protocols;
f. provide guidance to the Chair on ensuring the creation of an environment conducive to free and open discussion without prejudice to any staff member;
g. provide guidance to the review committee on how to produce the review report, in particular, ensure that:
    i. the report presents a balanced viewpoint, with positive comments as appropriate;
    ii. due recognition is included throughout the report to what the Unit is doing well and should continue to do;
    iii. all recommendations, and particularly those proposing significant change, are fully justified, substantiated by the evidence in submissions and from interviews, are well argued, and can stand up to close scrutiny;
    iv. the proposed recommendations are directed to the Unit, rather than to a senior officer of the University; and
    v. the report's contents are factually correct;
h. accompany the review committee to the Unit on the afternoon of the final day to present the draft recommendations.
i. after the Chair has presented the draft recommendations, inform the Unit about the process following the departure of the review committee, including the:
    i. time-frame for completion of the report;
    ii. opportunity for the Unit to consider the report and respond to it;
    iii. deliberative process at ABSC;
    iv. passage of the report through the Academic Board to the Vice-Chancellor; and
    v. implementation and follow-up processes;
j. lead discussion on the review report at the Academic Board Standing Committee meeting when the report is submitted for consideration, and presenting Academic Board Standing Committee's comments and recommendations to the Academic Board; and
k. participate, if available, in the 12-month implementation process.

Director/Senior Researcher from a Cognate Centre

(72) This provision only applies for reviews of University Centres.

(73) The role of the Director/Senior Researcher from a cognate centre is to:

a. have a sound knowledge of University policies and procedures;
b. provide perspectives on the centre's performance based on comparisons with own unit; and
c. advise the Unit on the rationale underlying a recommendation, if clarification is required.

Associate Dean (Research)

(74) This provision only applies for reviews of University Centres.

(75) The role of the Associate Dean (Research) is to provide advice on:

a. Faculty's strategic plan and objectives as they relate to the centre;
b. Academic organisational structure and resource allocation processes to the centre; and
c. other issues specific to the centre under review.

Senior Researcher from a Cognate Institute

(76) This provision only applies for reviews of Institutes.

(77) The role of the Senior Researcher from a cognate institute is to:

a. provide perspectives on the institute's research activities based on experience with comparable associated issues (e.g. research impact, resources, external links, research training).

Roles of the Secretariat

Secretary

(78) The Secretary is a senior member of administrative staff and plays a key role in the preparation for and the conduct of the review. The Secretary:

a. coordinates, collects and organises documentation for the review committee;
b. acts as a resource person for the Chair and members of the review committee;
c. provides relevant policy and procedural advice;
d. drafts a suitable review week timetable in consultation with committee members;
e. liaises with the committee members, Provost/Executive Dean, Director of the Unit and those being interviewed;
f. facilitates and, where appropriate, undertakes follow-up action arising from review committee meetings; and
g. ensures that recommendations made by the review committee are consistent with University policy and practices and drafted accordingly.

(79) The Secretary is not a member of the review committee, and therefore does not participate in the review committee's deliberations. During the review, the Secretary reports directly to the review Chair in all matters relating to the review. The Secretary, in consultation with the President of the Academic Board, may appoint an Assistant Secretary.

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

Review Coordinator

(80) The Review Coordinator is appointed by the Academic Registrar and is usually the Assistant Secretary to ABSC. The role of the Review Coordinator is to:

a. send advice from ABSC to the Director of the Unit and their Supervisor on the finalised composition, terms of reference and timing of the review;
b. confirm that members of the review committee, particularly external members, are available to attend the review week;
c. arrange travel and accommodation for external members;
d. ensure that external members are provided with relevant information about UQ (including location of UQ in relation to the airport, travel time, currency exchange, pharmacies, etc.);
e. book rooms for the review committee meetings and interviews;
f. be readily available during the review period and ensure that adequate documentation and supplies are provided to the review committee Secretary;
g. organise catering;
h. provide place-cards with the names of review committee members on them to facilitate communication during interviews;
i. write to those people who are being invited to make written submissions;
j. receive the Unit's submission, written submissions from others and distribute these to members of the review committee at the appropriate time;
k. ensure that members' expenses are reimbursed; and
l. provide other administrative assistance during the review as required.

Section 9 - Preparation of Unit's Submission

Part A - Preparation

(81) Units may wish to obtain copies of recent submissions made by other Units to assist them with preparing their documentation.

(82) In the year prior to the review, Directors of Units and key staff assisting with the preparation of the submission are invited to attend a briefing session by the President of the Academic Board on the Unit review process. A Head of School or Director of a Unit whose school or Unit has recently been reviewed also attends to speak about their experiences.

(83) Units normally engage in a detailed strategic planning exercise several months prior to the finalisation of the submission.

Part B - Contents of the Unit Submission

General

(84) The role of the review committee is to review the Unit in accordance with the approved terms of reference. The submission allows the Unit to reflect upon and analyse operations and its outputs in order to optimise future performance. Consequently, the focus of the submission is to identify future directions and strategic intentions for the Unit.

(85) However, to set the context for the review, it is important to briefly address the Unit's history and its present

circumstances with a focus on factors that have contributed to the current operating environment and potential future outlook of the Unit.

(86) Excluding the appendices, the submission should be no longer than 100 pages in length. A submission includes:

a. an overview/summary of the submission;
b. the history of the Unit;
c. the present circumstances of the Unit, with particular emphasis on its research quality and impact;
d. the future plans of the Unit for improvement and development; and
e. appendices (including the Unit's strategic and/or operational plan, the Unit's budget and additional benchmarking data).

The History of the Unit

(87) The section includes reference to:

a. the origins and histories of the disciplinary groups of the Unit and the history of their organisational relationships (i.e. the precursors to the current Unit);
b. management structures and leadership positions (e.g. Unit board and advisory committees, Unit executive committees) established and the rationale for their creation;
c. major outcomes of any previous review;
d. any factors which might have had an impact since the previous review (e.g. restructures, changes in funding, changes in University priorities, etc); and
e. any other significant changes since the previous review.

The Unit at Present

(88) This section includes a comprehensive analysis of the Unit's current status particularly with regard to research outcomes and impact. An overview of the Unit's current goals and priorities should be provided with an analysis of the extent to which these goals and priorities are being achieved.

(89) There are three types of data required:

a. core data;
b. Unit-specific data; and
c. benchmark data.

(90) Where possible, data should span at least three, and up to five, years to enable an assessment of trends.

Core Data

(91) The eleven terms of reference for Unit reviews cover those aspects of a Unit's operations that are common to all Units within the University.

(92) Submissions should include an assessment of performance according to the areas covered by the terms of reference.

(93) The data for Terms 5 (Discovery), 6 (Resources), 7 (Education), 9 (Organisational Structure) and 11 (Equity and Diversity) can be obtained through the creation of reports developed by Planning and Business Intelligence. The reports are available through the Planning and Business Intelligence 'Data Collections' webpage or by contacting Planning and Business Intelligence.

(94) Where quantitative data are available, comparable data for other relevant Units within the University should be supplied.

(95) Performance should also be explicitly linked to University Strategic Plans and operating priorities. Budget information provided is meant to inform discussion.

Unit-Specific Data

(96) The Unit should take the opportunity to present any particular strengths that are not covered by the core performance data, and ideally, assess those strengths against key performance indicators established by the Unit or against nationally/internationally-recognised discipline-specific markers of performance.

Benchmark Data

(97) Benchmarking data are provided for Discovery. The primary purpose of benchmarking with international institutions is to assist in determining the direction of the discipline and the quality of the scholarship. However, it is recognised that Units vary in structure and emphasis of research such that benchmarking against any Unit may be neither useful nor informative.

(98) Where a comparable Unit does not exist, benchmarking of researchers/research groups against high quality researchers/groups nationally and internationally should be undertaken.

The Unit in the Future

(99) This section should be the focus of the submission. It describes plans and strategies for the future development and improvement of the Unit over the next three to five years. It is expected that the Unit submit a concise operational plan in order to clearly display strategic objectives and goals, and to establish key targets.

(100) The review committee will determine a program of action in each of the areas of the terms of reference. The review committee's task is to provide an objective assessment of the Unit’s future directions and strategies and either confirm or recommend changes to those plans. Therefore, this section articulates goals and courses of action that are tied to:

a. an analysis of current performance and an assessment of the Unit’s strengths as well as factors preventing progress;
b. areas of potential growth. The future plans of the Unit include specific strategic priorities. Some of these areas might arise from the benchmarking exercise or involve predictions of future directions of areas of research; and
c. contribution to the University’s strategic and operational plans. Include how the Unit contributes to operationalising these plans.

(101) In each case, consideration should be given to the Unit’s human, financial and physical resources to enhance performance, to meet the Unit’s objectives and to achieve its targets. Key performance indicators should be identified clearly, alongside strategic priorities that link appropriately to specified timelines, milestones and resource allocations. For institutes, these may have been developed in the Institute-Based Performance Framework.

Section 10 - Standard Terms of Reference

(102) The standard terms of reference are available for download from the Academic Board’s Reviews website: Review of University Institutes and Centres - Standard Terms of Reference.

Status and Details

Status	Historic
Effective Date	14th August 2017
Review Date	14th August 2020
Approval Authority	Vice-Chancellor and President
Approval Date	14th August 2017
Expiry Date	11th December 2024
Policy Owner	Kathryn Blyth Director, Academic Services Division and Academic Registrar
Enquiries Contact	Academic Services Division

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.