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This document has three attachments:

1. Decision - Academic Restructure
2. Decision - Methodology for Evaluating Academic Roles
3. Decision - Professional Services Delivery
1. Introduction

On February 2, 2016 the University presented an organisational change proposal to all staff. The proposal for change document including three, more detailed, attachments, the PowerPoint presentation and a video and transcript of the presentation were posted to the Renewal website.

Additionally, a specific renewal email address was set up in order to receive written feedback and possible alternative proposals from staff. A separate email address was created to deal with staff wishing to confidentially discuss their personal circumstances and, if desired, express interest in redundancy.

From February 10 to 18 the Vice Chancellor and Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor held a series of meetings at various venues across the campus, open to all staff, to explain the proposal, answer questions and hear feedback.

In addition to these open forums, meetings to discuss the proposal were held with senior leaders and many Schools, Faculties and Divisions also met to discuss further.

Additional all staff open forums were held on February 22 and March 3 to present summaries of feedback received to date, answer questions and receive additional feedback and suggestions for alternatives to the proposal.

Feedback closed on March 7. Approximately 1,370 people attended the 11 staff meetings and the University received 331 written submissions regarding the proposal for change. The renewal website received 12,010 page views and 8,629 unique page views from February 2 until March 7.

Following the period of consultation with staff and consideration of the feedback and submissions received, a decision on the proposal has been made. All written and oral feedback has been carefully and seriously considered by the extended Executive. The decision outlined in the documents here incorporate a number of changes to the original proposal following consideration of all the staff feedback and submissions.

This document outlines:

- the decision regarding organisational change;
- a summary of the feedback received during the consultation process, together with comments addressing that feedback;
- amendments to the proposal dated 2 February as a result of the feedback; and
- next steps and indicative timeline for implementing the organisational change.
2. Decision

Following consideration of all of the feedback provided during the consultation period, the University has made the decision to implement the organisational change.

Several aspects of the proposed change have been amended in response to the feedback received.

The impacts of the change and staff transition principles are outlined below.

The final decision, including any changes to the original proposal, information on implementation and timelines and a summary of the feedback related to that part of the proposal are detailed in the attachments to this document.

- The new academic structure – refer to Attachment 1.
- The methodology for evaluating academic roles – refer to Attachment 2.
- The new service delivery model – refer to Attachment 3.

A summary of the feedback received on the overall proposal including suggestions for alternative proposals is detailed below.

3. Feedback on the Overall Proposal

Feedback and Responses

A number of themes emerged from the feedback received during the consultation period.

Understanding for the need to change
There was a large amount of feedback that expressed an understanding of why the University needs to change the way it operates to secure its future. This feedback came from academic and professional staff at all levels across the University.

Questioning the need to change
The NTEU and a small number of submissions questioned the financial exigency facing the University and the underlying drivers behind the proposals. The NTEU also questioned whether these proposals will improve the University's financial position.

Throughout the period of consultation and feedback, the University continued to highlight the reasons for change at every opportunity. In Securing Success and throughout the progression of the Renewal Project, the financial position of the University has been made very clear.

It has been explained in open forums and through the FAQs on the renewal website that while UWA recorded a net operating result of $90m in 2014 the underlying result portrays a far more accurate picture of our financial position. As reported in the University’s Annual Report, the underlying result for 2014 was a $14.9m surplus and has ranged between a $8.5m deficit and a $14.9m surplus over the last 4 years.

In the University’s Annual Report for both 2013 and 2014 the underlying operating result has been presented in a table which explains why and how this result differed from the statutory operating
result reported in the Annual Accounts. The major variation is driven by movements (up and down) in the book value of investments, capital grants received in a financial year which must be expensed for specific purposes in future years, donations which provide a capital sum to support future expenditure on academic positions, scholarships, and research initiatives, and the value of gifts in kind such as works of art.

If the University does not take any action in reducing costs, based on current projections, UWA’s projected underlying position will be below acceptable levels in the next 3 – 4 years. This will preclude the University from being able to make the investments required to achieve its goals, as described in section 4 below.

**Concerns about the effect of change**
A number of staff raised concerns about the effect of the proposed change. This included concerns about:

- maintaining staff morale and workload;
- uncertainty, insecurity and lack of trust some staff are feeling;
- previous restructures not being effective;
- change management generally;
- the pain of implementation versus the potential gain; and
- the core business of research outputs and teaching being impacted.

The University Leadership team understands that staff are naturally concerned about the future and their position at the university during this time of change. The University remains committed to implementing the changes in a way that provides staff with as much clarity as possible, as quickly as possible, while ensuring that due process is followed and staff have the opportunity to engage in the consultation processes and provide feedback regarding the implementation and next phases of the project.

**Timing**
Staff raised a number of issues regarding timing including:

- That the time scheduled for providing feedback was too short/too long;
- That the implementation process would take longer than 2016; and
- That the process should go quicker to resolve staff uncertainty as soon as possible.

Throughout the period of consultation and feedback, the University continued to highlight the reasons for change at every opportunity and reached agreement with the NTEU to extend the time scheduled for receiving feedback by over 2 weeks.

**Implementation**
A significant amount of feedback was provided on the substructures and implementation of both the academic structure and the service delivery model.

While this feedback is not directly related to the overarching proposals currently under consideration, these submissions will provide invaluable input to discussion and design of the substructures model during the next phase of the project.
Alternatives to the proposal

A number of suggestions were put forward by staff as alternative ways to make cost savings including:

- Graduate student service – HDR students who receive financial support from the University should provide a service contribution – e.g. conducting unpaid tutorials;
- Limit EBA increases and increments for academic staff salaries;
- Different appointment types – teaching only appointments;
- Put all core unit materials online and have only small class teaching;
- Sell university assets to buy time to allow for staff reduction via attrition; and
- Reduce salary costs through:
  - Reducing all staff salaries by a percentage; or
  - All staff working a 35 hour week; or
  - All staff working a 9 day fortnight.

The University Leadership team considered the suggestions for alternative ways to make cost savings and undertook an evaluation of each suggestion to determine if they would deliver the required recurrent reduction in the University cost base by the end of 2016.

While most suggestions would deliver some cost savings, the two suggestions considered able to deliver the required savings were:

- Sell university assets to buy time to allow for staff reduction via attrition; and
- Reduce salary costs through:
  - Reducing all staff salaries by a percentage; or
  - All staff working a 35 hour week; or
  - All staff working a 9 day fortnight.

The University does not have any material saleable assets. Most assets and investments are "restricted" in nature including the University's endowments, which we are unable to use for such purpose.

A preliminary analysis of a reduction in staff salaries indicates that in addition to the potential for significantly greater loss of average staff productivity, the permanent and on-going cuts to salary (and /or hours) required to achieve a recurrent cost saving of $35 – 40 M per year would be difficult for individual staff to absorb and additionally could restrict the University’s ability to attract and retain high performing staff in the future.

The renewal proposal is based on achieving a $35 – 40 M per year cost reduction and an increase in revenue of $60M. This initial cost saving through salary cuts does not allow for the recruitment of the proposed 50 new strategically aligned academic positions, which will have a significant impact on the University’s ability and opportunity to grow revenue and improve reputation.

Additionally, any reductions in salary levels or university wide changes to working hours would require negotiated amendments to the University’s Enterprise Bargaining Agreements and as such these are not feasible alternatives in 2016.
4. Drivers for Change and Benefits

In the *Renewal Proposal for Change* the University identified three drivers for change:

- Need for resources to invest in building on our existing teaching and research performance, and to deliver a strategy for the University that encompasses innovation and impact;
- Need for an academic structure that will deliver on the strategic goals of the University;
- Need to deliver a fit for purpose range of professional services.

The University also articulated the benefits of the proposed change:

- Significant financial savings for investment into core business and required infrastructure;
- An academic organisational structure that maximises the potential for academic coherence and aligns with the University’s drive for efficient and effective services; and
- Integrated, end-to-end professional services delivered across the whole University.

Greater detail on these drivers for change and benefits are available in the original proposal documentation and were presented and explained in the first meeting with staff on 2 February. This information is available on the renewal website: http://www.web.uwa.edu.au/university/executive/sustainable-futures/renewal

5. Extent and Nature of the Change

The implementation of this organisational change will see a transformation of academic and professional activities and service delivery across the University including:

- Implementation of a new academic structure;
- Implementation of a new service delivery model;
- Disestablishment of an estimated 300 positions;
- The need for retraining or transfer of employees to other work or locations;
- New reporting lines;
- Creation of new roles and position descriptions; and
- Significant review and standardisation of existing position descriptions for professional staff.

6. Staff Transition Principles

Once positions have been identified as redundant, the following principles would be followed for the staff transition to positions in the new structure. The University will adhere to the redundancy provisions within the enterprise agreements.

**Academic staff**

- Some tenured or tenurable staff identified for redundancy based on the applied methodology may be offered, and with their agreement, be transitioned to teaching intensive or professional staff appointments; and
- Fixed term staff will continue on their current appointment until the end date of their contract.

**Professional staff**

- Where a position of the same level with comparable duties and responsibilities in the new structure matches the qualification, experience and competence of the staff member, existing incumbents may be directly transferred at level into these positions;
- Where there is more than one staff member who could be transferred to a single position of the same level with the same or similar duties as their current position, those staff members will be able to apply for the new position through an internal merit based competitive process;
- Staff who do not apply for a comparable position may be placed in a vacant position of the same level with comparable duties and responsibilities which match the qualifications, experience and competence of the staff member;
- Staff who are not able to be transferred to a comparable position of the same level will be able to apply for new or significantly changed positions through a competitive process; and
- Staff in current fixed term positions will transition to the new structure until the end of their contract period.

Additionally, the implementation of this organisational change will provide all transitioning staff with clear accountabilities and direction as well as additional avenues for defined career pathways and increased opportunities to gain further skills, training and experience.

**7. Expressions of Interest for Redundancy**

During the initial stages of implementation individual staff may express interest in redundancy:

- For academic staff any expressions of interest will initially be considered at the local level and if supported by the Dean, will be forwarded to the central oversight panel for consideration.
- For professional staff expressions of interest may be submitted to renewal-HR@uwa.edu.au. These expressions of interest will be considered by the SDVC in consultation with the Dean or Divisional Director, when the structure for service delivery is finalised and the staffing requirements fully understood.

The severance provisions outlined in Schedule E of the Academic and Professional & General Staff Agreements only apply to on-going staff.

**8. On-going Consultation and Communication**

The University is committed to on-going consultation and communication with all staff throughout the implementation of this change process.

Consultation does not remove the University's prerogative to manage, but allows for a better-informed decision making process as the changes are implemented.

Over the coming weeks detailed implementation plans will be developed for the three projects under the renewal project. In each one of those projects the University will continue to provide information throughout the change process. When definite decisions are made around
implementation of the organisational change, the University will meet with affected staff and provide relevant information about the implementation of these changes.

Students, Alumni and external stakeholders are recognised as an important and vital part of the University community with a great interest in the academic structures of the University. The University will engage with these important community members throughout the implementation process.

In addition to on-going communication and consultation on each of the three implementation processes, there will be regular updates on the Renewal process through open forums, email and the Renewal Website http://www.web.uwa.edu.au/university/executive/sustainable-futures/renewal
### 9. Who to talk to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF</th>
<th>WHO YOU SHOULD TALK TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| You are feeling worried or stressed about the changes and need someone to talk to | The University provides free, confidential and professional assistance to employees through the Employee Assistance Program (EAP). The service providers who currently offer the program on behalf of the University are (please contact them directly):  
  - **OPTUM**  
    Level 27, 44 St Georges Tce (St Martin’s Tower)  
    Perth WA 6000  
    Phone (24 hours)  1300 361 008  
  - **UWA Counselling and Psychological Services**  
    1st Floor, South Wing  
    Social Sciences Building  
    Phone (office hours)  (+61 8) 6488 2423 |
| You have questions about the organisational change process and the related HR policies and EBA clauses | Please contact:  
  **Ms Louise Churchill**  
  Human Resources Business Partner  
  6488 3518/ 0415 372 981  
  louise.churchill@uwa.edu.au  
  or  
  renewal-HR@uwa.edu.au |
| You have questions about the new organisational structure and roles or the timing of the process | Please contact  
  Renewal-feedback@uwa.edu.au  
  Or visit the website:  
| You have a complaint about your treatment | Formal complaints are to be made to the Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor, the HR Business Partner for your business unit or **Gina Barron** Manager, Complaints Resolution (x 8547 and Email gina.barron@uwa.edu.au) |
This attachment is to be read in conjunction with the
Renewal Project - Decision on the Proposal for Change document
Introduction

On February 2, 2016 the University proposed a change to the academic structure of the University. In summary the proposal was to:

- **Create four strategic level academic units to be called colleges. The colleges were to be named:**
  - College of Natural and Physical Science
  - College of Engineering and Technical Science
  - College of Health and Medical Science
  - College of Social Science

  The academic leader of each new college would sit on the University Executive.

- **The School of Indigenous Studies (SIS) will sit organisationally outside of the new college structure and remain at a strategic level**

  The School would report directly to the Executive.

- **Existing structures such as research institutes and centres will be reviewed as part of the organisational change and positioned in the context of the new academic structure**
  - All current research centres (as defined by UWA policy) will reside as a unit within a school;
  - Centres and units offering research infrastructure services will become part of the professional service delivery model at UWA and sit within the Deputy Vice Chancellor Research portfolio;
  - The operating model and function of all UWA centres and institutes will be reviewed in light of the future resource allocation model and the proposed new service delivery model;
  - The use of the title of ‘institute’ will be reviewed;
  - All UWA research institutes will sit within colleges in the new academic structure;
  - Independent research institutes will remain outside the UWA structure; however the UWA staff within these institutes will reside in Schools. The relationship of these institutes to the College will be detailed and coordinated through the head of the college;
  - The UWA Energy and Minerals Institute (EMI) and other business development functions and units will be reviewed under the proposed new service delivery model.
Feedback

Feedback Themes

There was significant feedback on the academic restructure proposal during the consultation period with the emergence of a number of common themes:

- The naming conventions surrounding College versus Faculty
- The titles of all the colleges but particularly the College of Social Science
- The impact that the proposal could have on the Business School
- Positioning of Institutes and Centres in the new structure

The majority of the feedback related to the development and design of the substructures; this is addressed at a later point in this proposal.

Feedback and Response

The University has amended the proposals having seriously considered the feedback received during the consultation period. In some cases, the proposal has changed from the original proposal to reflect that feedback. The feedback and the University response is detailed below:

College or Faculty

A large proportion of the feedback submissions made comment of some kind on the title of ‘college’ for the overarching academic units. While there was strong support in some submissions for the use of college, especially to signal a significant change in operations to internal and external stakeholders, the vast majority of submissions detailed a strong preference for the title of faculty rather than college.

In response to this feedback the University has changed the original proposal and will retain the title of ‘faculty’ for the strategic level academic units.

Consideration of the purpose, responsibilities and functions of the faculties will be given during the next phase of the process.

The titles of all the colleges but particularly the College of Social Science

The titles of the colleges received significant feedback. The highest proportion of feedback was about the title of Social Sciences. In summary:

- Social Science does not adequately reflect or encompass the disciplines likely to be in that college
- Concern about the use of ‘science’ in every title;
- The titles are too long and should be shortened e.g. Science, Engineering, Medicine (most suggestions for alternative names for Social Science were longer);
- The titles seem to indicate the substructure which has not been decided yet.

In response to this feedback the University has changed the original proposal and will not determine the names of any of the faculties until the substructure of each strategic level unit is decided.
The impact that the proposal could have on the Business School
The Business School and a number of staff within the Business School provided feedback on the potential negative impacts the changes may have on current operations, future growth and international accreditation. Solutions to mitigate the potential negative effects were suggested by the School but all retained the School as a separate entity to the proposed four strategic level academic units.

After careful consideration the University has not changed the original proposal in response to this feedback. The University recognises the work and contribution made by the School and understands the structural requirements needed for accreditation and branding.

Positioning of Institutes and Centres in the new structure
While this was a smaller theme of feedback there were two distinct reasonably balanced sub themes:

- Yes - position UWA research institutes and centres as proposed
- No – do not position UWA research institutes and centres as proposed

In response to this feedback the University has not changed the original proposal. The arguments against the proposal to position institutes within the faculty level academic units and centres within the school level academic units were not considered sufficiently persuasive to change the proposal.

Consideration as to the role, function and responsibilities of UWA research institutes and centres will be given in the next phase of the project.

Implementation
In addition to the above feedback there was a large amount of feedback received on the possible substructures of the faculties. This feedback will be invaluable during the next stages of the academic restructure and some of the assumptions and concerns about academic cohesion, placement of schools and changes to the size and composition of schools will be addressed during that phase.

These final outcomes, including the changes to the original proposal, are detailed in the Decision section of this document.

Alternatives to the proposal
There were three suggested alternatives regarding the academic structure:

- No change to the current structure;
- Creation of a fifth college/faculty;
- That SIS be incorporated into one of the Colleges/Faculties or become a College/Faculty itself.

The University has given these suggestions careful consideration in light of the drivers for change and benefits required and has not changed the original proposal.

The option of making no change to the academic structure does not address the drivers for change or deliver the anticipated benefits and as such was not accepted.
When considering the development of a new academic structure, the following design principles were taken into account:

- Size and economies of scale;
- Management and allocation of resources;
- Alignment of structure to University strategy;
- Best practice organisational design principles;
- Identity and student attachment;
- Collaboration in research, teaching and innovation; and
- Academic coherence history and legacy of UWA, disciplinary identity and nomenclature.

A number of other factors were also taken into account, including:

- The specialised and unique role of the School of Indigenous Studies (SIS);
- Recommendations following on from the functional review regarding the most efficient and effective service delivery model;
- The future academic structure, taking into account the recommendations of the recent review of courses;
- The future leadership structure for each of the strategic level units and the substructures within;
- The future research priorities and strengths;
- Accreditation for specific professional degrees and sub-units, which require the continuation of some school structures (e.g. Business School);
- Nomenclature, branding and external interface locally, nationally and internationally;
- The impact of the new academic structure on the executive leadership structure of the University; and
- Subsequent implications for governance and decision-making.

When considering what structure would best suit UWA, the University Leadership examined the structures in use by the other members of the Group of Eight.

Table 6: Go8 Academic Structure and Size Indicators (2014 data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Current Structure</th>
<th>TOTAL Load</th>
<th>HDR Load</th>
<th>General Staff FTE</th>
<th>Academic Staff FTE</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Research Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21,560</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>888,443,000</td>
<td>183,231,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>7 (colleges)</td>
<td>15,470</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>977,511,000</td>
<td>251,479,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42,841</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>1,876,582,000</td>
<td>373,909,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52,836</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>3,559</td>
<td>3,757</td>
<td>1,675,052,000</td>
<td>314,501,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>8 plus ADFA</td>
<td>39,599</td>
<td>3,299</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>1,543,126,000</td>
<td>346,779,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39,754</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>3,711</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>1,671,571,000</td>
<td>381,765,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43,265</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>3,849</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>1,883,187,000</td>
<td>363,135,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21,237</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>937,831,000</td>
<td>215,199,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All data, excluding structure details, was drawn from the Go8 dashboard and is 2014 data.

During the benchmarking period, the University of Sydney announced that it was moving from 16 to 6 faculties at the start of 2017. Sydney is around twice the size of UWA, and thus it is not unreasonable for UWA to create a structure with three or four faculties.
The University Leadership considered the three main options in terms of the academic restructure:

1) A three faculty structure
   It was felt that a structure with three units would be too narrow for UWA and did not fully meet the requirements of the design principles.

2) A five faculty structure
   This option was considered very seriously. The University Leadership decided that such a structure would lead to imbalance amongst the units, most likely resulting in two very large units and three small units.

3) A four faculty structure
   This is the supported option. While the makeup of the faculties is yet to be decided, it was determined that four faculties would best meet the design principles outlined above and also best suit the other factors that needed to be considered as part of a decision to embark on an academic restructure.

The proposal for four strategic level academic units was made on the basis of a range of design principles including size and economies of scale and management and allocation of resources. No compelling argument was made to increase the number of strategic level academic units from four to five and as such this alternative was not accepted.

On this basis, the suggestion for SIS to become a college/faculty in its own right was not accepted by the University. The alternative suggestion that SIS be incorporated into one of the other colleges/faculties could be supported under the design principles but concern was raised that this may impact on the ability of SIS to deliver on its strategic platform to drive and support indigenous education and research strategy whilst acting in an advisory capacity across the University as a whole. Additionally, there was sufficient support in the feedback to validate the original proposal. As such this alternative was not accepted.

**Decision**

After serious consideration of the feedback and in light of the responses detailed above the following represents the final decision of the academic restructure proposal.

1. **Create four strategic level academic units to be called faculties.** The faculties will not be named until the substructure is determined.
   - The academic leader of each new faculty will sit on the University Executive.

2. **The School of Indigenous Studies (SIS) will sit organisationally outside of the new faculty structure and remain at a strategic level.**
   - The School will report directly to the Executive.

3. **Existing structures such as research institutes and centres will be reviewed as part of the organisational change and positioned in the context of the new academic structure.**
   - All current research centres (as defined by UWA policy) will reside as a unit within a school;
Centres and units offering research infrastructure services become part of the professional service delivery model at UWA and sit within the Deputy Vice Chancellor Research portfolio;

All UWA research institutes will sit within faculties in the new academic structure;

Independent research institutes will remain outside of the UWA structure, however the UWA staff within these institutes will reside in Schools. The relationship of these institutes to the faculty will be detailed and coordinated through the head of the faculty;

The operating model and function of all UWA institutes and centres will be reviewed in light of the future resource allocation model and the proposed new service delivery model;

The UWA Energy and Minerals Institute (EMI) and other business development functions and units will be reviewed as a part of the professional service delivery model implementation; and

Use of the title of ‘institute’ will be reviewed.

### Implementation and Indicative Timeline

A detailed implementation plan is being developed for the next stage of this process that outlines key milestones and opportunities for staff engagement and feedback.

The indicative timeline is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Implementation Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>In consultation with staff, the determination of the substructure of each faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Review the operating model and function of institutes and centres in light of the future resource allocation model and the proposed new service delivery model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Review of the title of ‘institute’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>Creation of documentation to reflect the governance arrangements of the new faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
<td>Consideration and advice to Senate on the documentation and proposals by Academic Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2016</td>
<td>Approval from Senate for the new academic structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
<td>Administrative implementation of the new academic structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who to talk to

At any time through this change process, staff members can ask questions, express concerns or provide feedback on the changes to the Renewal Project Team:

Renewal-feedback@uwa.edu.au

Staff members with personal concerns can also make contact with staff in Human Resources. At any time during the process of change, staff may seek guidance from HR regarding the implications of redundancy. The University will adhere to the redundancy provisions in the relevant Staff Agreement.

Renewal-HR@uwa.edu.au

For staff feeling worried or stressed about the changes and in need of someone to talk to, the University provides free, confidential and professional assistance to employees through the Employee Assistance Program (EAP).

The service providers who currently offer the program on behalf of the University are (please contact them directly):

- OPTUM
  Level 27, 44 St Georges Tce (St Martin's Tower)
  Perth WA 6000
  Phone (24 hours) 1300 361 008

- UWA Counselling and Psychological Services
  1st Floor, South Wing
  Social Sciences Building
  Phone (office hours) (+61 8) 6488 2423
This attachment is to be read in conjunction with the Renewal Project - Decision on the Proposal for Change document.
Introduction

On February 2, 2016 the University proposed that a methodology to identify potential academic redundancies needed to be developed. The methodology was to be based on the fundamental principles of fairness, consistency, transparency and equity.

To ensure fairness and consistency the methodology that is developed would be applied to all academic staff at UWA.

Feedback

Feedback Themes

There was a relatively small amount of feedback on the proposal to develop a methodology, with the emergence of five key themes:

- What would be included in the methodologies and how will it be measured;
- Concerns about achievement relative to opportunity;
- Ensuring equality in the methodologies across the different faculties;
- Concerns about effects on HDR students; and
- Support for use of a methodology.

Feedback and Response

The University has seriously considered the feedback received during the consultation period and responded to the key feedback themes below:

What would be included in the methodologies and how will it be measured

A number of staff raised concerns about what activities or measures would be included in the methodology. There was a particular focus on the use of SURF scores and their merit as an effective and fair basis for measuring teaching quality. There was also a strong resolve in the feedback that SURF scores, as an indicator of teaching quality, be included.

Other concerns related to the:
- Weighting of teaching v research;
- Qualitative feedback on teaching;
- Inclusion of teaching and research awards;
- Use of Socrates;
- Inclusion of impact and engagement factors; and
- Use of 2015 data.

While the proposal details the indicators and factors to be taken into account, the development of the methodologies and the specific measures to be included are the responsibility of each Dean. The feedback received to date will be considered by the central panel and the Deans as they commence development of the methodologies, and staff will have additional opportunity to provide specific feedback on their faculty’s methodology during that process.
Ensuring equality in the methodologies across the different faculties
Concerns were raised in the feedback that there could be inequalities in the methodologies assuming they are developed by the Faculties.

The proposal includes establishment of a central oversight panel to ensure that the faculty methodologies meet the fundamental principles of fairness, consistency, transparency and equity. The panel will be charged with identifying any inequitable differences between the methodologies and their application will be rectified before individual staff are identified during the process.

Concerns regarding achievement relative to opportunity
Concerns have been raised that junior staff, staff on parental or extended leave or staff with high teaching loads would be disadvantaged because of their absence or work focus during the evaluation window.

The proposal clearly states that the methodology needs to be applied to academic staff taking into account each staff member’s achievement relative to opportunity and the central oversight panel is also charged with ensuring the management recommendation has given due consideration to any individual’s submission to demonstrate achievement relative to opportunity.

Concerns about effects on HDR students
Some concerns were raised about the possibility of staff who are currently supervising HDR students being identified for redundancy and therefore those students having the potential to be disadvantaged.

If a staff member who is currently supervising students leaves the University for any reason at any time the University has an established process for support of students during the transition. While this situation is disruptive for the student it is one that needs to be managed on a regular basis and is a primary reason why the relevant University policy requires each HDR student to have more than one supervisor.

Support for use of a methodology
A large proportion of the feedback submissions gave support to the proposed approach of identifying staff for redundancy via a methodology. The feedback indicates that staff feel this method, rather than via other possible approaches, is both fair and strategic.

This positive endorsement was offset by concerns that the proposed approach conflates redundancy and performance management, because it is seen as an attempt to retrospectively impose some performance goals on academics. The minimum standards contained in the Academic Staff Agreement have always articulated the expectation on academic staff at UWA to deliver high quality teaching, produce research outputs and provide service and leadership to the University community. In addition, all academic staff have clearly identified expectations associated with their role with regards to teaching and research.

The proposal does not impose performance targets. It requires that each faculty develops a methodology for evaluating achievement of all staff in their area during a set period, relative to opportunity.

After serious consideration of the feedback above, the University has decided to progress the methodology for evaluating academic roles as originally proposed.

The final outcome is detailed in the Decision section of this document.
Decision

The following represents the decision on the proposed methodology for evaluating academic roles.

1. That each faculty develop a methodology for assessment of performance and output levels for academic staff in their area

The Dean will be responsible for the development of the methodology. The methodology will be based on the following four indicators and take into account:

1) Research publication outputs or creative equivalent, including appropriate quality measures over the period 2009-2014;
2) Teaching quality as determined by SURF scores and other indicators in use at the local level, including HDR completions;
3) Service to the University (committee membership, senior administrative roles etc.); and
4) Leadership and development (mentorship of junior staff and postgraduate students, collaboration with colleagues in teaching and research, contribution to the development of teaching and research etc.).

Each faculty will develop its methodology ensuring that the following factors are taken into account:

• the differences in publication patterns and discernment of quality within different faculties;
• the local understanding of measures of teaching quality; and
• service and contribution to leadership and development activities at school, faculty and university level.

The methodology will apply to all academic staff in the faculty, however it is anticipated that research output indicators will not be applied to staff in existing teaching intensive appointments.

2. That following consultation with academic staff and full consideration of staff feedback each faculty will finalise their methodology

Once a faculty has developed their proposed methodology based on the above indicators, all academic staff in that faculty will be consulted and have an opportunity to provide feedback for consideration.

The faculty methodology is subject to confirmation by the SDVC and the oversight panel, to ensure consistency, fairness, transparency and equity.

3. That academic staff will be evaluated against the finalised methodology of their faculty

Each faculty will apply the criteria developed by the methodology to academic staff taking into account each staff member’s academic level and achievement relative to opportunity (where applicable) including, but not limited to, current and historical FTE and periods of extended leave.

Preliminary management recommendations regarding those staff who do not meet the standards set by the developed methodology will be submitted to a central oversight panel chaired by the SDVC.

Management recommendations for tenured or tenurable staff may include a recommendation for:

• redundancy;
• an offer of a teaching only appointment (based on meeting the faculty’s and university’s criteria for teaching quality, service, and contributions to leadership and development); or
• an offer of a professional staff appointment.

Management recommendations for fixed term contract staff may include a recommendation for:
• non-renewal of a current fixed term contract, unless performance expectations are met;
• an offer of a teaching only contract (based on meeting the criteria for teaching quality, service and contributions to leadership and development);
• an offer of a professional staff appointment; or
• a combination of the above.

4. That a University Oversight Panel be established

An independent, central oversight panel will be convened. The role of the oversight panel will be to examine the recommendations made by the faculties. The oversight panel, chaired by the SDVC, will include members of the UWA academic promotions committee, along with a range of other contributors.

The role of the oversight panel will be to ensure:
• the faculty methodologies meet the fundamental principles of fairness, consistency, transparency and equity;
• the appropriate application of local expectations has been applied; and
• that faculty recommendations have fully considered achievement relative to opportunity.

The oversight panel will also be responsible for considering, on the recommendation of the Dean of the relevant faculty, any expression of interest in redundancy made by individual academic staff members.

Implementation and Indicative Timeline

A detailed implementation plan is being developed for the next stage of this process that outlines key milestones and opportunities for staff engagement and feedback.

The indicative timeline is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Implementation Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Establishment of central oversight panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Development of faculty based methodology for staff assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Consultation with academic staff and opportunity for feedback to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Application of the finalised methodology to all academic staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Management recommendations from faculty to the central oversight panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2016 onwards</td>
<td>Implementation of the approved management recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who to talk to

At any time through this change process, staff members can ask questions, express concerns or provide feedback on the changes to the Renewal Project Team:

Renewal-feedback@uwa.edu.au

Staff members with personal concerns can also make contact with staff in Human Resources. At any time during the process of change, staff may seek guidance from HR regarding the implications of redundancy. The University will adhere to the redundancy provisions in the relevant Staff Agreement.

Renewal-HR@uwa.edu.au

For staff feeling worried or stressed about the changes and in need of someone to talk to, the University provides free, confidential and professional assistance to employees through the Employee Assistance Program (EAP).

The service providers who currently offer the program on behalf of the University are (please contact them directly):

- OPTUM
  Level 27, 44 St Georges Tce (St Martin's Tower)
  Perth WA 6000
  Phone (24 hours) 1300 361 008

- UWA Counselling and Psychological Services
  1st Floor, South Wing
  Social Sciences Building
  Phone (office hours) (+61 8) 6488 2423
Decision - Professional services delivery
Attachment 3
March 15, 2016

This attachment is to be read in conjunction with the Renewal Project - Decision on the Proposal for Change document
Introduction

On February 2, 2016 the University proposed a change to the professional services delivery model of the University. The aim of the model is to deliver an integrated, effective and standardised approach to the planning, organisation and delivery of processes, functions and services across the University.

Feedback

Feedback Themes

A large amount of feedback on the professional services delivery model proposal has been received. The feedback was in three main themes:

- comment on the service delivery model;
- concerns about the impact of the model being implemented on staff and functions; and
- detailed submissions on how the model could be implemented in specific areas.

Feedback and Response

The University has seriously considered the feedback received during the consultation period and responded to the key feedback themes below:

Comment on the service delivery model

Most feedback has offered broad support for improved services, business process improvements, documented service catalogues and clarity of accountability with a definition of what excellent service means. There has been general support for the proposed model to both centralise and decentralise services. The majority of concerns focused on implementation rather than the model itself.

The predominately positive responses were offset by a much lesser volume of staff indicating complete opposition to change in professional services in any way.

Concerns about the impact of the model being implemented on staff and functions

A large number of questions and issues raised throughout the consultation period concerned the detail of the potential effects from implementation of the model such as:

- Physical location of professional staff
- Loss of local (school) based knowledge
- That standardisation would not allow adequate support of teaching and research
- That the administrative load of academic staff would increase
- That best practice in current operations and service would be lost
- That the model would not take work already undertaken in the functional reviews and projects like the IT Operating model into account

The detail that addresses these concerns and answers the questions raised will be determined in the next phase of this project. Many of the concerns were based on assumptions on detail that has not yet been developed and a number of staff are understandably concerned about where they will be sitting or how their role may change as a result of this process.

It is recognised that to deliver the service standards required there will be an ongoing need for some professional services to be delivered locally in schools/centres/institutes. Staff will have significant opportunity to provide additional input and feedback to the next stage of the process.
Detailed submissions on how the model could be implemented in specific areas
A significant number of submissions outlined possibilities and proposals for how certain areas or functions might be implemented under the new model. A great deal of time and thought has gone into the preparation of these submissions and while the feedback is not directly related to the proposals currently under consideration, these submissions will provide invaluable input to discussion and design of the model during the next phase of the project.

The level of engagement within submissions received signals the significant amount of support from professional staff in these areas.

Alternatives to the proposal

There were three alternatives suggested regarding the professional services delivery model:
- No change to the current model/structure
- Some sharing of services across the existing academic structure (based on no change to current academic structure)
- Fix business processes and invest in IT enablement before implementing a new model.

The University has given careful consideration to the feedback and suggested alternatives in light of the drivers for change as well as required benefits, and has not changed the original proposal.

The suggestion to keep the current model of service delivery or implement some sharing of services, which is based on retaining the current academic structure, will not deliver the drivers and benefits for change required, and as such has not been accepted.

The suggestion that we fix the business process and invest in IT enablement is compelling but not practical in our current situation. Many business processes will be reengineered in parallel to the implementation of the new model based on the work already undertaken in the functional reviews and subsequent projects. IT enablement requires significant investment which will be an outcome of the renewal project. In the meantime the University is committed to continuous improvement of process so that IT enablement automates fit for purpose processes that meet the needs of the new model rather than existing inefficient processes.

Decision

The following represents the decision on the professional services delivery model proposal:

1. Create 5 Service Delivery Centres to mirror the new academic structure and support central administration

Four Service Delivery Centres (SDC) will be created to support the four faculties, with a further SDC created to support the central administrative divisions and SIS.

Each SDC will be the primary point of service for all individuals and groups within schools, research centres, research institutes and offices within the faculties/central administrative divisions. The SDC’s role is to deliver a broad range of functional specialist services in conjunction with in-depth business knowledge and expertise to ensure the strategic and operational goals of each business area are achieved.
Each SDC will be designed to promote integration of functions, efficiency, value generation, cost savings and improved service for their client group along with greater professional staff career progression, service delivery culture and a ‘One University’ ethos across the University.

2. Create a standardised management structure and position descriptions for service delivery centre staff

Subject to the specific needs of their client, each SDC will be created with the same management and staffing structure to ensure consistency of service delivery, standardisation of all processes, cross unit collaboration and staff mobility across the University.

Standardisation of position descriptions allows for clear, transparent and equitable salary classification of the same roles across different areas of the organisation.

Management and staff positions that are mirrored in each SDC will hold the same level of accountability and management delegation; will be responsible for a similar range of services; and will be in a position that is classified at the same salary level. Counterparts across the service centres will be responsible for driving standardisation of processes and continuous improvement.

Standardisation encourages staff to view themselves as part of a broader staff group across the different service delivery centres and central administrative offices and allows for greater flexibility in staff mobility across the University.

3. Integrate and standardise services and processes

Services and processes will be standardised and integrated both ‘end to end’ and across different functions.

Standardisation of process and management structures will significantly reduce duplication and the number of staff required to deliver key services and functions. Where possible, processes will be automated. If IT enablement is not yet available, processes will be re-engineered so that when IT solutions are available the process is streamlined and ready for automation.

The service culture enacted by the SDCs will be articulated and documented. Performance measures against the service culture will be created and measured to ensure the highest level of service and client satisfaction.

4. Create service catalogues and service level partnerships

Detailed service catalogues will document all services delivered from SDCs. Documentation will ensure clarity for how and where each function is delivered and who is accountable for what elements of that service. Each SDC will have one service level partnership (SLP) with its client group for delivery of all functions within that Centre.

This means that there will be one SLP agreement between a faculty and its SDC. The SDC working with central administration divisions may have a SLP with each portfolio depending on the needs of the business.
5. Fundamentally redesign central functional units

All central units will be redesigned to focus on strategy, governance, corporate and government compliance, development of policy and IT architecture and governance. Some units that provide strategic services aimed at external stakeholders, such as business development services, may continue to offer those services from a central unit. All units will be reviewed to ensure there is minimal duplication and/or redesign of units offering similar services. Additionally, role titles and position descriptions will be reviewed for consistency across all units.

Some central units will also provide transactional services that are or can be completely automated or IT enabled so that service delivery is efficient and effectively delivered from a remote location (e.g. first tier IT desk top support).

All central units will be provided operational, administrative and transactional services from SDCs.

SDCs will be integrated and aligned strategically with central units to ensure services are seamless and deliver the correct level of service. SDC managers will have either ownership or significant influence over end-to-end processes for service delivery. SDC managers will play a significant role in ensuring that strategy developed in central units meets the needs of the client business areas.

Services that will be delivered from SDCs

Under this proposal, it is envisaged that the vast majority of operational and transactional services required by the University community will be delivered through the SDCs. These services may currently be delivered in a faculty, school or central administration unit. Decisions on exactly which services would be delivered from SDCs and which would be delivered from redesigned central units will be determined during the implementation phase. Significant process reengineering and standardisation as a part of the implementation will also be required.

Possible criteria for processes that will be delivered through SDCs are services that:
- are operational/transactional/administrative; or
- have the potential to standardise or some standardisation already exists; or
- require business knowledge/expertise rather than just functional service expertise; or
- involve high volume transactions.

Some functions and services will not be delivered through SDCs, include those that:
- are highly complex or high risk; or
- cannot be standardised at all; or
- are subject to a rapidly shifting environment or market situation outside the University; or
- require corporate control.

It is envisaged that services not delivered through SDCs might include functions such as brand management, legal services, government reporting, research ethics administration, tax and treasury management, management of endowment property and governance. A more comprehensive list will be determined fully during the implementation phase.
Implementation and Indicative Timeline

A detailed implementation plan is being developed for the next stage of this process that outlines key milestones and opportunities for staff engagement and feedback.

The indicative timeline is as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Implementation Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Commence business process reengineering and standardisation. Determination of which services and processes are to be delivered from which area of the model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – May 2016</td>
<td>Design the structure of SDCs and central units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>Creation of standard roles and position descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Final determination of how many staff are required in the new model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>Formal consultation with affected staff and opportunity for feedback to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept - Dec 2016</td>
<td>Implementation of the new structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is envisaged that the new model would be fully implemented by January 1, 2017 in line with the new academic structure.

Who to talk to

At any time through this change process, staff members can ask questions, express concerns or provide feedback on the changes to the Renewal Project Team:

Renewal-feedback@uwa.edu.au

Staff members with personal concerns can also make contact with staff in Human Resources. At any time during the process of change, staff may seek guidance from HR regarding the implications of redundancy. The University will adhere to the redundancy provisions in the relevant Staff Agreement.

Renewal-HR@uwa.edu.au

For staff feeling worried or stressed about the changes and in need of someone to talk to, the University provides free, confidential and professional assistance to employees through the Employee Assistance Program (EAP).

The service providers who currently offer the program on behalf of the University are (please contact them directly):
OPTUM
Level 27, 44 St Georges Tce (St Martin's Tower)
Perth WA 6000
Phone (24 hours) 1300 361 008

UWA Counselling and Psychological Services
1st Floor, South Wing
Social Sciences Building
Phone (office hours) (+61 8) 6488 2423