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Executive summary

The Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics faces significant and real financial challenges that require action to reduce expenditure.

As a partial response to these challenges, the Dean has decided to implement organisational change to reduce academic staff salaries originally proposed to staff on the 30 September 2010 and revised in scope on the 1 November 2010. This will impact on academic staff on teaching and research appointments in the Faculty’s six schools.

As part of this organisational change, staff will be identified for redundancy under the provisions of the Academic Staff Agreement through the use of a ranking process, which has been designed to ensure the Faculty maintains a strategic academic staff profile.

This decision follows a period of feedback and consultation with academic staff and other stakeholders under the University Organisational Change Guidelines and in compliance with the relevant Academic Staff Agreement. The feedback was carefully considered by the Dean, and a number of changes made to the original proposal in response to the feedback, particularly in regards to the ranking methodology.

This document outlines the organisational change, the feedback received during the consultation process, the amendments to the organisational change as a result of the feedback and the steps and timeline for implementing the organisational change.
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**Introduction**

On the 30 September 2010, the Faculty of Engineering Computing and Mathematics presented to academic staff on teaching and research contracts in the Faculty’s six Schools an organisational change proposal. The scope of this proposal was amended on the 1 November 2010 due to changes in the 2011 budget situation. This followed the identification by the Dean of the need for change based on the financial situation of the Faculty.

This followed a long period of informal discussion around the financial challenges facing the Faculty, commencing in 2009 under the previous Dean as part of the Strategic Review 2009, and extending through into 2010.

The organisational change proposal was presented in line with the University Organisational Change Guidelines ([http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/hr/publications/organisational_change_guidelines](http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/hr/publications/organisational_change_guidelines)), and involved consultation with affected academic staff. Academic staff were able to provide feedback until Tuesday, 16th November 2010 on the overall organisational change, including the ranking methodology. This was facilitated by two formal meetings with academic staff, written submissions, submissions through the relevant unions and direct contact with the Dean or the Manager, Strategic and Operational Planning.

In addition, feedback was received from students, other members of the University, and external stakeholders of the Faculty. This included a meeting with students organised by the University Engineers Club (UEC) and consultation with the UEC executive.

This feedback was considered carefully by the Dean, and a decision has now been made on organisational change. This document has been prepared for the third formal meeting in the organisational change process to convey the decision and discuss the way forward.

**Decision**

Following consideration of all of the feedback obtained during the consultation period, and in line with the organisational change guidelines, the Dean has made a decision to implement the organisational change.

The scope of the organisational change has been reduced, as outlined in the second formal meeting on the 1 November 2010, following changes to the 2011 Faculty budget.

As a result of the feedback, the Dean also made changes to the ranking methodology.

The nature of the change, its effects, and implementation are outlined below, as well as a summary of the feedback.
Reasons for change

This organisational change is being implemented as a result of the serious financial situation of the Faculty, and is directed to achieving financial viability, whilst also maintaining a strategic staffing profile.

Faculty's financial situation

The financial situation of the Faculty was initially outlined in the organisational change proposal, and in the presentation given at the first formal meeting with academic staff. Following changes by the University to the Faculty budget allocation for 2011, this information was updated in the second formal meeting. This information is available on the Academic Staff Organisational Change website at www.ecm.uwa.edu.au/staff/orgchange.

The Faculty has had operating deficits in every year since 2006, and recorded a deficit of more than $2.5 million in 2009.

In 2009, approximately 104% of Faculty Funding Model income was spent on salaries. This salary figure includes both teaching and research academic staff and professional staff salaries but excludes any salary paid through discretionary funds.

Further, the position of carry forward funds in the Faculty has declined, with the Faculty entering overall carry-forward deficit in 2009. Without action, the Faculty forecasted a $9.6 million carry forward deficit by 2013. This deficit is unsustainable for the Faculty and the University.

As indicated in the original proposal, this has prevented the Faculty making strategic investments and impeded the achievement of high-level outcomes that are consistent with its strategic goals.

Despite other attempts to address the financial situation, through reducing other expenditure and increasing income, and changes in the 2011 budget allocation, it is necessary for the Faculty to implement this organisational change to begin to address the financial situation.

Desired objectives

By implementing the organisational change, the Faculty is seeking an improvement in its financial viability and sustainability through a reduction in academic salary expenditure.

However, in doing so, the organisational change has been designed to ensure the Faculty maintains a strategic academic staffing profile that protects the Faculty’s strengths and reflects strategic priorities.

Financial viability for the Faculty

Implementing the changes will reduce the Faculty’s salary commitments below 90% in 2011. This will enable the Faculty the time and opportunity to bring its salary commitments to within 80% of its Faculty Funding Model income.

The 80% level of salary expenditure is benchmarked against the salary expenditure level commonly recognised in the University and elsewhere as an appropriate target to ensure financial viability in a high-cost, research intensive organisation.
Strategic academic staff profile

In addressing the Faculty’s financial situation, this organisational change will proceed in a way that ensures the Faculty maintains an academic staff profile with the capacity to meet the Faculty’s and the University’s strategic goals.

This is reflected in the ranking methodology that will be used to determine the reductions in staff numbers.

The Faculty is committed to being a research-intensive faculty that achieves internationally recognised high quality outcomes in both teaching and research, and which reflects its status as a member of a Group of Eight University.

This forms part of the University’s broader strategy of obtaining recognition as being amongst the best universities in the world, and which is reflected in the University’s stated strategic vision of being amongst the top 50 universities in the world by 2050.

To achieve this, the Faculty’s academic staff profile will need to reflect a commitment to internationally recognised high quality research, whilst valuing the important role high quality teaching plays. While the University and Faculty are strategically located to take advantage of the strong resources sector to fund both teaching and research, such funding is predicated on the Faculty having outstanding and relevant research.

The Faculty must maintain high calibre research to remain competitive domestically and internationally in its undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programmes. Coursework student markets are sensitive to Faculty and University reputations, and this reputation is primarily driven by research performance and recognition. The higher education environment is increasingly globally competitive, and the Faculty must position itself strongly to remain viable in this changing context.

The academic profile must also allow high-quality delivery of coursework programmes. This is achieved both by having leading researchers contributing to these programmes and through a commitment to maintaining and developing the teaching abilities and strategies of academic staff. This includes the development of early career academics in both teaching and research. This means a strengthening of the teaching-research nexus, and ensuring that academic staff are maximising their interrelated contributions to these areas of core business to the Faculty.

Nature and extent of the organisational change

This Organisational change will see a reduction in academic staff salaries of $2.5 million.

This will set the Faculty on the path to meeting its desired objectives of salaries at 80% of FFM income over time.

This will be achieved by a reduction in the numbers of academic staff on teaching and research appointments in the six Schools in the Faculty. This will be done by identifying staff for redundancy under the provisions of the relevant Academic Staff Agreement.

To identify academic staff for redundancy, a ranking process will be utilised, as set out in Attachment A. This ranking methodology has been amended by the Dean following the organisational change consultation process, based on the feedback provided.
The ranking methodology is designed in line with the strategic priorities of the Faculty and the University. It accounts for contributions and performance in research, teaching, service, collegiality and leadership across an assessment period, whilst taking into account the level of academic appointment.

As part of a strategic decision, the ranking process will be done on a Faculty-wide basis to ensure that staff in Schools that could become potentially unviable are not disadvantaged.

As advised at the commencement of the organisational change process, the Census Date for the ranking is the 30 September 2010. This is to ensure fairness and transparency in the conduct of the ranking process.

**Academic staff affected by the organisational change**

Other than those academic staff in the categories listed below, this proposal will affect all academic staff on teaching and research appointments.

**Staff not directly affected by the organisational change**

The following academic staff members are not directly affected by or subject to the organisational change:

- Academic staff on research-only appointments;
- Academic staff on teaching-only appointments;
- Academic staff on fixed-term contracts that expire before 30 June 2011;
- Academic staff that already have a formal agreement with the University regarding the end of their employment (such as a pre-retirement contract or a voluntary redundancy), at the time of any decision to implement the proposed changes; and
- Academic staff employed directly by one of the three Faculty centres: Centre for Offshore Foundation Systems, Australian Centre for Geomechanics and the Western Australian Supercomputer Programme.

Additionally, the professional staff of the Faculty are not subject to this organisational change.

**Summary of feedback and key amendments to the organisational change**

In line with the organisational change process, staff had the opportunity to provide feedback on the organisational change proposal. This feedback was considered by the Dean prior to making the decision to implement the organisational change.

A summary of the major themes and points of feedback is provided in Appendix 1 below, and in the PowerPoint presentation for the third organisational change meeting (available at [www.ecm.uwa.edu.au/staff/orgchange](http://www.ecm.uwa.edu.au/staff/orgchange)). In addition, Appendix 1 contains a summary of the key amendments to the organisational change and the ranking methodology in response to the feedback.
Effects of the organisational change

Reduction in numbers of academic staff

There will be a reduction in the numbers of academic staff on teaching and research appointments. The exact reductions in staff numbers will be determined by achieving a saving of $2.5 million in salaries, and will depend on the level of appointment of staff identified through the ranking process.

This reduction in academic staff will be in accordance with the redundancy provisions contained in Schedule E of the relevant UWA Academic Staff Agreement (available at www.hr.uwa.edu.au). Once staff have been identified for redundancy through the ranking process, the Faculty will follow the redundancy process set out in Schedule E.

As part of that process, the Faculty will consult with the individual staff member and attempt to mitigate the adverse impacts of the organisational change. This may include alternative measures such as a pre-retirement contract. In line with the Academic Staff Agreement, identified staff will be able to opt to have an employee representative of their choice with them during this process.

Staff can apply for voluntary redundancy or another alternative exit pathway from the University (for example, pre-retirement contracts) at any time during the implementation process, including before the ranking is finalised (at which point they will be removed from the ranking process). Further information is available in the implementation section below.

Workload

Following the implementation of this organisational change, there will likely be changes to individual staff workloads to ensure there is broad consistency across the Faculty.

Consistency of workload will be achieved through the continued rationalisation of teaching across the Faculty, both in terms of current courses, units and programmes, and, as already underway, through the design process for New Courses 2012. This will be combined with strong transition planning to effectively manage and minimise the workload during the transition between the current and new courses. Further, there will be changes to the way in which the allocation of teaching, research and administrative duties will occur, as described below.

To ensure broad consistency in workload across the Faculty, the faculty-wide workload model developed in consultation with Schools in 2010 will also be implemented. However this is not a direct effect of the organisational change and would have occurred irrespective of the decision to implement this change.

Reallocation of teaching, research and administration duties

The implementation of the organisational change will also likely impact on the duties performed by academic staff members and the allocation of those duties. This is a result both of the organisational change and the independent measures to address issues of workload indicated above.

The likely effects following implementation are that:

- Teaching will be allocated across the Faculty, so that efficient use of expertise within the Faculty can be used to deliver units, independent of which School the person resides;
- There will be focused use of research-only staff for delivery of parts of units;
• For units with large student enrolments, there will be increased use of professional staff to undertake administrative tasks, including entry of marks, organisation of timetabling, web page updating, etc.;
• A greater proportion of academic time will be spent on research; and
• Administrative tasks that do not require academic judgement will be undertaken by professional administrative staff, allowing teaching and research staff to concentrate on the academic and pedagogical issues associated with teaching.

Possible changes in school structure

Following the implementation of the organisational change, there is a possibility for the need for changes in the School structure in the Faculty. This is because the reduction in academic staff numbers could make an individual existing school(s) too small to be viable as an independent entity.

In this event, it is likely that the staff in the unviable school would be amalgamated with another School in a cognate area, with the focus being on ensuring a close academic alignment. It would be intended that any staff amalgamated in this way would maintain a strong discipline status, allowing the delivery of a more focused teaching programme in the area of the subsumed school.

In the event of a change in the School structure in the Faculty there could be changes in reporting lines, office location and administrative duties associated with the different Schools.

Should the need to make changes to the School structure arise, this will be the subject of a separate organisational change process involving affected staff members.
Implementation

The implementation of the organisational change will occur in four phases as follows:

1. **Conduct of the ranking exercise**;
   a. Collection and collation of ranking data;

2. **Review of individual ranking data by each individual academic staff member**;

3. **Identification of staff for redundancy and formal redundancy process**;
   a. Consultation with identified staff members, including formal process set out in Schedule E of the UWA Academic Staff Agreement;
   b. Negotiation, and attempts to mitigate the adverse effects of redundancy;

4. **Identified staff leave the University**;
   a. Staff either leave as a result of redundancy, or commit to a departure date as part of a formal contract with the University (for example, a pre-retirement contract);

An indicative date for completion of each phase is available in the appropriate sections below, and summarised in Table 1.

During the implementation, there will be a continual process of communication and consultation, which is also addressed below.

Collection of data

Phase 1 of the implementation process involves the collection of data for the ranking exercise.

As indicated in the ranking methodology, data will, where possible, be sourced from official University sources (such as Callista and Socrates).

However, some data will need to be collected from the Head of School (such as teaching allocations).

Further, some data (such as 2010 publications, as well as the appropriate portfolios and statements) will need to be submitted by the individual academic. This data is due by Monday 20 December 2010.

Full details and processes on submitting this data, as well as templates to complete the data into, will be emailed to all staff by Friday 26 November 2010. This will also draw to the attention of staff exactly what is required to be submitted, which will include details of 2010 publications (up to the Census Date), a Teaching Portfolio and an External Service Statement.

Staff wishing to submit an Opportunity Statement will have until Friday, 14 January 2011 to do so. Again, information on the process for submitting this data, including a pro-forma, will be communicated to staff by the end of November.

Individual staff will have the opportunity to review their data before the ranking occurs, as detailed below.

Individual review of ranking data

Once the data has been collected for staff and inputted into a format used for ranking, each academic staff will have the opportunity to review their individual data to ensure correctness as part of Phase 2.
Any changes to the data will need to be submitted to and approved by the Head of School based on evidence supplied by the individual academic.

Individual staff will have at least 5 working days to review their individual data collected, make any amendments with the approval of the Head of School, and return any updates to the Dean. The exact process and timing of this will be communicated to staff in January 2011; however it is likely to occur in mid-late January 2011.

**Identification of staff and the redundancy process**

*Identification of staff*

At the conclusion of the timeframe for individual staff to review their individual data contained in the ranking exercise, the final ranking will be completed, and staff will be identified for redundancy. These staff will then be notified by the Dean, and the formal process under Schedule E of the Academic Staff Agreement will commence.

*Redundancy*

Individual Academic Staff members who are identified for redundancy through the ranking process will be notified, and the redundancy process under Schedule E of the UWA Academic Staff Agreement will commence. Academic staff members are **strongly** encouraged to read the provisions of Schedule E, which are available at [www.hr.uwa.edu.au](http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au) under “Collective Agreements”.

As part of this process, there will be an individual consultation and discussion between the University and the individual staff member. During this process, a staff member has the option of having an employee representative of their choice with them to assist and provide support.

It is intended that the redundancies will occur over 2011, although it will be the intention of the Faculty to seek as prompt resolution to the redundancy process as is possible. Staff who are made redundant will commence to leave from February 2011, subject to individual discussions about notice or payment in lieu thereof.

Staff looking for further information on redundancy can contact:

**Ms Donna Kirkham**  
HR Consultant  
Employee Relations and Management Services, Human Resources  
6488 7831; donna.kirkham@uwa.edu.au

**Mr David Rogers**  
Senior Employee Relations Officer  
Employee Relations and Management Services, Human Resources  
6488 3003; david.rogers@uwa.edu.au

*Mitigation of adverse impacts and alternative options*

In line with Schedule E of the UWA Academic Staff Agreement, once staff are identified for redundancy there will be an individual process of consultation, during which alternative options to mitigate the adverse impacts of redundancy can be explored, as can other mitigation strategies.

One example of an alternative option is a pre-retirement contract, rather than a redundancy.
Academic staff are strongly encouraged to read Schedule E of the UWA Academic Staff Agreement, which is available from www.hr.uwa.edu.au.

Any alternative option or mitigation will be by agreement between the University and the individual staff member,

*Early exit from the University*

During the implementation process, staff may wish to consider taking a voluntary exit pathway outside of the ranking process, such as a voluntary redundancy or pre-retirement contract.

Academic staff who are interested in finding out more about the options available, or seeking preliminary information, can do so confidentially by contacting one of the following people:

**Ms Donna Kirkham**
HR Consultant
Employee Relations and Management Services, Human Resources
6488 7831; donna.kirkham@uwa.edu.au

**Mr David Rogers**
Senior Employee Relations Officer
Employee Relations and Management Services, Human Resources
6488 3003; david.rogers@uwa.edu.au

If an academic staff member decides to proceed more formally with requesting an alternative early exit, a more formal process can then commence. Staff members who elect to take this option will be removed from the ranking exercise.

*It is important to remember that the University has the discretion as to whether this early/alternative exit is approved.*

**Identified staff leave the University**

As a result of the formal process in phase 3, staff will either leave the University as a result of and in accordance with the redundancy, or if an alternative solution is identified on an individual basis (such as a pre-retirement contract), as agreed and in accordance with a formal contract with the University.

The timing of departure of staff through the redundancy process is affected by decisions around the serving of notice, or payment in lieu of notice, negotiated with the individual staff member.

Similarly, the timing of departure of staff with individual alternative situations is a matter of negotiation to the satisfaction of the University and the employee.
Further consultation and communication

During the implementation, there will be continuing consultation and communication with all staff to make the change process as smooth as possible.

This will involve updates on the progress of implementation through email and on the Organisational Change website at www.ecm.uwa.edu.au/staff/orgchange. In addition, it will involve contacting staff about implementation support seminars and activities as they are arranged. Finally, there will be updates on the timelines for the implementation process, especially commencing in early 2011 when the timing of the later phases of implementation become clear.

However, affected academic staff members should feel free to contact any of the contacts listed below at any stage throughout the process, whether directly, or through the union or employee representative.

Winthrop Professor John Dell
Dean
Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics
6488 3704; orgchange-ecm@uwa.edu.au

Stuart Broadfoot
Manager, Strategic and Operational Planning
Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics
6488 2463; orgchange-ecm@uwa.edu.au

As always, affected academic staff members with personal concerns can also make contact with the following staff in Human Resources:

Ms Donna Kirkham
HR Consultant
Employee Relations and Management Services, Human Resources
6488 7831; donna.kirkham@uwa.edu.au

Mr David Rogers
Senior Employee Relations Officer
Employee Relations and Management Services, Human Resources
6488 3003; david.rogers@uwa.edu.au
**Indicative timeline for implementation**

*Table 1: Indicative timeline for implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Dates</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 2008 - 2010</td>
<td>Identification and discussion of financial challenges in the Faculty</td>
<td>Dean; Heads of School; All Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 September 2010</td>
<td>Ranking Census Date / Organisational change proposed</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 November 2010</td>
<td>Decision to implement organisational change made and communicated to staff</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 November 2010</td>
<td>Detailed instructions provided to academic staff on submitting required data</td>
<td>Dean; Academic Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December onwards</td>
<td>Support services (such as seminars, career advisory services etc) made available to academic staff; Academic staff notified</td>
<td>Dean; Human Resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 December 2010</td>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong> for Academic staff to have submitted required Phase 1 data</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 14 January 2011</td>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong> for submission of an Opportunity Statement</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Late January 2011</td>
<td>All data collected and entered</td>
<td>Academic Staff; Head of School; Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late January 2011</td>
<td>Conduct ranking exercise</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early February 2011</td>
<td>Low ranked staff identified and communicated with informally</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-Mid February 2011</td>
<td>Identified staff formally notified of intention to offer a redundancy, and process in <em>Academic Staff Agreement</em> commences</td>
<td>Dean; Human Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Available support

Counselling and support

If during the organisational change implementation process affected academic staff require individual personal counselling or support, they are able to access this free of charge through the UWA Employee Assistance Program. Affected staff can contact the following providers:

**UWA Counselling and Psychological Services**
1st Floor, South Wing
Social Sciences Building
(08) 6488 2423 (During office hours)
www.counselling.uwa.edu.au

**PPC Worldwide**
Level 16, 251 Adelaide Terrace
PERTH WA 6000
1300 361 008 (24 hours)
www.au.ppcworldwide.com

All information provided through these support avenues is confidential, and will not be made available to the University.

More information on these personal support services is available at [http://www.safety.uwa.edu.au/policies/eap](http://www.safety.uwa.edu.au/policies/eap)

Implementation support

During the implementation, the Faculty and Human Resources will provide access to a wide range of support services to assist academic staff to consider their options and make informed decisions.

This includes career transition support from an outside provider, which can assist affected staff through counselling, career assessment and job search support. Costs associated with this service will be covered by the Faculty and University as part of a commitment to minimising the impact of these changes.

Other support available for affected academic staff at no cost, delivered through both Human Resources and outside consultants, includes information on the following:

- Pre-retirement opportunities;
- Retirement planning;
- Financial planning; and
- Information on redundancy packages.

Academic staff will be notified of the availability of these support services as they are confirmed. The Faculty and University are committed to making these services available as soon as possible. Staff will be notified by email and through the Academic Staff Organisational Change website at [www.ecm.uwa.edu.au/staff/orgchange](http://www.ecm.uwa.edu.au/staff/orgchange).

If during the process staff have a particular topic/type of support that they would consider helpful, please contact the Manager, Strategic and Operational Planning, Mr Stuart Broadfoot, at orgchange-ecm@uwa.edu.au, and all efforts will be made to try and accommodate this support. This may not always be possible, but in partnership with Human Resources, efforts will be made to
at least refer staff to appropriate bodies/organisations for advice where it is not feasible to conduct internal support services/run internal seminars.

ECM UniSuper Seminar

The University has already obtained a commitment from UniSuper to run a seminar for ECM staff on superannuation and related topics that may arise as part of the organisational change process. Details of this will be provided shortly, but the seminar will occur in early December.
Appendix 1 – Feedback on the organisational change

Feedback received

During the consultation process, a significant amount of feedback was provided. In terms of written feedback, there were:

- 50+ individual pieces of feedback from academic staff, both from individuals and from groups of academic staff
- 2 submissions from the NTEU
- 23 pieces of feedback from students, including a submission from the UEC
- 6 responses from other staff in the University and from industry

This is in addition to a significant amount of feedback provided directly to the Dean.

Summary of key amendments to the organisational change

The following is a summary of the key changes made to the organisational change, in response to the feedback (which is summarised below):

- Inclusion of a Teaching Portfolio indicator in the Teaching category, to be used to address teaching quality, contributions to curriculum development and professional development in teaching. This has been made relative to academic level by referring it to the Minimum Standards for Academic Levels in the UWA Academic Staff Agreement;
- Inclusion of leadership as a component alongside collegiality in the Collegiality, Leadership and External Service category, with a greater weighting for leadership amongst Level D and Level E academic staff;
- Introduction of the ability for staff to submit an opportunity statement to be considered by the Dean addressing why their achievement relative to other staff has been affected by factors other than the opportunities factored into the ranking methodology;
- The ranking methodology document clarified to ensure it is not construed as a performance management exercise, particularly over the connection with the Academic Performance Expectations and Targets document;
- Greater granularity in class size ranges in the Unit Teaching indicator in the Teaching category;
- Clarification in the ranking methodology that staff promoted during the assessment period will be assessed pro-rata based on the time spent at each respective level;
- A reduction in points awarded for HDR student enrolments versus HDR student completions, to ensure relativity is maintained with the nominal minimum performance expectations; and
- For staff who commence during the assessment period and are identified through the ranking process for redundancy, the ability for the Dean to moderate their research score based on their CV submitted at the time of appointment.

Summary of major themes and points of feedback and responses

A large amount of feedback was received, and was considered carefully by the Dean. This summary provides an overview of the major themes and points of feedback, and a brief response to the feedback. Not all of the individual feedback is reflected here.
The feedback can be grouped into the following categories:

- Feedback on the overall organisational change
- Feedback on the ranking methodology regarding:
  - The overall ranking system;
  - The Research Category;
  - The Teaching Category;
  - The Internal Service (Administration) Category; and
  - The Collegiality and External Service Category.

**Feedback on the overall organisational change**

- *There was feedback received that there was insufficient justification provided to warrant making the organisational change, and that there had been insufficient informal consultation on the Faculty’s financial challenges.*

There was not widespread concern evident from the feedback about the rational for the change, including the justification provided, or about the level of informal consultation provided on the Faculty’s financial challenges. In fact, the majority of the feedback accepted the need to make the changes and accepted the justification provided.

In regards to informal consultation, the Faculty has been discussing the serious financial challenges for some time, commencing in 2009. There has been information provided in a number of forums about the financial situation, and the high contribution of salary expenditure as a proportion of income.

As a result, no changes were made to the organisational change as a result of this feedback.

**Feedback on the overall ranking system**

- *In regards to the overall ranking system, there was competing feedback, with one set objecting to the use of a ranking methodology at all, and other feedback indicating that the ranking methodology was the most appropriate for a difficult situation.*

The focus has been on developing a ranking methodology that best assesses people fairly, and the ranking methodology exhibits a number of key characteristics, including a level of objectivity and the ability for the process to proceed at a reasonable pace.

Alternative suggestions made during the feedback process involved significant timeframes, which would potentially have left staff with uncertainty for a long period, and/or required significant work on the part of academic staff in having to contribute information.

There was also no consistency in the feedback, with feedback for and against the use of a ranking methodology relatively even.

As a result, there have been no changes made in response to this feedback.
• **There was significant feedback questioning whether the ranking methodology aligned with University policies and pronouncements, particularly in regards to the weightings of categories in the ranking system and the indicators used, with suggestions that the ranking involved a “moving of the goal posts”. There was also contrary feedback supporting the ranking methodology and weightings.**

As indicated in second formal organisational change meeting on the 1 November, the ranking methodology is a relative ranking exercise, and is not about determining whether particular staff are under-performing, and therefore the minimum expected performances are not being utilised to performance manage staff. Rather, the nominal minimum expected performance provides a differentiation between performance of staff at different levels.

The indicators utilised recognise the range of activities of the Faculty. In particular, it was suggested that Teaching is not valued. This is not the case.

Feedback was invited on the relative differences in standards by academic level, and none was received.

As a result, no changes have been made in response to this feedback.

• **There were concerns expressed in some feedback that the organisational change focuses on performance, and therefore that it is performance management. Suggestions were received to look at the ranking document to clarify the meaning of terms, and that the process should be done on a school-by-school basis.**

The ranking is not a performance management exercise. The reason for the organisational change is the long-term financial situation of the Faculty, and is not about assessing underperformance. The ranking methodology simply provides a relative assessment of staff across the Faculty.

It was a strategic decision to undertake the process on a Faculty-wide basis, and is about ensuring staff in schools with currently lower financially viability are not disadvantaged.

• **There was a large amount of feedback generally suggesting additional or replacement indicators for the ranking methodology across all of the categories. There was, in most cases, no consensus on any particular indicators to be included, and there was other feedback supporting the use of the chosen indicators.**

In response to the two areas of consistent, specific feedback, the ranking methodology has been changed in the Teaching and Collegiality and External Service categories. These are discussed in the relevant sections below. In these areas, there was a high degree of consensus on the need for amendments.

No other changes have been made in response to this feedback.

• **There was some feedback that the ranking system did not account for a broad enough range of factors that can affect opportunity to perform relative to other staff.**

In response to this feedback, academic staff will have the opportunity, if they wish, to submit an Opportunity Statement to the Dean addressing factors other than those accounted for in the ranking methodology which they believe have contributed to their achievement relative to other staff. This statement can be taken into account by the Dean in the ranking exercise, as part of a sensitivity analysis.
Feedback on the Research Category in the ranking methodology

- **There was some feedback expressing concern that collaboration, particularly in publications and grants, was over rewarded.** The feedback variously suggested that this failed to appreciate differences between disciplines regarding research collaboration, failed to recognise differences in workload between large collaboration papers/grants vs single authored papers/grants, and that it failed to take into account the range of reasons for including staff as collaborators on publications and grants, many of which do not reflect an active contribution to the development of the publication/grant application.

Encouraging and rewarding collaboration in research is a key Faculty strategy, and a key University policy. As a result, the full points will continue to be awarded to each author/investigator.

In response to this feedback, ARC LIEF grants have been excluded from consideration in the Grant Income indicator in the Research Category. This recognises that these grants, by their nature and due to the guidelines the ARC looks for in awarding these grants, contain a large number of “investigators” without reflecting contribution to the award of the grant.

- **A number of pieces of feedback pointed out that there were not nominal minimum performance expectations set for Level A academic staff in the Grant Income and HDR Student Supervision indicators.** The feedback then drew two main follow up points: one, that there should be some expectation on a Level A across 5 years in those indicators; and two that this caused problems with the calculation of the Research Category Score.

In response to this feedback, nominal minimum performance expectations have been set for Level A academic staff in the HDR Student Supervision and Grant Income indicators as part of the Research category.

- **There was some specific feedback suggesting that the Publications indicator did not take account of the size of the publication, and particularly, that in some fields one or two publications comprise the entire journal, with publications over 50 pages.**

In response to this feedback, the Publications indicator has been changed so that publications in excess of 50 pages are now awarded two publication points. The requirement that the publication still be in an ERA A*/A (or for staff assessed against the Laboratory and experimental research table, a B) rated source remains for all publications.

Feedback on the Teaching Category in the ranking methodology

- **There was significant, specific feedback that contributions to teaching quality, course, programme and unit development, and professional development in teaching were not recognised.** There were only small amounts of feedback suggesting specific indicators for measuring these factors, and there was no consistency in the indicators suggested.

In response to this feedback, a Teaching Portfolio indicator has been introduced to the Teaching Category, and will make up half the score for that category. The Teaching Portfolio will enable staff to address teaching quality, curriculum and course development and professional development in teaching. Academic staff will be asked to address the range of activities in teaching used in the promotion and tenure, and PDR processes.
The portfolio will be assessed by the Dean against the Minimum Standards for Academic Levels in the UWA Academic Staff Agreement, and in interpreting these MSALs, the Dean will have regard to the University-wide standard descriptors used in the promotion and tenure, and PDR processes.

- **A large amount of feedback also indicated there was insufficient granularity in the breakdown of points scored for specific class sizes in the Unit Teaching indicator, with concerns raised about over-weighting small class sizes and having too much variation in workload within one class size range.**

In response to this feedback, the number of steps in the class size scale in the Unit Teaching indicator in the Teaching category has been increased from 3 to 5, and the points allocation to each class size range has been adjusted. In particular, the points awarded for the smallest class size range have been reduced.

**Feedback on the Internal Service (Administration) Category**

- **Some feedback suggested that the use of outreach as a role/indicator in the Internal Service (Administration) category was unclear, not consistent and did not reflect the variety of outreach roles. This was said to be particularly the case with the points assigned to that role. Further, it was suggested that it was difficult to assign the role of outreach to a staff member, as there was no specific service role of that name.**

In response to this feedback, the outreach role/indicator has been removed from the Internal Service (Administration) category. Outreach activities however are valued within the Faculty, and form part of the Collegiality component assessment.

**Feedback on the Collegiality and External Service Category**

- **There was feedback suggesting that leadership was an important indicator missing from the Collegiality and External Service Category, particularly for Level D and Level E academic staff.**

As a result of this feedback, leadership has been incorporated as an indicator alongside collegiality in the Collegiality, Leadership and External Service category. Leadership for Levels A-C will be assessed in conjunction with Collegiality by the panel. For Levels D and E, Leadership is weighted to a greater extent, and is assessed by the Head of School, and then combined (after weighting) with the Collegiality score provided by the panel.

Leadership will be assessed relative to academic level based on the Minimum Standards for Academic Levels in the UWA Academic Staff Agreement. The panel and Head of School will also have regard to the activities under “Academic Citizenship” and “Leadership” used in the promotion and tenure, and PDR processes.
There was a small amount of feedback expressing the concern that the collegiality ranking process was not transparent, and is therefore potentially open to bias.

The process used for the assessment of the Collegiality indicator provides for three staff selected by the Dean for each School specifically for their collegiate behaviour and ability to approach the task with an open mind. Each of these staff assesses Collegiality and provides their score independently of the other panel members, and the individual score for each academic is then averaged across the three independent panel member scores.

As a result, no changes have been made in response to this feedback.