



**Planning Performance and Review
Committee Reviews Procedure**
UNDER REVIEW

Related Policy	Reviews Policy
Responsible Officer	Provost
Approved by	Provost
Approved and commenced	December, 2013
Review by	December, 2014
Responsible Organisational Unit	Office of the Provost

CONTENTS

1	Objective	2
2	Scope.....	2
3	Procedure	2
3.1	Identifying the Need for a Review.....	2
3.2	Risk Assessing the Proposed Review	3
3.3	Identifying the Review Methodology	3
3.4	Commissioning Reviews	4
3.5	Review Proposals	4
3.6	Receiving Review Reports	5
3.7	Monitoring Management/Administrative Review Outcomes.....	6
4	Definitions and Acronyms.....	6
5	Supporting Documentation.....	6
6	Versioning	6

1 Objective

The objectives of this Procedure are to:

- ensure a robust, efficient and effective system for the management and implementation of reviews of management / administrative matters as detailed in the Reviews Policy
- support the Planning Performance and Review Committee (PPRC) in the implementation of the Reviews Policy.

2 Scope

The PPRC uses the procedure to manage the reviews of management / administrative matters across all activities of the University with the exception of matters associated with appointment, probation, promotion and performance management of individual staff, although the policies and practices related to these matters are within scope.

3 Procedure

3.1 Identifying the Need for a Review

3.1.1 The PPRC identifies a need for a review as a result of one or more of the following triggers:

- the identification of risk, strategic need / opportunity, concern about performance on the basis of regular performance monitoring, benchmarking, previous reviews or other evidence
- major organisational or external environmental change posing risks or creating opportunities
- an external professional accreditation or audit exercise becomes due
- a cyclic review becomes due, although reliance on cyclical reviews will be the exception and their use in specific situations will require explicit justification.

3.1.2 To enable the identification of the need for reviews, the PPRC will receive and take into account relevant recommendations, information and data, including:

- recommendations from the Audit and Risk Committee
- audit reports generated by Risk Management and Audit Assurance
- recommendations from Academic Senate and/or its sub-committees
- recommendations from the Senior Management Team (SMT)
- recommendations from organisational units
- environmental scans of state, national and international higher education and geopolitical developments
- notices of professional accreditation and external audit exercises
- performance monitoring data and reports, including performance against plans and targets
- benchmarking reports
- previous review reports
- cyclic review reports
- notice of an external review or audit process
- current and planned audits and reviews
- any other relevant evidence the committee identifies.

3.1.3 Any element of University activity is potentially subject to review. However, reviews under the remit of the PPRC will most commonly focus on a:

- research group
- School / Centre
- Faculty
- University Institute
- Section
- Division
- policy / procedure
- process / theme (e.g. timetabling, graduations, web strategy, information and knowledge management)
- committee (e.g. Council, Academic Senate, Quality Committee)
- transnational education or other partnership
- strategic direction.

3.2 Risk Assessing the Proposed Review

The PPRC risk assesses the issues that will be addressed in the proposed review taking into account the UTAS Risk Management:

- principle
- policy
- framework
- toolkit
- matrix
- risk assessments conducted by organisational units accompanying recommendations for reviews.

3.3 Identifying the Review Methodology

3.3.1 The PPRC identifies the type of review to be initiated based on a consideration of the risk. A variety of review mechanisms is available, for example:

- self-review
- internal or external panel review
- external consultancy
- internal audit
- external audit
- professional accreditation.

The PPRC may consider that higher risk issues require an external panel review or external audit, for example; or that lower risk issues may be effectively addressed through self-reviews or internal audits. Professional accreditations and external audits may also be mandated by external bodies such as the national higher education regulator.

3.3.2 In many cases, reviews will be directed by the PPRC to be used in combination with other methodologies or sources of data such as a self-review, moderation exercise or survey. Information from these processes may identify a further risk, strategic need or performance concern that triggers a panel review or external audit and/or provides evidence to be considered in such a review process.

3.3.3 Risks identified and categorised by the PPRC through these processes should be added to the relevant UTAS Risk Register.

3.4 Commissioning Reviews

3.4.1 The PPRC commissions reviews through:

- a written notice to organisational unit(s) with instructions to conduct a review
- the establishment of an internal review through the office of the Provost or other Division or combination of Divisions
- the establishment of an external review
- any other mechanism the PPRC identifies as relevant.

3.4.2 The PPRC will give written directions on the review methodology, timeline and expected outcomes.

3.5 Review Proposals

3.5.1 Following the commissioning of a review, the PPRC will subsequently receive a written review proposal from the responsible organisational unit(s) or other designated body that will include:

- a statement of the scope and terms of reference (including reference to any specific trigger for the review and to any relevant goal or strategy)
- defined responsibilities for initiation and carriage
- reference to relevant performance indicators or other data
- reference to stakeholder data (e.g. students, staff, external)
- external stakeholder input to be sought where appropriate
- a specific but realistic timetable for all stages of the review including implementation, reporting and follow-up
- a communication strategy for informing stakeholders of the review outcomes in a timely manner
- approval, reporting, implementation and follow-up responsibilities
- a process for ascertaining management responses to the outcomes of the review and the inclusion of these responses in the review report.

3.5.2 On receipt of the review proposal, the PPRC will complete an assessment to ensure that the proposed review is to be undertaken in a manner that is:

- evidence based
- efficient (particularly in its use of staff time)
- rigorous
- transparent
- objective.

3.5.3 Following the receipt of a review proposal, the PPRC either:

- declines the proposal and informs the proposer(s) in writing
or
- accepts the proposal
or
- amends and/or returns the proposal to the proposer with written instructions for amendment and subsequent re-submission.

- 3.5.4 Re-submitted proposals are subjected to re-assessment by the PPRC.
- 3.5.5 When a proposal is approved, the PPRC gives written permission for the review to proceed.
- 3.5.6 The relevant Deans, Institute Heads or Heads of Division are normally responsible for resourcing reviews of activities in their portfolios. However, where necessary the PPRC may receive applications for alternative funding models. For example, the sharing of resourcing across portfolios may be appropriate depending on the scope of the review.
- 3.5.7 The PPRC will consider subsequent changes to approved review proposals received in writing from the proposer(s).

3.6 Receiving Review Reports

- 3.6.1 Unless otherwise specified by the PPRC, the relevant Deans, Institute Heads or Heads of Division will first receive the review report and provide to the PPRC their own assessment or commentary with a revised set of recommendations where considered appropriate. Consistent with the objective of continuous improvement and the requirements that reviews are purposeful, lead to meaningful outcomes and comply with the provisions of the Objectives, Approach, Deployment, Results and Improvement (OADRI) Cycle, the receipt of a report of a review process and the attached assessment or commentary is followed by careful assessment of the conclusions and recommendations by the PPRC.
- 3.6.2 The PPRC may require further work on or further explanation of the review report, assessment or commentary, and any attached implementation plans. Reviews normally mandate the submission of a follow-up report on implementation and outcomes of reviews within a defined timeframe.
- 3.6.3 When review reports are accepted as finalised by the PPRC, the committee:
- decides which recommendations and/or other conclusions arising from the review are to be acted upon
 - identifies which organisational unit(s) will implement the approved recommendations and/or other actions
 - identifies and resolves any resourcing implications
 - informs the relevant Deans, Institute Heads or Heads of Division in writing, specifying expected timeframes for completion.
- 3.6.4 Typically, this will need to be followed by the preparation of an implementation plan if not already submitted to the PPRC.
- 3.6.5 If implementation and follow-up plans are not already approved in the review proposal, the PPRC can either develop them in committee, commission them externally, or require one or more organisational units to develop them. If developed externally to the committee, the implementation and follow-up plans will be submitted to the PPRC for approval. That approval will be forwarded in writing to the relevant Deans, Institute Heads or Heads of Division involved in implementing the approved recommendations and/or other actions arising from the review.
- 3.6.6 The relevant Deans, Institute Heads or Head of Divisions are normally responsible for resourcing reviews of activities in their portfolios. However, the PPRC may receive

applications for alternative funding models. For example, the sharing of resourcing across portfolios may be appropriate depending on the scope of the review.

- 3.6.7 The PPRC will consider any subsequent changes to the approved plans submitted in writing by the responsible organisational unit(s).
- 3.6.8 Copies of approved review reports and assessments are provided to the Risk Management and Audit Assurance (RMAA) office to assist sharing of lessons and ensure alignment of activities.

3.7 Monitoring Management/Administrative Review Outcomes

The PPRC will:

- maintain a register of approved reviews
- monitor the implementation of reviews
- receive any mandated follow-up reports on implementation of recommendations
- update the entries in the reviews register to reflect review progress which will include the monitoring of outcomes.

4 Definitions and Acronyms

Organisational Unit	Faculty, School, Centre, University Institute, other University Entity, Division, Section or University Business Enterprise.
PPRC	Planning Performance and Review Committee
SMT	Senior Management Team

5 Supporting Documentation

- Management / Administrative Review Guidelines

6 Versioning

Current Version	Version 1 – Planning Performance and Review Committee Reviews Procedure; (current document); approved December, 2013.
-----------------	---