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Mrs Lesley Tubic
Secretary
AGENDA

1. MINUTES
   Confirmation of the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held on 31 March 2009.

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
   The chair invites members to declare interests in relation to any item on the agenda.

PART I – Items for Communication to be dealt with En Bloc

3. RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
   Due to his involvement in a two day research related workshop Professor Colin Raston, Chair of the Research Committee, has given his apologies for this meeting. He will provide an update on research activities within the Faculty at the next meeting.

PART II – Items for Decision to be dealt with En Bloc

   There are no items for inclusion in Part II

PART III – Items for Discussion and Decision

4. ONGOING CONTINGENT FUNDED RESEARCH CONTRACTS (CFCs)
   Mr David Rogers from Human Resources will speak to members regarding a new category of employment under the 2009 Academic and General Staff Agreements. This is an ongoing contingent funded research contract with limited term funding provided from external sources. They are not funded through an operating grant from government or funding comprised of payments of fees made by or on behalf of students. A staff member may be appointed to a CFC if:

   • They are 0.5 FTE or more;
   • Have been employed by UWA for at least three years and who have been appointed to their second or subsequent consecutive contract; and
   • Have met the definition of ‘research active’ as it applied in the Faculty.

   The discussion paper ‘Better Supporting Research Staff at the University of Western Australia’, which led to this category of contract is attached (ATTACHMENT A) and links to the Staff agreements are detailed below.

   General Staff Agreement:
   http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/hr/erm/enterprise_bargaining/updates?f=249683
   Academic Staff Agreement:
   http://www.hr.uwa.edu.au/hr/erm/enterprise_bargaining/updates?f=249682
It has been suggested that funding for these positions will be through the UWA Safety Net Scheme, which will mean that majority of the costs of this scheme will be borne by the Faculty and Schools.

For discussion.

5. SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS - PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF NEW UNITS REF: FS075
Professor Adrian Baddeley, School of Mathematics and Statistics, will speak to members regarding the proposed introduction of a Statistics for Science unit (STAT1400) by the School in 2010. This item was discussed at the Board of Studies on 5 May 2009, but as there was little detail on the process for determining content of the unit and consultation with other scientists, the item was deferred to the next meeting of the Board of Studies. This item would normally be considered by the Teaching and Learning committee meeting, but it is not scheduled to meet until after the Board of Studies meeting.

A covering letter from the Head of School and Checklist for the proposed new unit is attached (ATTACHMENT B)

For discussion

6. DEAN'S REPORT
The Dean will report on current issues of interest to members of the Executive Committee.

7. REDUCTION IN UNITS WITH ENROLMENTS LESS THAN 30
The Faculty must reduce the number of units that it offers, so that staff time is freed up to undertake research or clear leave. On the whole it is not economically viable to teach units with enrolments less than 50, but it is recognised that some cross subsidisation will occur. To start the process of reducing unit offerings in the Faculty, the Dean has proposed that undergraduate units with an enrolment less than 30 be dropped

For discussion

8. AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES QUALITY AGENCY (AUQA)
In May 2009 the University was audited by AUQA. This audit focussed on the way in which the University manages it activities and performance in the areas of student experience and international activities. The Dean will report informally on the outcome of the audit.

9. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
Changes to the University Performance Management system are about to be implemented and are detailed in the Attached (ATTACHMENT C). It is critical that regular PDRs are conducted with staff and in particular academic staff. It appears that although PDRs are being conducted, detailed reports on progress on goals set in the PDRs, particularly research goals, are not being kept and monitored. The new Performance Management system also includes a Performance Appraisal Report that will need to be completed within one week of the PDR.

For discussion

10. FEDERAL BUDGET
The Dean will provide an update on provisions for higher education within the Federal budget and impact on this Faculty.

For discussion
11. **TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE REPORT**
Professor Geoff Hammond, Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee will provide an update on teaching and learning activities within the Faculty.

12. **MIDDLE EAST RESEARCH INITIATIVES REPORT**
Dr Mohamed Makha, Associate Dean (Middle East Research Initiatives) will provide an update on the Faculty’s marketing activities in the Middle East.

13. **SOUTH ASIA RESEARCH INITIATIVES REPORT**
Professor Arunasalam Dharmarajan, Associate Dean (South Asia Research Initiatives) will provide an update on the Faculty’s marketing activities in South Asia.

14. **OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS**
BETTER SUPPORTING RESEARCH STAFF AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Background and context

A key issue for research-intensive universities today is the employment environment for research staff who are either on postdoctoral fellowships, fellowships funded by major grants bodies such as ARC/NHMRC, or who are employed on a grant, funded by the University or other sources, and held by a Chief Investigator (CI). As universities endeavour both to increase their research productivity, and to recruit a new generation of high quality academics, the relative satisfaction and commitment of research staff has become a key success factor.

However, reports and reviews in Australia and overseas continue to highlight concerns of research staff about the manner in which their professional lives are managed and supported. An important initiative in the United Kingdom, the Concordat on the career management of 'research only' staff in universities and colleges, signed by key British institutions and their principal research funders in 1996, set the framework for ongoing dialogue in the United Kingdom on this issue. A range of reports on the implementation of the Concordat across the higher education sector, and the identification of many examples of good practice, are available from the Universities UK website [http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/activities/rci.asp].

In 2003 the Higher Education Funding Council for the England commissioned its own review of practices adopted to improve the situation of research staff in English universities. The Executive Summary of this report, included as Attachment 1 of this paper, brings together most of the major issues that inform discussion on this topic. In so doing, this summary reflects most of the key issues
raised in reports on the status of research staff at The University of Western Australia in recent years. These include:

- *Researchers: Supporting their Development Needs* [OSDS, 2004]
- *Project for the Advancement of Research Careers* [PARC Report, 2005]

all of which are available on the Researchers Association homepage on the UWA website at [http://www.research.uwa.edu.au/welcome/for_researchers/resources_for_research_staff]

Of particular note in the HEFC 2003 report was the list of constraints confronting research staff, most of which pertain to the Australian environment. These included external, institution, and individual constraints. In terms of *external constraints* within Australia, current funding conditions, particularly those related to the funding of NHMRC projects, continue to cause significant problems both for researchers and for the grant holders, as the gap between the funds provided by the NHMRC through its PSPs (in full?), and the salaries at individual universities, continues to widen. The University of Western Australia has made representation to the NHMRC on this matter, and will continue to do so. There is an enhanced opportunity to have some impact on this issue now that the Vice Chancellor is Chair of the Group of Eight, all universities for which NHMRC funding is crucially important. Furthermore, the resumption by the Minister for Science of responsibility for Research enhances the possibility of an effective dialogue on this issue.

*Recommendation 1: that the Vice Chancellor takes up with colleagues in the Group of Eight the issue of the NHMRC funding gaps, with a view to presenting a position to the new Minister for Science.*
In terms of the *institutional* constraints noted in the HEFC report, the issue of obvious, visible careers paths is noted, as is a concern about levels of support from supervisors and heads of school. In the Australian context, in the current funding climate, opportunities for long-term careers as ‘research only’ staff are limited. However, there is a strong employment climate emerging for good researchers who can also take on teaching roles, and this is something addressed further within this paper, as is the issue of overall management of research staff.

The HEFC paper notes, under *individual* constraints, concerns about lack of development opportunities for research staff, lack of status and recognition, and general insecurity for staff due to the short term nature of contracts. These issues have arisen in discussions at UWA, and are also addressed in this paper.

**Issues for discussion and decision**

As a research-intensive institution, we are looking to strengthen the employment environment for our research staff, leading to a position of competitive advantage. The major issues confronting the working situation of research staff may be summarised and dealt with under the general headings:

- Career Development
- Management Development for Supervisors
- Contract of Employment
- Conditions of Employment

**1.0 Career Management**

In his report for the British Government on “The Supply of Science and Engineering Skills in the UK” (the Roberts Report, 2002), Sir Gareth Roberts noted the following:
The problems affecting postdoctoral and other contract research staff (CRS) are:

- lack of a clear career structure and uncertain career prospects associated with work on a short-term contractual basis is a major barrier to the recruitment and development of postdoctoral researchers;
- unsatisfactory training in the skills required either in an academic career or in a business research environment means that CRS are poorly prepared for potential careers; and
- increasingly uncompetitive salaries act as a disincentive to work as a contract researcher.

[Roberts Report, p.143]

He goes on to propose a range of career trajectories and clear career structures for those employed as contract researchers, which he summarises as:

- Academic trajectory in which the contract researchers with potential to become academics are identified, developed, and retained. "Better appraisals and career advice early on in a researcher's career should be aimed at identifying those with the potential for an academic career". [Roberts, p.150]

- Industrial trajectory, in which the contract researchers moved into industry (or in Western Australia's case, other institutions such as CSIRO or the Health Department) after a brief spell in academia. "The industrial trajectory would require awareness-raising by institutions and potential employers, and extra training in skills relevant to potential employers, including the provision of supervisory and managerial experience." [Roberts, p.149]
• Research trajectory, for those choosing to remain long term in academic research. “There are a group of contract researchers who want to continue with a research career and do not want to pursue an academic career. This track would principally apply to those who have developed specialist knowledge of specific research equipment or methodologies (e.g. mass spectrometry or NMR) and provide an ongoing support/enabling function within a research group of groups. ....Here the emphasis would be on the provision of permanent contracts underwritten by research contracts being held by university departments, which could in some cases assign individuals to other research projects if a particular line of funding were to cease.” [Roberts, p.150] In addition to the group of specialist technical workers described by Roberts, there are other full-time researchers whose career aspirations are to remain in research, funded through Fellowships, career development awards, and the like.

Roberts makes the comment that “Contract research should not become a permanent career option, but a preparation for a range of careers that reflect the skills possessed by contract researchers” [p.150]

These observations are equally relevant for research staff in the Australian system and there are a number of actions this University can take to provide greater clarity and certainty for research staff.

First of all, research staff should be informed very clearly about the expectations they can have about their career in the University. A research career in the Australian environment is highly competitive, tough, and can be insecure, although the measures outlined in this paper seek to mitigate some of that insecurity. Induction for new research staff should clarify that:
The University recognises the extremely competitive nature of a research career;

The University is putting in place a range of measures to support such careers, as outlined in this paper; and

Secondly, at the beginning of the appointment and again within the period of the first contract, research staff should be counselled about their career aspirations and offered appropriate training and development. This discussion should occur as part of the Professional Development Review that takes place annually, as well as through regular discussions with the supervisor. The Prof Vice Chancellor (Research & Research Training) and Pro Vice Chancellor (Research Initiatives) will be responsible for establishing mentoring programs for all early career staff. Some staff will be interested in a standard academic career and may undertake training to develop their teaching skills, for example. Others may have an interest in employment outside the higher education sector and need appropriate training for that direction. For those who wish to remain in a University research environment, the University supports those aspirations, and will provide the career support as outlined in this paper. However, it is recognised that not all staff will be able to meet their aspirations and it is important that the University ensures that those staff have clarity about their prospects and that they are also assisted to position themselves for other options.

In the Report of the Working Party on Research Staff to the Teaching & Research Nexus Working Party (Lake Report, UWA, 2002) it was noted that "Research staff should have the same support as all other staff as they represent a large and permanent, rather than transient, component of staff..." [p.28] and a number of strategies were put forward to assist in implementing this, including staff development, regular feedback from the supervisor, and encouragement to attend career development programmes. Feedback from the PARC Report suggests that implementation of this approach has been somewhat patchy on the campus. Therefore, to assist research staff with career management issues the
University has appointed a Postdoctoral Co-ordinator to work with the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research & Innovation) and OSDS in achieving better outcomes.

However, while University-wide training and mentoring programs can be established to support research staff in their career development, the most important factor here will be the ongoing advice and counselling of their line managers. Attachment 2 contains a responsibility matrix, adapted for UWA purposes from originals obtained from the University of Leeds, (with the permission of Leeds), which set out very clearly the relevant responsibilities in this regard. While UWA currently provides supervisor training for Deans, heads of school and heads of section, a new departure would be the training of Chief Investigators in the role of a supervisor for staff development purposes. The Chief Investigators will be expected to undertake the PDR review with their research staff and should all therefore have undertaken the relevant training.

Recommendation 2: That UWA adopts the Leeds model for implementation, together with development of a training program for CIs

The Lake Report also presented survey responses from UWA researchers in relation to teaching, both in terms of whether or not they undertook teaching, and whether they were paid for any teaching. It transpired that 69% of staff were involved in undergraduate teaching, and 71% in postgraduate supervision. However there were issues over (i) lack of formal recognition of teaching/supervision, and (ii) lack of pay, or low rates of pay in comparison with postgraduate students. The Report recommended that the contribution of research staff to teaching be incorporated into School workloads, and that measures be put into place to prevent exploitation of research staff. Clearly, for many research staff, teaching is an activity in which they wish to be involved, for its own sake and for their career development. Anecdotally, it appears that there
are still inconsistencies across the campus in terms of the way this issue is managed.

Recommendation 3: That the DVC(RI), PVC (R&RT), DVC(Ed) and PVC (T&L), with support from Human Resources jointly develop guidelines that govern the most appropriate means of involvement by research staff in teaching, including issues of payment, workload, and levels of responsibility accorded by the courseco-ordinators.

For researchers who wish ultimately to work outside the University sector, the University should seek, depending on numbers, either to establish annual workshops between researchers and industry bodies, or secondment programs for those researchers wishing to pursue career in industry. These could be pursued under the auspices of the Office of Industry & Innovation or incorporated into the future development of the Mobility Program.

For staff anticipating a career as a researcher at UWA, the potential to achieve this goal should be discussed realistically with them. For some research technicians, such as those operating sophisticated research equipment, long-term careers on ongoing contracts may be possible. It might also be possible to establish a 'pool' of staff who do the same or similar work, or where their skills are interchangeable, within and across disciplines and job types. However, while this possibility has been canvassed in British universities, and at UWA, concerns have been expressed about the importance of maintaining 'new blood' and avoiding sclerotic workforces. In the sciences, in particular, this option has not been well received. UWA will consider establishing a candidate register to trial the appropriateness of such an approach for our University.

Recommendation 4: That the DVC(RI), PVC(R&T), Director Research Services, and future PVC (Rn), with support from HR, review the options for creating a research appointments pool.
The University will continue to support those staff who are able to generate their own salaries through research grants, and it is hoped that the improved conditions outlined further in this paper will contribute to their successful careers at the University. However, the University has limited capacity to support staff who are not funded through a grant over a term longer than that applying to the Safety Net Scheme (see below).

2.0 Management Development for Supervisors

Many CIs at UWA see themselves as the employer of their research staff. Technically this is not the case as the University is the employer of all staff. Nonetheless, when an academic wins a grant he/she takes on the responsibility of supervising research staff as well as the budget. This is more complicated than many think and ideally all Chief Investigators should undertake some basic management training to assist them in this role. For first-time CIs a formal training program is now available through the Future Research Leaders Program. The module, Managing People in a Research Context, specifically explores the issues relating to supervising research staff. It augments the existing programs already available in terms of grant management to embrace training as a supervisor. Other workshops such as the supervisor training offered by OSDS as part of the Performance Development Review process are also relevant.

For experienced CIs there is still a need to ensure that effective staff management is taking place. Rather than establish mandatory training, it may be more effective to involve the experienced CIs in the PDR training of the new CIs and, in so doing, hone their own supervisory skills.

*Recommendation 5: That OSDS be requested to develop a training program for new CIs along the lines of the current PDR training and which will involve experienced CIs as both attendees and mentors.*
3.0 Contracts of Employment

3.1 The use of fixed-term contracts for research staff
Most research staff at The University of Western Australia are employed on fixed term contracts. One of the key issues is to look at how our research staff are employed 'in practice' – in other words, are our policies being adhered to in all parts of the institution? The PARC Report commented as follows:

*The use of short term contracts where there is funding available for longer term contracts creates unnecessary insecurity for research staff as well as resulting in poorer employment conditions (e.g. restricting access to superannuation and severance payouts). As a result, good researchers may be discouraged from applying for positions at the University, or may be attracted to other work sectors by more stable conditions of employment. Almost four out of five research staff have indicated that short term funded positions are a barrier to their career progression at The University of Western Australia compared to one in five teaching-and-researcher staff (2003 Working Life Survey).*

[PARC Report, p.14]

In this context, it is timely to remember that research staff are employed by the University, not the research group or the CI/PI, and the University therefore has a responsibility for ensuring that the employment conditions of all staff adhere to guidelines.

**Recommendation 6:** That wherever possible, research staff should be appointed for the full duration of the available funding. Shorter appointments must be approved by the Dean.
Given that academic research staff are also an important recruitment pool for future teaching and research appointments it is important that, where appropriate, candidates are given appropriate appointments. Research Officers ('general' staff) play a different role in a research team than Research Associates or Research Fellows (academic staff). Research Officers may have a PhD but work mainly in a technical role and do not wish to influence the direction of the research. Whether staff are classified as 'academic' or 'general' should not depend on whether the person has a PhD, but upon their role. Nonetheless, the new proposed academic structure and proposed single industrial agreement provide the opportunity of harmonising positions and appointments more effectively so as to allow for determination by role rather than qualifications.

**Recommendation 7:** That we revise our guidelines for the designation of academic versus general staff appointments for research staff in the light of the proposed new academic structure and proposed single industrial agreement.

### 3.2 Moving from contract to ongoing appointments

A number of universities overseas are looking at models whereby, after a certain period of employment on fixed-term contracts, a research staff member may be placed on an ongoing contract.

Oxford University, for example, has established a model where long term research staff on open-ended externally-funded contracts or on rolling program grants are given ongoing contracts. Whilst indicating that the position is only funded for the duration of the available funds for $x$ years on the specific project, they nonetheless provide an ongoing contract and a commitment to endeavour to retain the services of the staff member where possible and appropriate.
At the University of Leeds, consideration is being given to providing ongoing contracts to postdoctoral fellows after two 3-year contracts, subject to funding being available.

At Southampton, where a contract research staff member has had 4 or more years service and another appointment is sought, permanency of contract will be assumed.

At Glasgow, long-term fixed-term employees will be converted to ongoing appointments.

Regardless of type of contract, however, all universities are clear that, first and foremost, the nature of the contract must be made very clear to research staff when they are appointed. This includes:

- the duration of the contract;
- what the potential will be for offering further employment should grant funding cease;
- the commitment to career development; and
- the scope for ultimate redundancy.

The University of Glasgow has developed extensive guidelines for staff who manage research staff, to assist in the ongoing clarification of the employment situation for those staff (see Attachment 3).

Looking at the issue of moving research staff from contract to ongoing appointment requires consideration of a number of sometimes competing priorities. These include the differing career aspirations of research staff, the financial stability of the Schools or centres in which they work and the ongoing teaching and research needs of those Schools or centres. In consideration of these issues, is proposed that the University moves forward as follows,
Recommendation 8

Where a research staff member on contract:

- is .5 FTE or more; and
- has a PhD or relevant higher degree qualification; and
- has been funded through at least two grants; and
- been employed by UWA for a period of 6 years or more, or is on their second Fellowship; and
- has met the definition of ‘research active’ as it applies in their Faculty.

Then either:

1. they win a grant which covers their salary, and then move onto an ongoing research contract; or
2. they do not win a grant to cover their salary, whereby they go onto the Safety Net scheme for 1 year, during which time they undertake teaching and research within their School or a cognate School, after which they either:
3. win a grant covering their salary and go onto an ongoing contract; or
4. they leave the University’s employ.

For those staff moving onto ongoing contracts, success in the competitive grant process will be seen as the equivalent of a competitive application process for a position. However, should a research staff member wish to transfer to a teaching and research position, then a competitive process will be instituted, equivalent to that utilized for all teaching and research staff.

Research staff on Fellowships will automatically access the Safety Net scheme, subject to the approval of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research & Innovation), and with support from their School. (The University has operated a Safety Net Scheme for some years, with the purpose of providing bridging support to fund the salary of key personnel (Level 8 and above) normally supported by external research grant income but where an individual or group has failed to obtain-
continued funding for the position. The funding is provided for one year only up to a maximum of $40,000 per person, contingent upon matching funds on a dollar for dollar basis from the Faculty and/or School. Funding is also conditional upon the individual or group seeking external research funding to support the salary of the key staff member in the next available funding round.)

In the case of a research staff member on an ongoing contract, as a result of the proposal listed above, whose external funding ultimately ceases, a decision on their continuing employment will be made in the same way as that confronting any staff member(s) where income to their School is insufficient to meet the salary bill.

3.3 Dealing with salary shortfalls

The PARC Report raised the issue of potential shortfalls between a salary amount paid by a grant funding body and the actual payroll cost to the University for the particular staff member(s). University policy has been to use central funds to eliminate the gap between the amounts provided for fellowship salaries from NHMRC and ARC, and the equivalent UWA salary levels, while Faculties have funded those gaps created through academic promotion. This practice will be continued. Funding of shortfalls for fellowships awarded by other major funding agencies will be decided by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research & Innovation) if every attempt to obtain the necessary gap funding from the agency has failed.

The University does not supplement salaries of staff funded on external grants other than fellowships, unless a Collective Agreement increase exceeds 5% in a year, in which case the University may consider a small, one-off supplementation. The PARC Report recommended project management training as one means of addressing problems arising with gaps between funding income and salaries; such training is addressed in section 2 above.
4.0 Conditions of Employment

One of the priorities the Vice Chancellor has proposed for the University is to reduce barriers and differentiations between staff as much as possible. Encapsulated by the term 'one-staff, one university', this means provision of equality of opportunity, of security of employment, and of access to career and personal development opportunities for all staff, within the context of the effective performance and sound financial management.

In the context of conditions of employment, there are several key areas where fixed-term research staff do not currently enjoy the same conditions as ongoing staff. These are discussed below. However, this section should be presaged with a reminder that all attempts should be made to provide appropriate on-cost funding from external granting bodies.

4.1 Severance and Redundancy
These are currently governed by the UWA Collective Staff Agreements 2006. Given the difference in redundancy payment for ongoing general and academic staff and with the move to a one-staff agreement there will be a need to consider if a standardised arrangement should be introduced.

4.2 Superannuation:
Currently it is UWA policy to make superannuation (with the 17% University contribution) available to staff on an appointment of two years or more. In a change from existing practice, it is proposed that, where short term contracts are extended, the full 17% will be paid after two years’ continuous service at UWA. CIs will be responsible for ensuring that their funding applications include this within the budgets.
Recommendation 9: That, where a research staff member has been continuously employed at the University for two years or more, they will receive the full 17% employer contribution in their superannuation, regardless of the length of each individual contract.

4.3 Professional Leave

Research staff do not receive the study leave provision available to teaching and research staff (at a rate of six months for each three years or 12 months after six years). On the other hand, members of the teaching and research staff who move into research-only roles do not, on their return to a teaching and research position, carry forward any study leave credits accumulated prior to their research-only activities. Whereas study leave tends to be seen as a break from teaching and administrative duties for teaching and research staff, in order to pursue research or scholarship, research staff could benefit from ability to attend conferences or secondments into other compatible workplaces, and this should be encouraged by their supervisors.

4.4 Annual/Sick/Long Service Leave

Research staff are entitled to the same leave conditions as other academic staff. Managers are expected to manage their leave requirements in accordance with policy. The formerly different conditions between academic and general research staff have largely been harmonised as a result of the changes brought in through the Work Choices legislation. The current Collective Agreement negotiations will be used to address a few minor differences that still exist.
Summary

The proposals contained within this paper are based on the premise that, as a research intensive university, The University of Western Australia needs to continue to enhance the working conditions of research staff, such that the institution is regarded as an attractive place to work by high quality researchers, either on a relatively short-term basis as career researchers or potential industry employees, or on a longer-term basis as potential members of the teaching and research staff or as technical support staff for research teams.
15 April 2009

Professor George Stewart
Executive Dean
Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences
M011

Dear Professor Stewart

The School of Mathematics and Statistics wishes to introduce two new units and retire two existing units in 2010. The new units are STAT1400 Statistics for Science and MATH7438 4P8: Advanced Group Theory. The units to be retired are STAT1510 Statistics A and STAT1530 Statistics B.

STAT1400 Statistics for Science is intended to replace both STAT1510 and STAT1530. Similar to these, it addresses statistical ideas and methods but the emphasis is to be much more on data analysis and interpretation rather than the technical mathematical underpinnings. The pre-requisite for STAT1400 will be Admission to UWA.

MATH7438 4P8: Advanced Group Theory is intended to complete a full set of option for students doing Honours in Pure Mathematics. A few years ago an honours unit disappeared from the handbooks leading to an imbalance between the three MATH/STAT disciplines (Pure Mathematics, Allied Mathematics, Statistics) at Honours level. In the past two years this unit has run under a Special Unit code. The School wishes to make this unit a standard component of our Pure Mathematics Honours offering.

Yours,

Dr Des Hill
Director of Undergraduate Studies
**proposals for new UNITS**

**CORE QUESTIONS FOR CHECKLISTS USED BY FACULTIES**

All faculties must include the questions below in their checklists for new units. Faculties may add other questions as they see fit.

1. **Unit Details**

   (1) Please provide the following information:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>the proposed name of the unit; <em>(The character allowance for unit titles in Callista is 100 for long, 40 for short and 20 for abbreviated.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STAT1400 Statistics For Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>the proposed point value of the unit <em>(NB. By Council Resolution 110/02, all units must have a points value of 6 unless granted exemption)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>a very brief description, not exceeding one line in length, of the content/area of the unit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate statistics and data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>the names of the degree, diploma and/or certificate courses in which you intend to offer the unit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All degree and courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>the proposed quota on intake to the unit, if any, and the nature of the constraint on intake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (2) Please give a succinct summary of the academic objectives of the unit.
   An intuitive, nonmathematical approach to statistics and data analysis focussed on building a conceptual understanding of the big statistical ideas underpinning research at UWA.

   (3) Please summarise what teaching and learning practices will be used to realise the academic objectives.
   **Lectures, laboratory work**

   (4) Please advise what technologies (if any) will be required to support the teaching and learning practices.
   Computer lab, web based teaching and learning etc.
   **Computer lab**

   (5) Please outline what steps have been taken to ensure that any technologies to be used are readily available to staff and students.
   These technologies are being used in the current units that this unit will replace.

   (6) Please indicate whether the unit is the outcome of a school, course or other review.
   **School review, student feedback and staff feedback at UWA**

   (7) Please advise whether the unit utilises any material from existing units. If so, please provide details.
   Yes: STAT1510, STAT1530.

   (8) Please advise whether the unit is to be offered within standard semester dates. (If it is not, please attach a proposal form for a non-standard semester unit.)
   Yes

   (9) Please advise whether lecture outline has been provided.
   No

   (10) (a) Please list the intended student learning outcomes.
   A student having successfully completed STATXXXX should:
   (i) appreciate the power of statistical concepts in the interpretation of data;
   (ii) have developed knowledge of fundamental statistical tools and their application in statistics computer packages;
   (iii) be able to apply these statistical tools in appropriate real-world settings;
   (iv) be able to communicate effectively the results of statistical analyses.
   (b) Is assessment explicitly tailored to such outcomes?  Yes
   (Please elaborate)
   (Note: by resolution R23/08 the Academic Council endorsed the requirement that all new unit and course checklists should include the listing of intended student outcomes and affirmation that assessment is explicitly tailored to such outcomes).
2. **Demand**

(1) What are the estimated annual enrolments?  
Currently we have 330 enrolled for 2009

(2) How has the estimate in (1) been arrived at?  
Number combined for the two units it will replace.

(3) From which other units are students likely to move?  
STAT1510, STAT1530

3. **Assessment**

(1) Please advise how many examinations there will be for the unit and how long each will last. (Note: By Academic Council R18/94 the Examinations Office administers only standard examinations of 2 or 3 hours duration).

3 hours

(2) If you do not propose to use more than one means of assessment for this unit (as recommended in the University's Guidelines on Assessment ([http://www.secreatariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/assessment](http://www.secreatariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/assessment)), please explain the reason for this.

N/A

4. **Grading Schema for Unit**

(2) Please indicate if it is intended that the result for the unit be recorded as an ungraded pass or ungraded fail only.

No

5. **Resource-related matters**

(1) Please advise whether all the costs of the unit (e.g. including, if appropriate, those associated with teaching at the Albany Centre such as Library/computer software resources) will be met from school resources or whether the proposal is the subject of application for other funding (e.g. University Initiatives Fund).

Met by school

(2) Please indicate whether the school intends to suppress another unit to release resources for this one.

No

(3) Please name the staff members who are able to teach the unit.

It is envisaged that a rotation of Dr. Berwin Turlach, Mr. Kevin Murray, Dr Steve Su, Dr Ed Cripps, Dr Kathleen Chindarsi, will teach this unit however all applied statisticians in the school of maths and stats who have experience with data analysis could potentially teach the unit.

(4) Please confirm that you have attached a completed Library Consultation Form.

To be added

(5) Will the introduction of this unit give rise to any accommodation needs other than standard lecture theatres, tutorial rooms or laboratory space (e.g. office space, new kinds of laboratory space) which cannot be met from the School's/Faculty's existing space allocation? Please ensure that your understanding is consistent with that of the Dean.

No

(6) Will there be any ancillary student fees/charges associated with this unit? If so, please confirm that you have submitted details of these to the Dean.

(See [http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/M/for_uwa_students2/policies/asfc3](http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/M/for_uwa_students2/policies/asfc3))

No

6. **Consultation**

Please provide details of the consultations you have had with various groups and individuals during the development of this proposal indicating whether or not any issues have been raised. Consultation includes the following:
(a) heads of schools in cognate areas, which may have an interest in the unit content;
    Heads Engineering Schools
(b) students and graduates;
    Constant consultation with current students and graduates over the last 3-4 years
(c) employers and/or employer groups and professional bodies;
    Statistical Society of Australia members
(d) other universities in WA which teach similar units;
    N/A
(e) other leading universities in Australia or overseas which teach similar units.
    Melbourne University, Auckland University

7. Information Flow

Please confirm, by ticking the boxes and entering the date of action, that you have forwarded a copy
of this proposal, either in hard copy or electronically, to:

The Deans of all faculties involved, either through offering the unit in their degrees, or through
resourcing your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of</th>
<th>Engineering and Computing and Mathematics</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of</td>
<td>Life and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of</td>
<td>Natural and Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of</td>
<td>Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Head of any school which teaches in a cognate area (specify below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Librarian ______________________________ Date 06/04/09

8. Confirmation by Head of School

I confirm that the process leading to the proposal for the introduction of

STAT 1400    STATISTICA For SCIENCE (Name of new unit)

has included appropriate consultation with all other schools, both internal and external to the faculty,
with a potential interest in the proposed unit and that the proposed unit will not overlap significantly
with any existing unit.

Have any objections to this proposal been raised during the consultation process?
Yes No
(If yes, please attach details of objection and response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Head</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Secretariat
October 2008
(Now_Unit_Created)
proposals for new UNITS

CORE QUESTIONS FOR CHECKLISTS USED BY FACULTIES

All faculties must include the questions below in their checklists for new units. Faculties may add other questions as they see fit.

1. **Unit Details**

   (1) Please provide the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>the proposed name of the unit; <em>(The character allowance for unit titles in Calista is 100 for long, 40 for short and 20 for abbreviated.)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MATH7438 4P8: Advanced Group Theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>the proposed point value of the unit <em>(NB. By Council Resolution 110/02, all units must have a points value of 6 unless granted exemption;)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>a very brief description, not exceeding one line in length, of the content/area of the unit;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours Pure Mathematics unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>the names of the degree, diploma and/or certificate courses in which you intend to offer the unit;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCM, BSc, BCompSc, BA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>the proposed quota on intake to the unit, if any, and the nature of the constraint on intake.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (2) Please give a succinct summary of the academic objectives of the unit.

   (3) Increase the abstract algebra knowledge base of Honours students

   (4) Please summarise what teaching and learning practices will be used to realise the academic objectives.

   (5) Lectures and tutorials, with an emphasis on class participation

   (6) Please advise what technologies (if any) will be required to support the teaching and learning practices.

   (7) No

   (8) Please outline what steps have been taken to ensure that any technologies to be used are readily available to staff and students.

   (9) Whiteboards only required

   (10) Please indicate whether the unit is the outcome of a school, course or other review.

   (11) No

   (12) Please advise whether the unit utilises any material from existing units. If so, please provide details.

   (13) Identical to MATH7499 offered in 2009

   (14) Please advise whether the unit is to be offered within standard semester dates. (If it is not, please attach a proposal form for a non-standard semester unit.)

   (15) Standard semester dates

   (16) Please advise whether lecture outline has been provided.

   (17) Material covered will depend on background of students

   (18) a) Please list the intended student learning outcomes.

   Student learning outcomes: To develop geometric intuitions and the ability to articulate these intuitions within a formalism at an appropriate level. To understand and appreciate the power and beauty of mathematical abstraction; communicate effectively with others; present mathematical results in a logical and coherent fashion; and undertake continuous learning, aware that an understanding of fundamentals is necessary for effective application.

   (b) Is assessment explicitly tailored to such outcomes? Yes No

   (Please elaborate)

   Yes - written assignments and the final exam will be tailored to the outcomes.

   (Note: by resolution R23/08 the Academic Council endorsed the requirement that all new unit and course checklists should include the listing of intended student outcomes and affirmation that assessment is explicitly tailored to such outcomes).
2. Demand

(1) What are the estimated annual enrolments?
   5

(2) How has the estimate in (1) been arrived at?
   Enrolment in MATH7499 in 2009

(3) From which other units are students likely to move?
   None

3. Assessment

(1) Please advise how many examinations there will be for the unit and how long each will last. (Note: By Academic Council R10/94 the Examinations Office administers only standard examinations of 2 or 3 hours duration).
   One three hour examination

(2) If you do not propose to use more than one means of assessment for this unit (as recommended in the University's Guidelines on Assessment [http://www.secretariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/assessment]), please explain the reason for this.

4. Grading Schema for Unit

(1) Schools are required to ensure that final results\(^1\) for units in courses at all levels be produced as both percentage marks and letter grades wherever possible. However, a number of categories of units\(^2\) are exempt from this requirement. The following exemptions categories are pertinent for this checklist.

   (i) units where the involvement of external assessors makes it difficult to compare students' performance in an equitable manner and provide appropriately graded results for the units (for example, in-country units, cross-institutional enrolments and practicum units);

   (ii) units involving group activity where the contribution of individual students cannot be distinguished (for example, participation in the University Chorale/Orchestra compulsory field tours);

   (iii) specific skill-acquisition only units, which may be taken to be completed merely by attendance and participation (for example, use of medical equipment, legal skills such as negotiation and mediation).

(2) Please indicate if it is intended that the result for the unit be recorded as an ungraded pass or ungraded fail only.
   Yes          No

(3) If the answer is YES please indicate into which of the categories of exempt units listed above the unit belongs.

\(^1\) Results for supplementary assessment are recorded as Ungraded Pass or Ungraded Fail and the original mark remains. See University General Rule L.2.1.25(3).


5. Resource-related matters

(1) Please advise whether all the costs of the unit (e.g. including, if appropriate, those associated with teaching at the Albany Centre such as Library/computer software resources) will be met from school resources or whether the proposal is subject of application for other funding (e.g. University Initiatives Fund).
   Yes

(2) Please indicate whether the school intends to suppress another unit to release resources for this one. Yes, MATH7499

(3) Please name the staff members who are able to teach the unit.
   Dr Alder, Prof Noakes, A/Prof Stoyanov

(4) Please confirm that you have attached a completed Library Consultation Form.
   Yes

(5) Will the introduction of this unit give rise to any accommodation needs other than standard lecture theatres, tutorial rooms or laboratory space (e.g. office space, new kinds of laboratory space) which cannot be met from the School's/Faculty's existing space allocation? Please ensure that your

B
understanding is consistent with that of the Dean.
No
If YES, please confirm that you have attached a completed Accommodation Planning Form (http://www.secretariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/coursaunit/proposa).

(6) Will there be any ancillary student fees/charges associated with this unit? If so, please confirm that you have submitted details of these to the Dean.
(See http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/l4/for_uwa_students2/policies/cosfc)
No

6. Consultation

Please provide details of the consultations you have had with various groups and individuals during the development of this proposal indicating whether or not any issues have been raised. Consultation includes the following:

(a) heads of schools in cognate areas, which may have an interest in the unit content;
(b) students and graduates;
(c) employers and/or employer groups and professional bodies;
(d) other universities in WA which teach similar units;
(e) other leading universities in Australia or overseas which teach similar units.

Deans of FLPS and FNAS re MATH7499

7. Information Flow

Please confirm, by ticking the boxes and entering the date of action, that you have forwarded a copy of this proposal, either in hard copy or electronically, to:

The Deans of all faculties involved, either through offering the unit in their degrees, or through resourcing your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of</th>
<th>Engineering and Computing and Mathematics</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of</td>
<td>Life and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of</td>
<td>Natural and Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of</td>
<td>Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Head of any school which teaches in a cognate area (specify below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Librarian ___________________________ Date 06/04/09

8. Confirmation by Head of School

I confirm that the process leading to the proposal for the introduction of

4PK : Advanced Graph Theory (Name of new unit)

has included appropriate consultation with all other schools, both internal and external to the faculty, with a potential interest in the proposed unit and that the proposed unit will not overlap significantly with any existing unit.

Have any objections to this proposal been raised during the consultation process?
Yes No
(If yes, please attach details of objection and response)

Signature of Head ____________________

School of ___________________________

_____________Secretariat
October 2008
(New Unit Checklist)
ATTACHMENT A

Changes to the UWA Performance Management Processes, 2009

In 2006 the University of Western Australia introduced a performance management system to support all staff. In 2008, following two years of operation, a review of the PDR Version 1 process and its effectiveness was undertaken.

The feedback from respondents indicated strong support for the overall PDR process. Major benefits such as the value of a targeted performance discussion, clarification of performance expectations and the opportunity to resolve issues and misunderstandings were cited by many people. Early career staff were particularly positive about the value of discussing their career and long-term goals with an informed reviewer.

The review also identified a number of issues that required addressing, such as necessary system refinements and greater use of the Employee Self Service system for record keeping and reporting. The introduction of an additional performance appraisal process was determined, along with a push for improved reviewer guidance and skills.

Over the latter half of 2008 refinements and two new performance management versions were developed in consultation with stakeholders and then piloted with faculties and central service areas. The feedback from these participants was used to develop the final template and guidelines. The three systems are:

- **Revised professional development review (PDR).** This is a simplified and refined version that will now be prepared and recorded through the ESS system. It will allow more effective monitoring of PDR completions, analysis of training data, and tracking of an individual’s performance.

- **New staff / New Role PDR.** This is a simple commencing PDR to set expectations and to provide guidance on resources and support to be made available. It will be prompted through the HR system and will ensure induction is properly completed.

- **Performance Appraisal Review (PAR).** The PAR is a new process that provides a summative assessment of an individual’s performance. Performance-based decisions (e.g. probation, renewal of contract, proposed remuneration increase or promotion) will be contingent on a successful PAR. The appraisal can be triggered by the Supervisor or the Reviewee. It is required that all staff members will have a performance appraisal on an annual basis. This may occur at a date subsequent to the PDR, allowing time for agreed outcomes to be achieved. A Performance Appraisal Report **must** be completed within one week where the Professional Development Review has raised one or more performance concerns or where staff members appear at risk of a decline in performance.
The introduction of the new formats will be phased in, with the amended Professional Development Review (PDR) hopefully going live in April with a soft start, followed by the New Staff PDR and then the Performance Appraisal. Each system will be introduced through All-staff emails, workshops and presentations to public forums. Online support will also be available.

A concentrated promotion launch of the revised PDR will take place in May / June in all faculties to ensure good knowledge of the new system.

Academic standards are also being developed across different faculties to assist the Performance Appraisal Report. Faculties and Schools are being assisted in these processes by Organisational and Staff Development Services and the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning.

Mock ups of the three systems are provided in Attachment 1. Attachment 2 provides the supportive documentation for each of the three systems.
Attachment 1: Mock-ups of the new performance management systems

Professional Development Review

This Professional Development Review form is to be completed by the staff member and the Reviewer on an annual basis. It is comprised of two sections:

1. Reviewing and Planning: Work Outcomes Since the Previous PDR
2. Summary Statement and Confirmation of the Development Plan

The Professional Development Review document is confidential. Access is limited to the staff member, reviewer and supervisor (if not the reviewer), Head/Dean and other staff with delegated authority.

Name: Joe Employee
Job: Senior Information Systems Officer - Level B - 105335
Reviewer: Stan Supervisor
Mentor: (if appropriate)

Probation Review Date: 12-SEP-200
Probation Review Date: 12-SEP-200
Date of Discussion: 12-SEP-200
Date of Discussion: 12-SEP-200
Date of Commencement: 12-SEP-200
Date of Commencement: 12-SEP-200
Date of Report: 12-SEP-200
Date of Report: 12-SEP-200

For information on preparing for the PDR please see the Guidelines on Preparing for the Professional Development Review

Section 1: Reviewing and Planning

Reviewees should complete Section 1 of the Professional Development Review and submit it to the reviewer at least one week prior to the PDR discussion. Each question is followed by a text box which can be expanded to suit. If a question is not relevant to your work please put N/A and move on to the next question. Some questions are mandatory. The associated text boxes have been shaded. Early career staff, in particular, are advised to consider all questions.

Academic staff must also submit their Academic Portfolio. They may wish to cross reference the relevant sections of their Academic Portfolio as their responses to the questions. Material should not be duplicated across the two documents.

1. Has your work role changed during the reporting period? Are you enjoying the community in which you work? Are there any challenges you are experiencing? (These may be personal, interpersonal or professional.)
2. Outline your achievements (against goals and objectives) since your last PDR.

3. How have you met UWA’s Expectations of All Staff?

4. How have you reflected UWA’s Leadership Expectations of All Staff (where relevant)?

5. How have you reflected your school/faculty’s Expectations of Academic Staff (where available)?

6. What are your career aspirations for the coming 3 to 5 years?

7. What development have you undertaken since your last PDR?
8. Have you gained any qualifications since your last PDR?

9. What are your leave balances and plans?

- Annual Leave: 35
- Long Service Leave: 121.75

Please indicate your plans for study leave or retirement if applicable:

- Study Leave: 
- Retirement Plans: 

The next questions look toward the coming year...

10. What are your goals for the next 12 months?

11. What is your development plan for the next 12 months? Is it clearly linked to your personal and professional goals and the objectives of your work area?

Attachments
You may upload any of the following types of documents to include with this submission:

Current position description:
    - Academic Portfolio:
    - Professional Portfolio:
    - Curriculum Vitae:
Section 2: Summary Statement and Confirmation of Development Plan

Section 2 summarises the content of the Professional Development Review discussion held with the reviewer. The Reviewee should take responsibility for drafting the summary on behalf of both parties. If you feel reluctant about preparing this summary, please discuss this with your reviewer. This summary will draw on the material in Section 1 and any other sources of evidence that have been considered.

The summary should be completed within ONE week of the PDR discussion. The Reviewee should complete the first two items and then send the document to the reviewer for confirmation and any additional comments. A reviewer who is also a supervisor would complete all remaining elements of the form. For academic reviewers who are not the supervisor, the completed summary and comments should be forwarded to the supervisor for final sign-off.

Agreed or established goals and objectives for the coming year

Development Plan for the next year (with areas that need support)

Reviewer Comment (summary of achievements, progress, reflection of UWA Expectations; Leadership or Academic Expectations (if applicable); contributions and areas of focus for the coming year)
To be completed by the Supervisor:

☐ A Development Plan, as summarised in Section 2, has been agreed and is within existing resources. No further action required.

Or

☐ Additional support will be provided as detailed below:

Supervisor Comments on PDR Outcomes:

Follow Up Actions:
The next Review Meeting must be scheduled within the next twelve months and a six month 'checkup' is advisable. An email reminder will be sent to both parties.

☐ Duties: Where relevant the Position Description has been discussed, changes made, agreed and forwarded to Human Resources (in the case of professional staff) for consideration. The Work Profile has been amended (in the case of academic staff) and where relevant.

☐ Leave: Leave arrangements for the next twelve months have been discussed, agreed and recorded on Alesco.

☐ Workloads: Any workload concerns have been discussed and a plan to address these is in place.

Please click here to complete the Performance Appraisal Report at this time. Alternatively, you may choose to undertake the appraisal component at a later date when the development plan has been enacted.

(Reviewee sent copy for final response)

Reviewee Response (optional)
The Performance Appraisal Report may also require completion if decisions as to retention, recognition or performance management need to be made.
Professional Development Review
Commencing Staff or Substantial Role Change

Name: Joe Employee
Job: Senior Information Systems Officer - Level 6 - 105335
Reviewer: Stan Supervisor
Mentor: (if appropriate)

Probation Review Date: 12-SEP-200
Date of Discussion: 12-SEP-200
Date of Commencement: 12-SEP-200
Date of Report: 12-SEP-200

Self-Analysis and Planning:

These questions encourage you to think about your skills and how they can be employed in your new role. By the end of the commencing PDR discussion you should have a clear idea of what is expected of you.

1. What are your strengths? What contributions do you believe you can make to UWA?

2. Please review the UWA Expectations of All Staff, Code of Conduct, Code of Ethics, and the UWA Leadership Expectations of All Staff (where relevant). Are you clear about what is expected of you?

3. What are your career aspirations for the coming 3 to 5 years?

4. What resources and support will you require in the coming year? Do you wish to access flexible work / leave arrangements? If so, please outline your needs to
discuss with your supervisor.

Have you had an Induction?

Yes. ☐  No. ☐

6. What are your goals for the next twelve months?

6. What is your Development Plan for the next 12 months? Is it clearly linked to your personal and professional goals and the objectives of your work area?

Ideally, your second review discussion should occur within three months of this meeting. You will be reminded to set up a new review meeting in two months time.
Performance Appraisal Report

The Performance Appraisal Report is completed by the Supervisor, having regard for information from the Professional Development Review and other supporting evidence from Socrates, Teaching Indicators and the academic portfolio in the case of academic staff. The supervisor and reviewee must meet face to face to discuss the report prior to finalising the outcome.

The Performance Appraisal Report is a summary of the Supervisor's assessment of performance outcomes based on all aspects of the individual's performance in the period since the last appraisal. It is expected that all staff members will have a performance appraisal on an annual basis.

The report is required for decisions relating to recognition and reward processes, or where performance has been identified as requiring attention. Performance appraisal is required where the reviewee is seeking promotion or a change in status, as outlined below.

- Conversion from probationary to ongoing appointment;
- Approval for appointment to the extended scale of the new career structure; and
- Payment of an allowance or bonus (eg retention, merit).

The Performance Appraisal Report should also be completed as part of the review process in preparation for

- Application to be granted study leave; or
- Academic promotion.

A Performance Appraisal Report must be completed within one week where the Professional Development Review has raised one or more performance concerns or where staff members appear at risk of a decline in performance. It is also expected that an Appraisal Report be completed for all other staff on an annual basis.

Reviewee Name: --- Choose ---
Last PDR:

Assessment of Performance

The Reviewee has been deemed to be performing at the following level. Definitions for each of these categories are found in the Performance Appraisal Report: Guidelines for Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Performance Issues Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets role requirements</td>
<td>Generally meets job requirements but needs to focus on the following area/s as a high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds role requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding (This rating must be justified and agreed with the Dean or equivalent prior to meeting with the reviewee to discuss the appraisal report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following support has been agreed to address the identified area/s
Performance does not match job requirements. The following areas of performance or behaviour are of concern:

The following actions have been taken to address or monitor the problem/s:

Follow-Up Actions

Outstanding performance has been recognised and discussed. The following actions are recommended:
Recommend the reviewee's salary variance as follows:

- Progression into the supplementary increment scale
- Provision of an allowance
- Other: 

The reviewee will be supported in seeking (select applicable option if required):
- Confirmation of transfer from probation to ongoing status
- Application for promotion (academic staff)
- Renewal of contract
- Approval of study leave (academic staff)
- Reclassification on confirmation of work value changes (professional staff)

Supervisor Comment (to be discussed with the reviewee)
This form should be discussed with the reviewee before being lodged as the report.

**Reviewee Comment (if required)**

**Final Supervisor Comment (if required)**

[Save and send to Reviewee]
Attachment 2: Guidelines for the new performance management systems

Revised Professional Development Review (PDR) Guidelines

Preventing Section 1 of the Professional Development Review: Reviewing and Planning

Section 1 of the Professional Development Review provides a set of questions to help you document your achievements since your last PDR discussion. Each question in Section 1 is followed by a text box. If you feel a question is not relevant to your work, please put N/A in the box and move to the next question. There are some mandatory questions/areas. These are highlighted in the text below.

**Academic Staff:** Your Academic Portfolio will form the basis of your discussion with the Reviewer/Supervisor and should be submitted at least one week prior to the meeting together with your responses to the questions. If your reviewer does not receive the information in a timely manner, he/she may defer the session. Academic staff may wish to cross reference the relevant sections of their Academic Portfolio as their responses to the questions.

**Professional Staff:** Your responses to the questions form the basis of your discussion with the Reviewer/Supervisor and should be submitted at least one week prior to the meeting.

If your reviewer does not receive the information in a timely manner, he/she may defer the session.

1.1 Has your work role changed during the reporting period? Are you enjoying the community in which you work? Are there any challenges you are experiencing? (These may be personal, interpersonal or professional.)

Has your role changed in any significant way over the last year?

**Professional Staff:** If so, you may wish to bring a copy of your position description together with any changes you believe are appropriate so that these can be discussed. Once a position description is agreed, the supervisor should forward it to Human Resources for amendment. If you believe that the changes to your role warrant a re-classification of your position, think about the nature of those changes. It is important to note that the issue of workload is different to the work value. Workload relates to the amount of work you undertake. Work value relates to the type of work you undertake, and how it differs from the role you initially entered into. Re-classification requires a change in work value.

**Academic Staff:** If you hold an academic appointment, has your work profile altered (teaching, research, service) during the reporting period? It may be helpful to use the PDR discussion to review your work profile and confirm that the changes are appropriate / required. It can be useful to bring a listing of the roles and responsibilities you have filled so that they can be reviewed.
This question also invites you to consider your overall work context and the quality of work environment in which you are located. You may also wish to explore any challenges you are experiencing at work, be they personal, interpersonal or professional. You may wish to consider how effective and efficient you are in completing your required work, and identify any questions you have about your role requirements.

1.2 Outline your achievements (against goals and objectives) since your last PDR or commencement of employment

If you have completed a previous PDR, please outline how you have met your previously agreed goals and objectives. You may also have achievements and recognition for your work that falls outside those planned outcomes. List these here as well.

Were there factors that impacted on your capacity to achieve your agreed goals? Please describe them here. This will alert your supervisor to issues which should be recognised in reviewing your outcomes. In particular, use this occasion to raise with your reviewer/ supervisor any need you may have for flexible work practices (including purchased leave) or concerns you may have about workload.

(From 2010 you will be able to cut and paste your goals and objectives from your previous PDR into this section.)

1.3 UWA Expectations of All Staff

Consider the UWA Expectations of All Staff, Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct. These describe the behaviours expected of you as part of the UWA community. They relate to your personal effectiveness, capacity to work collaboratively, support for a positive work culture, and demonstrating a focus on outcomes. Think about how you have reflected these expectations in your work activities. You may wish to provide 1 – 2 examples for each. If you have encountered difficulties in meeting these expectations, please note them for discussion. This section is required of all staff.

1.4 Leadership Expectations of all staff

Address this question if you have supervisory responsibilities.

Please describe how you have demonstrated the UWA Leadership Expectations of All Staff in your work. These relate to people leadership and management, resource management, and university collaboration. Provide 1 – 2 examples of your leadership for each. If you have encountered difficulties in meeting these expectations, please note them for discussion.

Please outline how you have managed the performance of your staff. In so doing consider the following:

☐ Have all your staff completed a Professional Development Review? Have any issues arisen during this process? What have you learned from this process?
☐ How have you fostered the development of your staff? Here you may wish to outline any mentoring role you have.
☐ Do you provide new staff with suitable induction / orientation support? How?
☐ Do you encourage work/life balance for your staff? How?
1.5 **UWA Expectations of Academic Staff**

Please refer to your school’s guidelines on expected performance levels of academic staff. Provide a brief statement outlining how you have performed compared to these expectations. If you have not met these expectations section 1.9 should demonstrate how you intend to address these gaps in the coming year.

1.6 **What are your career aspirations for the coming 3 – 5 years?**

This question encourages you to think about how your career is progressing at UWA. For example,
- Have you clarified your career aspirations?
- Have you furthered your aspirations over the last year?
- Do you have access to adequate career development?
- What else do you need to achieve your career goals? For example, mentoring, mobility (including secondment), job extension.
- Have there been opportunities you felt unable to take advantage of?
- Do you have sufficient flexibility in your work and leave arrangement to meet your responsibilities outside UWA?
- If you are nearing retirement have you begun to plan for this? Both UniSuper and OSDS offer retirement workshops. Are you able to provide an indication of a retirement date? You will not be held to this date, but it can be helpful to discuss possible options with your reviewer.

Make a note of any points you would like to discuss. Think about how your aspirations might be supported in the coming year.

1.7 **What development have you undertaken since your last PDR?**

Please list any development activities you have undertaken. Include external conferences and courses as well as UWA courses and programmes. Have you had access to mentoring? Most UWA provided training may well be already registered in the ESS. Please add any others so that they are then registered in the system for future reference.

1.8 **Have you gained any qualifications since your last PDR or since commencement of your appointment?**

The original document will need to be sighted by your supervisor. A verified copy must be forwarded to Human Resources for inclusion on your staff file.

1.9 **What are your Leave Balances and Plans?**

When you open your PDR record, your latest update of leave balances will be indicated. Review the balances and consider how you plan to expend your accrued leave over the coming year. *It is your obligation to take accrued annual leave.* Taking annual leave in the year it is accrued is a means of maintaining a healthy approach to work and other demands in your life. Indicating your leave plans early also helps management to plan for staff absences and the University to manage its leave liability effectively. You should use the PDR discussion as an opportunity to discuss with your reviewer/ supervisor when you will take your leave.
Please indicate when you intend to clear your accrued leave over the coming year. It can be amended later if your plans change. All annual leave should be cleared by March following the year in which it was accrued. The Head / Manager must approve any requested carry-forwards. Use the occasion to discuss the use of Purchased Leave and Deferred Salary Schemes if you are interested in pursuing these options, or any other forms of leave you hope to take.

Please also indicate your travel plans for the coming year, that is, if you are planning to travel for work to conferences or other professional meetings etc.

The next part of Section 1 focuses on the coming year.

1:10. What are your goals for the next 12 months?

List 3 – 5 major goals you will emphasise over the coming year. Your goals should be realistic, achievable and measurable.

What are your personal and professional goals? Goals relating to your unit's activities, should also relate to the relevant Operational Priorities Plan. If you are looking for promotion you may wish to identify this here and discuss with your Reviewer.

If you lead an organisation unit you may find it useful to list two sets of goals: one relating to your own professional / personal growth and the second relating to your unit’s outcomes and priorities including your leadership responsibilities.

Have you identified any factors that might impact on your capacity to achieve these goals? Please note them here so that they can be discussed and addressed.

1:10. What is your Development Plan for the next 12 months?

Please list any development opportunities you wish to pursue over the coming year. These may include new work experiences, courses, mentorship, secondments or other mobility options (link to Mobility web page), study leave, higher duties or any other mechanisms that support your development. Any plans listed here need to be realistic and within the existing resources of your organisational unit. If you are a professional staff member and you have a development strategy in mind that may be costly, you may wish to consider applying for financial support from the Staff Development Fund.

Submit your draft Development Plan to your reviewer/supervisor for consideration prior to the PDR meeting. Following the meeting, please update it in line with the discussion with your reviewer and incorporate it into Section 2 for forwarding to the reviewer/supervisor. Section 2 is a summary of your discussion. Where the reviewer is not the Supervisor he/she will then send Section 2 on to the Supervisor who will confirm the Development Plan with associated resourcing and register it in your record. The summary in Section 2 forms the basis of your preparation for your next PDR.

Attachments for Review

You should submit relevant supporting documentation to assist in reviewing your performance. Supporting documents might include:

- Current position description
Academic Portfolio (maximum 15 pages) The portfolio should explore your development strategy and provide a list of any relevant evidence. Sources might include Socrates / citation indices [as appropriate], SPOT teaching and SURF unit evaluation reports, peer reviews/feedback on performance, Grants, recognitions / awards (see criteria and evidence in the Academic Portfolio guidelines). It is recommended that these be presented as summaries. Appendices should not be included with the submitted portfolio, although the reviewer may request them.

Professional Portfolio (for senior professional staff wishing to review their career strategy and outcomes).

Curriculum Vitae (including reporting any outcomes since your last PDR), and highlighting recent qualifications obtained.

There may be other information you feel is pertinent to the discussion. In deciding whether to include it, however, please ensure the material will add value to the review process.

Reviewer Preparation

The reviewer should review all material carefully. The reviewer may also wish to seek feedback from other relevant parties, including subordinates, colleagues, clients and any other persons deemed appropriate to supplement the information provided. It will be helpful to review the previous PDR Summary Statement to evaluate recent achievements.

Where the Professional Development Review has revealed one or more performance concerns the discussion should clarify what areas of performance are of concern and how they might be addressed. Clear guidance as to the necessary standards of performance should be provided. It should be noted that issues relating to poor performance should be addressed when they occur rather than being held until such time as a PDR occurs.

Where the supervisor has delegated the review role to a nominee, the reviewer should discuss the reviewee’s performance and likely performance goals prior to and following the meeting with the reviewee. Performance issues should be discussed with the supervisor as a matter of urgency to ensure consistent standards are being reflected. If performance issues are identified, the Performance Appraisal Report will need to be completed by the Supervisor.

Preparing Section 2 of the Professional Development Review:
The Summary Statement

Section 2 summarises the content of the discussion held with the reviewer. Ordinarily the Reviewee should take responsibility for drafting the content of this section on behalf of both parties. If you feel reluctant about preparing this summary, however, please discuss this with your reviewer.

Three areas of feedback should be clearly summarized in this statement:

1. Achievement of the agreed objectives from previous performance discussions;
2. Agreed goals and objectives for the coming year;
3. A Development Plan to address to support achievement of personal and professional goals
To assist you, the online PDR has a button which allows you to transfer your previous outline of goals, objectives and development plan for re-editing to integrate the outcomes from the PDR discussion. This update should then be sent to the reviewer for confirmation and any additional comments within one week of the PDR discussion. It is essential that you make time for this critical step in progressing your PDR.

It is the responsibility of the reviewer to confirm the content of the summary statement. The reviewer should also add an evaluative comment to this record.

The reviewer should return the updated response to the reviewee for information. The reviewee may add a final comment or simply confirm agreement with its contents and return it to the reviewer. Where the reviewer is also the supervisor they should then complete the remainder of Section 3 and confirm it in ESS. Where the reviewer is not the supervisor Section 2 is to be sent to the supervisor who will complete it prior to saving it into ESS.

Finalisation of Section 2 commits the Supervisor to providing the necessary resources to ensure that the reviewee can complete the agreed Development Plan. If the need for a mobility placement has been discussed and agreed then in principle approval should be recorded here.

It also schedules the next Review meeting. The next Review Meeting must be scheduled within the next twelve months and a six month 'checkup' is advisable. An email reminder will be sent to both parties six weeks prior to the meeting to allow preparation of necessary documentation.

If the position description has been amended it reminds the supervisor that this must be forwarded to Human Resources.

Section 2 also confirms that leave arrangements for the next twelve months have been discussed, agreed and recorded in the HR Information System.

Where appropriate Section 2 should record whether action will be taken to address workload concerns.

It is also expected that a Performance Appraisal Report will be completed for all staff on an annual basis. An appraisal report is required when the reviewee is likely to have a change of status or where promotion is being sought. Likely triggers for an appraisal include:

- Conversion from probationary to ongoing appointment;
- Approval for appointment to the extended scale of the new career structure (in the case of academic staff) (pending);
- Salary progression (in the case of professional staff);
- Payment of an allowance (e.g. retention, merit);
- Application to proceed on study leave; or
- Academic promotion
- Clarification of poor performance.

The Performance Appraisal Report may be completed at a date subsequent to the PDR, allowing time for agreed outcomes to be achieved. A Performance Appraisal Report must be completed within one week where the Professional Development Review has raised one or more performance concerns or where staff members appear at risk of a decline in performance.
The Professional Development Review for Commencing Staff or Staff in New Roles provides a set of questions that will help you to think about your skills and how they can be employed in your new role. It forms the basis of your discussion with the Reviewer/Supervisor and should be submitted at least one week prior to the meeting and within two months of commencing employment. If your reviewer does not receive the information in a timely manner, he/she may defer the discussion.

Each question is followed by a text box. Please address all questions.

By the end of the PDR discussion you should have a clear idea of what is expected of you.

1.1  This question relates to your work context and how you are fitting in. What are your strengths? What contributions do you believe you can make to UWA? What has been your initial experience of UWA? Is the job working out as you expected?

Think about the strengths and skills that you bring to your new job. Are there particular areas where you think you can make a contribution? Are there areas in which you believe you may need further development in order to fulfil your responsibilities? Has your initial experience of UWA been positive? What sort of culture are you experiencing? Do you feel you are fitting well into the community? Is the job shaping up to be what you expected? These can also be addressed further in 1.4 and 1.6.

1.2  Please review the UWA Expectations of All Staff, Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct and the UWA Leadership Expectations of All Staff (where relevant). Are you clear about what is expected of you?

The UWA Expectations of All Staff, Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics describe the behaviours expected of you as part of the UWA community. These relate to your personal effectiveness, capacity to work collaboratively, support for others in your community, and demonstrating a focus on outcomes. Are you clear about what is expected of you?

If you have leadership/supervisory responsibilities consider the UWA Leadership Expectations. These relate to people leadership and management, resource management, and university collaboration. Are you clear about these expectations?

As a supervisor you need to manage the performance of your staff and ensure that they complete a Professional Development Review. Do you have any questions about this?
UWA encourages work/life balance for all staff. Are you familiar with the flexibility in work/leave arrangements available to UWA staff? Are you clear about your manager's obligations to offer and manager flexible work practices?

1.3 What are your career aspirations for the coming 3 – 5 years?

This question encourages you to think about how your career might progress at UWA. For example,
- Are you clear about your career aspirations?
- What do you need to achieve your career goals?
- Will you need additional flexibility in your work or leave to meet your responsibilities outside UWA?

Make a note of any points you would like to discuss. Think about how your aspirations might be supported in the coming year.

1.4 What resources and support will you require in the coming year?

As a new member of staff you may wish to discuss a range of issues related to your new role – adequacy of resources, available assistance in settling in, and workload. For example, do you have any mentorship/support strategies in place? If this is something you would like, do you need assistance to identify a mentor or initiate a relationship?

Have you attended an orientation session (see 1.6)? Did you receive an induction into your work unit? Was it made clear what was required of you? What else do you need to know? Please review the UWA Staff Induction website and identify any issues you wish to explore further with your reviewer/supervisor.

1.5 What are your goals for the next 12 months?

List 3 – 5 major goals you will emphasise over the coming year. Your goals should be realistic, achievable and measurable.

What are your personal and professional goals? Goals relating to your unit's activities, should also relate to the relevant Operational Priorities Plan.

If you have leadership responsibilities you may find it useful to list two sets of goals: one relating to your own professional/personal growth and the second relating to your unit's outcomes and priorities including your leadership responsibilities.

Have you identified any factors that might impact on your capacity to achieve these goals? Please note them here so that they can be discussed and addressed.

1.6 What is your Development Plan for the next 12 months?

Have you considered what development support you may require? These may include courses, mentorship, and conference attendance. Any plans listed here need to be realistic and within the existing resources of your organisational unit. Your draft plan will be discussed and possibly amended during the meeting with your reviewer/supervisor.

As a new member of staff it is recommended that you consider attending orientation sessions relevant to you in your new work role. These include:
- UWA Staff Orientation
- UWA Research Orientation (for research active or research support staff)
- UWA Teaching and Learning Orientation (for teaching active or teaching support staff)
- Foundations of University Teaching and Learning Programme (required of teaching active staff as part of meeting their probationary requirements within two years of commencement unless exempted at time of appointment)
- UWA: Best Place to Work Orientation (for managers or leaders with staff and/or financial responsibilities)
- Graduate certificate in higher education

You are advised to visit the OSDS website to identify relevant programmes, courses and workshops that may be of value to you in working at UWA.

After discussion with your reviewer/supervisor please update your Development Plan and return it. Your reviewer/supervisor will then lodge it with ESS. The agreed goals and Development Plan will form the basis of your preparation for your next PDR.

Set a date for a progress meeting within three months time.

**Monitoring Progress**

Your goals and Development Plan should be reviewed within three months. An ESS prompt will be sent to the supervisor and staff member two months after the discussion has been held. The follow up meeting should explore how the staff member is progressing and any issues that may have arisen. Agreed goals or Development Plans may be varied at this time. In the case of professional staff the meeting also provides an opportunity for review prior to confirming whether probationary status should be converted to ongoing. Such confirmation requires completion of a Performance Appraisal Report.
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REPORT:
GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETION

Performance appraisal will be carried out at key points in an individual's career such as probation, renewal of contract, proposed remuneration increase or promotion. The appraisal can be triggered by the Supervisor or the Reviewee. It is required that all staff members will have a performance appraisal on an annual basis. This may occur at a date subsequent to the PDR, allowing time for agreed outcomes to be achieved. A Performance Appraisal Report must be completed within one week where the Professional Development Review has raised one or more performance concerns or where staff members appear at risk of a decline in performance.

The Performance Appraisal Report summarises the Supervisor's assessment of performance outcomes based on all aspects of the individual's performance in the period since the last appraisal. The Report should be consistent with the agreed performance expectations and standards that operate in the organisational area. The Supervisor should carefully consider all evidence and the previous goals and expectations (if available) in coming to a judgement. All relevant sources of evidence should be considered. In the case of academic staff, the sources may include the academic portfolio, Curriculum Vitae, Socrates, SURF and SPOT results. The supervisor and reviewee should meet face to face to discuss the appraisal report.

The appraisal may be triggered by particular events, as outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversion from probationary to ongoing appointment</td>
<td>Supervisor informed by Human Resources three months prior to the due date of confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval for appointment to the extended scale of the new career structure (Professional and Academic Staff)</td>
<td>Staff member or supervisor identifies need to consider appointment to the extended scale; (this may be as a consequence of the Professional Development Review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of an allowance (e.g. retention, merit)</td>
<td>Supervisor or staff member may initiate payment of an allowance. This appraisal must be provided as part of the justification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal of contract</td>
<td>Supervisor will be informed by Human Resources three months prior to contract expiry. The Appraisal Report should be attached to the documentation relating to renewal of contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following instances, the Performance Appraisal Report should contribute to the decision making process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application to be granted study leave</td>
<td>Where study leave is due within the next twelve months, the Performance Appraisal process must be considered as part of the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic promotion.</td>
<td>The individual makes independent application for promotion but is required to seek the input of the Head of School or Dean. The Head should undertake an appraisal prior to commenting on the application. The appraisal should draw on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
various sources of evidence, including Socrates, teaching indicators, the academic portfolio, and may have regard for the most recent Professional Development Review. Similarly, the Dean should not comment on a promotion application without reference to the appraisal outcomes. (N.B. The application form can still go ahead if the Head / Dean are unsupportive).

**Assessment of Performance**

Various levels of performance have been identified in the report document. The Supervisor should carefully read the following descriptions prior to classifying the overall performance of the individual. The Supervisor should take care to avoid any possible biases in this assessment. (link)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meets Role Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Staff placed in this category are those who perform appropriately in all areas of their work and fulfill the requirements of their role. This would be the normal expectation of staff. They demonstrate a commitment to the organisational unit and ensure their work is done to a high standard. They meet UWA expectations in their behaviour. Many UWA staff will fit into this category and are valued for their steady contribution to the University's outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceeds Role Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Staff who exceed expectations are normally those who have consistently met all requirements and have excelled in the work they undertake. They may have been recognised for their work by others, or generally demonstrated a high level of commitment and dedication to their role which is valued by their colleagues. Their work is of high quality, above the standard expected of someone in their role. They demonstrate a quality focus, aim for quality improvement and have performed effectively in all areas of their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent Performance</strong></td>
<td>Performers at this level are those who have consistently demonstrated high outcomes across all their role requirements. They will have performed well above the expected standards and generated outcomes that have improved the performance of their organisational unit and / or team. The person may have accepted additional roles and responsibilities and fulfilled those with distinction. They may also have demonstrated innovation and creativity in their work or improved productivity in their area. This person may also have demonstrated highly effective leadership skills. They would normally be people who are deemed to have potential for new and more challenging roles and responsibilities. Approximately 10% -30% of UWA staff might fit this category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding Performance</strong></td>
<td>Few staff will be deemed to be outstanding. This is a high accolade describing a person who has worked consistently well beyond the expectations of their level or role. Such people would normally have made a superior or distinguished contribution in all areas of their work. It is possible that they may have been recognised externally for their achievements and have played a significant role in the development of the University and its mission. All areas of the required role would be performed in an exemplary fashion. This person would be quite distinctive compared to other staff filling similar roles. Approximately 5% - 10% of UWA staff might fit this category. This will be relative to the comparative performance of other staff at a similar level. For staff to be rated as outstanding, a justification will need to be provided to the Dean or equivalent for confirmation prior to the staff member being informed of this assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generally meets</strong></td>
<td>Staff who are generally meeting the expectations of their role but have one or more areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations but needs to focus on one or more areas as a high priority.</td>
<td>that require improvement should be placed in this category. It does not imply that this person is not performing satisfactorily overall but rather highlights that one or more areas of the role require attention in the coming year. Someone who fits into this category might have a particular skill set that requires further development, such as an academic who needs to place more emphasis on their teaching, research or service. If this box is ticked, the reviewer should also note the area for development and the action being taken. The issue needs to be monitored and managed carefully. An agreed course of action should be outlined and a clear schedule of progress meetings arranged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance does not meet expectations.</td>
<td>Where the Individual has demonstrated areas of inconsistent or inadequate performance that need to be addressed, this category should be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are performance areas of concern that require monitoring.</td>
<td>Performance concerns might also relate to behaviours such as non-conformance with the UWA Expectations of All Staff, lack of adherence to the UWA Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics, or some other behaviour that has consistently caused concern (such as poor time management, bullying, disruptive behaviour). In the case of an academic, the assessment may relate to difficulties in balancing teaching and research or in reflecting the standards of performance expected of academics for their level in that area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before this box is ticked, the issues should already be under discussion with the individual and actions to address them in place. If performance issues have been identified for the first time, the box above should be ticked and clear guidance on areas to be addressed provided. Management of performance requires ongoing dialogue and monitoring of the staff member by the supervisor. A regular schedule of meetings should be established. For example, the supervisor and staff may agree to meet monthly to discuss performance over a period of six months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If performance does not improve, advice should be sought from Employee Relations and Management Services so that a formal unsatisfactory performance process can be initiated. Further guidance on managing poor performance is available from the <em>HR Policy on Procedures for Managing Unsatisfactory Performance and Workplace Behaviour</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The choice of rating should be consistent with the evidence and capable of substantiation. The Supervisor must write a brief statement documenting why the rating was selected and sources of evidence used.

Once the rating has been completed the supervisor should discuss the rating and summary comment with the reviewee. Where outstanding performance has been recognised it may be appropriate to support the reviewee by recommending a salary variation or to offer support for a change in their career status. These options are listed in Performance Appraisal Report. It may also provide an opportunity to reward good performance (e.g. by attendance at a conference related to their work).

Where there is disagreement concerning the evaluation the reviewee has an opportunity to make further comment in writing. The supervisor may also respond to this prior to saving the record in the ESS system. All such comments will remain on the Performance Appraisal record.