Strategic Plan Reporting and Evaluation Practices in Australian Universities

In the following report, The Hanover Research Council surveys the strategic plan reporting and evaluation methods among a sample set of twelve Australian universities. The frameworks used by the institutions to report and evaluate progress on their strategic goals and objectives are compared, and a case study example of best practices in strategic plan reporting and evaluation is provided.
Overview

In this report, Hanover examines the methods and practices employed by several Australian universities to report on and evaluate progress made towards goals outlined in their strategic plans. In order to examine these reporting and evaluation frameworks, however, it is first necessary to briefly review the reporting format and content of the strategic plans themselves. The timeframes, goals, and objectives outlined in the strategic plans guide the progress reporting and evaluation practices of each of the institutions.

In the first section of the report, we discuss similarities among universities in the reporting and evaluation of progress toward strategic plan goals. In the second section, unique elements among reporting and evaluation practices are discussed. Following this, a case study of the University of Western Australia’s strategic plan reporting and evaluation framework is reviewed as a best practice example. Finally, key findings and best practice recommendations with regard to strategic planning progress reporting and evaluation methods are reviewed.

Methodology

Twelve Australian institutions’ practices regarding the reporting and evaluation of progress toward strategic goals/objectives were reviewed. These institutions were chosen using one of two criteria: (1) national ranking and (2) similarity to XYZ University (XYZ). The first set of universities was chosen based on the criterion of academic excellence, as reflected by high university rankings, under the assumption that they are good candidates to serve as models for effective administrative practices, including procedures for reporting on and evaluating progress toward strategic planning goals/objectives. The institutions examined are the top ten universities in Australia, according to the Times Higher Education “World University Rankings 2008” report. They are listed below, by order of rank.

Top Ten Australian Universities:

- Australian National University (ANU)
- University of Sydney (US)
- University of Melbourne (UM)
- University of Queensland (UQ)
- University of New South Wales (UNSW)
- Monash University (Monash)
- University of Western Australia (UWA)
- University of Adelaide (UA)
- Macquarie University (Macquarie)
- Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT)

In order to supplement and diversify our sample set of institutions, two additional Australian universities are examined based on their similarity to ACU’s program specialization in the fields of health, education, and the arts and sciences. The following two institutions seem to be most similar to XYZ in terms of their academic emphases, and have similar rankings to the University.

**Similar Universities:**

- Flinders University (Flinders)
- Southern Cross University (SCU)

The analysis of these twelve Australian universities’ strategic plan reporting and evaluation practices is conducted using a case study methodology. Each university is examined, in turn, and reporting and evaluation practices are noted. Specifically, Hanover inspected each institution’s official website and recorded practices for strategic planning, progress reporting, and evaluation practices. Typically, information regarding a university’s strategic plan was found on its “Strategy and Planning” (or similarly named) web pages. Universities’ evaluative data, usually in the form of “Annual Reports” or other statistical reports, were found either on these same web pages or on the pages of a separate “Statistical Department.” Using this information, Hanover compares strategic plan progress reporting and evaluation frameworks.

**Key Findings**

The development of an institution’s strategic plan, goals, and objectives is an important process that sets the foundation for the reporting and evaluation of progress toward institutional goals. Consequently, Hanover’s review of the strategic plan reporting and evaluation frameworks of the twelve institutions began with a brief review of the institutions’ strategic plans.

Most universities publish strategic plans that are broadly similar in form, content, and scope, with somewhat abstract goals that cover a three to five year period of time. Interestingly, the goals included in the strategic plans are often not well-designed to facilitate efficient strategic plan progress reporting and evaluation frameworks. However, a variety of the institutions engaged in practices which may be presumed to facilitate strategic plan progress reporting and evaluation, including:

---


3 Ibid., 5.


5 A comprehensive list of the websites examined for this report is available in Appendix 1.
Setting concrete targets and indicating what specific data correspond to plan goals.

Providing supplemental reports which identify category-specific data related to various aspects of an institution’s operations in order to measure progress toward broader strategic goals.

Engaging employees in the strategic planning process – from inception to progress evaluation – by encouraging feedback to the strategic plan.

Using the evaluation of the strategic plans as a foundation, the strategic plan progress reporting and evaluation frameworks of the twelve institutions were analyzed for similarities and differences. A high degree of similarity in reporting frameworks among the institutions was identified. Generally, the twelve Australian universities profiled in our study reported progress toward strategic plan goals and objectives through annual reports and statistical summaries. While the annual reports were differentiated by the degree to which the data were organized and evaluated by content or functional area, the general practice of an annual review of performance was predominant. These reports were often lengthy PDF documents which include graphs, charts, and other visual representations of data.

The second most common reporting framework involved the use of annual statistical reports available as PDFs or other formats. These reports are typically category-specific, focusing on students, staff, research, etc. Finally, at a majority of institutions (eight of twelve), access to evaluative reports is restricted.

Given the fact that it is reasonable to assume that each of the twelve institutions studied is a unique entity with different student populations, faculty, staff, and strategic goals, it is not surprising that a degree of variability exists within each institution’s progress reporting framework. Case study examples for the University of Queensland, the University of New South Wales, the University of Adelaide, the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Southern Cross University, and Flinders University demonstrate the ways in which institutions may organize and allocate responsibility for specific data reporting regarding progress toward strategic goals and objectives.

Finally, a best practice example of the University of Western Australia’s Cycle of Planning and Accountability demonstrates the ways in which an entire institution can be linked to data reporting and evaluation relating to a strategic plan and other institutional planning documents.
Common Practices

There is a significant degree of uniformity in the strategic plan reporting and evaluation frameworks used by the twelve institutions studied in this report. Both the structuring of the universities’ strategic plans and progress reporting frameworks, as well as the data used to report progress, are very similar.

In this section, we first briefly describe the common practices related to strategic planning because the content included in these plans is the foundation upon which progress reporting and evaluation frameworks may be built. We then examine common reporting and evaluative practices in greater detail.

Strategic Planning Foundations

The strategic plans of each of the institutions share many elements that may influence practices regarding the reporting and evaluation of progress toward strategic planning goals/objectives. In particular, there is a significant degree of conformity in the plans’ targeted time frames, formatting methods, and content.

Typically, the universities’ strategic plans encompass a three to five-year time period and are available to the public online in a PDF format. Generally, the content of the strategic plans detail medium-term goals in areas such as research, education, community outreach, institutional planning, and financial management. While the goals and objectives for these content areas may vary from being abstract to easily quantifiable, they all provide the foundation for the organization of progress evaluations in annual reports or other documents, to be discussed below.

Reporting and Evaluation

The twelve universities examined in this report generally used two primary types of evaluative documents, (1) annual reports and (2) statistical reports/summaries.

Annual Reports

Annual reports are comprehensive documents, published each year, which contain information on all aspects of the university in question. They include data on student enrollment and demographics, faculty and staff, research output, university finances, and other areas of operation.

The reports are usually 75 to 150 pages in length and are available online, as PDF documents. Charts, graphs, and other visual representations of data are a common component of the reports; they are found embedded in the text and are not usually
available for individual download. Archived annual reports, from 2008 to circa 1997, are also commonly available.

The annual reports are usually organized into categories that directly relate to strategic plan objectives. For instance, Australian National University’s strategic plan outlines goals and objectives corresponding to major focus areas, including research, education, community, and planning. Consequently, the institution’s annual report describes progress according to these categories, usually in list form, with a few statistics (such as enrollment numbers, entry scores, and number of postgraduate students) to supplement the text reporting.6

A few of the universities further broke-down strategic plan progress reporting into annual reports created by individual colleges or departments within the institution. It may be presumed that colleges and departments within universities each have their own data sets, data standards, and specific strategic goals and objectives.

Another option for the structure of annual reports is to organize the reports into broad functional categories with unique data sets that report progress. For instance, the University of Adelaide’s reporting framework includes Annual University Performance Reports, Annual Faculty Performance Reports, Annual Financial Plans and Annual Program Performance Reports.7 While the content of these reports is restricted to the public, it is reasonable to assume that the term “Performance Report” and “Annual Report” may be used interchangeably in the context of strategic goal progress reporting and evaluation.

Over the past decade, the University of New South Wales has gradually adopted this type of reporting framework. Its initial strategic plan reporting framework included Performance Indicators Reports, in which areas such as student selection, student progress, student satisfaction, research outcomes, resources, staff profile, staff satisfaction, and student equity were reported upon and evaluated in terms of the institution’s strategic goals and objectives. In 2002, the Vice Chancellor of the University created an additional strategic plan progress report, the Faculty Indicators Report, to be used as part of a new strategic planning process. The Faculty Indicators Report will be discussed in greater detail below (page 10).

---

Additionally, the university decided in 2005 to develop and implement a new UNSW Planning and Review Process (PRP). Included in this effort was the intention to develop a “standard data set to support Faculty/Divisional Performance Self-Review.” While these documents are restricted to the public, it is apparent that individual colleges/departments within the university each have a specific standard data set. For instance, the Australian Graduate School of Management, Arts and Social Sciences department, the Built Environment department, the College of Fine Arts, the Commerce and Economics department, and the Institute of Environmental Studies each has its own standard data set as part of the Planning and Review Process.

The University also provides Research Benchmarks and performance indicators as a supplement to the data sets. The Benchmark appears to only have been reported once, in 2006.8

Macquarie University also uses this type of functional breakdown for the reporting of progress for its subsidiary strategic plan, the “Research Strategic Plan 2009-2011.” Each year, Macquarie evaluates its research and research training progress toward strategic goals through annual “Research and Research Training Management Reports.”9 Regardless of the division and organization of the annual reports used as part of the universities’ reporting frameworks, this type of break-down by content or function areas’ progress towards strategic goals may provide institutions with a reporting framework that enables both micro- and macro-level analysis.

**Statistical Reports and Summaries**

The second commonly observed reporting practice of Australian universities is the publication of various statistical reports and summaries. Similar to the institutions’ annual reports, the statistical reports include information related to similar categories of data (students, staff, research, etc.). However, unlike the comprehensive, text-based annual reports, statistical reports typically contain only raw data with little or no supplemental text. Instead, the data in these reports are often supplemented by graphs and charts.

Additionally, statistical reports are usually category-specific, containing data on only one area of university operations. For example, Monash University allows individuals to access specific statistical reports with data regarding admissions, enrollment, equity variables, academic performance, and university staff.10 In addition to these reports,
several universities also publish statistical summaries which provide similar data as the category-specific reports, but in a condensed form. Typically three to five pages long, the universities’ statistical reports and summaries are almost always available in either a PDF or Microsoft Excel format.

Finally, it is important to make note of the accessibility of the universities’ reporting and evaluating publications. On a majority of the websites examined in this study, one or more of the evaluative publications is not available to the general public. This is the case for eight of the twelve universities investigated.\(^\text{11}\) In such cases, **access to the various statistical reports and summaries is typically restricted to university students and staff.** In these instances, one must login using an official, university-granted username and password to review the documents. As a consequence, our analysis of the progress reporting and evaluation frameworks used by these institutions was somewhat limited.

---

\(^{11}\) The institutions that restrict access are: UA, UWA, Monash, UNSW, Macquarie, RMIT, Flinders, and SCU.
Unique Practices

Despite their broadly similar practices for strategic plan reporting and evaluation, there are important points of difference among Australian universities. In this section of the report, Hanover describes unique elements of the progress reporting and evaluation frameworks of the twelve institutions, with an eye towards those practices that could potentially facilitate effective and efficient reporting of progress towards strategic goals and objectives.

Strategic Planning Foundations

We begin our discussion of unique and effective practices in strategic plan reporting and evaluation frameworks with a brief review of unique strategic plan content:

- **Section of Strategic Plan or Supplemental Document Indicates Specific Data which Correspond to Plan Goals.** Only four of the universities reviewed by Hanover produce strategic plans or supplemental documents that specifically identify data that can be used to measure progress toward established goals. Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology and Flinders University, for example, devote special sections of their strategic plans to clearly describing what data are to be used to determine their progress towards their stated strategic goals. This feature of the strategic plans may be important in clarifying to all university members how progress toward strategic planning goals and objectives should be measured.

- **Supplemental Targeted Plans Published.** Southern Cross University publishes several supplemental reports which provide category-specific data on different areas of university operations. In addition to the institution’s “Strategic Plan 2005-2010,” these reports are of the following types: Functional, Service, Operational, and Business. The use of category-specific reports may make it easier to assign responsibility to individual university departments for the reporting and evaluation of data regarding progress toward goals.

- **Encourages Feedback to Strategic Plan.** University of Melbourne is the only university studied which employs the particularly innovative strategic planning practice of soliciting feedback from non-administrators, regarding the content of the university’s Strategic Plan. On the University planning webpage, alumni and staff are given the opportunity to email their responses to a publication by the university’s vice-chancellor, which describes and discusses the institution’s strategic goals. Collecting and responding to feedback may be helpful in clarifying the goals and objectives outlined in the plans as well as in identifying potential areas for improvement in future strategic planning documents.

12 Refining Our Strategy. University of Melbourne. growingsteem.unimelb.edu.au/about/refining_our_strategy
Reporting and Evaluation

The unique aspects of the strategic plans discussed above demonstrate the ways in which the strategic plans themselves can be structured to facilitate progress reporting and evaluation according to institutional needs. Yet even without incorporating all of these aspects into a strategic plan, the twelve institutions reviewed by Hanover provide a variety of examples of strategic plan progress reporting and evaluation frameworks.

We begin our review by highlighting unique administrative practices for reporting and evaluating data, and then address data reporting and content frameworks which may serve as examples for other institutions.

Unique Administrative Practices

- **Excel Spreadsheet Data Reports Available (non-pivot).** Surprisingly, only three of the universities examined, University of New South Wales, University of Western Australian, and Macquarie University offer statistical reports in standard Microsoft Excel format.

- **Pivot Excel Spreadsheet Data Reports Available.** Three universities, University of Adelaide, Flinders University, and Monash University, offer comprehensive statistical reports in Microsoft Excel Pivot format.

- **HTML Format for Data Reporting.** Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology is the only university profiled that produces statistical reports in neither PDF nor Excel document formats. Instead, RMIT reports data in HTML.

- **Three-Year Progress Reporting.** In 2002, the University of New South Wales introduced the Faculty Indicators Report, which measures faculty performance relating to strategic goals over a “rolling three-year period.” It reports on faculty measures according to their relationship with student demand, student progress, student satisfaction, faculty research participation, staff profile, and student equity. Staff opinion surveys supplement these performance measures. The three-year reporting period, as compared to the more typical one-year reporting framework, is said to allow for the monitoring of faculty performance over time to determine a standard of indicators.13 Similarly, Southern Cross University has “General Report Cards,” which show performance indicator trends over a three-year period.14

---

**Data Reporting and Content Frameworks**

The majority of the universities examined by Hanover were found to produce reports containing data that explicitly correspond to their strategic plan goals. As can be seen from the case study examples below, the progress reporting frameworks varied by institution, but tended to rely on the use of operational agendas and performance indicators. Despite producing reports with specific data indicating progress toward strategic plans, the University of Western Australia is not featured as a case study below. Instead, we profile this institution in greater length as a “best practice” example of progress reporting and planning in the proceeding section.

- **University of Queensland**: This institution reports progress towards its strategic goals and objectives through three different reporting frameworks:

  1. **Operational agenda** – a planning framework that reviews annual performance and sets one to three year university targets across a broad range of activities.

  2. **Enabling Operations Plans** – annual plans produced by the faculties and major research institutes of the institution, as well as the University Library, Central Administration and Ipswich Campus. The plans identify “the highest priority initiatives for the year ahead and set near term targets as performance benchmarks to be achieved.”

  3. **Portfolio Plans** – guide and direct Enabling Operations Plans and are generally reviewed every three years according to requirements. The portfolio plans include the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Plan, the Research and Research Training Plan, the International Plan, the Equity and Diversity Plan, and the Infrastructure and Support Plan.  

- **University of New South Wales**: The University of New South Wales has a detailed strategic plan reporting and evaluation framework. In addition to a variety of annual reports, **progress is also measured through student surveys**, which provide information for the institution’s planning and quality improvement processes.

  The surveys address issues of strategic importance, including access to information technology, student circumstances that might impact timetabling and transport, students’ acquisition of skills, and a general assessment of

---

students’ views of the institution and its values. These results are **included in annual reports**. In the past decade, general student engagement and first-year student engagement components have been added. Survey response analysis is supplemented by Course Experience Questionnaires (CEQs), which survey graduates for an assessment of their educational experience. Graduate Destination reports further assess students’ experiences and success.

- **University of Adelaide**: As discussed in the previous section, UA produces annual performance reports for a variety of university activities related to its Strategic Plan goals. However, it also produces **operational plans, operational theme plans** (education, research and research training, resources), **faculty business plans** for various departments, and **divisional business plans** that report progress towards goals and objectives on a two-year cycle.

- **Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology**: In its 2008 Annual Report PDF document, RMIT includes a ten-page section which **lists the university’s strategic goals to 2010 and reports corresponding data** on the institution’s progress towards those goals.

- **Flinders University**: On its planning webpage, Flinders publishes reports on “**Key Accountability Measures**” and “**Educational Profiles and Institutional Assessment Framework,**” which contain data explicitly related to strategic planning and quality assurance. These reports are PDF documents.

- **Southern Cross University**: SCU publishes **“General Report Cards,” which indicate the university’s progress** on specified “key performance indicators,” as outlined in the Strategic Plan. These documents are PDFs and **report three-year data trends** regarding specified goals.

*Additional Progress Reporting Features*

- **Ability to Request Custom Data Reports.** Monash University’s Statistics webpage allows individuals to **request custom data reports** if the required data are not available in an existing summary or pivot table report. Although a formal login is not required to submit a request, the request form does solicit information about the requestor’s affiliation with the university.
Executive Dashboard. Of the institutions studied in this report, the University of Queensland was the only one to report data using executive dashboard software. UQ has developed innovative dashboard tools for reporting data for both the institution itself and the “Group of Eight” research-intensive Australian universities. UQ-specific dashboards include data on enrollment, equity, performance, teaching quality, and finances. Several of the other universities examined by Hanover had links to UQ’s dashboards on their own websites.

The University of Western Australia’s planning process was recognized as best practice by the Department of Education, Training, and Youth Affairs (DETYA)-commissioned independent review of “Strategic Planning in Australian Higher Education.”23 The framework, called the Cycle of Planning and Accountability, is a timetable of actions needed to ensure that UWA systematically monitors and accounts for its performance in relation to its plans. The Cycle of Planning and Accountability is used to enhance performance review, evaluation, and reporting by (1) providing a greater degree of transparency and structure for planning activities, (2) increasing the institution’s coordination of efforts to meet strategic goals, and (3) facilitating more accountability for outcomes achievement. The Cycle also “reinforces the links between the broad planning directions articulated in the UWA Strategic Plan, the Academic Profile, and the Operational Priorities Plan (OPP), and the UWA Budget and faculty plans.”24

The Cycle takes into account six key elements in its efforts to ensure that the University’s plans, associated strategies and targets are updated by the responsible parties. These elements include:25

- Major Government reporting and accountability requirements – including Department of Education, Employment, and Workforce Relations (DEEWR) Reporting Requirements,
- University-level plans and the University Budget,
- Faculty-level plans, budgets and reporting,
- Accountable officers and boards/committees,
- Measures of performance, and
- The cycle of key events and an associated timetable.

23 “Cycle of Planning and Accountability Version 1.0.” The University of Western Australia. Pg.6 http://www.registrar.uwa.edu.au/university_planning/strategic_operational_plans/__data/page/65569/CPA-May08.pdf
24 Ibid. Pg.1-3.
25 Ibid. Pg. 8.
The planning cycle begins with the Strategic Plan, the Academic Profile, and the Operational Priorities Plan (OPP). These plans are integrated into an institution-wide planning, review, evaluation, and reporting framework that is divided into two major components:  

**University-Wide Management Plans**

- Admissions and Enrollment
- Capital
- Community Service
- Disability Access and Inclusion
- Equal Employment Opportunity
- Equity
- Finance
- Human Resources
- Investment
- Indigenous Education
- Information Technology
- Internationalization
- Marketing
- Procurement
- Record Keeping
- Research
- Risk
- Teaching and Learning
- Unicity (Strategic Asset)

**Area Strategic and Operational Plans**

- Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Visual Arts
- Faculty of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences
- Business School
- Faculty of Education
- Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics
- Faculty of Law
- Faculty of Life and Physical Sciences
- Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences
- Library
- Registrar’s Office
- Finance and Resources Office

---

26 Ibid. Pg. 15.
These two major divisions then work with the University Budget and Performance Review, Evaluation and Reporting functions to complete the Cycle. The timetable of progress reporting and evaluation activities is portrayed in the table below. For all of the activities listed, a combination of the Registrar, the Vice-Chancellor, the Deans, the Heads of School and equivalent, the Executive Director of Finance and Resources, and/or the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor are responsible for the activities. Both Excel and PDF formats are used to report data.\

**UWA’S Cycle of Planning and Accountability Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
<td>First round of admissions including adjustments to planned intakes. University-wide call for USF Submissions. Financial Accountability: Annual certification of compliance with University policies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td>Second round of admissions including adjustments to planned intakes. Package of Centrally-produced Performance Indicators for previous year to be finalized (Selected Performance Indicators and Selected Faculty Performance Indicators) (early-Feb). Leadership Retreat (planning workshop for senior management) Senate Strategic Directions Seminar (report on OPP performance and directions). In fifth year of Cycle, Senate approval of new OPP (including targets). Financial Accountability: Presentation of University Annual Accounts. Approval and certification. Financial Accountability: Report on actual financial performance against budget for previous year. Review Consolidated University bottom up budget for current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td>Annual Report to State Government - Financial Statements and Performance Indicators. University Executive to finalize the annual UWA Agenda (based on the OPP). In fifth year of Cycle, commence complete review and revision of University Strategic Plan and Academic Profile in light of years 1 to 4. Deans to report to Executive on Faculty OPP performance in previous year and confirm/adjust performance targets for current year with SDVC. OPP Executive Officers to review OPP performance in previous year, and suggest possible adjustments to targets and strategies as necessary. <strong>Planning &amp; Budget Workshop I:</strong> - Review previous year's performance and progress with regard to the University's OPP, Faculty and School plans and confirm adjustments to targets and strategies. - Review UWA Budget (Estimates of Income and Distribution) model parameters (if required). - In fifth year of Cycle, initial discussion of the next OPP. - In fifth year of Cycle, initial discussion of the outcomes of the University Strategic Plan and Academic Profile and possible shape of next iteration of the Strategic Plan and Academic Profile. DEEWR Student Data Collection submission (due 31 Mar). Financial Accountability: Half yearly SDVC, Dean financial evaluation meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td>Review of Admission and Quota Policy outcomes. Commence development of the next Admission and Quota Policy including discussion with faculties of planned intakes for the next year. Australian Graduates Survey (GDS/CEQ/PREQ) under way (30 April ref date). DEEWR Student Data Collection Past Course Completions File (due 30 Apr). Quarterly Financial Performance Report prepared and presented to Senate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

27 Planning Services. The University of Western Australia. www.planserv.uwa.edu.au/cis/reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td>Submission to DEEWR of bids for new places, if required. DEEWR Student Data Collection submission (due 31 May). Financial Accountability: Review March quarterly executive format reports performance against plan. Financial Accountability: March quarter Senate format reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning &amp; Budget Committee:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In fifth year, consider first draft of new University Strategic Plan and new Academic Profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In fifth year, consider first draft of new University Strategic Plan and Academic Profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Initial consideration of draft Admission and Quota Policy for next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review WA Budget Model (Estimates of Income and Distribution) parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In third year, complete review of each Transnational teaching program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Advise Deans/Executive Directors/Librarian of results of USF Round for the current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td>Commence revision of University management plans. Deans to provide Financial Services with estimated student fees for trans-national and domestic fee-paying postgraduate courses to be used in the UWA Budget (Estimates of Income and Distribution) DEEWR Capital Development Pool Applications (due mid-July) Annual Report to the WA Government Office of EEO. Quarterly Financial Performance Report prepared and presented to Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning &amp; Budget Committee:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Final draft of Admission and Quota Policy for next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Draft Income Estimates regarding General Purpose Funds and off the top budget allocations for the next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In fifth year, consider second draft of new University Strategic Plan and Academic Profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In fifth year, consider first draft of the new University OPP including draft performance schedule and targets (including Faculty targets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In fifth year, consider first draft of the new University Strategic Plan and Academic Profile to be considered by Academic Council and Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In fifth year, report on draft OPP to Academic Council and Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEEWR Campus file for next year (with fees and/or student contributions, cut-offs for each course by campus) (due 1 Aug) DEEWR Student Data Collection submission (due 31 Aug).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Accountability: Review June quarterly executive format reports performance against plan. Financial Accountability: June half year Senate format reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admission and Quota Policy to Academic Council for approval. Planning Services to provide Financial Planning with projected student load data Commonwealth Supported Places/Research Training Scheme and International (Onshore) enrollments. Research Services to provide Financial Planning with research and research training data (i.e., Research Income and Publications). In fifth year, new University Strategic Plan and Academic Profile to be finalized and presented to Academic Council and Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning &amp; Budget Committee:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider updated risk management plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UWA Budget (Estimates of Income and Distribution) confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In fifth year, consider first draft of the new Faculty OPPs including draft performance schedule and targets. Vice Chancellor reports on UWA Budget (Estimates of Income and Distribution) to Academic Board, Strategic Resources Committee, and Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule of student contribution amounts and tuition fees for next year to be published (DEEWR deadline 1 Oct).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Assessment Framework discussions with DEEWR (every two years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEEWR Student Data Collection submission (due 31 Oct).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly Financial Performance Report prepared and presented to Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Accountability: Revised forecast completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td>Faculty budgets finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deans adjust Faculty OPP’s in light of budget outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome of bids for places and Funding Agreement finalized with DEEWR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update Cycle of Planning and Accountability Timetable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Accountability: September quarter Senate format reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning &amp; Budget Committee:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discussion of expected financial outcomes for the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Final adjustments to income allocations for the current year under the UWA Budget (Estimates of Income and Distribution).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- USF Reports – progress with regard to allocations for current year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In fifth year, consider final draft of the new Faculty OPPs including performance schedules and targets. Management plan updates finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chancellor’s annual report to Senate (as part of Senate Review of the Year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report data collection commences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Accountability: Consolidated (bottom up) University budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix

Australian Universities’ Planning & Reporting Websites

**Australian National University**
- www.anu.edu.au/about/
- unistats.anu.edu.au/

**University of Melbourne**
- growingesteem.unimelb.edu.au/about
- www.unimelb.edu.au/about/

**University of Sydney**
- www.usyd.edu.au/about/index.shtml

**University of Queensland**
- www.uq.edu.au/about/
- www.mis.admin.uq.edu.au/content/Dashboards.aspx

**University of New South Wales**
- www.unsw.edu.au/about/pad/about.html
- www.planning.unsw.edu.au/

**Monash University**
- www.monash.edu.au/about/
- opq.monash.edu.au/index.html
- www.opq.monash.edu.au/ups/

**University of Western Australia**
- www.registrar.uwa.edu.au/university_planning
- www.stats.uwa.edu.au/

**University of Adelaide**
- www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/34/
- www.adelaide.edu.au/sp/ippf/current_reports_and_plans.html

**Macquarie University**
- www.research.mq.edu.au/policy/strategic_directions
- www.mq.edu.au/iru/
Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
  ❖ www.rmit.edu.au/about
  ❖ www.rmit.edu.au/browse/Our Organisation\%2FUniversity services\%2FPolicy and Planning\%2FStatistics and Reporting/

Flinders University
  ❖ www.flinders.edu.au/about/about_home.cfm
  ❖ planning.flinders.edu.au/

Southern Cross University
  ❖ www.scu.edu.au/about/index.php/21/
  ❖ www.scu.edu.au/pqr/
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This brief was written to fulfill the specific request of an individual member of The Hanover Research Council. As such, it may not satisfy the needs of all members. We encourage any and all members who have additional questions about this topic – or any other – to contact us.

Caveat

The publisher and authors have used their best efforts in preparing this brief. The publisher and authors make no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this brief and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of fitness for a particular purpose. There are no warranties which extend beyond the descriptions contained in this paragraph. No warranty may be created or extended by representatives of The Hanover Research Council or its marketing materials. The accuracy and completeness of the information provided herein and the opinions stated herein are not guaranteed or warranted to produce any particular results, and the advice and strategies contained herein may not be suitable for every member. Neither the publisher nor the authors shall be liable for any loss of profit or any other commercial damages, including but not limited to special, incidental, consequential, or other damages. Moreover, The Hanover Research Council is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. Members requiring such services are advised to consult an appropriate professional.