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What policy?
Local context
Why focus on policy?

- Inconsistencies
- Inefficiencies
- Not current
- Protracted change processes

= NEED
Opportunity

Commonwealth Structural Adjustment Fund
Role of policy

Governance standards

Academic quality standards

Management standards

Quality assurance | Risk mitigation
Compliance | Continuous improvement
Why then?

Policy Timeline (to Project end)

2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014

Dead Cat Bounce

Policy Refresh Project

Author: Mr Steve Ivey, Executive Director (Sustainable Business Management and Improvement) – adapted and used with permission
How?

Policy Refresh Project

Project aim:

to establish a flexible and sustainable framework for the management of policy
What?

Project objectives

1. Establish the guiding principles (framework)
2. Rework the technical infrastructure
3. Deploy the framework
Project deliverable #1

Policy & Procedure Framework

Policies (Principles)
- Complex
- Organisation-wide

Procedures (Processes)
- Matrix-style
- High levels of accountability

Framework approval hierarchy

Source: USQ, 2015, Policy and Procedure Framework
Project deliverable #2

Technical Infrastructure

Content management system
Publishing system
Policy and Procedure Library

Records Manager
Approval date audit
In-house development
University supported
Definitions Dictionary
Policy/procedure/schedules
Resources

Project deliverable #3.1

New or substantially revised Policy and Procedure

1. Confirm Requirement
2. Research
3. Initial draft
4. Preliminary consultation
5. Review
6. Consultation
7. Revise draft
8. Endorsement
9. Approval
10. Publication
11. Communication
12. Implementation

Project deliverable #3.2

Resources

- Flowcharts
- Manuals
- Checklists
- Templates
- Deployment Plan
Project deliverable #3.3

Student-facing policies

Tranche 1

Tranche 2
Project deliverable #3.4

Definitions Dictionary

- Legal basis
- Proof of concept
- Options
- Baseline
- Content & system integration
Policy and Procedure
Library

- Live
- Accessible
- Mobile device friendly
- Well used
Policy Library use

Top 20 Library Searches – September 2016

- assessment, 78, 11%
- student, 61, 9%
- academic, 50, 7%
- conduct, 49, 7%
- leave, 36, 5%
- credit, 35, 5%
- research, 35, 5%
- code, 35, 5%
- course, 34, 5%
- misconduct, 34, 5%
- management, 29, 4%
- complaint, 27, 4%
- admissions, 27, 4%
- media, 26, 4%
- information, 24, 3%
- appeal, 22, 3%
- enrolment, 21, 3%
- extension, 20, 3%

English, 30, 4%

Credit, 35, 5%

Research, 35, 5%

Course, 34, 5%

Misconduct, 34, 5%

Management, 29, 4%

Complaint, 27, 4%

Admissions, 27, 4%

Media, 26, 4%

Information, 24, 3%

Appeal, 22, 3%

Enrolment, 21, 3%

Extension, 20, 3%

Assessment, 78, 11%
Policy Library access

Unique Page Views – September 2016

- January
- February
- March
- April
- May
- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December

2015

2016
Challenges

- Organisational restructure
- System failure
- Contract variation
- Unclear accountability
- Complexity
The effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 dimensions</th>
<th>4 streams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Project</td>
<td>• Governance &amp; structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business as usual</td>
<td>• Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication &amp; education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resourcing/budget/staffing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical success factors

- Environmental scanning
- Sponsor and senior management engagement
- Stakeholder identification and engagement
Stakeholder management

Policy Refresh Project Stakeholders

Partners
- USQ International
- USQ Sydney
- International Partners

Formal groups
- Staff groups
- Student groups
- Community of Practice
- Senior Executive Officers
- Staff Consultative Committee
- Student Guild
- Student Representatives
- Unions

Indirect project personnel
- Drafters
- Corporate Records
- Faculty managers
- Operations managers
- Academic program managers
- Student administration
- SBM
- Campus heads

Operational
- University Program Management Committee
- Vice-Chancellor's Committee
- Academic Quality Policy & Procedure Working Group
- Deans/Associate Deans/Heads of School
- Senior DVC
- CCO
- CFO

Executive

Organisational Governance
- USQ Council
- Academic Board
- Research Committee
- Chair, Academic Board
- University Secretary
- University Lawyer
- Director (Integrity and Professional Conduct)
- Director (Audit and Risk)

Project Governance
- Policy Refresh Project Board
- USQ Connected Board
- USQ Connected Sub-Project Managers
- ED (SBM)
- Senior DVC
- SF Project Coordinator
- SF support staff

Project Sponsors
- Senior DVC
- ED (SBM)

Project Team
- Project Manager
- Policy Coordinator
- Policy Support Officer

Department of Innovation/Department of Education

ATEM Policy Network

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND
Critical success factors

- Effective team structures
- The right people
- Governance structures
Governance structures

Policy and Procedure Framework (BAU)

- University Council
  - Chancellor
- Chancellor’s Committee
  - Chancellor
- Vice-Chancellor’s Committee
  - Vice-Chancellor
- Policy Implementation Team
  - ED (SBMI)
- Accountable Officers
  - Senior Executive

Policy Refresh Project

- Program Board
  - Program Chair
- Vice-Chancellor’s Assurance Committee
  - Vice-Chancellor
- Policy Implementation Team
  - Project Sponsor

Shergold, P, *Learning from Failure - Why large government policy initiatives have gone so badly wrong in the past and how the chances of success in the future can be improved*, 2015, APS Commission, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, Australia.
Critical success factors

- Performance indicators
- Evaluation
- Project management approach
Project management approach

1. Project initiation
2. Objective & KPI identification
3. Milestone identification & adjustment
4. Plan / budget / resource
5. Monitor / adjust
6. Manage delivery / collect data
7. Objective & KPI delivery
8. Evaluation
9. Embedded outcomes = project success
## Impact

### 2016 Staff Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>% Improved since 2014</th>
<th>% Improved since 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Objectives</td>
<td>+10%</td>
<td>+22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Voice Survey Results, April 2016
Success!

ATEM 2016 Mindhive Policy and Governance Award

AIPM 2015 Queensland Project Manager of the Year
Opportunities

Policy enables change

Opportunities & lessons
Change enabler


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editorial Changes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Reviews</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New &amp; Major Reviews</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities

Policy enables change

Policy generates cross-collaboration

Opportunities & lessons
Cross-collaboration
Opportunities and lessons

Policy enables change

Policy generates cross-collaboration

Opportunities & lessons

Robust structured approach required
Robust structured approach

New or substantially revised Policy and Procedure

1. Confirm Requirement
2. Research
3. Initial draft
4. Preliminary consultation
5. Review
6. Consultation
7. Revise draft
8. Endorsement
9. Approval
10. Publication
11. Communication
12. Implementation

Deployment and communication

Engagement and consultation
Opportunities and lessons

- Policy enables change
- Policy generates cross-collaboration
- Opportunities & lessons
- Robust structured approach required
- Effective project management underpins success
Project management
Project benefits realised

- Engaged accountable officers
- Cross-organisational collaboration
- Enhanced governance and management reporting capability
- Modern, compliant, robust system
- Definitions Dictionary baseline
- Compliance integration
- Risk mitigation
Business as usual benefits realised

- Embedded policy development and review
- Business process improvement
- Policy and procedure change efficiencies
- Zero complaints
- Reduced audit issues and risk profile
- Improved staff survey results
- Improved student experience
Current state policy timeline


Dead Cat Bounce

Policy Refresh Project

Author: Mr Steve Ivey, Executive Director (Sustainable Business Management and Improvement) – modified and used with permission
The future

- Further develop organisational change capability
  - Embed
  - Integrate
  - Improve processes

- Enhance evaluation capability
  - Use data wisely
  - Get creative
Silo reduction
Questions

Fiona Margetts  MPM, MAIPM, MATEM, AFAIM, JP(Qual)
Manager (Policy Services)
University of Southern Queensland
Fiona.Margetts@usq.edu.au

USQ Policy Library
www.policy.usq.edu.au
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