

PERFORMANCE, DEVELOPMENT AND REWARDS

Rationale for Academic Measures

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SETTING PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	3
3. LEARNING & TEACHING	3
3.1 Standard Metrics for Learning & Teaching	3
3.1.1 The GDS/CEQ Standard Teaching Metric.....	4
3.1.2 The SFT Standard Teaching Metric.....	7
3.2 Individualised Learning & Teaching Measures	9
4. RESEARCH.....	11
4.1 Guidelines	12
4.2 Model Summary	12
5. LEADERSHIP & ENGAGEMENT.....	17
6. SWINBURNE BEHAVIOURS	18
7. SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS	19
7.1 For teaching & research staff	19
7.2 For research only staff	20
7.3 For teaching only staff.....	20
8. CONCLUSION.....	21
APPENDIX – Sample Development Activities.....	22

1. INTRODUCTION

As a learning organisation which aspires to excellence in both teaching and research, Swinburne seeks to develop its staff and reward outstanding performance. To achieve this, clear goals for all staff are required, based on the *Swinburne in 2015* vision statement and supported by a comprehensive system for performance appraisal, development and reward.

The new Swinburne Performance Development and Reward (PDR) system will assist staff members to negotiate priorities and agreed target outcomes with their supervisor on an annual basis. The PDR process will provide feedback to staff members on their annual performance and reward outstanding outcomes. Individual development plans will be agreed upon between staff members and their supervisors in order to improve institutional performance and support the career development of staff.

PDR Performance Plans will include performance objectives and measures for academics in Higher Education under the headings of:

- Learning and Teaching
- Research
- Leadership and Engagement
- Swinburne Behaviours

2. SETTING PERFORMANCE MEASURES

In the PDR process, each individual's outcomes for their performance objectives will be expressed as integer scores on a five point scale system. The 5 point scale and corresponding short descriptors to be used are:

5	Outstanding
4	Exceeds Expectations
3	Meets Expectations
2	Needs Improvement
1	Unsatisfactory

Table 1 *PDR 5 Point Scale*

3. LEARNING & TEACHING

Measures for Learning & Teaching will incorporate both standard and individualised options.

3.1 Standard Metrics for Learning & Teaching

The Swinburne PDR process is being designed to include standard teaching metrics that can be used for academic teaching staff across the Faculties. These teaching metrics are based on two *Swinburne in 2015* Aims related to learning and teaching performance across Higher Education. These are

Aim 5: Enhance CEQ and GDS performance at a rate of 1% per annum in each of the indicators over the next 7 years.

Aim 6: Swinburne will enhance innovation and excellence in the provision of a quality educational experience.

Aim 5 involves increases in proxy measures (Course Experience Questionnaire and Graduate Destination Survey results) for teaching performance within Swinburne's teaching programs, as determined by surveys of recent graduates. In these surveys, graduates respond to questions concerning their perceptions of their learning experience within their teaching program at Swinburne, plus their employment and/or further study outcomes post graduation. Based on Aim 5, the PDR standard teaching metrics will include a measure based on the CEQ and GDS. As teaching programs are delivered by teams of academics, this is predominantly a 'group measure' related to graduate outcomes.

Aim 6 relates more generally to enhancing the provision of a quality educational experience through innovation and excellence. The associated discussion in the *Swinburne in 2015* vision paper relates this to the performance of excellent teachers, together with innovation through implementation of initiatives such as the Swinburne Professional Learning Model.

A commonly used proxy measure for excellent teaching by individual teaching staff involves the outcomes of student surveys on teaching. For the PDR process, the Swinburne Student Feedback on Teaching (SFT) survey results will be used as the basis for the second standard teaching metric. As the SFT seeks student feedback on teaching by individual staff members, this represents an 'individual measure' related to teaching excellence.

Aim 6 also relates to effective teaching innovation – this aspect of Aim 6 will be discussed in Section 3.2 on individualised measures below.

3.1.1 The GDS/CEQ Standard Teaching Metric

Defining the GDS/CEQ Standard Teaching Metric

The **Graduate Destination Survey (GDS)** is administered to recent graduates across Australia and includes questions to recent graduates on

- Full time employment status, and
- Further full or part time study status.

Industry links and graduate employability outcomes are central aspects of the public image of Swinburne, but Swinburne graduate employment rates are not always as strong across all our undergraduate programs as that reputation might imply. Achieving strong graduate outcomes across all Swinburne disciplines is very important to the success of SUT and therefore a vital component within the *Swinburne in 2015* measures.

Further study rates for Swinburne graduates are also relatively low compared to those for other institutions. While there are some obvious reasons for this, including the strong take-up of Swinburne graduates by their IBL/IP employers, it doesn't necessarily sit well with our need to develop lifelong study skills in our graduates in order for them to maintain currency in their professions. More specifically from Swinburne's point of view, it is in our interests to promote further study options to our graduates, both in our coursework programs and as research higher degree candidature within our research specialisations.

Therefore the standard GDS/CEQ teaching measure to be used in the PDR will use the GDS full time employment and further full/part time study results for all the students in undergraduate program families related to a staff member's discipline group.

The **Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)**, also administered to recent graduates across Australia in conjunction with the GDS, contains a number of questions concerning graduates perceptions of their learning experience. Of those, percentage broad agreement for three groups of questions are used for the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF) and will also be used here. They provide measures of graduates' perceptions of

- Generic skills attainment (composite of responses concerning team skills, analytic & problem solving skills, written communications, ability to tackle unfamiliar problems, ability to plan work independently),
- Good teaching (composite of responses concerning providing comments feedback on progress, motivation to do best work; ability to explain things, make subjects interesting, & understand student difficulties), and
- Overall satisfaction.

When deciding how best to include CEQ survey results within a standard PDR teaching metric, use of a relatively large sample aids statistical comparisons of outcomes from year to year, and also makes sense in cases where staff teach across several programs within a Faculty. Therefore, the sample used will be the CEQ results for a whole Faculty, for both undergraduate and coursework postgraduate programs.

Both the GDS and CEQ measures outlined above are time lagged. For example, GDS/CEQ survey results available late in the current year apply to graduates from the previous year, and aspects of their learning experience that influence GDS/CEQ outcomes may be spread across several years of their study at Swinburne. This is a similar situation to the time lagged aspects of research measures, and probably unavoidable, although it does highlight the need for a concerted whole of program approach to improving graduate outcomes.

In summary and consistent with *Swinburne in 2015* Aim 5, the GDS/CEQ standard teaching metric to be used in the PDR will be an equally weighted combination of five components, based on the percentage of broad agreement to questions on

- full time employment (GDS)*
- further full/part time study (GDS)*
- generic skills attainment (CEQ)**
- good teaching (CEQ)**
- overall satisfaction (CEQ)**

*Graduate Destination Survey results aggregated at the level of broad program family (undergraduate only).

**Course Experience Survey results for undergraduates and postgraduates, aggregated to Faculty level.

Table 2 *GDS/CEQ Standard Teaching Metric*

The GDS/CEQ standard teaching metric as described above is clearly a group measure of learning and teaching outcomes. Graduate outcomes and graduates' satisfaction with their learning experience are holistic measures based on their whole study program and experiences while at Swinburne. The impact a single staff member may be able to make

within an individual unit of study may be limited, however independent of the year and program level at which individuals teach, members of discipline teams can and do collaborate to make a difference to Swinburne's GDS and CEQ results.

For example, discipline teaching teams implement Professional Learning Model approaches within their particular teaching programs designed to strengthen employability/further study outcomes and graduate satisfaction. These include curriculum updates to maintain program currency in the workplace, undertaking supervisory visits for student placements in industry, undergraduate and honours project supervision, sourcing industry speakers and clients for capstone projects, seeking out and responding to student feedback on teaching programs, giving students feedback on their generic skills development, leading and/or promoting study tour options, actively promoting graduate research pathways and further study options, work in support of professional accreditation of programs, taking part in professional development to strengthen teaching skills and widen teaching approaches, and providing final year students with discipline-based career advice.

Setting Performance Measures using the GDS/CEQ Standard Teaching Metric

Using the five point scale system (outstanding, exceeds expectations, meets expectations etc), the GDS/CEQ standard teaching metric should be used in to set Performance Measures for academic staff with teaching responsibilities as follows:

Role	Theme	Performance Objective	Weighting (10% minimum)	Performance Measure
Academics with teaching responsibilities	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Contribute to the overall increase in the performance of the Faculty with regard to the student experience and student outcomes.	Normally between 10% – 20%, must be included	GDS/CEQ Standard Teaching Metric* relevant to Faculty and Broad Program Family <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at or above national average* (= <i>Meets Expectations</i>) - above national average plus at least 1 percentage point increase on previous year (= <i>Exceeds Expectations</i>) - at least a quarter of a standard deviation above national average plus at least 1 percentage point increase on previous year (= <i>Outstanding</i>)

Table 3 Setting GDS/CEQ Standard Teaching Performance Measures

*As supplied by Strategic Planning and Quality (SPQ). 'National average' refers to the comparable GDS/CEQ metric based on national (unadjusted) data for Australian universities.

3.1.2 The SFT Standard Teaching Metric

Defining the SFT Standard Teaching Metric

The Student Feedback on Teaching (SFT) survey was introduced in 2007 and is administered online to students enrolled in Swinburne units of study.

The SFT survey comprises 12 separate survey items (1 – 6 Likert scores) and three open-ended comment fields. The SFT survey item statements are largely based on those used in Australian Learning and Teaching Council teaching awards. The SFT statements are:

- This lecturer/tutor has a thorough knowledge of the subject
- This lecturer/tutor demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching in the subject area
- This lecturer/tutor communicates ideas clearly and effectively
- This lecturer/tutor teaches in a way that provides motivation and inspiration to learn
- This lecturer/tutor encourages me to use skills in analytical and critical thinking
- This lecturer/tutor provides engaging and relevant subject materials and resources
- This lecturer/tutor provides helpful feedback on my progress
- This lecturer/tutor makes the requirements for assessment clear
- This lecturer/tutor uses educational technology effectively to facilitate my learning
- This lecturer/tutor shows genuine concern for students
- This lecturer/tutor is willing to provide help and advice
- Overall, I am satisfied with this lecturer/tutors teaching in this subject.

The current approach proposes using the single overall mean satisfaction score as the standard metric. Responses to the survey so far have a high degree of commonality within the surveys' 12 survey items, and therefore it is proposed to use "*SFT overall mean satisfaction*", based on the average response to the above 12 statements, as the basis of the SFT standard teaching metric for the PDR.

Swinburne students rate their teachers very highly on average in the SFT, as would be expected given Swinburne's strong reputation for teaching quality, and our success in the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund. The average SFT overall mean satisfaction for Swinburne teaching staff is currently 4.95, on a scale of 1 to 6, with approximately 9% of staff scoring above 5.5 and only 7% of staff scoring below 4.2, and no clear differences between broad fields of discipline.

In summary and consistent with *Swinburne in 2015* Aim 6, the SFT standard teaching metric to be used in the PDR will be "SFT overall mean satisfaction" which is

- the average of the responses to the 12 SFT survey items (on a 1 – 6 Likert scale)
- calculated either as an average across all (surveyed) units taught by the staff member during the year, or for one particular unit of study as selected by the staff member's supervisor, in consultation with the staff member concerned.

Table 4 *SFT Standard Teaching Metric*

In contrast to the GDS/CEQ measure, the SFT standard teaching metric as defined above is predominantly an individual rather than a group measure. Swinburne Professional Learning offers support to teaching staff in improving their overall teaching outcomes through both structured and informal professional development activities, participation in the Professional Certificate of Teaching Practice and the Graduate Certificate of Teaching and Learning in

Higher Education, and, where requested by Faculties, individual coaching and feedback including classroom observations.

Setting Performance Measures using the SFT Standard Teaching Metric

Together with the GDS/CEQ metric, the SFT standard teaching metric should be used to set Performance Measures for academic staff with teaching responsibilities. Where teaching staff teach across more than one unit of study in the year, in consultation with the teaching staff member concerned the supervisor will decide whether to use the average SFT across all units taught **or** the average SFT for one particular unit. In the latter case, supervisors may wish to use the metric to set a tailored performance target to take into account a specific unit of study which needs special attention.

Examples of Performance Objectives and Measures using the SFT metric:

Role	Theme	Performance Objective	Weighting (10% minimum)	Performance Measure
Academics with teaching responsibilities	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Exhibit a high standard in teaching performance across all units taught	Typically between 10% – 40%, must be included	Personal SFT “overall mean satisfaction” on 1 to 6 Likert Scale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4.2 or above (= <i>Meets expectations</i>), - 5.2 or above (= <i>Exceeds expectations</i>), - 5.5 or above (= <i>Outstanding</i>)
Academics with teaching responsibilities	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Improve SFT rating in a low performing unit of study	Typically between 10% – 40%, must be included	Personal SFT “overall mean satisfaction” on 1 to 6 Likert Scale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase previous year’s average by at least 0.5 (= <i>Meets expectations</i>), - 5.2 or above (= <i>Exceeds expectations</i>), - 5.5 or above (= <i>Outstanding</i>)
Educational leadership position (eg Deputy Dean, EDC, ADA...)	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Model good teaching practice across all units taught	Typically between 10% – 40%, must be included	Personal SFT “overall mean satisfaction” on 1 to 6 Likert Scale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - above 4.9 (= <i>Meets expectations</i>), - 5.2 or above (= <i>Exceeds expectations</i>) - 5.5 or above (= <i>Outstanding</i>)

Table 5 Setting SFT Standard Teaching Performance Measures

3.2 Individualised Learning & Teaching Measures

The PDR Performance Plans for academics who teach into Swinburne's teaching programs will typically include objectives that have individualized measures, as well as the standard teaching metrics discussed earlier. This is particularly appropriate for objectives which recognise contributions to Teaching Scholarship and Innovation.

Objectives related to Leadership & Engagement in Learning and Teaching will be discussed in Section 5.

Some examples of individualised performance objectives and measures follow. In setting individualised performance objectives, the challenges include the need to set targets that are not just achieved/not achieved, do not rely solely on the staff member holding a particular role, and, for relatively open-ended objectives, require the supervisor and staff member to agree on how specific to be concerning differences in performance between 'meets/exceeds expectations/outstanding'.

The following Table shows examples of some possible individualised Performance Objectives, Weights and Measures related to learning and teaching.

Role	Theme	Performance Objective	Weighting	Possible Measure
Academic with Teaching Responsibilities	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Contribute to the advancement of teaching scholarship in the faculty.	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular participation in faculty learning and teaching events, present a seminar/workshop in the faculty based on personal innovation or scholarship = (<i>Meets expectations</i>) assessment of seminar/workshop outcome conducted by EDC and DD (including exit survey of participants) = (<i>Exceeds expectations</i> → <i>Outstanding</i>)
Research and Teaching Academic	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Contribute to internationalisation of the curriculum within Faculty programs	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design and lead new Study Tour option, evaluate outcomes, provide report to Academic Committee, positive result = (<i>Meets expectations</i>) Feedback, evaluation and report = (<i>Exceeds expectations</i> → <i>Outstanding</i>)

Role	Theme	Performance Objective	Weighting	Possible Measure
Deputy Dean	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Increase student load in Summer and Winter Terms	10%	<p>Increase student participation across the Faculty's offerings in Summer and Winter Terms. (from ## in 2008)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 30% increase overall = <i>(Meets expectations)</i> At least 30% increase in summer and 30% increase in winter = <i>(Exceeds expectations)</i> At least 50% increase in summer and 50% increase in winter = <i>(Outstanding)</i>
Academic Development Advisor	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Supporting Faculty staff in developing and submitting Australian Learning & Teaching Council grant/citation/awards submissions and other scholarship activities	20%	<p>Number of Faculty grants submissions and citation/awards submissions forwarded to ALTC increased to at least 4, educational development papers submitted (journal or conference) in collaboration with Faculty and/or SPL staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 4 ALTC submissions, 2 papers submitted = <i>(Meets expectations)</i> At least 2 ALTC submissions successful, 2 papers accepted = <i>(Exceeds expectations)</i> At least 3 ALTC submissions successful, 3 papers accepted = <i>(Outstanding)</i>
Curriculum Project Officer	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Developing and submitting Australian Learning & Teaching Council grant submission in collaboration with other universities	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EOI developed, collaboration with other universities established, EOI approved for submission to ALTC = <i>(Meets expectations)</i> EOI selected for development as full proposal = <i>(Exceeds expectations)</i> Proposal funded by ALTC = <i>(Outstanding)</i>
Research and Teaching Academic	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Contribute to pathways to research within Faculty programs	20%	<p>Develop and promote research-linked capstone project topic(s), supervise project(s) for at least ## final year students = <i>(Meets expectations)</i></p> <p>Outcomes in terms of student feedback, intended enrolment in higher degree study = <i>(Exceeds expectations → Outstanding)</i></p>

Role	Theme	Performance Objective	Weighting	Possible Measure
EDC, ADA	Flexible in Learning and Teaching	Developing and submitting Australian Learning & Teaching Council grant submission in collaboration with other universities	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EOI developed, collaboration with other universities established, EOI approved for submission to ALTC = <i>(Meets expectations)</i> EOI selected for development as full proposal = <i>(Exceeds expectations)</i> Proposal funded by ALTC = <i>(Outstanding)</i>

Table 6 *Setting Individualised Learning and Teaching Performance Measures*

Note that the Objectives, Weights and Measures in Table 6 above are indicative examples only.

4. RESEARCH

The research component of the PDR will be assessed across three dimensions:

- Research Activity
- Research Quality
- Research Training

These dimensions have been developed through discussion with key stakeholders and due reference to:

- The SUT 2015 Statement of Direction
- The Forthcoming Federal Government ERA initiative
- Practise within the Higher Education community.

Performance against each dimension is measured with reference to one or more measures.

Given the range of research activity, it is not possible or desirable to fully specify how an individual academic should be scored for a particular measure. In broad terms, this document provides a benchmark for 'expected performance' against which the PDR Manager should assess the reviewed staff member.

The final classification for each dimension will be a qualitative assessment against the benchmark, taking into account particular circumstances and domain knowledge not explicitly allowed for within the benchmark. The PDR Manager will be accountable at the subsequent roundtable discussion for the classifications given to each staff member.

4.1 Guidelines

Selection of measures and the resulting assessment of performance will be through joint agreement between an academic and their PDR manager.

4.1.1 Teaching and Research Staff

Whilst teaching and research staff can allocate a percentage for the two components of teaching and research as a total of their performance, the measures contained for research are all weighted equally. Early Career Academics (as per the ARC definition) should move towards fulfilling the definition in *Research Activity* and must have a PD&R plan that reflects this objective.

Research Activity is a mandatory performance dimension for all non teaching-only academic staff. Additionally,

Level B staff must choose one further dimension

Level C staff must choose one further dimension

Level D staff must choose both further dimensions

Level E staff must choose both further dimensions, plus appropriate research components from the Leadership and Engagement category*.

*In the case of Level E staff who are also program coordinators, the individualised Leadership and Engagement objective may concern either their research or their program coordinator roles.

4.1.2 Research Only Staff

Are expected to report against each of the research dimensions at the appropriate academic level. Note that *Research Active* is a hurdle requirement for all research only staff. Such staff who do not meet expected performance levels for this indicator will not be eligible for performance rewards based on their research performance.

4.2 Model Summary

(1)	(2)
<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Measure</i>
1. Activity	Swinburne Research Active Definition (annualised)
2. Quality	Publication in highly ERA-ranked journals Success in NCG
3. Training	Supervision and Mentoring

4.2.1 Research Activity

Objective: To improve research activity

Measure: Annualised Swinburne University of Technology Research Active Definition

Description: SUT adopted a definition of Research Active in preparation for the RQF. This definition was based on best practise at other institutions and looked at performance over a five year period. The Research Activity measure used for the PDR process has modified this measure to suit annual-performance evaluation objectives.

Benchmark Calculation:

Research activity	Indicative Component Value
<p>Published at least 1 pro-rated item in the year that satisfies the requirement for DEEWR publication classification as a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Research Book ■ Chapter in Research Book ■ Refereed Journal Article ■ Refereed Conference Paper (low acceptance rate conferences only) ■ Major Recorded original work ■ Major Published original work ■ Major exhibition ■ Solo Exhibition of Original Art ■ Curated group exhibition or juried award exhibition ■ Patents <p>Each item is weighted according to the DEEWR convention (a sole authored book for example counts as 5 items)</p>	0.5 per item
One new external research grant from a scheme listed on the Australian Competitive Grants Register	0.5
New external research income won worth at least their workload adjusted faculty benchmark dollars per annum	0.5 per multiple of the lower bound of the benchmark annual income levels stated below.
Supervision to successful completion of at least 1 RHD student (or for ECR academics, successful timely supervisions of at least 2 FTE RHD students – see research training dimension below)	0.5

Expected indicative levels of performance for an academic with a 25% research workload:

	Level B	Level C	Level D	Level E
Performance Level	0.5	1	1.5	2

These indicative levels of performance need to be adjusted to allow for workload and ECR status.

National comparisons, current levels of performance within SUT, and modelling indicate that reasonable benchmarks for the average PhD qualified academic to be rated as achieving 'expected levels of performance' are the following annual research incomes *per year*:

Biosciences and Biotechnology: \$39,000 - \$65,000

Engineering and Environment: \$43,000 - \$73,000

Humanities and Creative Arts: \$30,000 - \$51,000

Math, ICT: \$35,000 - \$59,000

Physics, Chemistry, GeoSciences: \$40,000 - \$67,000

Social Behavioural, Economics: \$30,000 - \$51,000

These benchmark statistics are based in part on the aggregated performance of academic staff at all Australian Universities (excluding those with a Medical School). These figures therefore include both research-only and teaching/research academics (with a consequent estimated weighted average research component workload of 32.5%). Meaningful benchmarks must take account of this by applying an appropriate multiplier depending on the workload model for the academic.

Example 1: Dr J Bloggs has a research workload component of 25% and publishes 2 DEEWR (2 x 0.5 points) publications, and wins one benchmark-consistent competitive grant (0.5 points). This calculates to 1.5. Given there were no special circumstances, and Bloggs is a level D, she was deemed to have met expected performance standards.

Example 2: Dr Smith is a research only level C academic. He has written (pro-rated) 3 papers, and won (pro-rated) new competitive research income of \$200k, a record for his sub-discipline. His research active score is 2.5 (2 papers, a NCG, and income of 2x the workload adjusted benchmark for his discipline), which is below the expected value of 4.0 for a research only level C. However, the major grant win was clearly the result of above average research activity and despite his low score relative to the benchmark, his PDR manager rated him as exceptional performance on this measure and argued for that at the subsequent round-table.

Example 3: Professor Jones is "maxed out" of applying for national competitive grants and is also fully committed to managing existing industry funded projects. She has written 0.5 of a paper published in Management Science (an A* Journal), and had no research students graduate this year (four graduated the previous year). She has spent significant time mentoring other staff to apply for grants, and is demonstrably a leader in her discipline. Although she falls some way short of the indicative benchmark on performance this year, the mitigating circumstances which precluded application for funds, together with her indirect involvement in the grant activities of others, persuaded her PDR mentor to rank her performance as being of the 'expected' level.

4.2.2 Research Quality

Objective: Ensure research activity is directed at high quality deliverables.

Measure: An assessment of quantitative quality-related research statistics

Description: The generally accepted measures of research quality are:

- Publication in quality research outlets, such as ERA A* or A ranked journals
- Success in nationally competitive grant schemes, or equivalent

Benchmarks:

The figures below are based on a typical 25% research workload.

A* and A ERA Publications: The current national statistics indicate that the average PhD qualified academic publishes approximately 2.2 papers per year. Since around 20-25% of publication outlets are expected to be classified as A* or A, the typical performance in this category should be about 0.4-0.5 pro-rated papers per year.

NCG Success: National comparisons, current SUT performance levels, and modelling indicate that the average PhD qualified academic obtains the following annual national competitive grant incomes *per year*:

Biosciences and Biotechnology: \$16,000 - \$27,000

Engineering and Environment: \$18,000 - \$30,000

Humanities and Creative Arts: \$12,000 - \$21,000

Math, ICT: \$14,000 - \$24,000

Physics, Chemistry, GeoSciences: \$16,000 - \$28,000

Social Behavioural, Economics: \$12,000 - \$21,000

Success grants with annualised income at these levels is thus an indicator of 'expected' performance.

The benchmark statistics for ERA ranked publications and NCG Success are based on the aggregated performance of academic staff at all Australian Universities (excluding those with a Medical School). These figures therefore include both research-only and teaching/research academics (with a consequent estimated weighted average research component workload of 32.5%). Meaningful benchmarks must take account of this by applying an appropriate multiplier depending on the workload model for the academic.

Example 1: A research-only business academic publishes 1 A* article and gains a 3 year NCG worth \$100,000 per annum. Her quality publications output level is a little below expected, and her grant success is above the benchmark. Overall she has reached the expected levels of performance in this measure.

Example 2. An engineering academic with a 25% research workload publishes one A article and gets no NCG awarded this year. This is the first A or A* article the academic has published. Although they have not met the criteria for research income under this measure,

the PDR manager rates their performance as 'expected', and argues that at the subsequent round-table.

Example 3: A computer science academic with a 25% research workload gets a new ARC linkage grant for \$30,000 a year, but does not publish in an A or A* outlet. She does, however, win a 'best paper' award at her conference, which has a moderate 20% acceptance rate. Her PDR manager qualitatively assesses her performance over the year and assesses she is performing at about expected levels.

4.2.3 Research Training

Objective: Ensure research training is effective and of high quality

Measure: An assessment of quantitative research training statistics, moderated by an assessment of staff-mentoring activities

Description: The generally accepted measures of training quality are:

- Research Higher Degree Completions
- Research Higher Degree Load
- Average Time to Completion

Benchmarks:

The figures below are based on a typical 25% research workload.

A typical PhD qualified academic has the following research training profile:

- Completions: averages 0.2-0.25 per year
- Load: 3 FTE
- Average time to completion: 3.5 – 4.0 years

These benchmark statistics are based on the aggregated performance of academic staff at all Australian Universities (excluding those with a Medical School). These figures therefore include both research-only and teaching/research academics (with a consequent estimated weighted average research component workload of 32.5%). Meaningful benchmarks must take account of this by applying an appropriate multiplier depending on the workload model for the academic.

When considering the HDR load for an academic, only the net timely candidatures (those within the four years of FTE enrolment) should be counted. For example, an academic with an HDR load of 7 FTE, with 2 of them beyond the timely candidature limit, would have a load of 5 (ie. $7-2=5$) for the purposes of this metric.

Also, when considering this dimension, due account must be taken of the annual review reports for supervised HDR students. An above expected performance rating would require all HDR students to have received appropriate supervision.

Adherence to the supervision quality and monitoring provisions in the University RHD Policy for all supervised students is mandatory for expected (and above) levels of performance.

Example 1: Dr Watson has a high supervisory load of 8 FTE students but 4 of these are not timely. Three of these RHD students have been “on the verge” of submission for at least a year. Although the FTE load is at above expected levels, the inability to convert to completions is deemed significant by the PDR Manager and as a consequence Watson's performance on this measure is not rated as satisfactory.

Example 2: Dr Elliott is an ECR. He has had no completions to date, but has actively taken on new RHD students, in order to build up his profile. The annual reviews of Elliott's supervised students have not revealed any issues in regards to supervision. Elliott is ranked as performing at the ‘expected’ levels by the PDR Manager.

5. LEADERSHIP & ENGAGEMENT

Leadership & Engagement is a critical component for all staff and therefore all are encouraged to include an objective in this category. Research only staff and Level E teaching and research staff are required to include an individualised leadership & engagement measure in their performance plan. See below for examples:

Learning & Teaching Leadership & Engagement

- Program co-ordination
- Providing mentorship
- Centre/Group leadership
- Committee work
- Member, working group
- Specific projects
- Internationalisation activities
- Developing Professional Learning Model/Curriculum innovations
- Running or presenting at Professional Development sessions
- Working with schools, industry and/or Government
- Regional development
- Professional associations
- Consulting for University benefit
- Industry Based Learning
- Indigenous/social justice involvement
- Conference organisation
- Press spokesperson
- Internal and external reviews

Research Leadership & Engagement

To ensure staff are appropriately recognised for research service the PDR allows for qualitative assessment of **active** engagement in the leadership of research.

Research leadership can be demonstrated in numerous ways. For example:

- Active membership or chair of Faculty research committees (including Ethics Committees)

- Active membership or chair of University research committees or sub-committees (including Ethics Committees)
- Editors-in-Chief, co-editors or membership of the editorial board of a publication that would be considered eligible for ERA or HERDC collections
- Active membership of Boards of Management or other governance structures of organisations involved with research both within or external to the University
- Invited keynote addresses at significant national or international research conferences
- Leadership of a research team
- Active mentoring of research-junior staff, including grant support
- Successful collaboration with industry
- Successful tenders/research contracts

The PDR Manager must apply their contextual and domain knowledge to assess the reviewed academic relative to the Faculty cohort. Emphasis must be on active involvement on relevant areas rather than 'cv building'. The PDR Manager must also take into account:

- Complexity of the task
- Relative benefit to the institution rather than the academic. Activities which provide greater value to the institution rather than the academic themselves should adequately reflected in the assessment given

6. SWINBURNE BEHAVIOURS

Every employee's Performance Plan will incorporate a Swinburne Behaviour's performance objective with a minimum of 10%. Behaviours are the guiding principles that determine how we achieve our outcomes as individuals and as an organisation. The behaviours against which you will be assessed are: Teamwork & Collaboration, Personal Integrity and Leading & Innovating (see the draft Academic Guidelines for further information).

Objective: Achieve performance objectives listed above while exhibiting SUT behaviours: Teamwork & collaboration, Personal integrity, Leading & innovating

Sample measure: Observed contribution to teamwork and innovations within Faculty Academic Committee, assessed by Dean and Deputy Dean. Active participation in Faculty and University-wide activities.

7. SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

7.1 For teaching & research staff

i) Behaviours objective (10 to 20%)

- choose from sample objectives and measures as appropriate for academic staff or write your own in collaboration with supervisor

ii) One GDS/CEQ Learning & Teaching objective (between 10% and 20%)

- standard for all teaching staff

iii) One SFT Learning & Teaching objective (between 10% and 40%)

- standard measure for all teaching staff, objective can vary

iv) The Research Activity objective (10% min)

- standard measures and objective for all staff as per research performance matrix

Additionally, from the following 2 standard Research objectives:

1) Research Quality

2) Research Training

Level B and C staff must choose one further measure/objective

Level D staff must choose both further measures/objectives

Level E staff must choose both further measures/objectives and an individualised objective from the Leadership and Engagement category*

AND the option of including:

v) One or more individualised objectives from the following categories:

- Flexible in Learning & Teaching

- Leadership & Engagement

Teaching and research staff who are program coordinators and/or unit convenors should include at least one individualised Flexible in Learning & Teaching objective or individualised Leadership & Engagement objective concerning this role.*

Choose from sample objectives and measures or write your own in collaboration with manager.

*In the case of Level E staff who are also program coordinators, the individualised Leadership and Engagement objective may concern either their research or their program coordinator roles.

7.2 For research only staff

i) Behaviours objective (10% to 20%)

- choose from sample objectives and measures as appropriate for academic staff or write your own in collaboration with supervisor.

ii) Each of the following 3 standard objectives (min 10%)

- a) Research Activity (hurdle requirement)
- b) Research Quality
- c) Research Training

iii) One or more individualised objectives on Leadership & Engagement (min 10%)

Choose from sample research objective and measure or write your own in collaboration with manager.

7.3 For teaching only staff

i) Behaviours objective (10 to 20%)

- choose from sample objectives and measures as appropriate for academic staff or write your own in collaboration with supervisor.

ii) One GDS/CEQ Learning & Teaching objective (between 10% and 20%)

- standard for all teaching staff.

iii) One SFT Learning & Teaching objective (between 10% and 40%)

- standard measure for all teaching staff, objective can vary.

iv) Two or more individualised objectives from the following categories:

- Flexible in Learning & Teaching (at least 10%)
- Leadership & Engagement (at least 10%)

Teaching only staff who are program coordinators should include at least one individualised Leadership & Engagement objective concerning their coordinator role

Teaching only staff who are unit convenors should include at least one Flexible in Learning & Teaching objective concerning their convenor role.

8. CONCLUSION

The PDR objectives and measures described in this document will be reviewed by the PDR Steering Committee at the end of the 2009 PDR Trial Period on the basis of feedback from academic staff members and their supervisors.

For further information or with feedback comments, please contact:

Learning & Teaching

David Rutherford, drutherford@swin.edu.au, 9214 4801

Research

Sharon Kitt, skitt@swin.edu.au, 9214 5211

PDR Project Enquiries

Elise Green, egreen@swin.edu.au, 9214 5142
www.swin.edu.au/pdr

APPENDIX – Sample Development Activities

The Personal Development plan is an integral component of the PDR process and a sample of Development Activities are outlined below:

- Conference attendance (educational conference related to Faculty discipline)
- Progress PhD study
- Successfully complete at least one unit in Graduate Certificate in Teaching & Learning in Higher Education
- Participate in professional development program on Improving the Student Experience
- Successfully complete HR leadership training
- Attend Australian Learning & Teaching Council symposium related to assigned curriculum renewal Project
- Attend Discipline specific conference/workshop/seminars to ensure discipline knowledge is up to date
- Participate in mentoring program
- Successfully complete at least two units in Diploma/ Graduate Certificate in Sustainability
- Visit ECIU partner university known for curriculum innovation