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Abstract

Australian and New Zealand universities have developed increasingly sophisticated meta-policy, that is, ‘policy on policy’ or policy framework statements, to articulate university policy development, review and management processes. In part, this development represents a response to growing government accountability and transparency agendas and higher education sector quality and regulation requirements. University meta-policy invariably covers a broad spectrum of issues including range and application of policy instruments, policy classification schemes, approval authorities and policy cycles. Australian and more recently New Zealand universities have focused considerable effort on the development of policy infrastructure including meta-policy, online policy repositories, and the collation and consistent presentation of university policy documentation. Comprehensive suites of governance, academic and administrative policy documentation are now available online from almost all Australian and New Zealand universities. The increasingly regulated university environment – in particular the requirement to evidence policy implementation in Australia, and policy and practice legality/ethics in New Zealand, provides renewed impetus for considering emerging policy management models.

Introduction

This paper examines the regulatory drivers for Australian and New Zealand university policy process and identifies the key characteristics of Australian and New Zealand university meta-policy, that is, ‘policy on policy’. The vexed place of local policy and documentation supporting the implementation of formal university policy instruments is explored. This paper examines emerging models for strategic policy management, and the policy cycle reflected in university meta-policy. Specific policy cycle stages are explored in particular including evaluation, review and development. Comprehensive suites of polices are housed in online policy repositories. Genuine consultation with policy stakeholders, building policy capacity, and nurturing networks are ongoing challenges for policy managers. This paper builds on presentations at Association for Tertiary Education Management (ATEM) national policy forums in June and October 2012 in Melbourne, Australia (Freeman, 2012a; Freeman, 2012b), and discussions with New Zealand policy practitioners from the University of Waikato, WINTEC (Waikato Institute of Technical Education), University of Auckland, Otago Polytechnic and Otago University in New Zealand in December 2012 (Freeman, 2012c).

Australian university sector accountability and regulatory framework

The Australian tertiary education sector includes 40 publicly funded, self-accrediting universities including three private universities (Bond University, The University of Notre Dame Australia and MCD University), and two international universities (University College London and Carnegie Mellon University). The sector also includes other self-accrediting tertiary education providers such as the Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education and a large number of state and territory accredited providers including public Technical and Further Education (TAFE) institutes and private providers. In addition to vocational education and training (VET) programs, some of these non-university providers deliver undergraduate degrees, and postgraduate coursework and research programs. The Commonwealth government sector regulator maintains a National Register of Tertiary Providers.
The present Australian university policy landscape may be re-traced to the fundamental changes introduced by John Dawkins, the then Commonwealth Education Minister (1987-1992). The *Higher education: a policy discussion paper* (Dawkins, 1987) and subsequent *Higher education: a policy statement* (Dawkins, 1988) initiated reforms to the Australian university sector to drive increased participation and produce efficiencies of scale. The reforms included the abolition of the binary divide and subsequent amalgamation of Colleges of Advanced Education (CAEs) and universities, the introduction of the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS), and New Public Management requirements for increased institutional transparency and accountability. Universities were required to establish documentation to support education profile negotiations tied to Commonwealth funding, and review governance arrangements. These reforms spurred the development of university strategic plans and formally articulated policy documentation, and encouraged the establishment of legislative compliance and internal audit units. As a direct result of these developments, all Australian universities have suites of governance, academic and administrative policy, and to greater or lesser extents, legislation-compliance, quality and risk management focused activities.

More recently, the Commonwealth abolished the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) and introduced a new tertiary sector regulator. The Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA) was proposed in *Transforming Australia’s Higher Education System* (2009), the government’s response to the Bradley review of Australia’s higher education system (*Review of Australian Higher Education: Final Report*, 2008). The TEQSA Act 2011 embedded a risk-based and proportionate regulatory approach whereby a provider’s history and risk profile - including internal quality assurance mechanisms and financial considerations - influence the exercise of TEQSA power. Arguably most if not all Australian universities represent relatively lower risk than other tertiary sector providers (Shah, 2012) however all providers are obliged to comply with TEQSA regulation. The release of the Commonwealth’s legislative instruments, the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2011*, confirmed the central role of university meta-policy and policy management systems in quality and compliance frameworks. The *Provider Registration Standards* – which form one plank of the Threshold Standards – explicitly require that Australian tertiary provider’s ‘corporate and academic governance arrangements demonstrate: the effective development, implementation and review of policies for all aspects of the tertiary provider’s academic activities’ (p. 4). Despite the regulator’s risk proportionality approach, all tertiary providers must demonstrate compliance with the Threshold Standards. In at least some instances, universities have responded that they already have in place the fundamentals to demonstrate compliance with the Threshold Standards: ‘The Threshold Standards do not in themselves require the University to embark on new initiatives, at least at a substantive level, as it already has in place an elaborate matrix of policies and other mechanisms which further its objects, as reflected in its enabling legislation and in the expectations of its constituents’ (Penman, 2012, p. 1).

However, recent TEQSA briefings revealed that TEQSA will explicitly require, with respect to university policies and processes ‘evidence of implementation; evidence of (a) review schedule; evidence of approval processes …; (and) evidence of development and improvement over time’ (Fitzgibbon & Treloar, 2013, n.p.). TEQSA will also explicitly require ‘evidence of active benchmarking (and) formalised benchmarking relationships’ (ibid., n.p.). TEQSA’s requirement for articulated approval processes can readily be accommodated in existing university meta-policy, and generic policy review resources are available to support the preparation of policy review schedules. However, TEQSA’s requirement for evidence of policy implementation, improvement and benchmarking will fundamentally change the policy management function from co-ordinating policy ‘development’ to ‘implementing, reviewing, improving and benchmarking’. This will also require a shift towards policy-compliance and implementation-focused activities. These latter requirements – implementation, review, benchmarking - represent quality-related stages of sophisticated university policy cycles (Freeman, 2010). As such, there is renewed impetus for considering policy management in this increasingly regulated environment.
New Zealand tertiary sector accountability requirements enshrined in performance commitments

The New Zealand Education Act 1989 identifies tertiary education organisations (TEOs), principally including the eight New Zealand universities, 18 Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs) and three Māori wānanga spanning numerous campuses, including Te Wānanga o Raukawa, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi and Te Wānanga o Aotearoa. Under the New Zealand Education Act 1989 a polytechnic ‘is characterised by a wide diversity of continuing education, including vocational training, that contributes to the maintenance, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge and expertise and promotes community learning, and by research, particularly applied and technological research, that aids development’ (section 162[4][b][ii]). Wānanga are ‘characterised by teaching and research that maintains, advances, and disseminates knowledge and develops intellectual independence, and assists the application of knowledge regarding āhuatanga Māori (Māori tradition) according to tikanga Māori (Māori custom)’ (section 162[4][b][iv]).

New Zealand tertiary education organisations (TEOs) must comply with government legislation and obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi – the founding document regarding governance of Aotearoa New Zealand signed between Māori (chiefs) and the British Crown in 1840. A few New Zealand universities have established policies to frame organisational approaches to legislative compliance, such as the Victoria University of Wellington Legislative Compliance Policy (2011), and University of Auckland Legislative Compliance Policy (2007). Accountability requirements for New Zealand tertiary education organisations are articulated as performance commitments in Investment Plans negotiated with the New Zealand Tertiary Education Commission. The Tertiary Education Commission monitors governance, and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) monitors quality through external review processes. NZQA Tertiary Evaluation Indicators explicitly require that tertiary education organisations ensure that ‘policies and practices are legal and ethical’ (2010, pp. 24-25). The concept of ‘legal and ethical’ policies and practices is linked to harm-minimisation strategies and complaints processes by NZQA on the basis that ‘legal and ethical practice protects internal and external stakeholders’ (p. 25).

Table 1: Tertiary Education Indicators (New Zealand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME INDICATOR</th>
<th>WHY THE INDICATOR IS IMPORTANT</th>
<th>SOME PROMPTS TO AID EVALUATIVE CONVERSATIONS</th>
<th>EVIDENCE COULD INCLUDE</th>
<th>BACKGROUND INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies and practices are legal and ethical</td>
<td>Legal and ethical practice protects internal and external stakeholders</td>
<td>How does the TEO know it is meeting its legal and ethical obligations? What are the mechanisms for ensuring that the TEO complies with all legal requirements? How well is the TEO maintaining its compliance with legal requirements and how does it know how well it is doing this? How do staff and management actively seek to avoid harm to students? How do management and staff identify and understand appropriate ethical behaviour?</td>
<td>The use of steps and measures in place aimed at the “avoidance of harm” e.g. principles, professional codes of practice / conduct, professional development activities, case study or critical incident follow-up. The use of complaints processes for dealing with incidents. Any records of evaluation of the efficacy of complaint processes. Absence of incidents featuring behaviour that may be, or are, harmful to others.</td>
<td>The Baldridge Criteria of Education Excellence has identified legal and ethical behaviour as an important part of educational leadership (Baldridge, 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New Zealand Qualifications Authority 2010, Tertiary Education Indicators, pp. 24-25.

In some instances, university policy is explicitly aligned to government legislation to evidence legislative-compliance. For example the Victoria University of Wellington Policy Documentation Development Information states that ‘a robust Policy Framework … ensures that policy documentation supports the University community in complying with New Zealand (NZ) legislation’ (2007, p. 2). In other instances, evidence of policy-compliance is actively pursued - that is, evidence of compliant policy implementation. For example, using an audit-based approach the University of Waikato has introduced an initiative that requires that policy stakeholders formally confirm, by way of brief survey and signature, compliance with university administrative policy. Conversely, using an education-based approach, the University of Auckland Establishment of a policy within the University of Auckland procedure document clearly indicates that ‘the obligations to comply inherent in a policy are to constitute the core message of the document and need to be
concise and clear so as to determine consequences of a failure to adhere to a policy’ (2010, p. 2). The accountability, compliance, policy and audit agendas continue to coalesce in New Zealand as in Australia.

**Australian university meta-policy**

Meta-policy is ‘policy on policymaking, that is, policy dealing with the characteristics of the policymaking system’ (Dror, 1971, p. 3). The majority of Australian universities (26 of 40) have formal university meta-policy referred to variously as a ‘policy on policy’ or ‘policy framework’. A small number have no such meta-policy but have procedures (four) or other types of instruments (four, including a rule, standard, protocol and manual) which are effectively meta-policy. Some universities (seven) have no publicly available, documented university meta-policy, however it could be anticipated that processes associated with policy development and approval are established given that these institutions publish policy online.

In Australia, university meta-policy establishes the overarching framework for the university’s policy process. For example, the University of Melbourne *Policy on Policy* ‘defines the range of … policy instruments; establishes a classification scheme for … policy instruments; defines the application of … policy instruments; specifies Approval Authorities for all … policy instruments and establishes the University Policy Development and Review Cycle’ (2012, p. 1). Not dissimilarly, the University of Wollongong *Standard on UOW Policy* aims to ‘establish a consistent and enforceable system for the development, approval, implementation and review of policy documents … (and) provide a mechanism to ensure that policy documents are compliant with the strategic direction of the University and with relevant legislation’ (2007, n.p.). The *Standard on UOW Policy* defines the policy instruments - rules, codes, standards, guidelines, procedures - and positions them within a hierarchy, identifies approval authorities and establishes a policy cycle.

The analysis of existing Australian university meta-policy suggest that comprehensive meta-policy includes several key characteristics; it: defines university policy, establishes the range of university-specific policy instruments, specifies approval authorities, articulates policy cycle stages and defines the application of policy instruments. University meta-policy may also identify key policy categories as organising constructs for governance, academic and administrative policy published in policy repositories.

There is some considerable variation with respect to the manner in which Australian universities define ‘policy’. For example, on the one hand, the Swinburne University of Technology *Policy Framework* uses a concise definition: ‘A formal statement which gives effect to relevant University principles, values, procedures, requirements and strategic goals and improves the University’s risk management’ (2009, p. 2). On the other hand, Charles Darwin University, uses an extended definition:

> A Policy is a concise formal statement that outlines non-discretionary governing principles and intentions, in order to guide University practice. Policies are a formal statement of intent that mandate principles or standards that apply to the University’s governance or operations or to the practice and conduct of its staff and students. Those principles are derived from and shaped by: the law and regulations that govern the University; national standards and community expectations; and the values and mission the University articulates in its strategic plan. (2012, *Governance* web-page, n.p.)

In Australian university meta-policy the most frequently used range of policy instruments is ‘policies’, ‘procedures’ and ‘guidelines’. Diverging from this model, RMIT has recently amended their university meta-policy to introduce a new policy instrument - an ‘instruction’ - to complement policies and procedures. RMIT policy principles will be maintained in policy texts; high-level operational ‘rules’ will be located in procedures, and detailed process ‘rules’ will be located in ‘instructions’. As Australian university meta-policy is progressively reviewed, the location of policy principles and attendant processes may shift between policy instruments, or indeed between
policy and delegated legislation instruments. In some instances this will reflect the nimbleness or otherwise of high level university decision-making structures, and tension between requirements for overarching statements of principle and localised desire for more direction and specificity.

In terms of approval authorities, Australian university meta-policy articulates the approval authorities for policy documents; in the majority of cases the governing body (that is, the Council), the Vice-Chancellor (or other member of the senior executive) and Academic Board. In many instances, Australian university meta-policy is silent on approval authorities for lower-order policy instruments (that is, procedures and guidelines), and supporting local documentation. In a small number of cases, university meta-policy articulates a matrix detailing the category of policy (governance, administration, academic, or other as the case may be where approval authority varies by category) and type of policy instrument (policy, procedure, guideline), and local documentation. The level of detail illustrated in Table 2 may well be required to at least partly evidence policy approval processes for TEQSA.

Table 2: Approval authorities for university policy instruments and local documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF POLICY</th>
<th>POLICY INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>PROCEDURE APPROVAL AUTHORITY</th>
<th>GUIDELINE APPROVAL AUTHORITY</th>
<th>OTHER LOCAL DOCUMENT APPROVAL AUTHORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
<td>[identify approval authority]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, approval authorities located lower in the organisational structure or hierarchy, for example, heads of division and department are responsible for approving lower order policy instruments including procedures and guidelines (Freeman, 2010).

There is some considerable variation in the categorisation; for example the University of Queensland categorises policies under topics including: university organisation and governance; teaching and learning; research and research training; human resources; workplace health and safety; information and communication technology; physical facilities and services; financial management practices; sustainability and community and development activities. These categories could be broadly manipulated under the broader typography of ‘governance, academic and administrative’, or aligned with the three streams of university operations – teaching and learning, research, and third stream activities, frequently encompassing community engagement and development.

New Zealand university meta-policy

At least half of all New Zealand universities have university meta-policy, including the Otago University Policy Framework (2010), University of Auckland Establishment of a Policy Within the University of Auckland Procedure Document (2010), University of Canterbury Policies and Procedures Development and Review Policy (2012) and Victoria University of Wellington Policy Documentation Development Information (2007). It may well be that some of the remaining universities have formal documentation to support university policy process given that most of these institutions publish policy online; however such documentation does not appear to be publicly available via their university web-sites.

New Zealand university meta-policy has many characteristics in common with Australian university meta-policy, including providing definitions for the university-specific range of policy instruments, specifying approval authorities and articulating policy cycle stages.

New Zealand university definitions of policy tend to be either concise statements - much like definitions adopted by many, but not all, Australian universities - or all-encompassing of key aspects of university meta-policy. For example, the University of Auckland is relatively brief in defining a policy as ‘an appropriately authorised written statement which defines the University’s
position or strategy in regard to a core process and function. A policy defines the parameters for decision making and clarifies compliance issues for members of the University’ (2013, p. 1). Conversely, the Otago University Policy Framework incorporates various elements of university meta-policy in their definition of policy:

A Policy sets out the University’s position on a specific matter and requires a certain line of action to be taken, although it does not necessarily detail that line of action. Policies, except Human Resource (HR) Policies, are formally documented and approved by Council or under its delegated authority. The Vice-Chancellor establishes HR Policies pursuant to his or her authority under the State Sector Act. Compliance is mandatory. Examples: Research and Study Leave Policy, Purchasing Policy, Email Policy. (2010, p. 1)

As is the case in Australia, New Zealand university meta-policy the range of policy instruments includes ‘policies’, ‘procedures’ and ‘guidelines’. In addition, the University of Canterbury meta-policy provides for ‘protocols’ which define ‘fundamental principles, providing overarching statements about key activities’ (2012, n.p.) and the University of Auckland meta-policy provides for ‘frameworks’ which define ‘a structure that outlines the way a policy or concept may be implemented within the University environment’ (2010, p. 5).

In terms of categories, there is quite some variation between New Zealand universities, as is the case in Australia. Otago University categorises policies under topics including: governance; academic; and operational / human resources / other at least for the purposes of approval pathways. The University of Auckland policy repository categorises policies as: organisation and governance; teaching and learning; research; finance and purchasing; human resources; and information technology. As is the case with most Australian universities, these approaches could be accommodated under the broader typography of ‘governance, academic and administrative’.

**Place of local policy**

Much Australian and New Zealand university meta-policy focuses explicitly on university-wide policy documentation frequently without clarifying the place of local policy and other forms of local documents. This may be cause for some confusion. Local organisational units, particularly academic faculties, departments and schools, develop and publish formal texts referred to as ‘policy’. Effectively these documents are local policy in that they articulate statements of principle applicable to a local organisational unit. They are often mandatory. Ideally, such texts contain provisions that align with, and supplement, university delegated legislation, policy and procedures, although there are examples where contradictions occur either intentionally or through ignorance of university meta-policy.

Much university meta-policy restricts the term ‘policy’ for university-wide statements of principle. Whilst the University of Melbourne Policy on Policy quarantines the term ‘policy’, it is unlike most university meta-policy in also explicitly recognising local documents ‘including local provisions, instructions, forms, checklists or business process documents’ (2012, n.p.). Such recognition provides legitimacy to this type of text in the formal hierarchy of university delegated legislation, policy, procedures, guidelines and supporting local documents. The University of Melbourne Policy on Policy also establishes a type of text - local provisions - defined as ‘a mandatory statement of principle applicable at the level of an organisational unit (that is, at the level of a faculty, school, division or other organisational unit), approved by the head of the local organisational unit’ (2012, n.p.). In doing so, the university meta-policy formally recognises the existence of local statements of principle, that is, ‘local policy’ and provides a solution other than complicit ignorance. Indeed in many instances local policy and other forms of local documents are necessary components of systems required to implement university-wide policy.

The Otago University Policy Framework differentiates between formal policy instruments and local documentation: ‘Matters which have a more limited application or scope (i.e. matters that apply only to a particular division, department, organisational area, management unit or to members of the University dealing with a particular area) require formulation and approval by the
head of that area’ (2010, p. 2). Similarly, the Victoria University of Wellington Policy Documentation Development Information states that ‘Faculty and other (Central Services Unit) documents are meant to add specificity to university-wide policy documents or address issues that only concern the faculty or CSU. They must not contradict or conflict with university-wide policy documents’ (2007, p. 2). In other instances, New Zealand and Australian university meta-policy is silent on the issue of local policy, which can lead to confusion and varying interpretations.

Recognising local policy, regardless of the semantics, illuminates the often obscured issue of alignment between university-wide policy and local requirements and practices. Many policy practitioners recognise the tension between broad umbrella principles and local requirements for meaning, specificity and specialisation. For example, some university-wide credit policies include provisions regarding vocational education and training (VET) and higher education inter-sectoral qualification portability and articulation, recognition of formal and informal learning, the importance of credit approval in maintaining the integrity of institutional qualifications, and recognition of prior learning (Freeman, 2010). University-wide credit policy is frequently supported by faculty, department and/or school local policy that details specific credit application, assessment and approval requirements. Given the significant variations in disciplinary requirements and sector admissions processes, it is understandable that university-wide policy frequently contains broad umbrella principles and local documentation the variations. The fundamental question relates to alignment between the two, rather than the existence of the latter. This question may well be more challenging for large faculties with established governance arrangements and policy documentation, and multi-campus, cross-state universities such as the Australian Catholic University and MCD University; the latter of which encompasses autonomous colleges.

Strategic policy management - implementation of university meta-policy

The volume of formal university policy documentation in online policy repositories evidences the considerable effort that has been focused on the development of policy by Australian and New Zealand universities. University meta-policy contains numerous provisions regarding policy development and publication in online policy repositories, and supporting procedures and templates contain prescriptions regarding presentation in terms of consistent formatting and plain English requirements. However, policy management involves considerably more than policy development, publication and effective record keeping. Responsibilities representing ‘strategic policy management’ are articulated in few university meta-policies. The University of Melbourne and University of Wollongong are exceptions. The University of Melbourne Policy on Policy conceives policy management as:

- providing strategic oversight of the implementation of (the Policy on Policy); co-ordinating the development, approval, promulgation and review of Policy and university-wide Procedures in accordance with (the Policy on Policy); developing and delivering Policy development, evaluation and review resources and support; maintaining the Melbourne Policy Library; facilitating consultation and communication to support Policy development, review and implementation; developing Policy implementation monitoring and evaluation tools; (and) managing and facilitating the Policy Review Schedule (2012, n.p.).

The Policy on Policy also seeks to ensure alignment between university policy and university delegated legislation, strategy and plans. Not altogether dissimilarly, the University of Wollongong Standard on UOW Policy (2007) conceives policy management in terms of providing advice regarding the development and management of policies, liaison with policy owners to determine and facilitate approval pathways, overseeing consistent documentation presentation and alignment with university delegated legislation, document control, facilitating approval, maintaining the policy repository and ensuring timely policy review (2007, n.p.).

These universities have made some preliminary steps towards scoping strategic policy management essentially as: co-ordinating the policy cycle (including facilitation of policy approvals processes); ensuring timely policy evaluation and review; developing policy tools and resources; training and liaison with policy stakeholders; and ensuring alignment with key university documentation.
including delegated legislation and strategy. However, most New Zealand and Australian university meta-policy is silent on these responsibilities. Strategic policy management requires senior management support, a cultural shift from development- to implementation- and evaluation-focused thinking, and professional development for policy managers and practitioners. The imperative for this is the clear regulatory requirements for conceptual thinking regarding evidencing policy implementation, review and policy compliance.

**Policy development and review cycle (the policy cycle)**

The university policy process - the policy cycle - is frequently articulated in university meta-policy. Freeman (2010) reported three policy cycle models, from the most basic policy cycle involving most stages of drafting, consultation, approval, promulgation and review, to more sophisticated models including value-adding cycle stages as detailed in Table 3, below.

![Table 3: Australian and New Zealand university policy cycles: Models 1, 2 and 3](image)

Most Australian universities (25 of 40) have university meta-policy where there is a discernible policy cycle (Freeman, 2012a). For example, the Macquarie University *Policy Framework* (2012) illustrates a straightforward policy cycle representative of model 1, with policy cycle stages of: development, consultation, legal/Vice-Chancellor/University Policy Reference Group consideration, approval and maintenance. The Australian National University *Policy Framework* (2012) broadly illustrates model 2, with policy cycle stages of: identification of policy requirements, drafting, consultation, approval, communication, implementation and monitoring, and review. The University of Western Sydney *A Guide to Developing Policies at UWS* (2012) exemplifies a more mature approach to policy development and review, similar to model 3, with several value-adding policy cycle stages required including: identification of policy requirements, involvement of key stakeholders, establishment of a reference group, research and analysis, drafting, consultation, revision, approval, communication, implementation, feedback, review and assessment of impact and effectiveness. The University of Melbourne *Policy on Policy* illustrates a more mature approach representative of model 3, with policy cycle stages including ‘identification and confirmation of policy requirement, preliminary consultations, drafting, benchmarking, consultation, revision, compliance with the Policy on Policy and Melbourne Legislative Framework, endorsement, approval, communication and publication in Melbourne Policy Library, implementation, implementation and compliance monitoring, implementation evaluation, (and) triennial review’ (2012, p. 6).

The four New Zealand universities with university meta-policy have policy cycle stages including drafting, consultation, approval and review, and three of the four universities incorporate the stages of promulgation (model 1) and identification of policy requirements and implementation (model 2). As such, the four New Zealand universities would be considered to reflect model 2. Discrete policy cycle stages of ‘evaluation’ (which in this case refers to an examination of existing policy documentation and consideration of policy options) and ‘quality control’ are only evident in the Victoria University of Wellington *Policy Documentation Development Information*, and ‘endorsement’ is only evident in the Auckland University *Establishment of a Policy Within the University of Auckland Procedure Document*. Victoria University of Wellington meta-policy also indicates that ‘For University documents, particularly statutes and policies, there is a requirement to show evidence of benchmarking in the document writing process’ (2007, p. 5).
University policy review

Large bodies of university policy are becoming due - or are already overdue - for review; however just over half of all Australian universities have discernible policy cycle stages articulated in university meta-policy that either acknowledge some requirement for review post-approval (10) or explicitly refer to implementation, evaluation and review requirements as discrete cycle stages or interspersed requirements (11). The four New Zealand universities that have university meta-policy have a policy cycle stage dedicated to policy review. Some Australian universities have implemented comprehensive policy suite reviews including the Australian National University, University of Melbourne, Deakin University and University of Newcastle and Victoria University has embarked on this ambitious undertaking. These policy suite reviews have focused either on presentation-related matters or, in some cases, both presentation- and practice-related matters. Reviews focused on presentation-related matters have sought to determine whether policy is: correctly formatted; simple and accessible; categorised and written consistently. More sophisticated reviews have focused on both presentation- and practice-related matters by seeking to ensure that policy is: correctly formatted, simple, categorised and consistent; as well as accurate (in that it reflects practice); compliant with legislation, strategy and delegations; and benchmarked for good practice (Freeman, 2012b). The increasingly regulated environment involving a shift towards evidence of policy implementation with necessitate a shift towards monitoring, evaluation and sophisticated policy review focused on policy practice.

Australian and New Zealand universities have developed a limited number of resources to support policy review. This includes the University of Adelaide feedback/issues log, University of Wollongong policy issues log, University of Ballarat policy database (which flags review dates) and RMIT policy review schedule. Other examples include the Victoria University of Wellington policy review flowchart and online consultation systems established by the University of Tasmania, University of New England and Curtin University. Generic policy review resources have been distributed via the Association for Tertiary Education Management (ATEM) policy forums (Freeman, 2012b). This publicly available documentation includes: clauses for university meta-policy, review questions, inclusions for a policy approval form, feedback form, issues log, review schedule, draft policy consultation notice board, and links for Australian and New Zealand university meta-policies to support benchmarking and policy borrowing. These resources provide some preliminary support for policy review.

There remains only very limited information available regarding policy evaluation, with few Australian or New Zealand universities providing evaluation information, metrics, or capacity building. Evaluation remains the ‘black box’ of university meta-policy. The lack of resources, coupled with an absence of evaluation metrics embedded in policy documentation suggests limited experience in policy evaluation. Whilst Academic Boards have a long history of reviewing academic practices, courses and structures the relationship between academic quality assurance processes, academic standards, academic policy and university meta-policy is not necessarily immediately obvious or transparent.

The large volume of policy texts – ‘policy overload’

It is arguable that Australian policy practitioners and users are suffering ‘policy overload’ with literally hundreds of university-wide policies and related texts. For example, the Australian National University policy repository holds over 300 policies and procedures and a further 50 guidelines. The James Cook University Policy Library holds over 350 policies, procedures, codes and related texts, and the RMIT Policy Review Schedule identified over 500 discrete policies and procedures. The Curtin University Your Voice project identified ‘volume of policies’ as an area of concern (Yellowlees, 2012). In contrast, Southern Cross University has recently disaggregated a 270 academic policy into a larger number of discrete policies, procedures and guidelines.

While arbitrarily capping the number of policy texts is possibly antithetical in complex organisations that continue to grow in size, breadth and aspiration, halting the rash proliferation of discrete policy documents may be required, along with strategies to accommodate the volume of
texts in an accessible and meaningful way (for example, indexing). Reduction in the overall number of policy texts and in some instances the length of documents has at least in some instances been a guiding principle in policy suite review projects. For example, Curtin University undertook a policy review project to explicitly ‘reduce and simplify policies and procedures’ which resulted in a reduction in the number of policies (from 174 to 37) and procedures (from 96 to 54), representing an overall reduction in the number of texts from 270 to 91 (Yellowlees, 2012).

Decreasing the number and length of discrete policy texts may involve transferring policy principles to subordinate documents such as procedures that frequently require lower order, and often comparatively expedited, approval. Such a transfer raises the tensions between compliance - enforceability of policy over procedures, guidelines and other subordinate documentation, and flexibility - capacity to change. The appropriate location of policy principles also involves resolution of the tensions between umbrella provisions and detail sufficient to drive meaningful practice. As such, solutions to the issue of ‘policy overload’ need to be considerate of the potential for unintended consequences associated with diluted policy. It remains to be seen whether the number of policies will decrease whilst the number of subordinate documents increase, in which case the overall number of principles may well remain constant, but be embedded in policy instruments having less scrutiny and arguably less authority.

In related moves, some Australian and most New Zealand universities with university meta-policy have established policy gatekeeper mechanisms to restrict the development of new policy texts. For example, the University of Tasmania Policy Development and Review Procedure (2012) identifies positions, including the policy owner and the Governance and Legal Unit, which have authority to confirm the need for a new policy. The University of Sydney Policies Development and Review Rule 2011 requires that proponents submit a policy proposal for General Counsel certification ‘that the policy is necessary’ (2011, p. 7). Other universities are establishing overarching policy committees to strategically respond to calls for the development of new policy texts. Such mechanisms may well restrict the unnecessary proliferation of policy texts, however they may also restrict the development of requisite policy responses where implemented following a rigid conception of some ‘magical number’ of policy texts.

**Maintaining online policy repositories**

All Australian and most New Zealand universities have online policy repositories to provide the authoritative source documents for university-wide policies and procedures. Centralised policy repositories have gained much traction, evidenced by widespread practice and the progressive inclusion of texts both higher and lower in the hierarchy of legislative, policy and local documents. For example, Edith Cowan University aims to add their statutes, rules and by-laws into an all-encompassing Policy and Legislation Directory; the University of Auckland Policy Register includes policies, statutes, regulations and rules, and links to New Zealand legislation, and the University of Queensland Policy and Procedures Library holds forms.

Good practice features of online policy repositories include a high level of search functionality: topic or category, title, instrument type, audience, alphabetical list, consideration of the file format for accessibility purposes: html, pdf, txt or other, and inclusion of an interface between the repository and the individual texts: title, summary, owner, approval authority, related texts (Freeman, 2010). A small number of universities, including Southern Cross University, provide access to former versions. This is important primarily for some student-facing and human resources policies through which legal recourse or resolution may be sought, for example, student misconduct, academic integrity and conditions of employment. In addition, this capacity may provide one avenue to evidence regulator requirements for improvement of policy documents over time.
**Intra- and inter-institutional networks and consultation**

Genuine consultation throughout the policy development and review stages fosters policy stakeholder and end-user support required for effective policy implementation. The University of Tasmania and University of Melbourne have both established formal intra-institutional policy networks, involving all institutional managers up to and including the Vice-Chancellor, plus others interested in policy-related matters and student organisations. These policy networks have memberships of 350-450 respectively, and provide an efficient mechanism to communicate policy-related matters to stakeholders dispersed throughout large institutions, including invitations to participate in consultation processes.

Similarly, relationships between policy managers and compliance, legal, quality, audit and risk focused organisational units could be nurtured to explore responses regarding evidencing policy implementation and compliance. One such structural example is provided by Latrobe University where the Academic Quality Committee of Academic Board requires reports and will increasingly require reflections based on quality indicators with respect to policy implementation. Throughout Australia consideration is being also given to the relationship between policy, academic standards, and business intelligence systems required to collect data for evaluation purposes. Policy networks may provide a mechanism to share information about responses to discussions regarding compliance and regulation.

**Concluding discussion**

Australian and New Zealand universities must comply with, and be able to demonstrate compliance with, government legislation. Frequently, universities evidence compliance with government legislation by simply citing the existence of relevant university policy. As the body of government legislation grows this approach to compliance perpetuates the focus on policy development, potentially leading to a ‘policy as panacea’ mentality whereby compliance gaps are addressed through the development of new policies. This approach could be used to demonstrate compliance with Australian tertiary Threshold Standards, and New Zealand Tertiary Evaluation Indicators; that is, universities may evidence compliance simply by citing the existence of relevant university policy.

The recent game changer is the Australian regulator’s requirements for tertiary providers to evidence implementation of policy, and improvement over time. Similarly the New Zealand governments’ requirement for evidence that university policies and practices are legal and ethical; that is, universities may evidence compliance with government legislation by evidencing compliant policy implementation. In this environment, policy implementation evaluation and policy review take on new importance as they provide a sensible response to excessive regulatory requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>FUNCTIONAL APPROACH</th>
<th>POLICY CYCLE STAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with government legislation</td>
<td>Audit government legislative requirements&lt;br&gt;Map university policy to government legislative requirements (including a gap analysis)</td>
<td>Policy development and/or policy review (to address ‘gaps’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with government tertiary Threshold Standards and Evaluation Indicators</td>
<td>Map university policy to Threshold Standards and Evaluation Indicators (including a gap analysis)</td>
<td>Policy development and/or policy review (to address ‘gaps’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with university policy / Evidence of policy implementation / Evidence of compliant policy implementation</td>
<td>Audit university practice(s) against university policy</td>
<td>Policy implementation monitoring (i.e. practice[s])&lt;br&gt;Policy review&lt;br&gt;Practice[s] review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of policy improvement</td>
<td>Evaluate policy practice(s)</td>
<td>Policy evaluation&lt;br&gt;Policy review&lt;br&gt;Practice[s] review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University policy infrastructure is in place in almost all Australian and New Zealand universities, including university meta-policy, policy repositories, comprehensive suites of policy texts and now some generic review resources. There is a high level of commonality between this policy
infrastructure both within Australia and New Zealand, and between the two countries. In large measure this is due to the prevalence of policy borrowing, the widespread awareness of the Policy without (much) pain (Aitken et al., 2010) better practice guide, and the abundance of good practice examples shared through the Association for Tertiary Education Management (ATEM) Institutional Policy Network and policy forums. Given the commonality in university meta-policy and similar focus on university policy development, evaluation and review, increased networking between universities, institutes and other providers, and indeed between Australian, New Zealand and international policy practitioners would be a more effective continuous improvement strategy than exhaustively reworking this infrastructure in isolation.

The issues identified in this paper suggest that key continuous improvement strategies include securing senior management support for policy management and building opportunities for genuine consultation with policy stakeholders including content experts, students and end users. Increasingly, policy practitioners are building relationships with those responsible for regulatory compliance, legal matters, quality and risk management to ensure coherence between policy texts and other institutional frameworks. Involving policy stakeholders and related professionals in the policy development, evaluation and review phases could increase the relevance and buy-in necessary for the successful implementation of policy.

To date, much policy-related professional development has focused on policy development (that is, drafting). Whilst specialist policy drafting skills will be required wherever university policy itself is needed, professional development requirements have evolved alongside the policy suites themselves. Professional development is now required in policy evaluation (measures and method), and formal policy presentation and practice-related review. There may be opportunities to transfer lessons from academic policy evaluation and review to governance and administrative policy, however this requires more consideration. In addition, professional development requirements include policy benchmarking and project management of the initial policy implementation phase. Developments in this area would support a shift from the current development-focused regime to a holistic policy management approach aimed at ensuring the longer-term relevance and sustainability of university policy and useful response to regulatory requirements for evidence of policy implementation.
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The Association of College & University Policy Administrators (ACUPA) is a US-based network of professionals interested in university and college policy. To join ACUPA or communicate with the network, look at: http://www.acupa.org/.
POLICY ON POLICY

RELEVANT LEGISLATION
University of Melbourne Act 2009 (Vic)
Statute 1.7 – University Governance
Statute 4.1 – The Academic Board

SCOPE
This Policy applies to all University of Melbourne Policies, Procedures, Schedules and Guidelines. This Policy does not apply to policies developed by University of Melbourne controlled entities.

This Policy:
• defines the range of University of Melbourne policy instruments
• establishes a classification scheme for University of Melbourne policy instruments
• defines the application of University of Melbourne policy instruments
• specifies Approval Authorities for all University of Melbourne policy instruments and
• establishes the University Policy Development and Review Cycle.

POLICY

1. Legislative and policy hierarchy
1.1 Policy instruments are located within a hierarchy as follows:

1.1.1 Legislative instruments:
• University of Melbourne Act 2009
• University statutes
• University regulations

1.1.2 Standing Resolutions of Council
1.1.3 Resolutions of the Board
1.1.4 Codes of conduct
1.1.5 Policy instruments:
• Policies
• Procedures
• Guidelines

1.1.6 Local documents (including local provisions, instructions, forms, checklists or business process documents).

1.2 A document lower in the hierarchy must not be inconsistent with a document higher in the hierarchy.

1.3 Where two documents in the hierarchy may otherwise conflict, the document higher in the hierarchy takes precedence.

2. Range of policy instruments
2.1 The range of University of Melbourne policy instruments includes:
• Policy
• Procedure
• Guideline.

2.2 A Policy is a statement of principle that articulates, and aligns with, legislative, regulatory or organisational requirements. Observance of Policy is mandatory.

2.3 A Procedure is a statement that provides information or step-by-step instructions to implement a Policy. Observance of Procedure is mandatory.

2.4 A Guideline is a statement that provides guidance to support the implementation of, and ongoing compliance with, a Policy or Procedure. The term ‘guideline’ does not refer to a guideline as described in the University of Melbourne Act 2009, which may be subject to separate University legislation or Policy.

3. Classification scheme for policy instruments
3.1 Policy instruments are categorised as:
• governance or
• academic or
• administrative.

3.1.1 Policy instruments in the governance category address the broad decision-making and accountability processes of the University, including giving effect to legislative, regulatory and organisational requirements.

3.1.2 Policy instruments in the academic category address the core academic functions of the University and are classified as follows:
• learning and teaching
• courses and subjects
• studying at the University and
• research and research training.

3.1.3 Policy instruments in the administrative category address the University’s administrative operations and are classified as follows:
• working at the University
• finance and procurement
• health and safety
• managing buildings and information technology (IT) and
• engaging with the community.

4. **Application of policy instruments**

4.1 Policies have university-wide application.

4.2 Procedures may have either university-wide or local application (that is, application to one or more local areas such as a faculty, school, division or organisational unit).

4.3 Guidelines may have either university-wide or local application (that is, application to one or more local areas such as a faculty, school, division or organisational unit).

5. **Approval Authorities**

5.1 **Governance policy instruments**

5.1.1 In accordance with the *University of Melbourne Act 2009* Council is responsible for a governance framework for the University which is consistent with legal requirements and community expectations. In accordance with *Statute 1.7 – University Governance*, Council is also responsible for deciding the expenditure authorisation limits of the Vice-Chancellor and other senior officers of the University.

5.1.2 Council is the Approval Authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of Policies in the governance category.

5.1.3 Each of Council and the Vice-Chancellor (delegated to the Senior Vice-Principal) as appropriate is an Approval Authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of university-wide Procedures in the governance category. The University Secretary (delegated to the Provost) is the Approval Authority for archives-specific university-wide Procedures in the governance category.

5.1.4 The Responsible Officer for all Policies and Procedures in the governance category is the University Secretary. The University Secretary is also the Approval Authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of all university-wide Guidelines in the governance category.

5.1.5 The Responsible Officer (University Secretary) and University Policy Officer may approve minor amendments to Policies in the governance category, and university-wide Procedures and Guidelines in that category. This includes changes that do not otherwise affect document content such as changes to titles, names, structures, references or hyperlinks.

5.1.6 The head of an organisational unit may approve local Procedures and Guidelines in the governance category specific to that organisational unit, including the amendment and disestablishment of all such Procedures and Guidelines.

5.2 **Academic policy instruments**

5.2.1 The Board is the Approval Authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of Policies in the academic category.

5.2.2 In accordance with *Statute 4.1 – The Academic Board*, the Board may delegate any of its powers and duties, including authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of Policies in the academic category.

5.2.3 Each of the Board, the Provost and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) is an Approval Authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of university-wide Procedures in the academic category relevant to their respective areas of responsibility. Where the Procedure spans responsibilities or portfolios, the President of the Board will nominate the Approval Authority.

5.2.4 The Responsible Officer for all Policies in the academic category is the President of the Board, or another officer where delegated by the Board (for example, the Provost or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor [Research]).

5.2.5 The Responsible Officer for all Policies in the academic category, or the Academic Secretary, or the University Policy Officer may approve minor amendments to Policies in the academic category and university-wide Procedures and Guidelines in that category. This includes changes that do not otherwise affect document content, such as changes to titles, names, structures, references or hyperlinks.

5.2.6 The head of an organisational unit may approve local Procedures and Guidelines in the academic category specific to that organisational unit, including the amendment and disestablishment of all such Procedures and Guidelines.

5.3 **Administrative policy instruments**

5.3.1 The Vice-Chancellor (delegated to the Senior Vice Principal) is the Approval Authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of Policies and Procedures in the administrative category. The Vice-Chancellor and Senior Vice Principal take advice on Policies and Procedures for the University’s administration and their implementation from Senior Executive and Administrative and Business Advisory Group (ABAG), as applicable.

5.3.2 The Responsible Officer for all Policies in the administrative category is the relevant Function Leader. Where there is no Function Leader for a particular Policy in the administrative category, or where the Policy spans responsibilities of several Function Leaders, the Senior Vice-Principal will nominate the Responsible Officer. The Responsible Officer for Policy instruments in the administrative category is also the Approval Authority for the approval, amendment and disestablishment of Guidelines in that category.

5.3.3 The Responsible Officer for the relevant Policy in the administrative category and University Policy Officer may approve minor amendments to Policies, Procedures and Guidelines in that category. This includes changes that do not otherwise affect document content, such as changes to titles, names, structures, references or hyperlinks.

5.3.4 The head of an organisational unit may approve local Procedures and Guidelines in the administrative category specific to a particular organisational unit, including the amendment and disestablishment of all such Procedures and Guidelines.

5.4 **Approval of delegations embedded in policy instruments**

5.4.1 Council may delegate its powers or functions to a member of Council, a committee of Council, any member of staff of the University including the Vice-Chancellor, the Board, or any other entity prescribed by the Statutes. Council can not delegate the power to delegate.

5.4.2 In approving this *Policy on Policy*, Council has authorised the relevant Approval Authorities to:

- approve, amend and disestablish Policies, Procedures and Guidelines and
- approve delegations, authorities and responsibilities embedded in policy instruments and
- approve amendments to, or cancellations of, delegations, authorities and responsibilities embedded in the following instruments,
provided substantial amendments to, or cancellations of, delegations, authorities and responsibilities in:

- Procedures in the governance category are reported to Council
- Policies in the academic category (where approved by a delegate of the Board) are reported to the Board
- Procedures in the academic category (where approved by an Approval Authority other than the Board) are reported to the Board
- Policies or Procedures in the administrative category are reported to Senior Executive.

5.4.3 In accordance with the Delegations Policy, Council maintains responsibility for approval of the Delegations Policy and its schedules and procedures, as well as the Register of Authorities and Responsibilities (RoAR).

5.4.4 The University Secretary will annually update the Register of Authorities and Responsibilities (RoAR) to reflect any amendments to delegations, authorities and responsibilities embedded in Policies or Procedures.

5.5 Summary of Approval Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>APPROVAL AUTHORITIES</th>
<th>AMENDMENT</th>
<th>DISESTABLISHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Policy and Schedule to Policy</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Minor*: Responsible Officer (University Secretary) and University Policy Officer</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not minor: Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University-wide Procedure</td>
<td>Council or Vice-Chancellor (delegated to Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
<td>Minor: Responsible Officer (University Secretary) and University Policy Officer</td>
<td>Council or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Secretary (delegated to the Provost)</td>
<td>Not minor: Initial Approval Authority</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor (delegated to Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for Archives Procedures only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Procedure</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of Organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University-wide Guideline</td>
<td>Responsible Officer (University Secretary)</td>
<td>Responsible Officer (University Secretary)</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Guideline</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Board or delegate</td>
<td>Minor: Responsible Officer (President of Board or delegate of the Board), Academic Secretary, University Policy Officer</td>
<td>Board or delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not minor: Initial Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University-wide Procedure</td>
<td>Board or Provost or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)</td>
<td>Minor: Responsible Officer (President of Board, Provost or DVC[R]), Academic Secretary and University Policy Officer</td>
<td>Board or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not minor: Initial Approval Authority</td>
<td>Provost or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Procedure</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of Organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University-wide Guideline</td>
<td>Responsible Officer (President of Board or delegate of the Board)</td>
<td>Responsible Officer (President of Board or delegate of the Board)</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Guideline</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor (delegated to the Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
<td>Minor*: Responsible Officer (Function Leader or nominee of Senior Vice-Principal) and University Policy Officer</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor (delegated to the Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not minor: Initial Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University-wide Procedure</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor (delegated to the Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
<td>Minor: Responsible Officer (Function Leader or nominee of Senior Vice-Principal) and University Policy Officer</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor (delegated to the Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not minor: Initial Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Procedure</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University-wide Guideline</td>
<td>Responsible Officer (Function Leader or nominee of Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
<td>Responsible Officer (Function Leader or nominee of Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
<td>Responsible Officer (Function Leader or nominee of Senior Vice-Principal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Guideline</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td>Head of organisational unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Approval considerations
5.6.1 Prior to approving any Policy, Procedure or Guideline, or any amendment, the Approval Authority will seek to ensure that sufficient checks have been undertaken to ensure:
- compliance with Commonwealth and State legislation and regulation
- compliance with this Policy
- consistency with existing Policies and Procedures (unless consequential amendments are concurrently proposed or identified)
- consistency with existing delegations, authorities and responsibilities (unless proposed amendments to delegations, authorities and responsibilities embedded in Policy are concurrently proposed or identified to facilitate updating of the Register of Authorities and Responsibilities), and reporting of substantial amendments is planned.

6. University Policy Development and Review Cycle

6.1 The University Policy Development and Review Cycle, as outlined in the Policy Development and Review Procedure, applies to all Policies and university-wide Procedures.

6.1.2 The University Policy Development and Review Cycle includes the following stages:
- identification and confirmation of policy requirement
- preliminary consultations
- drafting
- benchmarking
- consultation
- revision
- compliance with the Policy on Policy and Melbourne Legislative Framework
- endorsement
- approval
- communication and publication in Melbourne Policy Library
- implementation
- implementation and compliance monitoring
- implementation evaluation
- triennial review

7. Records management

7.1 Approved and archived versions of Policies and university-wide Procedures will be stored in the Melbourne Policy Library and the university record keeping system (TRIM).

7.2 Records relating to the development and review of Policies and university-wide Procedures will be maintained in accordance with the Records Management Policy.

8. Melbourne Policy Library

8.1 The Melbourne Policy Library will provide the authoritative source for all Policies and university-wide Procedures. Local area websites (that is, managed by a faculty, school, division or organisational unit) will link to the Melbourne Policy Library as the authoritative source.

8.2 The University Secretary will manage the Melbourne Policy Library.

8.3 The Responsible Officer or Function Leader may request that the University Secretary restrict an individual Policy or Procedure held in the Melbourne Policy Library to authenticated users.

8.4 Local Procedures, and university-wide and local Guidelines will be maintained by the responsible local areas, and as required, made available on locally managed websites.

9. Melbourne Policy Network

9.1 The University Secretary will maintain a Melbourne Policy Network to provide opportunities for policy-related communication, information dissemination and consultation regarding policy development and review.

10. Documents developed at the organisational unit level ('local documents')

10.1 Policy instruments are supported by documents developed at the organisational unit level (that is, by a faculty, school, division or other organisational unit).

10.2 These local documents may include local provisions. A local provision is a mandatory statement of principle applicable at the level of an organisational unit (that is, at the level of a faculty, school, division or other organisational unit), approved by the head of the local organisational unit.

10.3 These local documents may also include instructions, forms, checklists and business process documents, developed and approved (where required) as determined at the organisational unit level.

10.4 These local documents may apply university-wide (for example, Human Resources forms), or to one or more organisational units.

11. Roles and Responsibilities

11.1 The University Secretary is responsible for University Policy management including:
- providing strategic oversight of the implementation of this Policy
- co-ordinating the development, approval, promulgation and review of Policies and university-wide Procedures in accordance with this Policy
- developing and delivering Policy development, evaluation and review resources and support
- maintaining the Melbourne Policy Library
- facilitating consultation and communication to support Policy development, review and implementation
- developing Policy implementation monitoring and evaluation tools
- managing and facilitating the Policy Review Schedule.
11.2 The Responsible Officer is responsible for overseeing the development, implementation, monitoring and review of policy related instruments.

11.3 The Implementation Officer is responsible for promulgation, implementation and interpretation of policy related instruments.

11.4 The University Compliance Officer is responsible for ensuring that the overall legislative and policy frameworks of the University meet all applicable compliance obligations.

11.5 University staff are required under their contracts of employment to comply with University legislation, Policies and Procedures when carrying out their duties.

11.6 Students of the University are required under their terms of enrolment to comply with University legislation, Policies and Procedures when undertaking their studies.

SCHEDULES
Nil

RELATED DOCUMENTS
Delegations Policy
Register of Authorities and Responsibilities (RoAR)
Melbourne Legislative Framework
Terms of Reference, Administrative and Business Advisory Group (ABAG)
Policy template
Procedure template
Guideline template
Approval Form
Policy and Procedures Feedback Form
Policy and Procedures Issues Log

DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval Authority</td>
<td>A body or position that has authority to approve (or otherwise amend or disestablish) University Policy, Procedures or Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>A Guideline is a statement that provides guidance to support the implementation of, and ongoing compliance with, a Policy or Procedure. The term ‘guideline’ does not refer to a guideline as described in the <em>University of Melbourne Act 2009</em>, which may be subject to separate University legislation or Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Leader</td>
<td>The officer so designated by the Executive Director (Human Resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local provision</td>
<td>A local provision is a mandatory statement of principle applicable at the level of an organisational unit (that is, at the level of a faculty, school, division or other organisational unit), approved by the head of the local organisational unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Policy Network</td>
<td>Network of University of Melbourne managers, policy practitioners, interested staff and student organisations established by the University Secretary’s Department to communicate university policy matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>A Policy is a statement of principle that articulates, and aligns with, legislative, regulatory or organisational requirements. A reference to a Policy includes any attached schedule to that Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy stakeholder</td>
<td>Those directly affected by a Policy, including those responsible for implementation, periodic monitoring and evaluation. May include university staff and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>A Procedure is a statement that provides information or step-by-step instructions to implement a Policy. A reference to a Procedure includes any attached schedule to that Procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of the Board</td>
<td>A decision of the Board, recorded as a Resolution of the Board, maintained and published as a formal record by the Academic Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Resolution of Council</td>
<td>A decision of Council, recorded as a Standing Resolution, maintained and published as a formal record by the University Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER
The University Secretary is responsible for the development, compliance monitoring and review of this Policy and any associated procedures and guidelines.

IMPLEMENTATION OFFICER
The General Manager, University Records and Policy is responsible for the promulgation and implementation of this Policy. Enquiries about interpretation of this Policy should be directed to the Implementation Officer.

REVIEW
This Policy is to be reviewed by 28 February 2016.

VERSION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
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<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Sections Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>[DD Month YYYY]</td>
<td>[DD Month YYYY]</td>
<td>New policy, replaces in entirety the Melbourne Policy Framework (which will be archived)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>