This paper describes the methodology and outcomes of the CSU Workplace Productivity Program, A Structured Approach to Workplace Productivity, Renewal and Reform conducted at CSU between 2005 and 2008. It is a companion paper to a series of downloadable modules on tools, templates and case studies associated with the program. Collectively these form the external extension package for the Higher Education Sector. The package offers support for other institutions in the sector planning to or undertaking workplace reform programs and can be accessed at www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp.
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Introduction

This paper is part of a package of extension materials developed by Charles Sturt University as part of its workplace reform program Workplace Productivity Program (WPP) - *A Structured Approach to Workplace Productivity Renewal and Reform*, completed in November 2008.

The paper describes the methodology and outcomes of the program.

The target audience for the package of materials includes those within the HE sector, with an interest in conducting renewal or reform programs, building ongoing reform capability, or involved in key decision making around investment in ICT and non-ICT improvement initiatives, enterprise architects, business process managers, process portfolio managers and the chief information office.

The full package of extension material is available online at the following link and includes tools, templates and case studies from the program: http://wwwdevel.csu.edu.au/special/wpp/

It is hoped that this paper and the overall package of materials will serve as a useful resource for the sector.

Symbols in this document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="lightbulb.png" alt="Lightbulb" /></td>
<td>Key point of information or a guideline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1. Program Overview

Background

In 2005, having identified business process improvement as an imperative in its University Strategy, Charles Sturt University launched a review of work processes across the University with the objective of identifying opportunities for improvement or renewal of processes. The project’s key driver was the recognition of the need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of work processes to support the University’s core business of Learning & Teaching and Research. This was seen as vital to its overall sustainability and to ensuring that it could continue to capitalise on its key strengths.

As the review progressed, an application for grant funding was made to the then Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST), through its Workplace Productivity Program, towards expediting the review and extending it to encompass workplace reform. The objective of DEST’s Workplace Productivity Program, was to encourage higher education providers to undertake projects to reform the efficiency, productivity and performance of their institutions, strengthen their capability to manage and implement workplace change and contribute to the diversity of the higher education sector.

CSU was successful in its application and the updated program was called: Workplace Productivity Program (WPP) - A Structured Approach to Workplace Productivity, Renewal and Reform

Program Objectives

Consistent with the grant application, the program team confirmed the broad objectives of the revised program as.

- Review work processes at the (i) University level, e.g., Planning and Budgeting processes of the Senior Executive, processes of the Academic Senate, (ii) intra- Organisation unit level and (iii)cross-organisation unit level, and identify wide ranging opportunities for process improvement.

- Produce an Enterprise Model of CSU.

• Use the model in co-operation with managers and staff, both academic and general, to inform and lead the implementation of improved business processes and practices.

• Provide a toolkit for the implementation of the program methodology to the HE sector at large.

The program was arranged as five separately managed but related projects as depicted in Figure 1. The detail regarding these projects is discussed later in this paper.

Note the figure includes evaluation of the program by an external consultant and the extension of the program to the HE sector, of which this paper forms a part.

Figure 1. CSU Workplace Productivity Program – Constituent projects

The deliverables of the program are set out against each of these projects in Table 1. A program chronology can be seen in Appendix A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>A range of models including a CSU Process Model identifying the core and support processes for the university. The models development form the basis for the overall enterprise model, treated in Project 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>A detailed report identifying key themes and detailing gaps, issues and process improvement opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Reform</td>
<td>A comprehensive schedule of improvement initiatives going on at CSU detailing purpose, alignment with strategy and resource consumption, actual or projected, to be used to update the information infrastructure plan and inform investment decision making in the 2007/2008 budget round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A repeatable initiatives handling process to guide investment decisions and the selection and prioritisation of key initiatives in future budget rounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A plan for progressing business process management as a discipline at CSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement initiatives at organisation unit level based on the findings in Project 1: Opportunity Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement initiatives at the strategic level addressing the major themes identified in the Opportunity Identification report from Project 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Model</td>
<td>An enterprise context model of CSU, comprising artefacts developed in Project 1, ready accessibility and leveraging of key information through an integrated booklet and website available to the University at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An electronic repository capturing key enterprise information centred around processes, that would serve a range of applications including business process management activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Disciplines</td>
<td>Changes to processes, systems and analysis tools to facilitate the management of a CSU discipline profile including management reporting and decision support with respect to CSU disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Change</td>
<td>An institutional change and renewal framework to guide how change is managed in the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development and learning resources based on the information gathered and developed in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Extension</td>
<td>A documented approach for the implementation of the methodology by other Institutions across the sector comprising a range of program resources including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A description of the program methodology and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A range of downloadable resources describing tools, templates and case studies from the program. These resources may be found at the following link: <a href="http://www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp">www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>An independent evaluation report assessing achievement of the desired outcomes of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.** Deliverables of CSU’s Workplace Productivity Program
Program Methodology

CSU Workplace Productivity Program
A Structured Approach to Workplace Productivity Renewal and Reform

Implement Targeted Organisation Unit Funded Initiatives
Examples:
- Restructure Div. of IT
- Procurement Reform
- Travel Systems
- Research Procedures
- Online Requisitioning

Implement Funded/Strategic Initiatives
Examples:
- Service Alignment
- Student Experience
- Renew Senate Processes
- Division of HR Moving Forward Initiative
- Apps Portfolio Mgmt.

Review Work Processes
P1: Opportunity Identification

CSU-Wide Themes
Process Health Reviews
Candidate Improvement Initiatives
Recommendations

Build Workplace Reform Capability
- P2: Implement Initiatives Handling Process
- P3: Build Enterprise Model
- P4: Build Discipline Profile Mgmt. Process
- P5: Implement Change Mgmt. Framework

CSU PLANNING AND REVIEW CYCLE

Figure 2. Outline WPP Program Methodology
Figure 2, illustrates the overall program methodology and sets the projects in context. The Opportunity Identification phase provided:

(i) Reports to individual organisation units providing the basis for the selection of improvement initiatives that could be resourced through unit operational funds.

(ii) Input to a funding gap analysis resulting in revised CSU budget plans for 2007/2008 esp. with regard to the funding of initiatives already in the information infrastructure plan and accommodating strategic initiatives emerging from the recommendations.

(iii) Input to building ongoing workplace reform capability through the workplace productivity program. The report indicated that, while continuous improvement efforts were being undertaken as part of the day to day management of organisation units, quite often, the impacts of change efforts on other processes across the organisation were not well understood. In addition, it highlighted deficiencies in change management understanding and practice as a key theme. This in turn led to strong support for:

- The implementation of a change and renewal framework as called for in the university strategy 2007-2011 through the institutional development plan and
- Better management of business processes through developing a plan for progressing business process management capability in the organisation.

Figure 2 shows the building of ongoing reform capability working to support the university’s planning and review framework through enhancing the **Review** and **Improve** stages in the **Plan**, **Implement**, **Review**, **Improve** (or PIRI) cycle.
Program Organisation

The program organisation followed a traditional model, operating under CSU’s Project Management Framework (PMF)\(^2\).

The Program Manager reported to a steering committee chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration) that included representation from academic and administration areas. Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of administrative processes, in particular, would free up valuable resources in both academic and administrative areas to focus on core activities and strengths.

The Project Managers reported directly to the program manager and were responsible for the day to day conduct of the projects and for managing their respective project staff.

Regular progress meetings were a feature of the program since all projects were interconnected to one degree or another. The enterprise model, for example, would act as an enabler for reform projects and for developing business process management capability. The culture and change project, responsible for developing the change management framework for the university, would provide the foundation for change efforts large and small.

Ongoing internal extension activities in the form of briefings to the Senior Executive Committee, to reference and focus groups and to the Vice-Chancellor’s forum (sitting three times a year and having wide management representation) afforded the opportunity to communicate progress to the wider university community, seek feedback and moreover, maintain impetus for the program.

---

\(^2\) The PMF establishes guidelines and templates for the general conduct and governance of projects and programs at CSU.
**Program Outcomes**

The grant application to DEST, specified performance indicators for the workplace productivity program. Table 2 details achievements against these indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence gathered through internal audit on the use, availability and accuracy of the information upon which decisions are made</td>
<td>The processes introduced in the course of the program to improve availability and accuracy of the information are in relatively early stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- As an example, the Process Knowledge Base is in use by the Directorate of Enterprise Architecture and its maintenance is owned by that group. The group has a vested interest in maintaining the accuracy and completeness of information to support its work in ensuring alignment of the portfolio of initiatives with the Enterprise Architecture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence by audit of the use of the model in university decision making. The use of the model in budget and planning decisions making is direct.</td>
<td>- The early iteration of the model, namely the yourCSU booklet is in widespread use by the wider university community. 5000 copies have been printed and distributed across the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The model is used to support investment decision making through the initiatives handling process, a new process introduced specifically to provide detailed information about the wider impact of initiatives including likely resource consumption and the impacts on the portfolio of initiatives. Thus the model supports the selection and prioritisation of ICT initiatives. The University Budget committee bases its decisions in part on the information that this process delivers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The various elements of the model support business and process analysis activities. Business analysts from the Project Service Centre, routinely use existing stakeholder maps, process models and profiles in their review of processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The program has received a number of requests for formal process mapping exercises to be conducted for projects where this has not been the case prior to the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and decision making processes and financial management are based on factual information including data on the external and internal environment.</td>
<td>Decision making on investment in and prioritisation of strategic improvement initiatives is supported by an initiatives handling process that provides key input into CSU’s budget and planning processes. Under this regime, initiatives are tested for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Alignment with strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource requirements (funding and HR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Impact on the enterprise architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact in the context of the portfolio of initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The outcome is enhanced decision support to the executive in investment in and prioritisation of initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CSU Disciplines Profile contributes directly to CSU’s planning and decision making. This is discussed under a separate heading hereunder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicator</td>
<td>Achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Process Knowledge Base reflects the business of CSU and of the organisation units. The knowledge base is a key reference for the Directorate of Enterprises Architecture and for the Project Service Centre and supports:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Management of the Applications Portfolio Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Supporting the development of initiative proposals and analysis of proposed initiatives from the perspectives of business impacts, resources impacts and Enterprise Architecture Impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Project-based business and process analysis efforts allowing wider impacts to be understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wider applications of the knowledge base are expected to emerge over time. One example that has been discussed is in Business continuity planning where for example, the identification of critical business processes supports developing continuity plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The business model of the university aligns course/student load, funding, facilities and human resources management. Planning is used to inform Management Information Systems and reports. | The CSU Discipline profile MIS details course/student load, funding, facilities and human resources requirements as well as other key criteria such as Research related criteria. This facilitates realisation of this indicator. |
| The disciplines profile informs workforce planning, teaching and research, and supports fulfilment of quality, excellence and sustainability goals. |

| Managers are trained to analyse business factors through (e.g., load/funding and human resources), : | 1. Frontline management and leadership development programs delivered as part of the Culture and Change Project.  |
|                                                        | 2. Managers are trained in the interpretation and analysis of the CSU Disciplines profile.  |
|                                                        | 3. Training and mentoring is provided for business analysts through the Project Service Centre, covering business analysis tools and techniques. Currently this is generally confined to business analysis staff working on defined projects. The longer term vision is for such training to be provided to general staff based on need.  |
|                                                        | 4. Specific training in process mapping and the use of process analysis tools and techniques is called for as part of the overall business process management strategy for the university.  |

<p>| Managers are trained to apply analysis to planning | Impact analysis is carried out by the Directorate of Enterprise Architecture on proposed initiatives and on the portfolio of initiatives. This supports planning decisions related to the implementation of initiatives and budget and Information Infrastructure planning. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Managers are trained to communicate analysis and planning to staff to inform actions to achieve outcomes and for individual performance management. | 1. Frontline management and leadership development programs delivered as part of the Culture and Change Project.  
2. All learning resources and manager training have planning and analysis at their core, aligned with the strategic direction of the university.  
3. All learning resources and manager training is focussed on work-based learning, communication and practice with teams and staff to improve organisational and performance outcomes.  
4. A survey of participants and their managers in November 2008 will identify the effectiveness of learning resources (identified below) in increasing the capability of managers to communicate analysis and planning to their staff, and to identify subsequent improvement in individuals and their teams. |

| Manager training general | Delivery of Frontline Management, Executive Leadership Programs and the “Leading People Series” and other workshops across the University on topics including:  
- Strategic Context (Planning Unit 1)  
- Facilitating Planning (Planning Unit 2)  
- The Process of Managing Change (Change Management Unit 1)  
- Leading and Facilitating Change (Change Management Unit 2)  
- Effective Team Leadership  
- Understanding Culture  
- Resource Management  
- Business and Report Writing Skills  
- Business Analysis  
- Project Management  
- Procedures Writing  
All of these modules have been developed as online modules for future use by staff. These workshops attracted attendance by 750 staff across all levels from Level 4 through to Executive levels and across all Divisions, Offices and Faculties.  
Focus groups on internal communication and organisational culture conducted across a wide range of groups across CSU in 2007 and 2008. These identified changes in management practice and cultural changes. |

| The university has a shared business reporting language across Divisions and Faculties to inform planning and resource allocation. | 1. The CSU and organisation unit process models provide us with an element of business reporting language through the characterisation of processes at the CSU and the organisation level.  
2. Development and deployment of a glossary of Business Reporting Language. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The university meets its own performance targets for the period 2007-2011 and ongoing.| 1. The CSU Disciplines Profile provides lead indicators that support measurement of KPIs. For example the profile indicates those undertaking PhDs. We can check completion rates against this to test whether we have achieved that KPI.  
2. The work process improvement review identified improvement opportunities within Research that led to an implementation projects. These contribute directly to Key Objective 2 in the University Strategy, namely “Conduct strategic and applied research of an international standard..”  
3. The work process improvement review drove the establishment of the Service Alignment review and the subsequent constitution of the Student Experience (Service alignment) program. This program directly links to delivery upon Key Objective 3 in the University Strategy, namely “Continue to lead in the quality provision of flexible delivery of learning and teaching..”  
4. The restructure of the Division of Information technology around process has assisted in the identification of gaps in its support delivery to the university. This has resulted in improved service delivery to all areas and contributes to Key Objective 4 in the University Strategy, namely “Continue to build institutional strength, reputation and sustainability..”  
5. The “CSU Organisational Change and Renewal Framework – a framework and resources for Leaders and Managers, 2007 – 2011” developed. The framework is endorsed by the Institutional Development Committee and by the Senior Executive. |
Summary

Reform and/or renewal of work processes is a key agent in enabling CSU to realise its strategic objectives and to build on its strengths, not least through freeing up valuable resources that might otherwise continue to be weighed down by inefficient processes. Undertaking a reform program, however, is not trivial. It requires a structured approach, beginning with developing an understanding of the current situation across the organisation’s processes and using that to inform the identification and design of reform projects. In addition to identifying business process improvement opportunities, the capacity of the organisation for undertaking reform needs to be understood and addressed. In CSU’s workplace productivity program, this took the form of projects aimed at developing frameworks and strategies for building change management and business processes management capabilities and skills, the design of an enterprise model as a key enabling tool for process reform and renewal and developing a process for improved management of the CSU Disciplines profile.

The deployment of these projects has enhanced decision making through timely and accurate information on the internal and external environment, facilitated a shift from a task-centric to a process-centric organisation and provided detailed information about the workings of the organisation to the wider university community. It has worked to develop skills in analysing business factors in the management community and using this to achieve better university outcomes and to support individual performance management. It has provided professional development in change management and business process management understanding through frontline management and leadership programs, providing the organisation with an enhanced capacity to bring a structured approach to the implementation of change initiatives.

This positions CSU well to meet its performance targets now and into the future.

The next section discusses the individual projects in detail. For each project, the project overview, objectives, deliverables, approach / methodology and outcomes are described.
Section 2. Projects Detail

Project Deliverables

1. Opportunity Identification Report detailing the major themes emerging from the review, recommendations to the executive, detailed process health check results, and issues, impacts and improvement opportunities.

2. CSU and organisation unit process models, stakeholder context models and Process Profiles for all core and enabling processes.

3. As-Is Situation reports for the Divisions, Offices and Centres, detailing organisation unit process models, process health check reports and issues, impacts and improvement opportunities for organisation unit processes – the enabling processes of the University.

Project 1: Work Process Improvement, Stage 1, Opportunity Identification

Overview

The Opportunity identification project was driven by the strategic imperative in the university strategy to review business processes at (i) the University level (esp. budgeting and planning) at (ii) cross –organisation-unit level and at (iii) intra organisation unit level. The review was intended allow staff across the organisation to identify opportunities for the reform or renewal of work processes.

Objectives

Objective 1: Develop a Model of the Organisation.

The modelling should capture the high level core and enabling processes of the organisation, alignment between processes and the business goals of the organisation, interrelationships among processes, and list inputs, outputs, controls and mechanisms. Tangible outputs of the exercise would include a range of spatial models and narratives, including high level process models, stakeholder context models and process profiles.

Objective 2: Identify Gaps and Issues with Faculty and Division work processes and their impacts.

Using the models developed through Objective 1, review the processes of the organisation through a series of interviews and workshops with relevant stakeholders and prepare reports on gaps and issues.

Objective 3: Identify candidate process improvement opportunities based on the gaps, issues and impacts.
Approach summary
(For a detailed overview of the project methodology, see Appendix B)

1. Prepare a draft high level CSU Process Model (Figure 4). The process of developing the model was iterative beginning with a draft model refined with input from the senior portfolio managers. Further refinements were developed with senior management in each area. The complete CSU model also included reference to University values and to the 4 key objectives set out in the University Strategy 2007-2011, so that these could be acknowledged as the review of processes progressed throughout the organisation.

2. Confirm the University Strategy and verify the CSU Process Model with the Senior Executive Committee.

3. Conduct Briefings with Faculty Deans, Heads of School, Executive Directors of Division and their Directors and Senior Managers to:
   - Agree the makeup of process review teams
   - Verify the CSU Process Model and
   - Prepare draft Divisional process models.

4. Conduct Workshops with review teams to:
   - Refine Process models and capture the key stakeholder interactions (Figure 5 – Stakeholder context model example)
   - Conduct process health analysis and document gaps, issues and improvement opportunities

5. Capture detailed process profiles identifying the key attributes of university core and enabling processes (Figure 6)

6. Prepare and Deliver the ‘Opportunity Identification’ report to the Senior Executive covering detailed analysis of the core Learning and Teaching and Research processes.

7. Deliver ‘As-Is Situation’ reports to the Divisions Offices and Centres covering detailed analysis of the enabling processes.
Figure 4. CSU Process Model
Figure 5. Stakeholder Context model example
## PROCESS: WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

### SUB-PROCESS

**PROCESS RECLASSIFICATION APPLICATION**

### BRIEF DESC

General staff prepare an application for reclassification for consideration by their supervisor and the Job Evaluation Committee.

### EXPERT / PH NO Name & Title

June Scott  
Ph: 12341

### RESPONSIBLE DEPT

Division of Human Resources

### LOCATION(S)

Where is the process performed?  
Bathurst Campus on behalf of all staff on all campuses.  
Does it need to be in a fixed location(s)?  
No

### GOAL

Brief desc of the goal of this Process  
To ensure that changes to positions are captured and appropriately graded.

### INPUTS

What is required for the process to execute?  
- Position Description which forms the basis of the classification (has Org chart attached)  
- Classification descriptors

### OUTPUTS

What is the result of the process?  
- Successful or non successful reclassification applications  
- Successful applications are then updated in Alesco  
- Correspondence to staff (and their supervisors) regarding outcomes of applications

### MECHANISMS

**Systems/Applications**  
e.g Banner, Excel, Access  
- Alesco  
- Microsoft Office 2007 products  
- Videoconferencing  
- Teleconferencing

### CONTROLS (generic level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privacy Act</td>
<td>CSU Reclassification Policy</td>
<td>CSU Enterprise Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RELATED PROCESSES

Are there any processes that precede or are dependent on the outcomes of this process?  
- Alesco updates  
- Original classification of positions

### Key Stakeholders

**Dept Internal**  
- Employee Relations department

**CSU Internal(including, Committees)**  
- All staff  
- Job Evaluation Committee

**External (Suppliers, Stat .Bodies, Referral agencies)**

### EVENTS / DATES

**Approx Date/ Period**  
- May and August  
- July and October  

**Event Desc (End of Year, HECS Closing date)**  
- Submission dates for Applications  
- Advise to applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>23.4.2008</td>
<td>A.J. Milner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6. Process Profile Example*
| Participation – Seek wide input from process owners and participants. |
| Inclusivity – Communicate with the organisation in the language of the organisation rather than, for example, ‘corporate speak’. |
| Consult early with Faculty Deans, Executive Directors and Directors to secure top level commitment. Universities are large and complex organisations and collegiality is considered important. Begin this process when designing the methodology. Given significant existing pressures on academic and administrative staff, ensure to optimise time with these key resources. |
| Validate the approach and the findings through engagement with key reference groups³ |
| Communication: Develop an appropriate balance of face to face briefings and other methods such as web-based communication |
| Keep an eye towards timeliness of the outcome: Maintain momentum in the interests of relevancy and sustained buy-in. A 12 month timeframe from the commencement to the completion of the process was originally estimated. A draft report was released in that timeframe and the final report released 3 months later. |
| Establish feedback mechanisms early to track outcomes of the review itself. At CSU, in addition to the initiatives triggered by the final report, many activities were triggered as a direct result of review workshops. If feedback/monitoring mechanisms are not in place, many of these will be invisible and the overall impact will be poorly understood. |
| Focus on the key stakeholder interactions rather than every interaction. Determine what these are at a high level before spending time extracting irrelevant detail in workshop settings. |

³ At CSU, these included a range of groups including, Professoriate, Course-Co-ordinators’ Committee, Middle Managers’ Forum, Senior Women’s Forum, Heads of School Forum
Outcomes

The Opportunity Identification Report

Themes

The Opportunity Identification report identified organisation-wide themes to be addressed at the strategic level. The themes identified:

- A range of process inefficiencies that result in duplication, increased operating costs and diversion of funds from strategic activities.

- Inadequate Information Infrastructure and Systems support for particular processes. Lack of availability and access to timely and accurate corporate data and support for data sharing among applications.

- That clear ownership for “student support” has not been ascribed

- That recognition and articulation of customer support as a key responsibility of operational divisions would facilitate the identification of issues and gaps in this important area.

- That Budget Centres in Schools and Divisions indicated a number of problems related to the general issues of day to day management of the business. Examples include inadequate support and training in business management techniques for academics assuming roles with a high administrative responsibility e.g., Head of School.

- That management of change presents a challenge for the organisation whether in managing process change, policy change or overall organisational change.

- That no formal framework or strategy exists for managing business processes or identifying ownership of end-to-end processes.

- That the organisation has a limited understanding and knowledge of the relationships, interactions and dependencies among people, processes, projects, information, events and strategy, moreover, how CSU works.

Recommendations
16 general recommendations were addressed to the Senior Executive Committee on strategic and tactical improvement opportunities

**Issues, impacts and improvement opportunities**

A comprehensive schedule of issues, impacts and improvement opportunities were identified for the core processes of the University

**Divisional As-Is Situation Reports**

14 As-Is situation reports were presented to the Divisions, Offices and Centres identifying issues, impacts and improvement opportunities, many of which had no impact outside the relevant organisation unit and could be funded from operational budgets.

**A Higher Education Reference Model**

The CSU Process model (Figure 4) can be readily adapted as a reference model for the HE sector. Most institutes will identify with Learning and Teaching and Research as core processes and the enabling planning and governance processes will be similar to those presented in the CSU Process model.

| Time spent drafting, reviewing, and gaining consensus on a high level process model for the organisation is time well spent. It provides the basis for communicating the business of the institute to a wide audience and supports wide ranging applications, some examples being business process management, applications portfolio management, business continuity, induction, and decision making on investment in strategic and tactical initiatives with or without an ICT component. |
Project 2: Develop an Enterprise Model

Overview

“Enterprise modelling is the process of understanding an enterprise business and improving its performance through creation of enterprise models. This includes the modelling of the relevant business domain (usually relatively stable), business processes (usually more volatile), and IT......

An enterprise model is a representation of the structure ("things" and relationships), activities, processes, information, resources, people, behavior, goals, and constraints of a business, government, or other enterprises.”


The CSU Process model, the stakeholder context modes and the process profiles developed in Project 1, provided the key inputs to the development of an enterprise model that could be used to support workplace reform and continuous improvement. The process model identified what the organisation does with detail on the processes provided through process profiles gathered in Project 1. The stakeholders models identified much of the ‘Who’ and the process profiles provided information regarding inputs, outputs, controls, systems, process relationships, goals, events, and activities. What was needed now was a means to bring this information together and to make it accessible to a wide range of known and future applications.

The early stages of the program, drew upon review of theory and practice in Enterprise modelling and business process modelling and set about:

A. Identifying relevant frameworks, in particular, the Zachman Framework see (www.zifa.com), and value-chain analysis (Porter, 1998) and the current information and data architecture knowledge, then using these to guide thinking about what information set ought to be considered in developing the model.

B. Deciding on the information required to populate the model

Project Deliverables

- yourCSU handbook and online version capturing models of the organisations’ processes and organisation.
- CSU Process Knowledge base; a relational database that links process data and applications and supports process renewal and improvement efforts.
- Communication of the model to the University community
- Note: The CSU Process Model and Organisation Unit Process Models developed in earlier stages form part of the overall Enterprise Model
C. Developing templates and ‘sub’ models that could be used to capture the required information. This led to the development of templates for the process models, stakeholder models and process profiling.

D. Developing a data model.

E. Constructing a prototype database to house the model information.

In Project 1, Opportunity Identification, process information was collected through the development of process and stakeholder models of the university and of organisation units and through the conduct of interviews, surveys and workshops. The information thus gathered was maintained in a variety of formats, but it provided the basis for the development of a Process Knowledge Base.

While this was in progress, it became clear that benefit could be drawn from this process knowledge in the short term, if it could be made accessible to the wider CSU community. This would shift the emphasis from a task-centric to a process-centric view of the organisation, thereby developing a better appreciation of the impact of changes in one area on other parts of the organism.

This resulted in the identification and launching of two separate but related sub-projects:

(i) **Develop a reference handbook** as a resource for all staff members that would provide high level information about the inner workings of the University. The handbook brought together:

   a. Business Process information drawing on information gathered in the review of work processes.

   b. Organisation information in the form of organisation charts and associated narrative.

   c. A description of the University Planning and Governance processes

(ii) **Develop a Process Knowledge Base** repository to house the detailed process information gathered in the review of work processes, as an enabler for a range of decision support processes and to support continuous improvement efforts and business process management into the future.
Objectives

1. Extend the design of the functional model developed in Project 1 to establish linkages with applications and data architectures, and to capture process profiles including identification of inputs outputs controls mechanisms, goals, related processes.

2. Set up a relational database that can be used to support process improvement and renewal effort.

Approach summary

Project Organisation

- 1 x Fulltime Business Analyst/Project Manager reporting to the program manager
- 0.3 x Senior Architect (Consultation on the development of a data model)

Stakeholder consultation with:

The Senior Executive Committee
To sign off on the broad content and design of the handbook and web page.

Focus Groups
Identify focus groups in conjunction with the Organisational Development section of the division of HR. The purpose of the focus groups is to provide input on the design of the handbook and website.

Activities

---

Focus Groups included Course co-ordinators committee, Middle Managers’ forum, Heads of School forum, Professional Experience Network,
It was determined that the model would comprise inter-related representations of the business of the University, with a high level CSU Process Model at the core. The model is a structure depicting all the primary processes and their relationship to one another to accomplish the objectives of the University. The process model describes the core and enabling processes of CSU.

Other components of the enterprise model include Stakeholder context models, identifying key stakeholders and describing the interactions that the stakeholders have with the university.

The CSU process model served to guide the review of CSU’s processes including the conduct of health reviews of those processes and the identification of issues and their impacts and improvement opportunities. The process model continues to serve as a communication tool for various cohorts within the University. These cohorts include the Senior Executive and those engaged in planning processes and those undertaking process analysis, improvement and renewal across the University. The model has tactical application also such as supporting induction and training processes.

**Components of the model**

Table 3. describes the major components of the model and the applications that each supports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Typical applications supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The CSU Process model *(Note 2)* | Describes at a high level the core and enabling processes of the University | • Training and induction  
• Process health reviews  
• Enterprise architecture impact assessments  
• Prioritisation of business initiatives  
• Can be adapted as a reference model for other institutes in the HE sector. |
<p>| 2. Organisation unit Process models such as Divisional Process models | Describes at a high level the core and enabling processes of the organisation unit, e.g., Division of Facilities Management, Office | • Training and induction |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Typical applications supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| of Planning and Audit, Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Division of Information Technology etc. | • Process health reviews  
• Enterprise architecture impact assessments  
• Prioritisation of business initiatives | |
| 3. Stakeholder Context diagrams and associated interactions tables. | Identifies the key stakeholders of the University and the nature of the interactions between the University and the stakeholder.  
Stakeholder contexts were developed at the CSU level and at the Organisation unit level.  
Stakeholder contexts assist with the identification of appropriate participants in process review, redesign or renewal activity | • Process health reviews  
• Enterprise architecture impact assessments | |
| 4. The CSU Disciplines Profile | Describes the disciplines of the university that informs the core processes of Learning and Teaching and Research, and is a key strategic and workforce planning tool. | CSU Strategic Planning and Budgeting (CSU Disciplines profile) |
| 5. Core and Enabling Process Profiles | These profiles identify inter alia, inputs, outputs, controls, mechanisms, goals, related processes and key events. | Training and induction  
Process health reviews  
Enterprise architecture impact assessments  
Prioritisation of business initiatives |
| 6. yourCSU handbook and online versions | Describing the Who, What, When, How, Where, Why of the University in a format accessible to the University at large. | The booklet is a key reference for creating understanding of the connections among people, processes and strategy across the University. |
| 7. CSU Process Knowledge Base | The need to provide ready access to the information gathered in the Opportunity Identification project and the possibilities that integration of the process information could offer resulted in a project to develop a CSU Process Knowledge Base. | The Knowledge Base includes support for Enterprise Architecture Assessment of initiatives and general initiatives management support. Other applications will be rolled out as the organisation matures. |

Table 3. Enterprise Model components
**Stage 1 Activities**

1- Collate the stakeholder context models, CSU and Organisation unit process models and process profiles gathered in the WPI Opportunity Identification exercise.

2- Review also organisation charts and role descriptions for the functional units and for the university committee structure.

3- Consult with the executive and with focus groups on the design, content and format of the printed and online versions of the handbook.

4- Prepare a draft design and review with the executive and with forums.

5- Finalise and organise print and distribution of the handbook.

6- Develop processes for maintaining and updating handbook content.

7- Handover to the Directorate of Enterprise Architecture

**Stage 2 Activities**

1- Trial the early prototype – an access database – with the Data manager, Office of Planning and Audit and consider the feedback from that office.

2- Develop an updated data model linking the process engine with other Enterprise architecture schema for applications and data in conjunction with the directorate of enterprise architecture.

3- Consult with vendors towards developing an updated prototype. Consider also developing the solution internally. The outcome of this exercise was a decision to develop internally due to (i) budget constraints and (ii) insufficient level of comfort with the vendor’s understanding of the requirement which would have resulted in too much ‘hand-holding’.
4- Develop and populate the updated solution with test data.

5- Review the new CSU Process Knowledge Base (PKB) with the Project Service Centre including Project managers and business analysts. Review also with the Directorate of enterprise architecture.

6- Populate the model.

7- Handover PKB to Enterprise Architecture as the primary users of the tool. Enterprise Architecture is in the process of migrating the tool to an Oracle back end.

Communicating the model

The vehicles through which the model has been communicated to the wider university community include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Process Improvement, Opportunity Identification Report, April 2007.</td>
<td>The key deliverable of the Work Process Improvement, Stage 1 review that was the first project in the overall program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourCSU – hardcopy handbook and online versions</td>
<td>A handbook describing the who, what when where and how of CSU using models developed during the Stage 1 review in addition to organisation charts and roles and responsibilities descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CSU Process Knowledge Base</td>
<td>A relational database that holds models, process profiles and links to other enterprise architecture information such as the data and applications architectural descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CSU Disciplines Management Information System</td>
<td>An MIS that maintains the CSU Disciplines information and informs strategic and workforce planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented Models and Narratives</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes

Fundamental organisational information readily accessible to the wider university community through access to yourCSU handbook and online, covering the why, who, how, where, when and what of the University. This has served to

- Further the concept of ‘One University’.
- Widen appreciation of the impacts of change through knowledge sharing
- Provide a key reference supporting induction and professional development activities
- Improve organisational communication,

Access to the CSU process knowledge base delivering:

- A central repository of process information currently available for use by the Directorate of Enterprise Architecture and in the future to a range of cohorts in the University.
- Enhanced decision support information available as input to university budgeting and planning processes, e.g., supporting selection prioritisation and investment in ICT and non-ICT improvement initiatives.
- An enabling tool for:
  - The implementation of Applications Portfolio Management through, inter alia, linking processes, people (process owners, contributors, and other stakeholders), applications and data.
  - Supporting continuous improvement and business process management through, inter alia, providing a framework for conducting process health checks and for monitoring performance.
- Supporting business analysis efforts through providing business analysts with a central repository of information on processes, stakeholders and applications.

| Quick win. The model represents significant effort in bringing together information about the organisation and the potential for the organisation to benefit from this is significant. In CSU’s case, the development of the yourCSU handbook enabled the workings of the university to be communicated to the entire university staff in a readily accessible format. |
| Involve enterprise architects, business analysts e.g., from the project centre in developing the model. |
| Develop a prototype that makes sense for your organisation before looking outside. Once the potential applications of the model are better understood, you will have a greater appreciation of the scale and complexity involved from the data collection, data maintenance and roles and responsibilities perspectives. Moreover, the chances of making a convincing case to buy or build a tool that works for the organisation are greatly enhanced. |
| Develop a communication strategy to optimise messaging to the organisation. Work with the marketing department to identify forms of media that work best for which cohorts. |
**Project 3: WPI Stage 2**

**Overview**

Addressing key recommendations in the Opportunity Identification Report, specifically through (i) Considering the key improvement/renewal recommendations and using these to inform the budget and planning process for 2007/2008 (ii) Developing and implement an initiatives handling process towards improving decision making with regard to the selection and prioritisation of improvement or renewal initiatives and (iii) Develop a Business Process Management strategy appropriate for CSU.

**Objectives**

**Objective 1: Consider the findings of the Opportunity Identification report as input to the budget and planning deliberations for 2007/2008**

The Portfolio Managers guided senior management through a review of the opportunity identification report to identify priority items that needed to be include in the annual planning and budget cycle. This assisted in the identification of new initiatives or the re-prioritisation of existing planned initiatives in the budget process. This was conducted as a point in time activity through the development of a list of all initiative currently underway and the identification of resources needs to support those initiatives.

**Objective 2: Develop an initiatives handling process**

Objective 1. To guide how process improvement initiatives are selected and prioritised. Much of the difficulty in dealing with change is competition for resources. While mechanisms did exist by which portfolio managers and organisation units develop and select initiatives in their particular domain, the cross organisational impacts were not that well understood resulting in difficulties in selecting and sequencing projects and vulnerability to vested interests dominating the selection process. Better decision support in the selection process was identified as a key area to be addressed.
Objective 3: Establish a business process management (BPM) framework appropriate to CSU.

The Stage 1 report identified change management and business process management as disciplines that needed to be addressed at CSU. Lack of any process architecture for the organisation meant that there was little chance that the broader impact of proposed changes would be taken into account in complex cross organisation improvement efforts. The establishment of a BPM framework that would take account of the contextual variables that applied at CSU was seen as key to underpinning process change. In turn this would be complemented by the establishment of a change and renewal framework that was the remit of the Culture and Change program.

Approach summary

Developing the Schedule of Initiatives

As part of the overall review of the Opportunity Identification report, the University Administration Services Executive Committee considered the findings of the report and identified target improvement initiatives for consideration in the 2007/2008 budget round. A schedule of initiatives was commissioned bringing together in one place the list of all initiatives at various stages of the initiative cycle from concept through to active project. Representatives from Faculties, Divisions, Offices and Centres were invited to identify initiatives in their respective areas and to provide information regarding sponsorship, funding status, alignment with strategic or operational objectives and, where possible, resource requirements. On the basis of their input, the schedule of initiatives was developed.

Initiatives were categorised into four groups:

- Active projects
- Pending Projects for which funding was already approved.
- Projects seeking funding in the current budget round
- Wish list of other project for the longer term
A resource analysis report was developed to accompany the schedule. This report outlined the current position with regard to resources deployed on active projects and the projected requirements for all other categories. The schedule and resources report provided direct input to budget decision making.

The committee then agreed a selection of target improvement initiatives that were then presented to the budget committee for consideration in the 2007/2008 budget round.

Developing the Initiatives handling process

The value of the schedule of initiatives and the resource report in the budget deliberations triggered the demand for a repeatable initiatives handling process that would support the initiative life cycle from concept through to funding and prioritisation.

The Administrative Services Executive Committee nominated a working party to develop an outline initiatives handling process. A discussion paper was developed based on the Opportunity Identification report and previous handling models used in the University. The working party sat for a series of three facilitated workshops to develop an outline process. An outline process was presented for comment to the Institutional Development Committee and the Senior Executive. The proposed process with some refinements was signed off, an implementation plan developed and the first phase implemented. Further phases are expected following monitoring of the performance of the first implementation.

Business Process Management Strategy

In reviewing contemporary practice in business process management, the program established a connection with the Business Process Management Group at QUT, a leading research group conducting third-party funded research projects into BPM. The connection led to an invitation to CSU to participate in a case study exploring the progression of business process management practice across a range of public and private organisations, using as a key tool a business process management maturity model. The case study focused on mapping CSU’s position with regard to BPM on the BPM Maturity model and tracked the progression of business process management at CSU from the first year of the program, 2005 through to 2007.

---

5 The Institutional Development Committee oversees the implementation of the Institutional Development Plan, one of five plans established to address the key objectives of the University Strategy.
This provided input into the development of a BPM strategy for CSU. A paper on the development of the BPM strategy for CSU is available as a downloadable module at: [www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp](http://www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp)

### Outcomes

- Inclusion of new initiatives for inclusion in the Infrastructure plan for the organisation.
- Recognition at the executive level of the importance of understanding the overall resource capability picture with regard to servicing the schedule of initiatives. This recognition was instrumental in securing buy-in for objective 2.
- A repeatable initiatives handling process improving decision making on selection and prioritisation of initiatives.
- A defined channel for the submission of initiative from wherever they emanate in the organisation.
- A business process management strategy for the university.
- An applications portfolio management process for the University.

Opportunity identification will lead to improvement activity, but without creating a framework within which change can be managed, the potential for initiatives to be undertaken in silos is significant. The impact of change on other processes and other aspects needs to be understood.

In considering a BPM strategy, a holistic approach that considers all aspects including, strategic alignment of processes, governance structures, information technology, methods, people and culture is required.
Project 4. Culture and Change

Overview and Objectives

Change Management

A key objective of the CSU University Strategy 2007-2011 is to continue to build institutional strength, reputation and sustainability through developing a culture responsive to organisational change and renewal. To achieve this objective CSU recognised the importance of an Organisational Change and Renewal Framework which was developed under the WPP Culture and Change Project. This framework will assist CSU to:

- Provide a systematic approach to managing change for important change initiatives, such as organisational reforms including large scale projects and initiatives
- Assist leaders and managers to effectively manage change, importantly before the change is decided, to maximise the chance of success and minimise resistance to change
- Demonstrate to affected parties how different workplace reforms and initiatives could impact upon and improve performance
- Assess and manage the impact of individual reforms on the organisation and therefore minimise the risk of individual reforms conflicting with each other
- Appreciate and understand the effects of change in advance, to proactively support and implement change and reform (engineer rather than adapt because of change)
- Scope the extent of change and organisational change initiatives
- Provide professional development to leaders, managers and staff engaging in change management that will develop a culture responsive to organisational change and renewal

Business Reporting Language and Professional Development for Leaders and Managers

A share business reporting language, skills in managing change, planning, people and resources were all seen as important in the effective management of change at CSU and for increasing organisational knowledge and capability to report against our business. These resources will assist CSU staff to:
- Inform planning and resource allocation
- Analyse business factors (load, funding and human resources)
- Apply analysis to planning, including change management
- Communicate analysis and planning to staff to inform individual, team and organisational performance

**Cultural Change**
A change in culture that is demonstrated by business practices that base planning, decision making and financial management on factual information including data from the external and internal environment (benchmarking and standards).

| Look at the ideas from the other projects areas | these suggestions are important in all cultural change work and were important in this process. |
| Identify and consult with all key stakeholders early | and involve them in the development of cultural change tools – change management framework and learning resources. Senior management ‘buy in’ is important early, however is difficult to engage in an authentic sense. |
| Don’t reinvent the wheel - use the experts, library databases and colleagues from other universities | change management and cultural change are not new concepts. |
| Less is more | develop learning resources considering realistic timelines, workloads of leaders and managers and links to existing resources. |
| Take a facilitative approach | the project manager is a skilled and Certified Professional Facilitator who facilitated consultative approaches with stakeholders and developed learning resources for facilitative leadership. |
| Quick wins | demonstrating the success of cultural interventions such as yourCSU and Email Best Practice Guidelines early and during the project helps to gather momentum and ‘buy in’ to the process. |
| Establish feedback mechanisms early | focus groups are an effective tool for benchmarking the current status while promoting the project and cultural change initiatives early. |
| Learn, review and continually improve | be authentic in your approach and use the tools that you are promoting eg. PIRI cycle (Plan, Implement, Review and Improve). |
| Be patient and don’t expect early adoption or organisational respect | being at the forefront of innovation can be a lonely place. Building rapport and being a mutual sounding board with project peers and managers is important for survival. |
Approach Summary

Preliminary phase
1. **Benchmarking** with other universities and organisations and reviewing the literature on change management
2. Understanding current organisational culture through conduct with **focus groups and interviewing staff** to identify the levers for success and resistance to change and to foster an organisation responsive to organisational change and renewal

**Phase 1:** Develop the change management framework in consultation with CSU enablers and leaders and an organisational change specialist, through
- A workshop with CSU stakeholders and the change specialist to develop a draft framework
- Further consultation and processing of feedback on the framework from CSU enablers and leaders to refine the framework

Note: The framework is based on Synnot’s (2007) framework for organisational transition with modifications devised in the workshop. The framework encompasses elements of John Kotter’s change management framework (Kotter 1996, Kotter and Cohen 2002).

**Phase 2:** Draft framework further developed to incorporate links to change management interventions, tools and web resources, including existing workshops that have been facilitated, eg Division of Library Services, 2005 and 2007

**Phase 3:** Integration with and links to existing CSU resources for leaders and managers, branded as “Leading People Series: Managing Change; Planning; Resources and People”

**Phase 4:** Development and trialling of professional development modules on managing change, planning, resources and people with CSU leaders and managers

**Phase 5:** Development of a change management plan which will include a communication plan to promote the framework and the resources

**Phase 6:** Communication and implementation

**Phase 7:** Revise modules and engage an instructional designer to convert them to online modules available on the Division of Human Resources Culture and Change site and through the extension webpages www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp

*Without successfully managing a difficult transition no leader can be effective for very long – William Bridges*
Evaluation

1. Cultural Change: Focus groups and interviews: conduct focus groups and interviews with staff to identify cultural change in management practices
2. Professional Development Resources: Attendance and workshop participant feedback: the number of staff and their satisfaction will be collated to measure and improve the quality of the learning resources
3. Changed leadership/workplace practice and behaviour: business reporting
   a. conduct survey of Leading People Series participants in October 2008 to establish a change in and adoption of leadership and change management practices
   b. conduct follow up 2 hour assessment workshops in 2009 to establish a change in workplace culture and practice and to record competency on human resource database

Outcomes

1. Organisational Change and Renewal Framework: the framework was endorsed by the Senior Executive Committee on 14th May 2008. Following professional development to roll out the framework it has been used in a number of important change initiatives:
   ● Restructure of Centre for Enhancing Learning and Teaching (CELT) and Learning Materials Centre (LMC) into one Division of Learning and Teaching Services
   ● Indigenising the CSU Curriculum
   ● Review of Laboratory Staff
   ● Engaging online technologies: Divisions of Marketing; LMC and Project Service Centre; Student Administration
   ● CSU Sustainability Plan
   ● As well as in other areas by managers with their teams in managing changes in processes (personal communication and feedback).
   The framework and supporting resources are available on the extension webpages at www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp
2. Professional Development Resources and Business Reporting Language
   A shared business reporting language was incorporated into the yourCSU booklet and website, the Enterprise Model and the suite of professional development resources, importantly Business and Report Writing Skills, Project Management and Business Analysis. All of the following workshops will be available as online modules in 2009. They will also be available to the Higher Education sector as PDF documents at www.csu.edu.au/special/wpp
Table 4.: Professional Development Resources: Workshop Attendance and Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rating (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Change</td>
<td>The Process of Managing Change, Leading and Facilitating Change</td>
<td>Internal workshops 2008, 2009; online 2009</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Strategic Context, Leading and Facilitating Planning, Business Analysis</td>
<td>Internal workshops 2008; online 2009</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Resources</td>
<td>Resource Management, Business &amp; Report Writing Skills, Procedures Writing (pilot in Library 2007), Project Management</td>
<td>Internal workshops 2008; online 2009</td>
<td>Online 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing People</td>
<td>Understanding Culture, Effective Team Leadership, Career Management, The Discipline Model</td>
<td>Internal workshops 2008; online 2009</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

1. Cultural Change: Focus groups and interviews
   A. Internal Communication and Organisational Culture Focus Groups and Phone Interviews: the program manager, a Certified Professional Facilitator (International Association of Facilitators), facilitated groups and interviews with staff in July-October 2007 and 2008. Staff were represented from Albury, Bathurst, Dubbo, Goulburn, Ontario (by videoconference), Orange, Thurgoona and Wagga Wagga.
# Table 5: Focus Groups: Internal Communication and Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Change interventions initiated by the project (what was done)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Key Themes from focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Communication &amp; Organisational Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Academic Staff 49 General Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Change Management Framework - includes a communication plan;</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>While there were continued issues and recommendations mentioned for more effective change management, the Leading People Series of resources and the use of the change management framework and resources, especially in a large divisional restructure, were mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 2 leaders modules: Process of Managing Change; Leading &amp; Facilitating Change</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>yourCSU (the red booklet) and the Discipline model, often referred to as effective for induction and knowing about the organisational structure - “your CSU” gave me a quick overview of where everybody sits &amp; fits so I found it really good” (new staff member).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of induction and support especially about the University structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>While staff reported a difference the guidelines and training needed to be more widely disseminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yourCSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overwhelmed by downward flow of communication with no context especially from senior manager’s emails</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some staff reported that WPI had not been initiated in their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Lack of processes and information”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email Best Practice Guidelines &amp; training of executive assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WPI and Initiatives Handling Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Due to low take up by academic staff, focus groups were offered to Schools. Academic staff were less aware of cultural change interventions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Change interventions initiated by the project (what was done)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Key Themes from focus groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Themes (from focus groups, 2006 Staff Climate Survey, WPI Stage 1)</td>
<td>handling so that we are not asked by 8 different constituencies for the same information”</td>
<td>Leading People Series of resources</td>
<td>Leading People Series often mentioned as very positive professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Professional Development Resources: Attendance and workshop participant feedback

Refer to Table 4. A total of 598 staff attended the workshops. The majority of modules had a satisfaction rating of >5.5 out of 7.0 which indicated an above average satisfaction with the learning provided. A survey of

3. Changed leadership/workplace practice and behaviour: Business reporting
   a. **Survey**: A survey of participants and their managers will be completed in November 2008. This survey will assess the effectiveness of the learning resources and change interventions in terms of workplace practice and enhanced leadership capability.
   b. **Assessment workshops 2009**: these workshops are planned. Outcomes will be reported to DEEWR.
Figure 1: CSU Organisational Change and Renewal Framework: The Eight Dimensions for Effective Organisational Change and Renewal (after Kotter 1996, 2002, and Synnot 2007)

1. Laying the Foundation for New Ways – Leadership & Readiness for Change

Forums: VCF; CHoS; MMF; SMF; SWF; Professorial; CCs; PEN
OD Frameworks: Continual Professional Development, Performance, Leadership & Management, Workforce Planning (WPF)
Leadership programs: FLM; LDW; GCULM; MLQ/
Executive Coaching
Culture: Climate Survey (’06); focus groups (’07)
CSU Enterprise Agreement 2005-2008: Managing Change

2. Establishing a Sense of Importance (Clarity of Purpose)

External: DEEWR – Learning & Teaching Fund; AUQA; Carrick Institute; risk & compliance; triple bottom line sustainability; market position & student numbers; technology; labour & skills shortages
Internal: University Strategy: creating the vision; WPI/BPM: working in different ways; WFP; financial; infrastructure; leadership

3. Forming a Change Team/ Defining Change Management Interventions

Leaders & change enablers/stakeholders working as a team with shared commitment; CSU project and change management, methodology, plans & tools

4. Creating Strategic Alignment

University Strategy 2007-2011 & plans: include “creating a culture responsive to organisational change & renewal” and “one university” approach; Approval processes - Initiatives Management; Line-of-sight Performance Management

5. Communicating the Vision for Change

Build a communication plan using all means: VC’s road shows/staff meetings/bulletin; staff forums/conferences; induction; yourCSU; What’s New; CSU News; focus groups

6. Maximising Connectedness

Increase transparency of decision making processes & create opportunities for staff engagement & trust at all levels; high performing teams & culture; identify & remove barriers (systems, structure & people) to change
Identify and foster stakeholder relationships

7. Creating and Celebrating Short-Term Wins

Establish & celebrate short term, realistic milestones;
Report on progress against strategy, market position: course profile & student load
Staff & organisational rewards & recognition: VCs awards for excellence; PPF; internal & external research funding; Carrick awards & citations; AUQA; individual organisational units

8. Consolidating Performance Improvements & Institutionalising New Ways

PIRI: Plan, Implement; Review; Improve: change systems, policies & processes (WPI/BPM); WFP: employee recruitment, retention, promotion & development; create a culture responsive to organisational change & renewal, innovation, creativity; transformational leadership & learning; mentoring & coaching; Performance Management line of sight continual improvement
Project 5. CSU Disciplines Profile

Overview

Discipline is the key academic building block (fundamental quality and accounting unit) and it is essential that suitable information is available to make decisions and provide suitable controls with respect to the University’s academic focus and strategic direction. This is particularly relevant in the current higher education environment where universities are expected to concentrate on their strengths (i.e., their discipline strengths).

Quality discipline information provides a significant opportunity for the University to examine and, where appropriate, adjust its course and discipline profile and direct resources accordingly.

The aim is to remain innovative and competitive while becoming more efficient – quality discipline information is critical towards realising this aim.

Objectives

The goal of the CSU Disciplines Project was to provide CSU with information to guide planning and actions that:

- ensure that each discipline in which a major or specialization or undergraduate degree program is offered is supported by appropriate depth of academic staffing
- ensure that the discipline profile and associated academic staffing will meet the needs of the University’s course profile for the next 5 years or more
- improve the linkages between teaching and research
  - align the discipline profile with key objectives of the University; especially improving the national and international standing of courses
  - meeting regional needs
  - enhancing research activity

Project Deliverables

Creation of an approved CSU Discipline Profile, including:

- a central authoritative source of the profile and information;
- a management process for the profile i.e. how the profile will be added to/deleted from;
- a supporting University statement or policy with respect to the profile

A strategy to facilitate the introduction and cultural changes with respect to disciplines. This includes:

- The promotion of the availability of and education in the use of this information for the benefit of the University.
- A communication strategy including presentations with exemplars to senior management in a variety of forums.
- A “trickle down” communication process to inform academic and general staff at all levels.

Changes to recruitment, subject approval, and HR administration processes required to maintain the discipline profile.

- Modifications to policies and systems to enable discipline data to be collected and the currency of that data to be maintained.
- Population of the relevant systems with correct discipline information
- Creation of methods and tools to extract, transform, aggregate and present this data into suitable discipline information for the organization.
Specifically, improved information was sought with respect to the relationship between discipline and staffing, student load, funding and costs, teaching quality, and research output. This information is to be used to guide strategic direction and workforce planning.

**Approach summary**

The project was sponsored by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), and a project manager and senior analyst appointed to run the project.

Key project participants were selected from across the Administrative, Academic and Research areas.

Discussion and analysis papers were developed and iteratively distributed and considered by the participants, with actions assigned towards achieving the key deliverables identified above.

Initial findings were discussed with the Senior Executive Committee, the Vice Chancellor’s Forum, Deans, Heads of School, and Faculty management committees. A subsequent communication plan was put in place to introduce final reports.

**Outcomes**

The project developed a CSU Discipline profile, modified processes and systems to ensure the profile is maintained and facilitated the extraction of corporate information with respect to CSU disciplines. The deliverables described have been met.

The project has provided CSU with information to guide planning and actions to ensure that each discipline in which a major, a specialization or an undergraduate degree program is offered, is supported by the appropriate depth of academic staffing and that the discipline profile and associated academic staffing will meet the needs of the University’s course profile for the next 5 years or more. It improves the linkages between teaching and research and aligns the discipline profile with key objectives of the University. The information provides a sense of the University’s performance, sustainability and flexibility at a meaningful level.

The discipline report will be generated annually and is listed as an activity in CSU’s yearly planning and review cycle.
The disciplines profile serves an additional purpose in new initiatives related to setting standards in Learning and Teaching and Research at CSU.

It is expected that the discipline information will become a key academic workforce planning tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Define ‘discipline’ for your own organisation</strong></th>
<th>so that it is meaningful and stands the test of time. Don’t utilise government defined disciplines. Apart from changing, their use of disciplines will be different.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relate people (staff) and subject prefix to your disciplines</strong></td>
<td>and store it – from these two all other information follows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilise data</strong></td>
<td>in existing systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don’t get bogged down in exact data</strong></td>
<td>– these are ‘indicators’ to warn you and to allow you to investigate later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build disciplines profiling into your organisation’s planning and review cycle</strong></td>
<td>to ensure it becomes embedded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Process</td>
<td>Those that directly relate to the core business of CSU. In the CSU model 2 core process streams are indicated:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Learning &amp; Teaching and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Research and Graduate Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Context Model</td>
<td>A repository of Process profiles – key information about processes including goals, inputs, outputs, controls, related processes, common data used and known issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current version of the CSU Context model is in the form of the collected project documents including process profiles, process models, stakeholder diagrams and narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The development of this model forms a part of the brief of the Workplace Productivity Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Processes</td>
<td>CSU supporting processes, largely the responsibility of the Divisions and Offices of the University, that enable Learning and Teaching and Research and Graduate Training processes to be carried out effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Processes:</td>
<td>Those processes that directly influence the core and enabling processes of the University, Faculty or Division. These are largely the direct responsibility of the executive but also include the Audit and Risk processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Processes</td>
<td>Such as the processes of the Senior Executive Committee including developing the University Strategy and the Planning and Review process for which the SEC is responsible. It also includes the development of the 4 University Plans and the Enabling plans that support it and finally, the development of Annual Operating plans by the Divisions and Faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Model</td>
<td>A representation of the organisation in terms of its Core, Enabling, Planning and Governance processes described in this Glossary. The model represents the business of the organisation and is independent of organisation structure. In other words it represented WHAT the university does not WHO does it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variants :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSU Process Model – covering the core processes such as Learning and Teaching and Research and Graduate Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Division/Office&gt; Process models covering Divisional processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Profiles</td>
<td>Pre-defined templates used to capture key process information such as – what are the inputs and outputs, who are the stakeholders, what governs the processes. The process profiles are the primary source of data for the CSU Context model described in this Glossary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Artefacts</td>
<td>Templated process documentation capturing the output from review activities. These include, process models, process profiles, Stakeholder context diagrams and other documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Context Diagram</td>
<td>A spatial representation of the links between an organisation unit and its customers, suppliers, partners and governance agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workplace Productivity Program</strong></td>
<td>Program under the auspices of the Institutional Development Committee towards delivering on the goals of the WPP grant and at a project level, delivering workplace renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Alignment</td>
<td>A planned program under the auspices of the Institutional Development Committee to align service delivery across CSU. See the Institutional Development Plan for details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A. Program Chronology

July 2005  CSU identifies business process improvement as an imperative in its University Strategy.


September 2006  Approval for the Workplace Productivity Program (WPP) Grant from DEST is received allowing the WPI review to be expedited and extended as Workplace Productivity Program – a Structured approach to Productivity renewal and reform.

CSU Launches inaugural Enterprise Architecture Symposium

December 2006  Preliminary Opportunity Identification report delivered to the Senior Executive Committee.

March 2007  First progress report to DEST

April 2007  Final Opportunity Identification report delivered to the Senior Executive committee including individual As-is Situation Reports for each of the Divisions, Offices and Centres. Launch of follow on WPP projects.

August 2007  Findings of the review input to the Budget Process for 2007/2008

2nd Enterprise Architecture Symposium hosted by University of Canberra

December 2007  Release of “yourCSU” printed and online handbook as Stage 1 of Enterprise Model.

March 2008  Second progress report to DEEWR

May 2008  CSU Disciplines Profile launched.

June 2008  Initiatives Handling Process implemented

July 2008  CSU Process Knowledge Base handover to Directorate of Enterprise Architecture.

September 2008  External evaluation of program outcomes conducted

November 2008  3rd Enterprise Architecture Symposium hosted by Latrobe University. CSU presents extension materials to the Symposium.
Appendix B. Opportunity Identification detailed approach

The work process improvement project that was the precursor to the workplace productivity program, was entitled **Opportunity Identification** (See the main body of this document for details of the objectives of this project). This project was far reaching in terms of organisation scope and task scope. Initial meetings to outline the project occurred in October/November 2005 and the final report was delivered in April 2007. To deal with a project of its scope and nature, required close attention to communication with a wide audience and well planned activities. This appendix describes the detailed activities undertaken in the Opportunity Identification project.

**Project Organisation**

Form Steering committee comprising key representatives from academic and administrative communities. The project sponsor with the support of the steering committee and the project manager set about defining the scope of the project.

The membership of the steering committee included:

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration) –Project Sponsor
- Executive Director, Division of IT
- Director, Organisational Development
- Manager, Project Service Centre
- University Secretary
- Director, Management Information
- Convener, Professorial Forum

---

8 Using the University Project management framework (PMF) templates and guidelines.
Convener, Heads of School Forum
Director, Office of Planning and Audit

Appoint a Project Manager charged with delivery of the project, defining the project in conjunction with the Project Sponsor, managing the day to day activities of the project and reporting to the steering committee to an agreed schedule.

Appoint a Process Review team comprising the Project Manager /Senior Process consultant, 2 x Business analysts and a change analyst. The responsibility of this team is the conduct of the project including documentation reviews, scheduling and conduct of briefings, interviews, and workshops, managing process documentation and preparation of the major reports. The change analyst’s role was to review the draft reports on identified process improvement opportunities to identify potential change issues.

Brief the Senior Executive Committee, Executive Directors of Divisions and Directors of Offices and Centres, Faculty Deans and key reference groups on the goals of the program and the implementation plan. These sessions were used to refine the scope and the planning and scheduling of the project.

Activity Sequence

Documentation review

Review existing documentation on the processes of the university including the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) review of CSU and other reviews conducted over the period. Review also the University Strategy and related planning documents to develop a clear understanding of University direction. Finally, review recommended internal reports on issues facing the university and current and planned initiatives underway.

Develop CSU Process model / Verify university strategy

Prepare a draft process model for the university identifying the core and enabling processes of the university.

Review the draft University Process model with the Portfolio Managers of the core processes of Learning & Teaching and Research & Graduate Training and of the enabling processes including planning, governance and Administrative processes.
Update the model as appropriate. Verify the university Strategy.

Conduct Stakeholder Briefings
Brief the Executive Directors of Administrative Divisions, the Faculty Deans, and key reference groups\(^9\) in the course of which agreement is reached on the most appropriate representation in process review interviews and workshops – generally this worked out to be the Divisional/Office Management teams and the Dean/Faculty Advisory committees.

**Process Review Phase**

Schedule and conduct preliminary interviews with all workshop participants and use the outputs to prepare discussion papers for the process review workshops. For the Divisions Offices and Centres, develop draft Organisation unit level process models and draft stakeholder contexts and narratives to guide assessment of unit level processes.

Prepare templates for use in the workshops to capture key process attributes. These include stakeholder context models and interactions tables and stakeholder/process contributor tables. Prepare health review tools to aid in capturing process health. Included in this is the development of health assessment scoring guides.

For each faculty:

**Workshop 1:**
Using the refined CSU Process model, develop stakeholder context diagrams and narrative and process/stakeholder contribution charts. Post workshop, distribute the documented output to the participants and update as required in preparation for Workshop 2.

**Workshop 2**
Assess process health against defined criteria using a scoring mechanism and scoring guidelines. Do this for all core Learning and Teaching processes. Capture narratives that qualify the scoring. Finally capture as a narrative, issues with administrative processes at the faculty and school levels. Post workshop, distribute the documented output to the participants and update as required.

**Workshop 3**
Present the issues identified in Workshop 2. Discuss the impact of these issues in particular with regard to strategic impact and identify improvement opportunities.

For each Division, Office and Centre:

**Workshop 1:**
Refine the draft process model for the organisation unit and gain consensus on the model. Refine also the stakeholder contexts and narratives. Describe a high level service catalogue for the organisation unit.

---

\(^9\) These included, Heads of School forum, Professorial forum, course-co-ordinators committee, Middle Managers’ forum and the Senior Womens’ forum
Post workshop, distribute the documented output to the participants and update as required in preparation for Workshop 2.

**Workshop 2:**
Assess process health against defined criteria using a scoring mechanism and scoring guidelines. Assess also the health of each service identified in the catalogue. Capture narratives that qualify the scoring.
Post workshop, distribute the documented output to the participants and update as required.

**Workshop 3**

Present the issues identified in Workshop 2. Discuss the impact of these issues in particular with regard to strategic impact and identify improvement opportunities.

**Deliver Preliminary Report to the Sponsor and the Senior Executive**

Prepare a preliminary report for the Sponsor and the Senior Executive team including the Portfolio Managers, to provide an indication as to the key themes emerging. Identify remaining work to be done.

**Review remaining areas**

Following the workshops methodology described earlier, conduct workshops similar to the above for the areas of Research and Graduate Training, Budget and Planning processes of the Senior Executive and the processes of the Academic Senate and Secretariat.

**Draft report**

Prepare a draft report including the residual areas reviewed.

Seek review and comment from change analyst and the key reference groups\(^{10}\) on the report and update as required.

Prepare As-is situation reports for the Divisions Offices and Centres and seek review and input from the heads of those areas. Update the As-is situation reports as required.

**Deliver Final Report and As-is situation reports**

Release the final report titled “Work Process Improvement, Stage 1 – Opportunity Identification” to the Senior Executive Committee for review and actioning.

---

\(^{10}\) These included, Heads of School forum, Professorial forum, course-co-ordinators committee, Middle Managers’ forum and the Senior Women’s forum
Release the As-is situation reports to the Divisions, Offices and Centres for their action.

**Process Profiling**

A parallel activity in the course of conducting the review interviews and workshops was capturing basis process attributes including inputs, outputs, controls and mechanism, goals, key events, related processes and current initiatives related to the process. This collateral comprises part of the detail of an enterprise model to be discussed later.