

## **BENCHMARKING PROCEDURE**

### **PURPOSE**

This document sets out CG Spectrum Institute's (CGSI) procedures for benchmarking standard operating practices and processes, organisational policies, course content and academic performance. This document is aligned with the CGSI Benchmarking Policy.

### **SCOPE**

This procedure applies to all CGSI benchmarking activities.

### **DEFINITIONS**

**Benchmarking** involves the systematic and regular comparison of CGSI's courses and qualifications and quality assurance practices and processes, with that of other relevant higher education providers to inform continuous quality improvement.

**Benchmarking activities** encompass all aspects of organisational performance at the institutional, faculty, course and subject level; comparison of standard operating processes and practices; comparison of data on student performance and outcomes data; student evaluation and feedback data; and/or best practice benchmarking.

Benchmarking will include admission criteria and processes, course design, curriculum content, delivery, student performance, learning outcomes of courses and subjects, assessment, staffing profile, selection and performance, course information for prospective students, the student experience, and graduate outcomes.

### **RESPONSIBILITIES**

**The Academic Board** is delegated responsibility by the Board of Directors for the academic governance and leadership of CGSI. The Academic Board is responsible for oversight of the quality of teaching and learning at CGSI, and for ensuring that all aspects of CGSI's courses meet comparable quality standards in course design, teaching and learning, policies and staff selection, and reflect contemporary research and innovation. The Academic Board is responsible for the implementation of this procedure.

The Academic Board has oversight for the quality of CGSI's higher education courses, and responsibility for ensuring that CGSI meets comparable quality standards in course design, teaching and learning, policies, and staff selection.

The Academic Board delegates responsibility for academic benchmarking activities to the **Teaching and Learning Committee**, which oversees benchmarking activities, and establishes a Benchmarking Project Team to be led by the CEO.

The **Academic Director** is responsible for undertaking benchmarking activities.

### **PROCEDURE**

The general procedure for all benchmarking activity is to:

- Determine which areas to benchmark

- Identify benchmarking partners
- Determine types and level of benchmarking
- Determine collaboration protocols which include the sensitivity and confidentiality of information and processes
- Prepare benchmarking documents and templates including the purpose, scope of project, performance indicators, performance measures and performance data
- Design the benchmarking process
- Implement the benchmarking process
- Review results
- Communicate results and recommendations
- Implement and monitor improvement strategies

### **COURSE REVIEW**

1. A Benchmarking Review of organisational and academic processes will be conducted every three years.
2. The Benchmarking Review will consider the following matters:
  - admission processes, including requirements, qualification verification mechanisms, English language literacy requirements, granting of advanced standing and credit transfer, and student cohort analysis and tracking of equity groups
  - the fit between student need, demand and profile and CGSI's course offerings, based on student enrolment statistics, market research, employment opportunities, graduate outcomes, and analysis
  - critical review and assessment of course design, including the range and diversity of subjects within a course, the course structure and currency of the knowledge base
  - analysis of staffing profiles and staff to student ratios and student evaluation feedback on quality of teaching and curriculum
  - the adequacy and appropriateness of course-related information provided to students
  - ongoing evaluation of modes of study, course delivery methods and use of technology
  - alignment between assessment activities and student performance, course learning outcomes and graduate attributes
  - comprehensive data analysis (based on student evaluation data) that indicates significant trends in retention, attrition and progression, and student needs for academic support; and
  - analysis of graduate outcome data and feedback from other stakeholders.

### **PROCESS**

1. The Academic Board will approve Terms of Reference for benchmarking activities in accordance with the Benchmarking Policy.
2. The CEO will compile a list of suitable benchmarking partners and present to the Academic Board for approval.
3. The Academic Director will arrange benchmarking meetings and exchange of data with benchmarking partners.

4. A Project Team will be established by the Academic Director which will work in collaboration with benchmarking partners to compare courses, curriculum, student outcomes, staffing profile and organisational quality processes.
5. Progress benchmarking reports will be presented to the Teaching and Learning Committee.
6. A Benchmarking Review Report will be developed to highlight significant similarities and differences with benchmarking partners, and to make recommendations for improvements to CGSI courses, student supports and organisational processes, on the basis of identified strengths and/or weaknesses and note the date the benchmarking was carried out.
7. The final Report will be presented to the Academic Board, and will include recommendations for course, subject/s, and organisational improvements, for the Board's consideration and endorsement.
8. The Academic Director is responsible for implementing the Academic Board's decisions about the Report and its recommendations.

### **RELATED**

Benchmarking Policy  
 Quality Assurance Framework  
 Course Design Development and Approval Policy  
 Course Design Development and Approval Procedure

### **Version Control**

<b>Document:</b> Benchmarking Procedure		
<b>Approved by:</b> Academic Board		<b>Date Approved:</b> 24 February 2020
<b>Version:</b> V3.0	<b>Replaces Version:</b> V2.1	<b>Next Review:</b> 2022
V2.1	Minor edits and logo	