



## BENCHMARKING PROCEDURE

### Governing Policy

[Benchmarking Policy](#)

### Purpose

This procedure outlines planning, implementation and communication of outcomes from AIB's benchmarking activities.

### Definitions

Unless otherwise defined in this document, all capitalised terms are defined in the [glossary](#).

### Procedure

#### 1. Planning

- 1.1. AIB's Benchmarking Schedule, which is reviewed and endorsed by the Academic Board, specifies regular benchmarking activities, processes and, where relevant, the external partners involved. Implementation of the Schedule is monitored by the Quality, Risk and Compliance Committee on behalf of the Board of Directors.
- 1.2. Where activities become regular over time, they will be added to the AIB Benchmarking Schedule.
- 1.3. Any required additional resourcing and costs for external and internal benchmarking activities will be approved by the AIB Executive.
- 1.4. Benchmarking partners will be approved by the AIB Executive. Memorandums of understanding with external partners will be approved and signed by the CEO. The AIB Executive approves specified objectives, scope and method, timelines, resourcing and deliverables for internal benchmarking and will monitor the negotiation of these aspects in external benchmarking projects.
- 1.5. See [Appendix 1](#) for typical areas to be benchmarked.

## 2. Communicating and Implementing Outcomes

- 2.1. Each benchmarking project should normally result in:
- (a) identification of good practices and areas for improvement.
  - (b) development of recommendations to address areas for improvement.
  - (c) clear understanding of the findings of the benchmarking process and the ways to implement the desired improvements.
- 2.2. The outcomes of benchmarking activities may be:
- (a) lodged with the Quality section or directly to AIB Executive for reporting to and monitoring by the Quality, Risk and Compliance Committee, Teaching and Learning Committee and/or Research and Higher Degrees Committee, Academic Board and Board of Directors
  - (b) shared with relevant functional areas and used to identify good practices, areas for improvement and recommendations for action
  - (c) where possible, developed into research publications to be published by AIB staff.

## 3. Evaluating Outcomes

- 3.1. The Quality section will normally conduct a review 9 to 12 months after the benchmarking exercise to evaluate the effectiveness of the benchmarking activity and its implemented outcomes.
- 3.2. A review report with findings and recommendations for future benchmarking activities will be presented to the Quality, Risk and Compliance Committee in the first instance, and then onto the respective academic and/or corporate governing bodies.

### Related Forms and Documents:

AIB Course and Subject Benchmarks (Internal)

### Responsibility:

Academic Dean

<b>Current Status:</b>	<b>Version 2.2</b>
<b>Approved By:</b>	Academic Board
<b>Date of Approval:</b>	14 September 2022
<b>Effective From:</b>	<b>14 September 2022</b>
<b>Previous Versions:</b>	17 May 2022 11 December 2019 <i>25 October 2017 Benchmarking Policy V2</i>
<b>Date of Next Review:</b>	14 September 2025

## **Appendix 1 – Typical areas to be benchmarked**

Typical areas to be benchmarked may include (but are not limited to):

### **1. Student experience**

- (a) Student feedback and satisfaction.
- (b) Graduate outcomes, i.e. graduate course satisfaction, graduate employment and further study.
- (c) Wellbeing and safety provisions and support services.
- (d) Research candidate satisfaction and experience.

### **2. Teaching and Learning**

- (a) Student performance such as grade distribution, progression rates, retention rates, attrition rates and completion rates.
- (b) Academic appointments including staff qualifications, professional development and promotion processes.
- (c) Course and subject design, including entry criteria, learning outcomes and methods of assessment.
- (d) Course delivery, including technology enhanced learning.
- (e) Teaching performance.
- (f) External Moderation (e.g. external double marking of samples of assessment items).

### **3. Research**

- (a) Research output by staff.
- (b) Research degree completions.
- (c) Quality metrics and output quantity (may include external research income and supervision training).

### **4. Higher Education operations**

- (a) Governance.
- (b) Risk management.
- (c) Resources and infrastructure.
- (d) AIB's representation of itself including marketing and student recruitment.