



University
of Glasgow

IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE: YEAR 1 REVIEW

Table of Contents

- 1. Background..... 3
- 2. Introduction 3
- 3. Methodology..... 4
- 4. Feedback 5
- 5. Summary and Next Steps.....22
- 6. Key commitments and actions.....23
- 7. Final comments24

1. Background

1.1. In October 2009, Court approved a proposal from the Principal and the Senior Management Group (SMG) to restructure the University. The proposal replaced the existing Faculty/Department structure with a College/School structure.

1.2. The drivers of the restructuring project were:

- The need to enhance the University's competitiveness
- The need to promote greater collaboration and multi-disciplinarity
- The need to grow income from research and increase the quality of research outputs in an increasingly competitive environment
- To promote efficiency
- To reduce the number of high level budget holders, and reduce the size of Senior Management Group

1.3. The objectives of restructuring were to

- Facilitate collaboration, multi-disciplinarity and joint working
- Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of academic units
- Facilitate improved research performance
- Improve communication to stimulate creativity
- Enhance the postgraduate research student environment
- Support strategies to improve student success
- Build on the high quality student experience
- Improve administrative support and efficiency

1.4. The establishment of four colleges was defined at the outset with the 'then' SMG, comprising the nine Deans of Faculties. Thereafter, the development of Schools was led by Vice-Principals working with the Deans of Faculties on a nascent College basis

1.5. The project timescale was short, with the new structure in place on 1 August 2010. As part of the project plan, there was a commitment given to reviewing the success of the new structure following the first, third and fifth years of operation.

1.6. The Year 1 success criteria are:

- S1. Establishment of functioning Colleges
- S2. Establishment of 19 functioning academically coherent Schools (removal of existing internal barriers)
- S3. Establishment of functioning Research Institutes
- S4. Establishment of 4 functioning Graduate Schools
- S5. Sustainability of student satisfaction measures in 2008/09 (measured through National Student Survey (NSS), First Year Student Learning Experience Survey (FYSLES), Postgraduate Research Student Experience Survey (PRES) and International Student Barometer (ISB) results)

2. Introduction

2.1. The University's restructuring was one element of a broad package of change aligned with the Strategic Plan, Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision¹ and discussed with colleagues during 2010. This also includes

- Review of reward and incentivisation of performance to include revision of performance and development review processes, completion of modernisation process

¹ http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_180610_en.pdf

- Major investment in corporate systems to improve management information and services to students and staff
- 2.2. During the year (2010/11) the University had to respond to major budgetary pressures due to the deteriorating economic climate and public funding situation. Thus Colleges and University Services were asked to deliver a significant reduction in the salary costs of the University as part of a 3 year programme agreed by Court in February 2011 to reduce the cost base of the University by £20m by 2014/15. This led to the introduction of a Voluntary Severance (VS) scheme, and a series of consultations around a proposal to re-shape further areas of activity across the University, to ensure strategic alignment. As a result of the VS scheme 264 staff (119 from University Services; 145 from Colleges, the majority of whom were support staff) who were in post prior to the commencement of restructuring will be leaving the university before 31 July 2012 (the vast majority of whom had left before 31 July 2011). As a result, £10.5M will be removed from the salary bill.
 - 2.3. In autumn 2010, Schools and Research Institutes were asked to increase our taught Masters provision following a series of 'Gap analyses' conducted by staff in the Recruitment and International Office. These indicated where new degree programmes and revision of some currently offered would enhance attractiveness to international and home students and support, in particular, the planned growth in our international student community. Thus 58 new masters degree programmes were developed and launched by staff across the university and many others revised. This reflects a significant amount of work that contributed to ensuring the projected targets for our international student number (3,166 non-EU) for 2011-12 have been met, and will underpin further growth in our student community over the next couple of years.
 - 2.4. Further programmes of work during the year included the mini-REF pilot and, in particular in the latter half of the year, a significant cohort of staff from across the Colleges and University Services was tasked with supporting development of MyCampus, the new student information system.
 - 2.5. Thus the introduction of the new structure was undertaken against a backdrop of significant change, both as a result of internal commitment to delivering the strategy and as a result of funding changes in the external environment. With hindsight, SMG was overly optimistic about what it wished to achieve within the associated timescales given the range of other projects that were planned and those that had to be initiated as a result of changes in the external environment. The impact on staff was a primary concern for SMG, however the totality of change was greater than was expected or could have been anticipated. The SMG is conscious of this and recognises the efforts and forbearance of staff across the University during what was a period of immense transformation.

3. Methodology

- 3.1. The first year review was designed to be multifaceted with four main strands of work including:
 - a survey of a small number of staff across the University, mainly in or having been in management /leadership positions, as well as the SRC. This survey was conducted by Valuta², in order to give an external perspective to this aspect of the review, and was based on face to face interviews with individuals and focus group discussion.
 - a survey of staff across the University conducted on-line to obtain feedback on issues highlighted through the external review. This survey was open to all staff.
 - a review of support structures by the College Secretaries. It was recognised that the new College support staff structures would need to be developed further during the first year

²Valuta is a consultancy agent based in Scotland, which has worked with a range of public sector organisations, universities and private organisations.

of operation. Thus, College Secretaries were tasked with developing these as the new structure was brought in to operation over the first year.

- A review of the Roles and Responsibilities of the College, School and Research Institute³.
- 3.2. The approach was approved by Senate and Court. The results of each of these strands of work have been integrated into a report based on the key themes arising from all. Results of individual themes are reported in relevant appendices.
- 3.3. A set of commitments and themed areas for action has arisen from this review (Section 6). The purpose of this is to address issues that have arisen, to embed effective processes and develop our supporting structures further, and to progress achievement of the restructuring objectives to address the Year 3 criteria (see Appendix 1).

4. Feedback

4.1. Academic management structures

4.1.1. *Composition/boundaries of Colleges*

Feedback indicates that the new academic shape (which comprises 4 colleges, 19 schools and 7 research institutes) is fit for purpose. Colleges are academically coherent and provide appropriate fora for developing and taking forward the University's strategy. Concern about subject identity in the Colleges of Arts and Social Sciences in particular remain, although the management structure (Heads of Subject on school management committees) and the new website structure is supporting the promotion of our broad range of subjects. Dispersal of their estate makes the integration of support and promotion of cross school activities difficult for some schools and research institutes. We will continue to work to ensure that our broad range of disciplines that underpins the breadth of our work is promoted fully.

College management groups are considered to be working well. During the year, Heads of College led the development of College strategy and engaged in the process of developing the College teams. These are considered to be working well; they provide a two way communication flow among the Schools and between the Heads of Schools/Directors of Research Institutes, the Deans and the Head of College and have brought a cohesive approach to the consideration of resource, research, teaching, postgraduate and university-wide matters in a single forum.

4.1.2. *School structures and Sub School organisation*

Feedback from Heads of Schools (HoS) and Directors of Research Institutes (DRI) indicates that although it took some time, School / RI management teams are working effectively in general across the four Colleges. Real challenges remain around operational issues and processes, communications and engagement of staff in decision making, and level of decision making across the Colleges (see below). Schools have sought to centralise administrative support (and organise by function), but this has created tensions at the subject level in some areas, particularly in meeting staff expectations for localised administrative support.

4.1.3. *Research Institutes*

The seven research institutes (RI) reflect the strategic priorities mainly of the College of MVLS and are considered to be appropriate; staff are enthusiastic and supportive of the potential of these new units. Feedback from external bodies (e.g. Medical Research Council, British Heart Foundation, Wellcome Trust) has been very positive about the potential created by Glasgow in drawing together disciplines across the clinical, life and social sciences and the enhanced opportunities to attract funding. The Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology reports to both the Colleges of MVLS and Science and Engineering, and the newest RI, Health and

³ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/humanresources/policies/p-z/rolesandresponsibilities/>

Wellbeing, has membership of staff from the Colleges of MVLS and Social Sciences, and associate members from other Colleges; a Director was appointed in May 2011.

There remains a concern expressed by some staff about the perception of the academic profile and activity of those in schools and those in RIs. The College Management Groups are working hard to promote an environment where all who contribute positively to the achievement of the College Strategy in research, teaching and internationalisation are recognised, rewarded and feel valued. During the year a mechanism for staff to transfer in and out of the RIs and schools was agreed, and is being supported by a mentoring programme.

Consistent with reports from HoS, the key challenges and difficulties remain around communication, operational issues and processes.

4.1.4. Cross College structures e.g. Graduate School

Graduate Schools existed prior to restructuring but with the introduction of the new structure, there was a reduction from nine to four. With the exception of Arts, this involved the merger of what had been separate units (e.g. MVLS - FBLS, Medicine and Veterinary Medicine; Science & Engineering - FIMS, Physical Sciences and Engineering; and Social Sciences – LBSS and Education). In addition, the new Graduate Schools have responsibility for overseeing all aspects of the postgraduate experience (PGT and PGR); previously, the focus had been on PGR students.

Major priorities for Graduate Schools in 2010-11 were:

- Strategic development of graduate studies including overseeing the development and approval of a suite of new PGT programmes in line with College strategic plans. Nearly 60 new PGT programmes were introduced for 2011-12.
- the streamlining of policies and operational procedures for PGT and PGR students.

Staff report that they have found it easier to coordinate activities given that there are fewer operational units across the University. It is more manageable to get feedback, collate responses and obtain consensus (either in person or by email) and therefore decisions are being reached more quickly.

Deans of Graduate Studies provide the strategic leadership for the Graduate School (GS) and they have found the scale of the role extremely challenging within the time allocation (0.5 FTE). Whilst most Deans feel they have adequate support, this is not the case for one. The first year of the new structure may not however, necessarily represent a normal year, with much work associated with establishing the structures and making them work. The situation, and time commitment, will be clearer once there has been a period of bedding down.

Research Planning and Strategy Committee commissioned a review of the developing GS towards the end of the last academic year. This review concluded that although the GS have diverse structures and varied approaches to key issues, all are functioning effectively and fulfilling expectations. Overall, the GS have developed well in a short period of time, establishing effective organisational structures. The review identified the need for improvements in three key areas:

a. Communication / Information dissemination

- i) Communication with and information dissemination to students, staff and supervisors remains a difficult, and unresolved, problem. Students rely heavily on supervisors and PG convenors for information and Graduate Schools need to ensure robust internal lines of communication. Staff and students also receive a high volume of email communications which makes it difficult to weed out vital information.
- ii) It has been difficult to ensure student representation; this may improve with SRC restructuring.

b. The PhD Journey

- i) Consistent strategies for supervisor training should be introduced and maintained.
- ii) At the start of each year students should have access to clearer induction and class timetables.
- iii) A standard Progress Review process was welcomed, but the form needs to be redesigned.
- iv) PGR students should all have access to some degree of teaching experience and expectations around this should be more effectively managed
- v) It may be helpful to adopt a more systematic approach to encouraging interdisciplinary and collaborative research formats.

c. Space

Attention should be given to ensuring that PGR students have appropriate social and study space.

These findings were supported by the results from this year's Postgraduate Research Student Experience Survey. Satisfaction with the intellectual climate provided by the Colleges including the supervisory relationship and access to research facilities continue to be high, with the exception of the College of Arts where concerns about study space still feature prominently.

The RPSC-commissioned Committee review indicated that the issues noted above would be resolved during the continuing evolution of the GS. However, a number of issues will need to be addressed in the shorter term, such as, simplifying the progress review forms and the level of supervisor training required of and available to staff in these roles. These will be addressed through the Deans of Graduate Studies Committee and the Researcher Development Committee, both of which report to RPSC.

4.1.5. Review of Centres

It was agreed that a review of pre-existing Research Centres would be undertaken during 2010/11 with a view to closing those that were performing poorly or were no longer required. Colleges are leading the review of Centres (guided by the Centre Constitution⁴) and RPSC is involved in scrutinising new Centre proposals and confirming the status of continuing Centres.

Arts: The review of existing Centres within the College of Arts has been progressing well. Seven Centres have been reviewed and will continue, although five of these will be subject to further review after 18 months. The College also scrutinised proposals for the development of new Centres before requesting formal approval from RPSC. This process has led to the approval of four new Centres:

- Centre for Robert Burns Studies
- Centre for Scottish and Celtic Studies
- The Stirling Maxwell Centre for the Study of Text/Images Cultures
- The Centre for Medical Humanities (subject to the provision of further detail about how the Centre will integrate with other areas of the University)

Social Sciences: The review of existing Centres within the College of Social Sciences has been progressing well. Six Research Centres have been reviewed by the College R&KT Committee and (subject to RPSC approval) will continue their activities. Five Centres have been closed and two further centres, whose activities are primarily connected with teaching and learning, will pursue changing their titles to 'Graduate Centre'. This potentially has important implications for overseas PGT student recruitment and will require time to investigate through market research. A further nine Centres are currently under review with decisions expected in the New Year.

⁴ http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_185779_en.pdf

The College has also been scrutinising proposals for the development of two new Research Centres, specifically:

- The Scottish Centre for China Research, and
- The Solway Centre for Environment and Culture

MVLS: MVLS reviewed their existing organisational units during the formation of the Research Institutes. Existing Centres were maintained including the MRC Centre for Virus Research, the Wellcome Centre for Parasitology and the Robertson Centre for Biostatistics; these centres are 'located' organisationally within Institutes and Centre directors are line managed by the DRIs. New Centres may be developed in the year ahead.

Science & Engineering: All Centres continue to be active in the College but some, such as the James Watt Nanofabrication Centre, may not be consistent with the Centre Constitution nevertheless they are established units with an international reputation and, as such, are not being reviewed in this way.

4.1.6. Roles & Responsibilities of the College, School (and Subject) and Research Institute

A number of additional items have been included in the Roles & Responsibilities document (See Appendix 2) to make it more comprehensive; these items were not available for inclusion in earlier versions as work was ongoing at that time. The additions include:

- job descriptions and the appointment process for College Deans
- job descriptions and the appointment process for College and School Quality Officers
- statements on the role of Heads of College/Schools in the student advisory process and the remits of Chief Advisers and Advisers of Studies,
- the remit of Graduate Schools
- clarifying the role of the School or RI representative on Head of School and Director of Research Institute appointment panels.

Some minor changes have also been made such as, an update of the introductory text to reflect that the new structure is now in place rather than being anticipatory.

4.2. Support within Colleges/Schools/RIs and Implications for University Services (US) of reorganisation

4.2.1. Support within Colleges and Schools/RIs

The College Secretaries were set the task of reviewing support structures in the first year following restructuring, recognising that the assimilation of staff from the previous Faculty and Department structure to a generic support structure agreed at a high level was completed over a short period of time. The early months of the year following implementation (August – December) were occupied with getting the units that comprise each of the new Colleges into operation i.e. establishing the committee infrastructure as per the agreed framework and establishing new College teams.

4.2.2. Structures

While it was up to the nascent Colleges to propose school academic structures suited to them, guidance was given such that functional teams would be established for learning and teaching, research, and operational support: the latter two could be combined but it was expected that staff supporting learning and teaching would be dedicated to that functional area. Similar functional areas would be established at College level with the addition of Human Resources, Finance and Business Development, being devolved from University Services (see Appendix 3). Significant work was associated in identifying appropriate structures; this was informed by the outputs of several working groups⁵, which outlined the services that were to be delivered locally within a College and delivered centrally, and advised

⁵ <http://www.gla.ac.uk/students/campus/restructure/workinggroups/>

broadly on the job roles / support structures required to be established in the Colleges along with changes to be made within University Services as required. The student experience group also advised on measures to be taken to ensure continuity of the student learning experience.

For some Colleges the change in structures was radical (e.g. MVLS) and the work required to develop support structures during the first year was much greater than for others. For Schools that were drawing together a range of different departments, similarly much of the first year has been concerned with developing working management teams and committee structures to support the ongoing business as well as working on the shape and nature of the interface with the College teams.

For all staff much of the first year was concerned with ensuring that no major problems arose and the focus was very much on business continuity. In preparing for the new structure the project team had consulted with colleagues in other universities who had undertaken similar change: the experiences of University College Dublin, whose student support arrangements were affected badly during the first year by their restructuring, was very much in the minds of staff. The student satisfaction surveys indicate high levels across our broad and diverse student community (see section 4). This is a significant achievement.

The support structures are broadly configured appropriately, but there are significant tensions around the extent of support in some areas in all colleges. Furthermore the responsibilities of support teams are only partially understood by staff in some areas. There is clear evidence from the staff survey and from feedback from HoS/DRIs/Deans that there has been an increase in bureaucracy, that some processes are more complex than previously, and that decision making authority has been pulled centrally.

Development is still underway within all of the Colleges as they seek to ensure that the balance between College level and School level support is appropriate (adding value and no duplication of effort) and that there is effective resourcing for support units. This is particularly relevant in light of the VSER process last year. This work has been prioritised within Colleges and SMG in 2011/12.

a. Learning and teaching/student support

The vast majority of schools have a learning and teaching support unit, and this functional approach will be extended across all Schools in the medium term. Progress was made across all Colleges in co-locating student support/teaching offices enabling dedicated support for students, and removing the scope for students to visit former departmental offices and find them unstaffed at any point. It is recognised that for some Schools this has been challenging. National Student Survey data⁶ (which samples final year undergraduate students) indicated a maintenance or improvement in scores for learning support.

The impact of the development and implementation of MyCampus has delayed developments in Learning and Teaching support structures and procedures, with staff from across all of the Colleges engaging in developing the infrastructure and processes for the implementation phase.

Work was also undertaken to introduce streamlined arrangements for PG students within the newly established Graduate Schools (enquiries, applications, induction programmes). With the formation of a single Graduate School in each College, progress has been made in harmonising processes and systems for both PGR and PGT students. Outstanding issues around the support levels for the Graduate Schools will be dealt with by College Management Groups in the year ahead.

⁶ <https://frontdoor.spa.gla.ac.uk/commdoc/senate/LTC/Papers/LTC/2011/06.pdf>

Learning and Teaching (L&T) support has worked effectively during Year 1, primarily due to the commitment of staff to ensure effective student support. There are improvements to be made in the support for staff leading a range of activities that contribute to L&T development and enhancement, and ensure there is adequate support for students. To address these, College Secretaries will be reviewing staffing levels and administrative processes as part of their broader work during 2011-12.

b. Research support

Following the establishment of teams at both College and School level, alignment of these teams has begun to promote and support delivery of the College Research Strategies and progress has been made in applying consistent policies across the College. Some colleges have enlarged their research support team which has created a more focused and engaged activity and further work is required to assess the balance of support at both College and School/RI. In particular support for European funding bids has been prioritized and although in the early stages, this has been positive.

Issues that have been a feature of research support for several years are being addressed collectively as part of the project to review and improve our research processes. In the latter part of the year, following discussion with Deloitte, a large number of staff supporting research (as well as some academic staff and academic leaders) have engaged in activities to review research processes across the University and this project, straddling the Colleges and University Services will continue into the current year. It is clear that our research processes have been complex and unwieldy, and re-organisation has made these more difficult in some respects. On the other hand, more robust project approval processes (introduced in each College) have been bedding-in well, to ensure good alignment with strategic priorities. Our research application data indicate that during Year 1 there has been a small decrease in applications. It is too early at this stage to identify an impact on cross disciplinary activity through applications data.

Application and Award number & values

Awards

Financial Year⁷	No. of Awards	Award Value	3 Yr rolling average
2006/07	1,987	£129,123,223	-
2007/08	1,965	£118,748,667	-
2008/09	2,051	£126,112,752	£124,661,547
2009/10	1,964	£110,972,824	£118,611,414
2010/11	2,027	£128,736,280	£121,940,618

Applications

Financial Year	No. of Applications	Application Value	3 Yr rolling average
2006/07	3,260	£372,374,685	-
2007/08	3,456	£363,273,299	-
2008/09	3,297	£383,005,512	£372,884,499
2009/10	3,391	£348,358,477	£364,879,096
2010/11	3,187	£333,801,020	£355,055,003

⁷ 1st August – 31 July

c. Operational support

Devolution of Finance and Human Resources to Colleges has had a significant impact.

- i) Finance: Support to Colleges for budget-setting has greatly improved. There were problems initially with finance and budget transfers, but these have been systematically addressed over the year. There was considerable work in establishing a new organisational hierarchy and in translating from the old hierarchy to the new. A number of difficulties in the transition where there was no easy mapping, required manual intervention. Furthermore, assimilation was still ongoing on 1 August 2010, so budgets were not able to be finalised for the beginning of the year (2010/11). This caused many DRIs and HoS and Heads of School / RI Administration significant concern. Using the new hierarchy also identified the need for information to be provided at different levels of granularity. The introduction of MyCampus has brought further complexity with questions currently hanging over student attribution, particularly to RI.

Financial control has been improved through the devolvement of budgets and financial reporting packs to Schools/ RIs, although issues remained throughout the year within MVLS where the lack of progress on the attribution of teaching income led to significant problems. At this time, all HoS and DRIs should be fully aware of their Schools/RIs financial performance across Teaching, Research and Commercial activity. A significant amount of work was undertaken during the 2010/11 budget round to ensure that Heads of School/DRIs were involved in agreeing I&E's and Key Performance Indicators for 2011/12. This will improve ownership of financial information at School/RI level and improve accountability. Regular review meetings are now held between the Heads of School/DRI and Heads of Finance to monitor financial performance and take corrective action where appropriate.

Working relationships are being established between the College Head of Finance and Finance staff within the Schools/ RIs and plans exist for considerable training and upskilling of support staff to assist in understanding and interpreting budgets and financial information. All of this should help improve both financial control and management information. However further work on structure is required in this area to ensure these relationships are optimised and that management information and financial control are improved.

- ii) HR Function: The devolved location of Human Resource Managers (HRM) and their HR teams has ensured that the HR function is better placed to be able to respond to local client needs, both strategically and operationally. There remain concerns about turn-around times for recruitment of staff and authorisation hierarchies for new posts. The culmination of various organisational issues i.e. restructuring, cost reduction, harmonisation, etc. has meant that devolved senior HR staff are increasingly immersed in operational issues impairing and ability to engage meaningfully at a strategic level.

Corporate HR staff and the College/US HR managers meet to discuss HR Strategy on a quarterly basis in order to align HR strategy and related initiatives with the University's Strategic Plan. In addition, there is a regular monthly HR operational meeting/team briefing forum. Developing and establishing a set of common values and core beliefs to underpin the HR strategy and function aligned with Glasgow 2020: a global vision will be a challenging but significant step in maintaining a coherent, effective and consistent approach across the University.

In summary, the devolved HR structure is operating well from a client viewpoint as senior HRMs have the knowledge and expertise to add significant strategic value to the University. However, challenges remain in relation to two way communication within and outwith the function, the demands of managing within an environment of continual change and the associated skills mix required in a devolved structure

- iii) Other operational matters: Local operations support contacts have been identified for each School/RI which has allowed for some streamlining of e.g. purchasing, albeit that more work is required.

4.2.3. Engagement of staff in the Colleges in determining support needs

Each of the Colleges has engaged with its support staff and with managers in determining support needs. Away Days and both College Management Group and School Executive Group discussions have been held. MVLS has undertaken a review of support levels across the College under the auspices of a panel reporting to the College Management Group. S&E has undertaken staff surveys regarding particular support functions. Social Sciences has engaged staff in a review of its PGR processes and held open meetings on support for international student growth. Arts has held review days in Schools and improved administrative practice as a consequence, as well as engaging with functional Deans to determine support needs. All Colleges hold regular meetings of all heads of support functions in the College Office together with Heads of Administration in each of the Schools and Research Institutes to identify and share best practice.

An away day was held on 7 October 2011 involving all of the Heads of University Services and the College Secretaries. The agenda was focused around meeting the University's needs with discussions on engaging with service users to do so and how services might be delivered more effectively.

4.2.4. Efficiencies

A key objective of restructuring was to improve administrative support and efficiency. Restructuring was not driven by a financial imperative, however during Year 1 all four Colleges reduced spend on support. This was driven largely by the Voluntary Severance/Early Retirement (VSER) scheme which was launched in response to the economic climate and the need to reduce the cost base of the University by £20m by 2014/15. Staff feedback indicates that in a number of areas there is a lack of support for activities; equally some efficiencies have been made by for example co-location of functional teams and, in some cases, resource sharing between Schools. However, a key issue for all colleagues during the year was the lack of clarity/ uncertainty around decision-making authorities; addressing this systematically across all Colleges will promote better and more effective support for staff as we continue to develop over the next two years.

4.2.5. Identification of what remains to be addressed/ improved

The re-structuring of College support teams is at an early stage. A number of activities have been identified, either within Colleges or involving University Services, where improvements are required: These include

- Management information; this is currently not regarded as either reliable or trusted. Consequently there is a lack of confidence around data provided from a range of sources and duplication of effort as staff retain local data information
- More clearly aligning University Services and College strategies to ensure effective partnership working
- Clarifying boundaries between Colleges and University Services particularly with regard to HR and research/commercialisation matters but also regarding student recruitment/internationalisation, development and alumni matters and registry functions
- Improving upon the dispersal of the estate and clarifying decision-making on estate matters
- Removing remaining boundaries between subjects
- Administration of ethics matters in Colleges
- Identifying and responding to training needs of staff in new roles

4.2.6. Future plans

It is recognised that during the last year because of the significant change for many units across the University, time spent on administrative tasks increased. Consistent plans exist within each of the Colleges to develop support structures and arrangements for supporting the College's activities. These include

- Maximising the impact of new systems and processes with particular emphasis on MyCampus, research support review and the HR/Payroll system
- Undertaking further process reviews to optimise support – these will include support for learning and teaching and the staff employment lifecycle
- Rebalancing support staff resources to meet the needs and strategic objectives of the College and its constituent units, and to equalise workloads
- Increasing the cohesion of support to provide effective service and release academic staff time from administrative work.
- Instituting a training and development programme for support staff with Staff Development Service
- Considering opportunities for the sharing of services
- Improving communication (see below)

4.3. Communications

4.3.1. Staff views

Internal communications has emerged as a key issue in the feedback received from staff through the external review by Valuta (Appendix 4) and the staff survey (Appendix 5).

The Valuta Report, generated through face to face meetings with a range of managers/leaders across the University, recognised both the communications issues raised by the restructuring process, but also the opportunity to create an internal communications environment that “engages written, verbal and digital channels”. One of the four core recommendations from that report was that the University should develop and deliver a comprehensive internal communications strategy. This central recommendation for the development and implementation of an internal communications strategy is reinforced by the strength and depth of feedback via the respondents in the staff survey.

Some recent changes in practice adopted include:

- More frequent email messages to all staff from the Principal, or from Secretary of Court, sent out at the same time that crucial Court decisions, or announcements, are made.
- A fortnightly eNews letter to all staff
- “From the Principal’s Notebook” – this regular feature has been introduced in Campus eNews, and statistics show that it is consistently the top story.
- Principal’s surgeries, where staff have the opportunity to meet the Principal on an individual basis.

Feedback from staff indicates, however, that the content of these communications can be overly positive/ optimistic rather than being realistic and honest.

Looking to the future, the Senior Management Group has prioritised the development and delivery of a comprehensive internal communications strategy (see Section 6). This might include e.g. the re-instatement of the Court and Senate Reports, and a new SMG report as standing items in our Campus eNews and a range of approaches that adopt face to face approaches (the preferred method of communications as identified in staff survey).

4.3.2. Website

i) Preparation

Corporate Communications took the opportunity presented by restructure to commission a new visual design and to re-organise the structure of the website: both to reflect the move from Faculties and Departments to Colleges and Schools, and to meet the needs and expectations of our core audiences. In line with the University's strategic aims, the site now highlights our taught programmes, our research and our research-active staff. The web team devoted considerable time and effort into creating the new sites that went live on 1 August 2010. Each College and associated Graduate School, School and Research Institute had a site published in the new web visual identity: with contact listings for constituent staff, and links to appropriate taught programmes, research and research opportunities. All externally-facing core content: 'About the University', 'News'; 'Events'; 'Research and Innovation'; 'Student Life'; 'Postgraduate study'; 'Undergraduate study'; 'International students'; and so on, was migrated to the new design. Statistical analysis of the two weeks before and after restructure showed that re-organising the site led to more visitors finding the information they were looking for more quickly.

ii) Staff profiles

A rolling programme was put in place to provide each research-active academic with a personal profile: drawing contact details directly from the HR database, and information from Enlighten: the University's research publications repository. Referrals from the University's site to content held within Enlighten have increased five fold over the year since restructuring: much of this attributed by the Enlighten team to staff profiles. Each School and Research Institute has been given the opportunity to migrate legacy Faculty and Department information to new profiles. 25 of the 26 Schools and Research Institutes now have such profiles in place.

iii) Taught programmes

All taught programmes are listed within the Undergraduate and Postgraduate taught A-Zs. Prior to restructuring there was duplication in effort and content. The central listings have led to a reduction in duplication of effort, an increase in users viewing this content, a more seamless experience for potential students and improved search engine rankings for this content. The migration prioritised PGT programmes: 71% are now complete. Work on undergraduate programmes is ongoing. The publication of supporting content is being managed locally, with each of the Colleges' Recruitment, Conversion and Marketing Officers taking an overview.

iv) Research

The majority of content still to be migrated surrounds the University's research groupings and activities, and staff have expressed significant concern about this aspect of the website. Feedback indicates that significant additional support is required to push this work forwards. This is a priority for the current academic year.

v) Subjects

Corporate Communications, in consultation with Heads of Schools and Colleges, implemented a new Subjects A-Z in July 2011, allowing individual disciplines to have a presence as appropriate which may not have been obvious from the School title. Usage data indicate that five times more visitors use the functionality of Subjects A-Z to find undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes than the Academic Units A-Z.

vi) Staff views

While the restructured website has led to an increase in external visitor hits, staff have commented that:

- a. the new site is too externally focussed. It does not address the needs of staff and current students, who are frequent and extensive users of the site and not just occasional visitors (some staff believe that it is not fit for purpose), and was developed without appropriate requirements gathering or piloting. Relegating the key access point for staff and current students to the footnote section of the page is seen as an indication that staff and current students are not considered important users. Staff are frustrated that the new site does not allow them to do essential things such as list their PhD students on School/RI pages.
- b. the availability of resources in some Schools/RIs to support websites has diminished.
- c. The new format is more difficult to navigate, the number of clicks needed to access key information has increased and information is more difficult to find. In particular, information on University Services is difficult to find.
- d. In the run up to the Research Excellence Framework exercise, the University's research is not well presented.

4.3.3. Future plans

The Webteam has rewritten the web publishing training and support material to take into account both the new structure and visual design, and the new session of staff training is in place. After staff are trained, University Services will be migrated to the new design. The Webteam continues to build and support new templates to display a variety of content: including image galleries, and audio and video content.

Feedback from a range of sources across the University indicates that further work is required on the website. There is much consolidation work still taking place and migration of content from old departmental sites to new School and College sites continues. It will be particularly important to continue to develop the website in advance of the ELIR visit scheduled for 2013 and for showcasing our research effort in the build-up to REF 2014. Consequently, additional investment in the website has been agreed as a priority by the SMG. The Director of Corporate Communications is leading this work in partnership with staff in Colleges.

4.4. Organisational Development⁸

4.4.1. Context

An organisational development plan was agreed in June 2010 and put in place to support the University in restructuring and the implementation and achievement of its strategic plan. The Organisational Development (OD) Plan consisted of a range of activities including:-

- College specific facilitated events to develop College identities, establish effective working arrangements and support strategic plan imperatives
- School/ RI team focused initiatives to support Heads of Administration*
- Themed workshops
- Heads of School/DRI Practice Exchange Groups
- Cross College Deans Implementation Forum & Network

It was anticipated that a mixture of these one-off events and continuing networks would occur at regular intervals throughout academic session 2010-11. In addition, effective from January 2011, it was envisaged that priority would be given to:-

- Developing Performance Management Ethos

⁸ Organisational development: a planned, holistic approach to improving organisational effectiveness – one that aligns strategy, people and processes (Roffey Park, 2011).

- Developing & Supporting Leadership & Management Capability
- Increase Coaching/Mentoring Capability*

4.4.2.Delivery

College Specific Facilitated Events: During August 2010 to September 2011, approximately 450 participants (equating to around 200 individuals) attended organisational development plan activities from across Colleges/University Services, broken down as follows:

College of Social Sciences	173	College of Arts	69
College of Science & Engineering	94	University Services	29
College of MVLS	89		

College Management Group Sessions: There were 10 College based CMG sessions which 175 participants attended. The key themes included:

- Focus agreed on key areas of College Strategy
- Integration of Colleges/Schools/Institutes
- Cost reduction agenda agreed and worked on
- College Teaching load duplication and reductions identified
- College research strategy and tactics agreed & good practice shared
- Post grad teaching and research agenda clarified and opportunities identified for cross College collaboration
- Team Development for CMGs

School /RI Team Focused Initiatives to Support Heads of Administration*: During August 2010 to September 2011, there were 7 College Administration team sessions which 81 participants attended. Key themes included:

- University Strategy and Admin teams' role in its delivery.
- Following restructure, gaps in service provision & how to address these
- Admin Team strengths and areas for development
- New ways of working better together with limited resources
- Working in a matrix structure
- The need for a common approach/methodology to help re-design of business processes
- Team development for admin teams

Heads of School Practice Exchange Group Meetings: There was 1 Practice Exchange Group meeting for Heads of School/Director of Research Institutes in August 2010 which 18 participants attended. In response to feedback, these were suspended and a 'Heads of School/DRI forum' convened by the Senior Vice-Principal was established in December 2010. This forum has met bi-monthly throughout the academic year, and will continue in the year ahead. There was a stated preference from Heads of School for individualised 1:1 support in the short term that was individually focused in support of perceived immediate development needs. 1:1 coaching support was subsequently arranged and offered.

Coaching: All members of College Management Groups and Service Directors in University Services were given the opportunity of coaching/mentoring and approx. 46% took this up. Participants advised that coaching had helped them to plan better, find practical solutions to dealing with a large number of issues, prioritise better, focus on developing their strengths, consider team dynamics (understand their team better).

VSER: The VSER scheme coincided with the Year 1 restructuring work and in many ways diverted line management from focusing on the OD agenda in its entirety. A VS project team was put in place to help support HRMs and line managers in dealing with VS requests. The team supported managers to deliver the cost reduction required. VSER has allowed some new structures and working methods to be developed.

4.4.3. College-led initiatives

All Colleges have initiatives for engaging staff, particularly in the development of strategy. For example, the College of Social Sciences held a successful professorial away day where senior colleagues met and discussed key issues for developing its strategy. There are plans to repeat this event for other staff groups, such as early career staff.

4.4.4. Future plans

As part of the Year 1 review of the implementation of new structure, staff feedback from a number of sources has been analyzed and some significant OD themes have emerged, viz: improving face-to face two way communication at all levels; providing effective guidance, support and training accessible to all staff in handling and managing change; engaging and involving staff at all levels in decision making processes, particularly in relation to facilitating change management projects and continually supporting managers through the provision of fit for purpose and effective training & development opportunities. In addition, a core recommendation from the Valuta report was that the University should acknowledge and respond to the human impact of change. There is direct and anecdotal evidence that a number of staff suffered with anxiety and mental health issues relating directly to the structural reorganisation combined with the impact of other change projects: many found themselves in unfamiliar territory or overwhelmed with the new workload. Some staff were absent but many remained at work. In going forward, it will be a priority for and focus of staff development services to address these concerns, working in partnership with teams across the University.

The University is committed to ensuring that staff are valued, empowered and engaged in a supportive and inclusive work environment, one in which staff are motivated to contribute to the delivery of University goals and objectives. This can be achieved with the support of staff at all levels. The SMG working with staff in leadership and management roles is responding to the issues identified by staff having participated in Year 1 review processes. As part of this, an OD action plan has been developed (for summary see Appendix 6) and will be implemented on an ongoing basis to ensure staff and managers are fully developed, supported and equipped to undertake the challenges of new or evolving roles.

4.5. Governance

4.5.1. University committee structures

The compositions of the main Senate Committees were changed substantially as a result of the new organisational structure but their remits remained largely the same (Education Policy & Strategy Committee - EdPSC, Research Planning & Strategy Committee – RPSC, and Student Support & Development Committee - SSDC and associated subcommittees). Committee Conveners have said that the changes in composition have had no negative impact on the operation or effectiveness of the committees. Most have said that the reduction from nine Faculties to four Colleges has streamlined discussions and decision making processes. Only relatively minor changes to compositions are being proposed for 2011-12.

The Researcher Development Committee (RDC), a subcommittee of RPSC is new replacing the Skills Training Forum, but has a wider remit as it considers academic staff development as well as that of research students and has responsibility for the implementation of the Concordat for Career Development of Researchers. RDC has been effective in bringing together staff from services across the University including HR, Staff Development Service, Careers and the Students Representative Council. Previously, representation was not possible from all 9 faculties but now the RDC has representation from varying career stages in each of the four Colleges.

4.5.2. College committee structures

The following Committees were established within Colleges and standard remits developed

- College Management Group
- Learning & Teaching Committee
- Board of Studies
- Research & Knowledge Transfer Committee
- Graduate School Board
- Appeals Committee
- Research Ethics Committee

Feedback from Colleges is that the College committee structures have been operating satisfactorily. Some changes to the schedule of meetings for 2011-12 are proposed to better co-ordinate the timing of College, RI/School and Subject area committees for onward reporting. Improvements are also proposed to access Committee papers and minutes, either through on-line access or through Sharepoint.

College Council's were also established as "a forum for the consideration of College business and for consultation and communication with staff and associated student representatives in the Colleges on academic planning". College Council meetings were held in 2010-11 in all Colleges except MVLS but a meeting of its Council is scheduled for 23 November 2011. There is some evidence that staff would welcome the opportunity for greater discussion and to put discussion items on the agenda rather than just being presented with reports, which is a current perception. When Senate approved the revised academic governance arrangements in April 2010, it was also agreed that the effectiveness of the remit and operation of College Councils should be reviewed two years after their establishment. This review will be scheduled for summer of 2012, to allow for any changes to be implemented for session 2012-13.

While the committees are working effectively, staff commented in the staff survey on the lack of access to information on decision making (34% feel involved in decision making affecting their work) which included committees. In particular some staff amongst the professoriate have expressed the view that they have lost a forum for contributing to strategy development and discussion. Mechanisms to improve staff engagement in decision making will be given further consideration during this year.

4.5.3. School committee structures

Senate agreed that Schools and RIs (as appropriate to RIs) should establish:

- A Learning & Teaching Committee
- A Research and Knowledge Transfer Strategy Committee
- A Student:Staff Liaison Committee
- A Fitness to Practise Committees, as appropriate

The remits of the Learning & Teaching and Research and Knowledge Transfer Strategy Committees were developed to reflect those of the equivalent College. Some additional School committees have been set up to suit local needs eg Ethics, PGT. The general structure is reported to be working well.

4.5.4. Student representation / liaison

The recent academic restructuring has afforded the Students Representative Council (SRC) the opportunity to develop a more comprehensive representative system. Previously, the high number of class representatives who came under a SRC Faculty Convenor's remit rendered it impossible for these Convenors to keep track of all their class representatives' as well as receive feedback and act upon their activities and issues.

The new schools structure has enabled the SRC to introduce an intermediate representative layer in its democratic hierarchy; Faculty Convenors have been replaced by College Convenors. School Representatives have been introduced and sit between Class Representatives and College Convenors. School representatives only require to be familiar with their own School and keep track of a smaller number of class representatives; College representatives in turn can make use of a much smaller advisory group of School representatives to gain an informed overview issues particular to their school.

The challenge for the academic session 2010-11 was managing a transition which meant running two representative structures side by side. In part this was due to the timings of the SRC elections meaning a 'clean break' was impossible. Throughout the session the SRC still managed to deliver informed representation and effective student engagement within the new structures.

The challenge to GUSRC for 2011-2012 and beyond will be to build the credibility of these extended tiers of representation and ensure that new representatives are effectively trained, supported and recognised by both GUSRC and the University. The withdrawal of sparqs from course representative training places a larger burden on GUSRC to adequately resource such activities at a time when its own funding is under pressure.

4.6. Student Satisfaction

One of the success criteria for Year 1 was to sustain the student satisfaction measures in 2008/09 (as measured through National Student Survey (NSS), First Year Student Learning Experience Survey (FYSLES), Postgraduate Research Student Experience Survey (PRES) and International Student Barometer (ISB) results).

Survey	Overall Student Satisfaction (Response rate)		
	2010/11	2009/10	2008/9
First Year Student Learning Experience Survey (FYSLES)	91% (23%)	90% (19%)	87% (25%)
National Student Survey (NSS)	90% (77%)	90% (75%)	90% (71.1%)
International Student Barometer	89.4% (28%)	91.6% (29%)	90% (25%)
Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES)	88% (45.5%)	- ¹	- ¹
Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES)	84.7% (23%)	- ²	87.2% (36%)

¹. The results were not published in 2009/10 as the response rate was only 5.6%. The University did not participate in 2008/09.

². The University participates in PRES on a biannual basis.

As can be seen from the table above, student satisfaction levels have been maintained (less than 3 percentage point variation is not considered significant). It is worth noting that there was a 3% increase in student satisfaction in the 2011 NSS relating to Organisation and Management.

4.7. IT Systems

In March 2010, SMG agreed to a review of support for the University's IT infrastructure (networking, hardware, configuration tools, emails and backup systems). The review was independent of restructuring but the implementation of the new structure provided a good opportunity for conducting the review with a view to streamlining service delivery and looking for efficiencies. Good progress has been made respect to the key service areas summarized below and in Table 1 below, and discussions are ongoing with each College.

- E-mail – all Colleges are now using centrally provided e-mail services
- Managed desktops - the Standard Staff Desktop (SSD) model is now the primary desktop deployed in three out of four Colleges. It has been adopted for all administrative staff and all academic staff in one School in the fourth College, with adoption where appropriate in other Schools in that College.
- Helpdesk – three out of four Colleges have adopted the centrally supported Helpdesk for staff, students and IT support staff. There is gradual deployment in the 4th College.
- Central filestore (including resilience, backup, disaster recovery and archiving) - Central filestore has emerged as a significant requirement for Colleges and University Services. IT services are working with College IT staff to help prepare a business case for sufficient central filestore provision to support the University's teaching, research and administration functions.

It should be noted that there is a significant range of centrally supported IT services which by their nature Colleges and central administration depend on.

Each College has appointed an IT Manager. IT Services staff numbers have not increased. College IT Managers are reviewing the range of services Colleges need to retain and identifying the corresponding IT support structure that will dovetail with the central team while supporting local needs. In addition, the College of Science & Engineering has established an IT working party to review a range of issues including IT governance, College and School specific IT services, IT support at College, School and RI level.

Table 1: Core IT Services and College positions

Core IT Service	Arts	MVLS	Science and Engineering.	Social Sciences
Central e-mail				
Agreement	Yes	Yes	Yes for all Schools.	Yes
Actions Complete	Yes	Yes	Yes for four Schools. Psychology, Computing Science and Chemistry to be completed.	Yes
Central Standard Staff Desktop (SSD)				
Agreement	Yes	Yes	Yes for all Administrative staff in the College and for academic staff from GES. Adoption for academic staff in other Schools where appropriate.	Yes
Actions Complete	Yes	Yes	Yes for all Administrative staff and for staff from GES. Adoption for academic staff in other Schools contingent on significant customisation/additional software installation.	Yes
Central HelpDesk				
Agreement	Yes	Yes	Maths and Stats have fully adopted. Other Schools accessing in part at present.	Yes
Actions Complete	Yes	Yes	Maths & Stats adopted full SupportWorks client. Chemistry, Psychology and Physics & Astronomy partly adopting at present.	Yes

Central Filestore				
Agreement	Yes	Yes	To be decided. The College has approx 2Pb of research data with a daily access requirement of around 100Tb. Concern over scale of storage required and network connectivity.* Some usage of facility, eg Computing Science stores School (but not research) data – ca. 1Tb.	Yes
Actions	Business case for central filestore provision to be agreed between IT Services and Colleges and submitted to IPSC			

* In ideal conditions a 1gigabit connection would take around 30 minutes to transfer 1 terabyte of data.

4.8. Estates

4.8.1. Completed Works

There was minimal estate change at a macro level following restructuring. University Services and the Colleges of MVLS, Arts, Science and Engineering experienced little change as they remained consolidated in buildings that were already allocated to them. Developing the four College office teams locations took place over the summer of 2010.

The College of Arts office is based in the former Faculty of Arts office in 6 University Gardens. Final establishment of the College office will be achieved following refurbishment of 13 University Gardens in the summer of 2012. Completion of refurbishment works will allow a number of local administration relocations across the College to consolidate the College team in 6 University Gardens.

The MVLS College office was consolidated in the Wolfson Medical School Building, including relocation from the former FBLS office in West Medical Building and the establishment of the Graduate School office in the Wolfson Link Building. These moves were mainly logistical with minor internal building alterations.

The College of Science and Engineering is based in the former Faculty of Information & Mathematical Sciences office in Level 3 of the Boyd Orr Building. Estates & Buildings enlarged and reconfigured the Faculty office to accommodate the College Team.

The College of Social Sciences was established in Florentine House 55 Hillhead Street. This was perhaps the most challenging College office to establish as the property was an existing active Research Group base. However, with the good will and flexibility of the research group, satisfactory alternative accommodation was identified nearby to allow the College to develop Florentine House as the College Office.

In addition to the development of the College office structure across Gillmorehill and Garscube Campuses, many School and Research Institute offices were established over the summer of 2010. In the main, Schools and RIs were consolidated in former Faculty and Department office accommodation. Establishment of the School & RI offices required some minor building re-configuration but generally existing accommodation was found to be suitable.

With the exception of the College of Arts, the physical re-location and development of the new College, RI & Schools was successfully completed during the period from April to October 2010.

4.8.2. Ongoing Works

Estates & Buildings meets with Colleges and a number of Schools on a quarterly basis to review accommodation and space requirements. Proposals to improve or promote space savings are discussed and initial proposals advanced at these meetings.

The College of Social Sciences was the main College to experience churn and re-allocation of building use. The College has the most widespread locations and there is SMG approval to progress a consolidation project within the next 3-4 years. Following co-location of the Business School, the next priority focus for the College is to consolidate the School of Political and Social Sciences.

All initial refurbishment projects related to re-structuring have been completed with the exception of the College of Arts (see above - related to the refurbishment of 13 University Gardens). It is expected that this refurbishment will be complete by March/April 2012 and the subsequent moves can then be achieved.

University Services and Colleges are continuing to follow the established estates planning process which was used by Faculties. This is fully linked to the University's Capital Plan and general refurbishment allocations continue to be available to Colleges and University Services for ongoing minor works. While there are emerging projects that are refining College locations and consolidations these are not classed as restructure projects.

The first phase of campus re-signing has been completed. Lessons have been learned from the quality problems incurred and these will be mitigated in any further phases. It is expected that phase two can be delivered in 2011-12.

There have been some operational issues as administrative contacts have changed and it has taken time to agree local responsibilities for items such as security, fire safety, general safety and building contacts. The main cause of the issues was the restructuring of administrative functions to College and School level rather than at department and building level. This has now largely settled and Estates are continuing to refine their points of contact.

5. Summary and Next Steps

- 5.1 Much of the first year was concerned with ensuring that no major problems in research and teaching arose. In this respect the implementation during the first year was successful, with no major problems and student satisfaction data indicating that students were well supported throughout Year 1. Given the large influx of new students (in particular international students), together with much work associated with the development of MyCampus, and the intense financial pressures and VSER scheme, this is quite an achievement. It is based on the commitment and intense loyalty of staff to the University and its students.
- 5.2 The Year 1 criteria for restructuring have been met, recognising that these were set at a high level and reflected the recognition that a major restructuring of the magnitude undertaken would take time to be implemented in full. However, it has been a challenging and difficult year for many staff. The feedback received highlights that this has been due to the amount of change, in particular cost reduction and system development / implementation alongside restructuring. This significant additional activity has taken a toll. Moreover, the difficulties of implementation of the registration and enrolment sections of MyCampus have added significant burdens on some staff at the start of our new academic year. And so the staff survey (undertaken between August and September) preceded by the Valuta report have shown that a range of staff while strongly committed to the University's mission, vision and values, are feeling that the pace of change has been too fast, that communications other than across local teams need improvement at all levels, and that the SMG and some service functions do not understand or recognise the local impact of the myriad of change projects on staff.
- 5.3 Feedback has indicated that there is a strong view that decision making has been moved upwards in many areas, thus introducing delays and resulting in paralysis of and uncertainty around decision making at 'local' levels. While it was anticipated that in introducing the new structure, decision making would move up the management chain for a period of time until new teams were established under new leadership and bedded in (and new job duties, roles and networks were better understood), it is appropriate now that an active push is made to address the decision-making tree around many core and routine procedures, devolving and delegating within clear sets of responsibilities and accountabilities in a consistent manner.

- 5.4 The SMG has listened to and discussed this feedback at its recent 'away day' and strategy day with HoS/DRIs, Deans and Heads of Services and is committed to improving how staff can be better engaged and involved in strategy development and delivery, and to communications that are a genuine two way process at all levels.
- 5.5 A strong element of feedback from staff in some Colleges was a lack of administrative resource, combined with changes in local support arrangements. The loss of support staff through the VSER scheme has undoubtedly had an impact, which has been amplified by the change in support structures and centralisation of some administrative teams in Schools/ RIs. This has left some staff unclear about whom they should approach for support and, for staff in those Schools/ RIs dispersed over more than one location, has led to a drop in local administrative support.
- 5.6 There are positive outcomes from this year of change. College management groups are working well and there is strong ownership of the strategic development of the Colleges. The budget and planning process is working well and the devolved services, while still developing, are making an impact. Colleagues have not identified many new opportunities for collaboration: though many colleagues have advised that it is too early to judge how effective we will be in this regard at this time. Some Schools report much closer collaboration in teaching between different subjects/disciplines. Others have not yet seen the benefits of coming together in terms of teaching innovation. Externally, research funders like Research Councils, who have visited Schools and Research Institutes and spoken to research groups have spoken very favourably of the new academic structures, and found them well-aligned with funding priorities.
- 5.7 While the challenge of VSER was immense during this particular year, the progress made has enabled the University to position itself well in the medium term. Undoubtedly there is much work to be done to refine and embed our new structure more fully and address the areas and processes that are not yet functioning effectively to ensure that we deliver the objectives agreed at the outset of restructuring. Experience from other Universities which have moved to this structure (e.g. Edinburgh, Birmingham) suggests it takes 3-4 years for such structures to be fully refined and embedded.

6. Key commitments and actions

SMG is committed to delivering a set of outcomes to improve the issues identified from our various strands of feedback from a range of staff. The following have been identified by SMG for action:

- Improve internal communications, in particular face to face communication practice
- Develop and deliver mechanisms/strategies to improve and strengthen staff engagement and transparency in decision making processes
- Deliver an organisational development programme to support staff across the University
- Develop a plan for delivering a reduction in 'bureaucracy' around core processes e.g. research grant/ award management, staff recruitment
- Review administrative resource (staffing levels and skills) and its deployment in Colleges and ensure visibility and clarity of support structures and key roles and responsibilities of these units
- Further develop the website, particularly in preparation for REF and ELIR
- Senior Management Group will reflect on the impact of developments and initiatives on staff across the full range of our activities (seeking and listening to their views) with a view to delivering future projects and developments at a pace that is congruent with the key research and teaching aims of Colleges, Schools and Institutes

7. Final comments

On behalf of the SMG I would like to thank staff and the SRC who have taken the time to feedback and contribute to this review whether through the on-line survey, written comment or informal report. The phenomenal effort by and dedication of staff to delivering our new structure with a short lead-in time, while maintaining an excellent student experience and research reflects a major achievement and contribution to the University's strategy by staff.

I believe we have captured in this report the progress made, the problems encountered, some of which have persisted and the areas for further action, both immediate and longer term. An action plan will be agreed following consideration of the report by Senate and Court to ensure that commitments outlined above are translated into tangible actions and results.

Andrea Nolan
Senior Vice Principal
30 November 2011