

EARLY STAGES OF YOUR PROJECT				LATTER STAGES OF YOUR PROJECT				
What the current issues/problems are that you face. Why are you carrying out the project? What needs to change?	Stakeholders (who has been or will be affected by the change)	Indicators (develop or choose qualitative or quantitative indicators to record change that will happen)	Expected benefits. What do you anticipate these indicators will be at the end?	Baseline (current state)	Actual change (outcomes, or what happened?)	JISC inputs that have helped, or not helped, in the change process. Resources that would have helped.	Narrative around this. Low and high points, HITS analysis (barriers experienced, unexpected outcomes, things to do, solutions)	
Administrative processes differ across faculties with different aspects of best practice being present in each. There is an organisational imperative to streamline and standardise to reduce costs and improve services through adoption of these best practices, including flexible deployment of staff to improve the experience for academic staff and students.		Processes with fewer administrative steps	Time and resultant cost saving				High Points - lots of creativity unlocked in staff who had typically felt unempowered prior to start of project	
		Deletion of duplications in process steps	Tasks only being carried out once, by one person or by one department.					High point - higher than expected level of motivation and engagement with change agenda from administrative support staff
There is a need for flexible working and working more collaboratively. The intention is that administrators, through learning from others, are able to develop transferable skills and understanding of common practices across all faculties to bring about flexible working and more participatory knowledge sharing in the future.	Administrators	Processes that are consistent across faculties	Clarity on responsibility and accountability. The evolution of a central repository for guidance and frequently asked questions. Consistent proforma and data recording. More effective management of processes.	Three faculties working independently, with differing processes. Administrators carrying out procedures that they are confident can be improved, but without any mechanism to affect change. Three processes were baselined including: Mitigating Circumstances; Student Applications Process; Exam Boards Management.	<p>Mitigating Circumstances Process was changed. Now one process exists across the organisation where there were originally differences in the process in each of the three faculties</p> <p>The improvements included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - formulation of a consistent process for mitigating circumstances for the university - refined mitigating circumstances envelope with clearly defined guidance - new process with unambiguous instructions, inclusive guidelines (developed in conjunction with the disability service) - modified method of recording mitigating circumstances, using existing central student database, so that all faculties are able to access the mitigating circumstances record - reduction in the amount of mitigating circumstance boards that takes place - one board quarterly incorporating all faculties, eliminating the necessity for a board for each faculty. 	<p>JISC inputs that have helped, or not helped, in the change process. Resources that would have helped.</p> <p>Process Review Intokit (now Process Improvement Intokit)</p> <p>Archi modelling Software for Archimate</p> <p>Project Management Intokit</p> <p>Change Management Intokit</p>	Professional Development - administrators learned new skills, such as using University VLE System, Process Mapping principles and practice, Action Research and presenting and influencing skills.	
	Quality Managers	Processes that take less time to complete due to streamlined and reduced actions	Improved customer (student) experience. Reduction in work hours spent on tasks.					Low point - Initial distrust of project motivations as seen as potentially designed to reduce staffing
	Head of Quality Enhancement Faculty Administration Managers	Processes that are inclusive	Fewer complaints from students for inappropriate or inequitable treatment.					Low point - Initial lack of belief in techniques such as Archi, but over time most staff became convinced that a demonstrably rigorous process carried more weight internally.
	Deans of Faculty Disability Service Prospective and Current Students	Academic staff report improved processes	Contented academic staff that have more time to spend on academic responsibilities					Professional Development - A noticeable difference in confidence levels of administrators presented in contribution at meetings and presenting data resulting from action research. Raised awareness - academic and management groups became aware of just how much school administrators can contribute to change agendas. Barrier - lack of support from members of the senior management team presented in a lack of trust that administrative staff have the capability to review and enhance own work.