University of Glasgow

Transforming Research Management Project Board
Wednesday 02 May 2012 at 09:00
Kelvin meeting room, 11 The Square

Minutes of Meeting

Present:	Professor Steve Beaumont, Vice Principal, Research & Enterprise
	Ms Nancy Donald, College Secretary, SS
	Mr Robert Fraser, Director of Finance (Convener)
	Miss Alice Gee, Head of Research Administration, MVLS
	Ms Joanne Hulley, Head of Research Support
	Mr Tom Jordan, Project Management, Integra Consultant
	Ms Julie Lee, Head of Systems Support & Development
	Dr Catherine Martin, College Secretary, Arts
	Professor Graeme Milligan, Dean of Research, MVLS
	Mr Gordon Scott, Human Resources Policy Dev. Manager
	Professor Adrienne Scullion, Dean of Research, Arts
	Mrs Louise Virdee, College Research Administration Manager, SS
Apologies:	Professor Stephen Brewster, Human-Computer Interactions, Computer Science
	Professor Catherine Schenk, Dean of Research, SS
Attending:	Miss Sharon McCredie, Project Administrator (Clerk)

1. Minutes of the Last Meeting
Minutes of last meeting dated 23 March 2012 were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

Matters Arising
Actions from the last meeting were followed up as follows:
1. Joanne Hulley (JH) invited Joe Sventek to become a member of the Project Board. Unfortunately, he was unable to commit to the project. However, he agreed to continue to contribute as a member of the PI Steering Group. Joe Sventek and John Chapman recommended that Prof Stephen Brewster represent Science and Engineering on the Project Board. JH met with Stephen Brewster to provide an overview of the project and current status as he was unable to attend today's meeting.
2. JH submitted the updated Funder Intelligence document to the meeting *(appendix 1).* It was agreed that no further amendments are required.
3. Adrienne Scullion (AS) notified Arts PI's to be approached to join the PI Steering Group.
4. Update on Grants process is included in the status update.
5. JH circulated the list of issues/decisions required which were raised at workshops to the meeting *(appendix 2)*.
6. Julie Lee (JL) circulated the updated risk register prior to the meeting *(appendix 3).* It was noted JL will be leaving the University in June 2012.
7. Robert Fraser (RF) & Steve Beaumont (SB) have yet to meet to agree how the HR recruitment process review will link into project. In addition, it was agreed Gordon Scott (GS) should also attend.
8. GS advised most data issues with CORE have been resolved. However, noted a requirement to ensure new posts are coded correctly.
9. JH noted further information on specific system concerns was received from Catherine Martin (CM).

2. Strategy Actions Update
Steve Beaumont (SB) advised that the areas highlighted at the last Board meeting are being progressed. Discussions have taken place on how to support research initiatives effectively including how to offer support to current and future research stars. SB advised that RPSC, Colleges and research committees have identified particular initiatives which the group should focus on.

3. Project Status Update *(appendix 4)*
JH provided the Project Progress report to the Board members.

Grants Process
JH advised that the draft grants process was complete and validation was in progress with workshop attendees. No major changes have been identified to-date. Validation with workshop attendees is expected to finish by 11th May 2012 with the exclusion of Project Management. JH to contact staff who currently carry out project management activities to support the development of a better definition of requirements.

The draft Grants process to be circulated prior to the next meeting for review by Board members.

EU Process
A different approach has been taken to draft this process. Firstly, a planning session has been scheduled on 02 May 2012, Derek Motherwell, Joe Galloway and JH will be in attendance. SB raised the need to ensure all relevant expertise were included in consultation. It is hoped the draft process will be completed by the 31 May 2012, which will be followed by validation sessions.

Contracts Process
JH advised work will commence on the Contracts process on Monday 21 May 2012. It is hoped that the draft process will be concluded by 31 May 2012, to be followed by validation sessions.

PI Steering Group
JH has met with four PI's; Miles Padgett, Lee Cronin, Joe Sventek & Iain McInnes. JH to arrange one to one meetings with the remaining PI's.

HR Issues
JH and some of the workshop attendees attended a meeting with HR Managers to discuss HR issues which were raised at workshops. An actions list was compiled and will be progressed.

Systems
Work has begun on creating a system requirements document based on the draft process for grants. However, JL noted further engagement will be required to obtain further detail.

The team are currently investigating system functionality for a number of key requirements, and continuing to liaise with Unit 4 (software provider) to establish solutions. Adrienne Scullion (AS) highlighted the need for a consistent approach across the University. JH noted it was planned to keep systems as common as possible, however, some exceptions may be necessary e.g. approval levels may differ in each College.

JL & JH met to agree a list of potential quick wins for the claims process.

RF informed the Board that Agresso had approached GU with an opportunity to work in partnership to develop the front end of the system and improve integration. He had a meeting scheduled for week commencing 07 May 2012 and requested approval from the Board to proceed. The Board members agreed that RF should meet with Agresso, with a view to progressing this development if the outcome of the meeting is successful. If not, the University will have to develop a front end solution. It was noted that this would result in a delay to the project but the revised timing should support the risk mitigation and workload issues surrounding REF.

RF confirmed that since this was development of an existing system, there would be no requirement to go to tender.

JL to draft a list of detailed system requirements and circulate prior to the next meeting.

RF confirmed the current system will remain in use until after the new system is in place and is fully functioning. Delphi software support will now cease in March 2013, but it is felt that this is low risk. Jim Ross will complete National Insurance updates thereafter.

4. **Approvals Workflow – Discussion document** *(appendix 5)*
    JH circulated the above mentioned document and reviewed it with the board members. The electronic workflow process will greatly reduce the time spent in gaining approval for applications and awards.

    Criteria for escalating risk
    The following to be included as red flags:
    - Experience of PI against the scope of the project
    - Ethics – process in place, however, requirement to record completion on the system
    - Health & safety requirements
    - Impact on Estates
    - PI/RA time commitment on projects – over commitment
    - Overseas working – due diligence

Transforming Research Management Project Board
Wednesday 02 May 2012 at 09:00
Kelvin meeting room, 11 The Square

The above should not stop the application process, however, would flag the need for further review and escalation at an early stage. It was agreed there is a need for additional guidance on the application process for PI's.

Confirmation of principle of sequential approval based on value
The above was agreed by members.

Confirmation of approval levels and approvers – consistent across colleges?
It was agreed that there may be a need for Colleges to have different approval limits. Colleges to advise of suggested approval levels to JH.

Confirmation of requirement for separate approval workflows for each partner operating simultaneously
This requirement was agreed by the Board members.

Cross college/school collaboration – responsibility for risk assessment (lead only or each partner?)
It was agreed that while the lead had an overall responsibility for assessing risk of the project, each partner would need to assess the impact on their own college.

Ability to transfer income across partners if required
This was previously agreed in principle by the University, however, never implemented. The board agreed this function should be implemented, because the ability for flexibility is required.

Arbitration where one partner doesn't wish to proceed but the rest do
It was agreed the application could not be progressed if all partners do not agree to proceed, but Deans of Research should be involved in assessing if the project should proceed.

Fast Track Approval
The criteria recommended at the workshops for Fast Track are as follows:
- Travel grants less than or equal to £5000 (where FEC = Price)
- Consumables only grants less than or equal to £10000 (where FEC = Price)
- Vacation Scholarships (where FEC = Price)

Only 50 applications processed in the last year would fall within the proposed fast track criteria. While the fast track process was agreed in principle, it was agreed that significant investment in system development should be avoided if the volume did not justify it. It was agreed fast track applications will progress straight to the end of the process, but the Head of School should approve the application. It was noted there is a requirement to ensure all relevant information is recorded.

Awards – What criteria should apply for automatic approval?
It was agreed that award approval is required if one or more of the following occurred:
- percentage contribution change
- percentage of value change
- staff resource change

If there are no significant changes from the previously approved application, automatic approval will be given. This would then progress straight to the recruitment process. Details of awards automatically approved should be made available to college staff.

5. **Peer Review Requirements (Appendix 6)**
   It was noted peer reviews are not currently formally documented or standardised throughout the colleges. It was agreed to record future peer reviews and the names of the reviewers within the new system.

6. **Key Issues from Grants Workshops (Appendix 6)**
   JH raised the key issues for discussion as follows:

   At what point should we capture project on system?
   The board agreed there is a need to encourage PI's to record their project on the system as early as possible as this would help to track progress of bids and to manage and co-ordinate competing bids.

Transforming Research Management Project Board
Wednesday 02 May 2012 at 09:00
Kelvin meeting room, 11 The Square

Approvals – see discussion document (appendix 5)
Please see agenda item 4.

Outline applications – same process? Approval – where costs required vs no costs? Peer review requirements?
It was agreed Outline applications should utilise the same process with the difference at approval stage, depending on the type of outline application. There is still a requirement to ensure costing of applications is correct, where this is required for the outline application. The need for a peer review would be dependent on the type of application and if the School wish one to take place.

Ability for PI's to do own costings (if they want) – sensitivity of salary information. PI's use to agree prices for work without going through proper process.
It was agreed that PI's should be given access but there is a requirement to restrict access to sensitive information, especially with collaborative applications.

Competing bids – how should these be managed in the process
Competing bids will need to be picked up by the Funder Expert and flagged to the VP R&E's office so that they can be managed. There is a requirement to track such applications as part of an institutional bid and with internal deadlines set.

Fast track for low value/low risk – see discussion document (appendix 5)
Please see agenda item 4.

Award received where no application
JH highlighted that an initial review of the awards data in the Research System suggested that 30% of the awards received had no previous application processed in the Research System. JH to investigate further.

Informal notification of award – can anything proceed on this basis?
The board agreed this decision should be made by the relevant college.

Can project proceed before collaboration agreements signed?
The board agreed this decision should be made by the relevant college.

Can project proceed before PO number received?
The board agreed this decision should be made by the relevant college.

Can award be accepted prior to approval? (due to tight funder deadlines)
The board agreed awards can be accepted prior to approval provided there is no significant change.

Reason for rejection - formally capture in system? (raised at previous Board meeting)
The board agreed the reason for rejection should be captured. It was noted a rejection reason is not always supplied by funders.

Ethics – can award proceed before ethics granted?
It was agreed that awards should not be progressed prior to ethical approval, but there are exceptions, i.e. a clinical trial may not start until 3rd of 4th year into a project, therefore ethical approval can take place later in the process. However a control needs to be built in to ensure Ethics approval is progressed.

"Click-through" agreement – acceptance of funder t&c? + adherence to GU policy?
The group agreed that this should be included.

Service Level Agreements/culture change – last minute applications
It was agreed that service level agreements should be developed, but, it was noted this would be challenging. The need to steer a culture change away from last minute applications was agreed. It is hoped the benefit of value added support given to PI's who submit applications within the agreed timeframe will encourage this change. It was noted that funder's deadlines can be tight and no applications should be refused due to tight timeframes.

Transforming Research Management Project Board
Wednesday 02 May 2012 at 09:00
Kelvin meeting room, 11 The Square

Policy where funder will only pay direct to PI
It was noted there are tax and NI implications with PI's directly receiving awards from funders. It was agreed JH should investigate examples of this.

7. **Risk Register** *(appendix 2)*
JL noted the risk register had been updated to include comments raised at the last meeting. It was agreed Horizon 2020 and how this will impact the University should be added to the risk register.

8. **Organisation Design Workstream** *(appendix 7)*
Gordon Scott provided his report on the above mentioned paper to the board. The next steps in the process are as follows:
- *Defining and implementing the organisation design*
- *Communication and consultation (ongoing)*
  GS advised Union consultation is ongoing. The board noted key members of staff who are involved in workshops and have fed into the process are informed on the project's progress. However, it was noted some staff within schools may not have received an update for a year. It was agreed JH should attend the College Management Group to give an update on the progress of the project (after RF has met with Agresso to enable further information on timelines). JH to draft a communication plan.
- *Defining and agreeing the new organisation design (May – August 2012)*
- *Assessing the impact on existing structures and associated staff (May – August 2012)*
- *Managing the transition of staff into the new structure (August 2012 – March 2013)*
- *Training and development (May 2012 – June 2013)*

Staff shortages
It was noted that some departments are short staffed due to redundancies and staff leavers not being replaced as the outcome of the organisational design is awaited. The board agreed that once the organisation structure has been reviewed, it will be possible to start the recruitment process for some posts.

9. **AOCB**
None

Actions
1. Arts PIs to be invited to join steering group. **JH**
2. Agree how the HR recruitment process review will link into project. **RF/SB/GS**
3. Meet with current staff who undertake Project Management activities to develop Project Management requirements **JH**
4. Grants Process Map – draft document to be completed and circulated prior to next meeting. **JH**
5. PI Steering Group – progress meetings with remaining PI's. **JH**
6. List of detailed system requirements to be drafted and circulated prior to next meeting. **JL**
7. Approvals Workflow – colleges to advise of suggested approval levels to JH. **ALL**
8. Awards received without application – further investigation to take place. **JH**
9. Policy where funder will only pay direct to PI – further investigation to take place. **JH**
10. Risk register – Impact of Horizon 2020 to be added. **JL**
11. Date of next meeting and venue to be circulated. **Thursday 21 June 2012 at 14:00 in Kelvin Meeting Room, 11 The Square. SMc**

Enabling transformation - funder Intelligence

Theme Intelligence	"Soft" funder intelligence	"Hard" funder intelligence
	Strategic • Funder relationship management • Funding body strategies – an insight into upcoming research themes and opportunities • Influence – funding body priorities, and regulations **Tactical** • Funding body pipelines – upcoming confirmed opportunities • Funding body evaluation standards	**Operational** • Up-to-date knowledge of Funder Terms and conditions • Communication of changes to T&C, assessment of impact and system change requirements • Maintenance of funder data and templates • Funder procedural requirements • What costs should be applied for/claimed • Funder cost categorisation • Guidance on preferred application content and completion

Guidance on application content and completion

<u>Peer Review System Requirements</u>

- What do we require from the system?
    - Formal workflow within the system with required controls; or
    - Just the ability to record names of peer reviewers
    - Outline applications – requirement for peer review
    - > 1 internal partner – peer review through lead's process only?

<u>Key Issues from Grants Workshops</u>

- At what point should we capture project on system?
- Approvals – see discussion paper
- Outline applications – same process? Approval – where costs required vs no costs? Peer review requirements?
- Ability for PI's to do own costings (if they want) – sensitivity of salary information. PI's use to agree prices for work without going through proper process.
- Competing bids – how should these be managed in the process
- Fast track for low value/low risk, eg
    - Travel grants up to £5k (FEC = Price)
    - Consumables only up to £10k (FEC = Price)
    - Vacation scholarships (FEC = Price)
    - But accounts for small volume of applications (50 last year per RS)
- Award received where no application
- Informal notification of award – can anything proceed on this basis?
- Can project proceed before collaboration agreements signed?
- Can project proceed before PO number received?
- Can award be accepted prior to approval? (due to tight funder deadlines)
- Reason for rejection - formally capture in system? (raised at last Board meeting)
- Ethics – can award proceed before ethics granted?
- "Click-through" agreement – acceptance of funder t&c? + adherence to GU policy?
- Service Level Agreements/culture change – last minute applications
- Policy where funder will only pay direct to PI

University of Glasgow
Research Support System

Risk Register

Risk Id.	Date Raised	Raised by	Date Last Updated	Event	Owner (Role)	Lik	Imp	Risk Value	Impact on Project Objectives	Mitigation	
1	13-Jan-12	Project Charter	15-Mar-12	Insufficient support from main supplier throughout the course of the project. **28-Feb-12**: Consultancy schedule agreed with key consultant **15-Mar-12**: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made. **27- Apr-12:** Risk reviewed by PM; no change made.	PM	2	4	8	Project Delay	Project Manager relationship with ensure required s are achieved.	
2	13-Jan-12	Project Charter	15-Mar-12	Stakeholders not delivering a consensus of the business requirements within the required timescales. **14-Mar-12:** After discussion between SU and PM, timescales extended for Requirements Definition. **15-Mar-12:** Risk reviewed by PM - Still high risk activity - no change. **27- Apr-12**: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	SU	4	5	20	Project delay	Senior User, sup Project Sponsor Board, gains com stakeholders.	
3	13-Jan-12	Project Charter	15-Mar-12	Full stakeholder agreement of revised organisational structures not achieved within the required timescales. **15-Mar-12:** Risk reviewed by PM - no change 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	SU	2	5	10	Project delay	Effective engage stakeholders to e of the new struct clearly communi	

University of Glasgow
Research Support System

Risk Register

Risk Id.	Date Raised	Raised by	Date Last Updated	Event	Owner (Role)	Lik	Imp	Risk Value	Impact on Project Objectives	Mitigation	
4	16-Jan-12	Project Management	15-Mar-12	Stakeholders not validating the solution design to the requirements within the required timescales. **15-Mar-12**: Risk reviewed by PM - no change. 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	SU	3	5	15	Project Delay	Senior User, sup Project Sponsor Board, gains com stakeholders.	
5	26-Mar-12	Project Board	26-Mar-12	Systems are in place to enable accurate and timely reporting for REF 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	PS	2	5	10	Potential to squeeze or increase timescales.	Ensure that syste available at the ri live of the new R: agreed appropria	
6	26-Mar-12	Project Board	26-Mar-12	Potential limitations with the system functionality 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; Likelihood increased.	PM	5	5	25	More time needs to be spent on system development	Spend more time development to c bespoke solution	
6	26-Mar-12	Project Board	26-Mar-12	Opportunity Costs relating to time required from the project team, and workshop attendees 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	PB	3	4	12	This will not directly impact on the project but will have an impact on the University in general	Ensure careful cc applied to the pla project to ensure engagement fron	
7	26-Mar-12	Project Board	26-Mar-12	Resource requirements relating to interfaces. Getting the required level to build and test those required. 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	PB	3	5	15	Interfaces not being built in time resulting in a project delay.	Interface requirer already being cor discussions are c to the build of tho Needs to be clos	

University of Glasgow
Research Support System

Risk Register

Risk Id.	Date Raised	Raised by	Date Last Updated	Event	Owner (Role)	Lik	Imp	Risk Value	Impact on Project Objectives	Mitigation	
8	26-Mar-12	Project Board	26-Mar-12	Lose external support for Delphi as at the end of March 2013. Potential risk regarding the accuracy of research costing. 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	PS	5	1	5	Increased urgency for going live with new costing functionality. Time pressure upon the project.	Assess all implica ensure continger possible if require	
9	26-Mar-12	Project Board	26-Mar-12	Data Migration requirements. 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	SU	2	5	10	Data Migration requirements not identified correctly	Ensure all output checked against and ensure data held in a suitable new system.	
10	26-Mar-12	Project Board	26-Mar-12	UAT taking place within period for REF selection 27- Apr-12: Risk reviewed by PM; no change made	PB	5	5	25	Impact upon resources available. Extending the timescales required for the testing period and delaying go live.	Ensure resources and made availal required.	

University of Glasgow

Research Support System Implementation Project

Project Board Progress Report
As at 30th April 2012

Project Status

Activity	Completion date	Status
Requirements Definition	31st May 2012	In progress
Proof of Concept & Solution Design	3rd August 2012	
System Development	14th September 2012	
User Acceptance Testing	23rd November 2012	
Live Preparation	14th December 2012	
Phased Live Implementation from	17th December 2012	
Live implementation complete	5th April 2013	

Project Highlights

1. Draft process maps for Grants (excluding Project Management) complete. Validation started with workshop attendees 26th April and targeted to complete by 11th May.

2. EU draft process – scheduled to start w/c 30th April. Validation targeted by end May.

3. Contracts draft process – estimated start w/c 21st May. Targeted completion by end May

4. PI Steering Group – further engagement required. Meetings held with 4 PI's to-date: Miles Padgett, Lee Cronin, Joe Sventek, Iain McInnes.

5. Meeting held with HR managers to review issues raised at workshops – follow-up actions to be progressed.

6. Started creating a system requirements document based on the draft process maps for grants.

7. Investigating system functionality for a number of number of key requirements, and continuing to liaise with Unit4 (software provider) to establish solutions.

8. Reviewing a list of identified quick wins for the claims process.

Julie Lee, 30th April 2012

Workflow Approval – Discussion Document

		Value	Approver
S e q u e n t i a l	PI		
	Stage 1	<£1m	Head of School/Institute
	Stage 2	>£1m or application breeches expected contribution range	Head of College + Head of Finance
	Stage 3	>£2m or negative contribution > £xk	Principal

→ Partners - simultaneous →

Workflow for approval will be sequential (ie Stage 2 approval won't be triggered until Stage 1 approval complete).

Partner approval will have the same stages as above but the workflow for approval will be triggered simultaneously for each partner. Application will not be fully approved until appropriate sequential approval is completed for each partner.

Issues for discussion
- Criteria for escalating risk
- Confirmation of principle of sequential approval based on value
- Confirmation of approval levels and approvers - consistent across colleges?
- Confirmation of requirement for separate approval workflows for each partner operating simultaneously
- Cross college/school collaboration – responsibility for risk assessment (lead only or each partner?)
- Ability to transfer income across partners if required
- Arbitration where 1 partner doesn't want to proceed but the rest do
- Fast Track Approval

Awards

Approval same as for application, but "automatic" approval where there is no significant change from previously approved application.

What citeria should apply for automatic approval:
Eg. %age contribution change + % value of award change + staff resource change

Transforming Research Management Project Board
2 May 2012
Organisation design workstream overview

Introduction
This paper provides an overview of the organisation design workstream of the research management project. It summarises the progress to date, the current position and provides an outline of the future steps required to define and implement a revised organisation structure and roles maximising the benefit to the University taking account of the requirements of the new business processes and research management system.

Background
Phase 2
During phase 2 Deloitte carried out a survey of staff involved in the research management process and provided an analysis of the position at that time. The analysis highlighted:
- A lack of clarity over accountabilities and responsibilities
- That activities were undertaken by too many people across the organisation with 78 different roles contributing to research management
- Too many people were being asked to provide funder expertise
- There was considerable rework and duplication of transactional activity due to poor data quality and errors.

The Deloitte Blue print report made a number of recommendations at the end of phase 2 related to the organisation design. These included improving the organisational design by introducing new capabilities relating to funder relationship management, funder expertise and project management as well as the provision of cradle to grave support to PI's through dedicated project support. They also highlighted that transactional support must be delivered right first time to free up resources and allow these to be refocused on adding value.

They recommended that the future organisation design and the allocation of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities should be based on the following overarching principle: 'to be efficient and effective, activity needs to be undertaken by the minimum number of people at the lowest grade competent for the quality requirements of the task, and by the most appropriate post holder '

Phase 3
During phase 3 a significant number of stakeholder workshops were held to define revised business processes for grants, contracts and EU funding. The outputs of the workshops informed the recommendations by Deloitte for the organisation design.

The organisation design workstream outputs included recommendations on high level structures, roles and capabilities as well as outlining a number of high level design principals. These have previously been shared with the Project Board. The phase three recommendations and design principles will be used to inform the development of detailed proposals for the future organisation design.

Following discussion at the Project Board it was established that further work was needed to define the detailed standard operating procedures and systems requirements and this would inform the detailed requirements for future organisational design and associated posts.

Current position
Over the past two months workshops and stakeholder meetings have been held aimed at defining the detailed operating procedures for the new grants process as well as collecting detailed requirements for the configuration of PFACT and Agresso Award Management. The outcomes of these workshops will be validated over the coming weeks and work will also be undertaken to undertake a similar process for contracts and EU funding.

The focus of the recent workshops was on correctly defining the detail of the future business processes and outlining what will be required from the new system going forward. While generic roles and capabilities were captured as part of the process there was not detailed discussion on how roles would be grouped into specific posts or where accountability for activities would sit within the organisation. Following validation of the grants process one of the next steps will be to develop proposals on organisational structures and generic posts for the Project Board to consider at a future meeting. The work carried out in the workshops and the level of automation provided by the new system will be instrumental in informing these proposals.

Next steps - Defining and implementing the organisation design
There are a number of areas that now require to be progressed in order to define, agree and implement the new organisational design. These include:

- *Communication and consultation*
- *Defining and agreeing the new organisational design*
- *Assessing the impact on existing structures and associated staff*
- *Managing the transition of existing staff into the new structure*
- *Training and development*

Each of these areas is outlined below in more detail.

Communication and consultation (Ongoing)
To date there has been significant effort to engage key staff and stakeholders in the project through a range of workshops and stakeholder meetings. It will be essential to continue this approach through ongoing consultation and communication throughout the implementation phase of the project to maximise the engagement of those involved and the success of the project.

A detailed communication plan will be developed as part of the overall project plan to ensure that there is effective communication with stakeholders at key points in the project during implementation. There will also need to undertake appropriate consultation for affected staff and the Trade Unions on the proposals and implementation approach.

Defining and agreeing the new organisational design (May – August 2012)
As outlined above, high level proposals for the organisational design will be developed for discussion and approval by the Project Board following the definition of detailed business processes, standard operating procedures and systems requirements. Proposals will clarify at a high level where in the University accountability for tasks will lie, future organisational structures and an outline of generic roles and associated capabilities. It is anticipated that these will be developed during May – June 2012.

Once proposals are agreed in principle then more detailed work will be required to finalise the grouping of tasks and responsibilities and incorporate these into job descriptions and person specifications that will then be graded.

The specific staffing requirements and support structures for each of the Colleges and the central Research Support Office will need to be defined, sized and costed and detailed structure charts developed summarising these.   This will require input from the project team, College Secretaries, College HR Managers and other key stakeholders in the Colleges and the central Research Support Office.

During this process appropriate consultation and communication will need to be undertaken with staff and the Trade Unions. Final approval of the proposals and any resource implications will require to be endorsed by the Project Board and approved by Senior Management Group.

***Assessing the impact on existing structures and associated staff (*May - August 2012)**

During the earlier phases of the project Deloitte undertook work to quantify the roles currently engaged in research management and the activities that they were engaged in. This was partly through the research management survey (during phase 2) and through the analysis of existing job descriptions (during phase 3). Through this work they developed a summary of existing roles and organisational charts highlighting research management roles that gave an indication of the proportion of role associated with research management activities. At the time these were validated at a high level with College HR Managers and College Secretaries.   Further work is now required to revisit the analysis and ensure that is still accurate and up to date.   It is anticipated that this will commence in May in conjunction with College Secretaries and HR Managers.

Once the organisation design proposals are further refined then we will require to identify which roles and staff will be affected by the proposed changes to practice and the extent that this may affect them.

The current arrangements involve significant numbers of staff where a relatively small proportion of their role is engaged in research management support in addition to supporting a range of other areas. One of the key principles of the new approach is that research management support will be provided through dedicated roles to allow development of expertise, transfer of knowledge across Colleges, ensure consistency of approach and allow economies of scale.   Concerns have already been raised by College Secretaries regarding the challenge of freeing up resources from parts of existing roles to support dedicated research management support roles.

Managing the transition of staff into the new structures (August 2012 – March 2013)

Given the issues identified with the current ways of working it is likely that transition to the new business processes and organisation structure and roles will have impact on a significant number of staff.   Once the proposals for the organisation design have been fully developed and the impact assessment carried out the principles and approach for selection of staff and transition into new roles will be developed in consultation with the Trade Unions. It will be important that the approach adopted ensures that the right people with the right skills and capabilities are placed in appropriate roles.

Where skills gaps are identified training and development will be used to address these. There may be some areas where the capabilities do not exist within the current staff and there may be a requirement to recruit externally e.g. contract lawyer. There may also be roles that cease to be

accountable for research activities or where activities are no longer required as a result of the new system. In this instance efforts will be made to appropriately redeploy staff to alternative duties.

A plan will be developed to ensure that the transition of staff into new roles is undertaken in line with the introduction of the new operating procedures business processes and the rollout of the new research management system. This is aimed at ensuring that new ways of working are successfully established and embedded in the organisation.

Training and Development (May 2012 - June 2013)

It is anticipated that a range of learning and development interventions will be required to support the successful implementation of new roles, new organisational structures and the research management system. A people development plan is currently being developed in conjunction with the staff development service to address this.

It is anticipated that a range of interventions will be required in addition to training relevant staff on the new system and related operating procedures. These will include skills and capability development to bridge skills and knowledge gaps, team development and development of the effective communication mechanisms between teams in Colleges and the central research support office.

Conclusions

This paper provides an overview of the organisation design workstream of the project. It outlines progress to date and the future plans relating to the design and implementation of the organisation design. The Project Board are asked to agree the approach in principle and provide comments if required.

Gordon Scott
HR Policy Development Manager
20 April 2012