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# Project Overview

## 1.1 Project Summary

Across the HE sector, significant moves are being made to incorporate benchmarking techniques into institutional planning and performance monitoring activity.

One of the greatest barriers to this activity is the structural framework of nationally published data sets which are organised into structures that do not allow meaningful benchmarking below the level of the institution as a whole

The Enabling Benchmarking Excellence project proposes to begin work to overcome this barrier, by gathering **a set of metadata** detailing institutional organisational structures. Institutions organise themselves according to a variety of functional models and this is often a significant issue when attempting detailed analysis of data.

This metadata will be applied to the new academic cost centres (as determined by the current HESA cost centre review) and the way in which these map to academic units.  This will facilitate a three dimensional relationship map that will allow data to be disaggregated and compared in a meaningful and robust way.  Initially we will use a select range of partner institutions selected to cover a wide range of organisational structures.  While this project aims to deliver a proof of concept, the eventual aim is to make comparative analysis far more flexible and useful to all stakeholders within the HE community.  **The outcomes will therefore be taken forward by HESA as part of its benchmarking provision across all HEIs in the sector.**

## Objectives

* Prove the concept of a **three-dimensional model which can be used by HESA in providing benchmarking facilities** to the HE sector.
* **Identify key metrics** which make use of this model to enable more meaningful inter-institutional benchmarking at different levels within organisational structures.
* Provide **guidance to institutions in mapping their academic units** to cost centres and their organisational structures.

## Anticipated Outputs and Outcomes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Output / Outcome Type**  *(e.g. report, publication, software, knowledge built)* | **Brief Description** |
| **Output** |  |
| Sample Data Set | Sample set of organisational structures mapped to academic units and the new set of HESA cost centres |
| Business Uses Report | Report detailing the business use of the mapped data, following discussions with a select group of HEIs and illustrated with example metrics |
| Knowledge Source | Covering approaches to mapping academic units to cost centres, that can be used by HESA to inform the guidance sent out to institutions prior to the full HESA data collection of cost centre data and organisational structures and in 2012 |
| **Outcome** |  |
| Access to Meaningful Benchmarking Data | The outcomes of the project will enable the manipulation and analysis of national data sets in a way that would not otherwise be possible |
| Understanding | Will facilitate Universities’ understanding of their relative strengths and weaknesses at Institutional, departmental and unit level.  Lessons Learned from the project will be retained by HESA to inform future data collection exercises. |

## Overall Approach

**Strategy/Methodology**

* We will recruit a number of partner HEIs who will work with us to identify their institutional structures and the relationships between institutional structure and HESA cost centres.
* Durham and HESA will analyse the data and relationships identified to ensure comparability between institutions.
* The data will be presented in an appropriate manner to enable benchmarking of data at a department/unit level.
* Feedback will be sought from partner institutions and a focus group held to look at different business uses of the mapped data.
* A report detailing the proposed uses of the data will be produced to include examples and illustrations of the proposed metrics for business use.
* A full review of the project will take place including scope, methodology, results, communication and presentation to inform the production of a knowledge resource covering approaches to the mapping of academic units to cost centres. This will be particularly useful for HESA to inform the exercise of full data collection (post project).

**Important Issues**

* The cost centre review being carried out by HESA will run concurrently to this project and provide the list of revised cost centres on which the mapping will be based.

**Scope & Boundaries**

* This project will lay the foundations for the full implementation of the work being carried out as part of the HESA review of cost centres. Full implementation will NOT be carried out as part of this project.

***Critical Success Factors***

* The project demonstrates that the example metrics defined in the Business Uses report can be applied to the sample data set compiled from information gathered from the partner institutions

## Anticipated Impact

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Impact Area** | **Anticipated Impact Description** |
| Institutional Performance Monitoring / Benchmarking | Future development of the project outputs by HESA will facilitate benchmarking at institutional and academic unit level throughout the sector. |
| Departmental Performance monitoring / benchmarking | Departments / academic units will be able to make direct comparisons of performance data with units in other institutions. |
| Access to Data | Institutions will be able to access information regarding how the data is structured for each HEI, enabling them to make informed decisions on which data is relevant. |
| Provoke further development of benchmarking capability eg HEIDI | Enable the future development of benchmarking tools such as HEIDI |

**Impact Areas** : maintain research excellence; maintain teaching & learning excellence; be more effective/save money; have a positive impact on wider society; be ready for technology needs in the future.

## Stakeholder Analysis

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** | **Interest / stake** | **Importance (H/M/L)** |
| Partner Institutions | Project Participants / users of outputs | H |
| HEIs | Interest in further development of HESA benchmarking capability | M |
| Planning Departments | Main users of benchmarking data/tools | M |
| HESA | Responsible for the collection and production of statistics. Project Partner | H |
| HEIDI Steering Group | Potential for future development of model | M |

## Related Projects

None

## Constraints

**Time**

* Planned activity by HESA – Timescales
* Attendance at planned events / timing of external events

**Data Availability**

* Data collection and manipulation being complex – time needed to analyse data means that we can only look at a small number of institutions in the time available to complete the project

## Assumptions

* A sufficient number of institutions will be willing to provide data on structure and CC breakdown.

## Risk Analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Description** | **Probability (P)**  **1 – 5**  **(1 = low**  **5 = high)** | **Severity (S)**  **1 – 5**  **(1 = low**  **5 = high)** | **Risk Score**  **(PxS)** | **Detail of action to be taken**  (mitigation / reduction / transfer / acceptance) |
| Insufficient partner HEIs engage with the project | 2 | 4 | 8 | Early communication with an informal network of institutions has indicated that there is an appetite for institutions to get involved. Multiple sources/networks to be canvassed. |
| Data collected proves too complex to model effectively | 2 | 4 | 8 | Sound understanding of the subject matter alongside knowledge of multiple types of institutional structure. Skilled data analysts available to work on the project when necessary. |
| Model produced does not allow HEIs to use the data in the way they would like | 3 | 2 | 6 | Further development of the model will be required however user requirements will be detailed thoroughly and are in themselves a valuable output of the project work. |
| Insufficient resource allocated to the project to complete the scope of work | 2 | 3 | 6 | Both partners have committed significant resource to the project and project structure will allow early identification of any issues in this area. |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Technical Development

The project does not propose to develop any technical solutions and thus has no requirement to adhere to technical standards.

## Standards

No technical standards are applicable to this project (please see section 1.11 above).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of standard or specification** | **Version** | **Notes** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Intellectual Property Rights

HESA will act as guardians of the mapped data set collected by the project and will retain intellectual property rights, although the outputs will of course be made available to JISC for dissemination through the BI resource.

The undertaking by HESA to build the outputs of this project into the ongoing HEIDI development schedule will also ensure maximum availability to the HE user community, through the HEIDI subscription model (of which ~80% of UK HEIs are a part). The subscription paid by HEIs to access HEIDI covers the operational costs of the service and ensures sustainability and a structured development programme.

# Project Resources

## 2.1 Project Partners

Durham University will be partnered by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) on this project.

Benchmarking Data available to institutions to measure performance is frequently published into a structured framework of academic cost centres and JACS codes. As the body responsible for much of the collection and publication of institutional data, working with HESA will enable us to have a direct input to how data is collected, organised and presented.

HESA is currently conducting a review of the cost centre structure, specifically because institutions are known to find the current coding frame too restrictive and an impediment to meaningful benchmarking analysis.

This project and the timing of the HESA Cost centre review presents an opportunity to conduct thorough research into what HEIs wish to use the HESA data for, and investigate the feasibility of implementing a tool to facilitate comparisons between institutions on a department/faculty/academic unit level.

Consortium Agreement to be signed 16th May

## Project Management

The project will be managed in accordance with Durham’s agreed project management methodology (PRIDE) which is a version of PRINCE2.

**Project Organisational Structure**

An outline project organisational structure can be found below in figure 2.1

The overall direction and management of the project will be the responsibility of the Project Board. It holds responsibility to review the status and current reported progress, against plan and budget, review key risks and issues, and will be able to assist the project by acting as a mechanism for escalation and decision making to ensure the project remains on track.

It is envisaged that the Project Board will meet quarterly (either in person or via tele/video conference) or whenever the key project milestones dictate. The Project Board will receive regular monthly highlight reports from the project manager which will include status updates on Budget, Progress against plan, risks and issues.

The Project Team will be responsible for the day to day work on the project, coordinated by the Project Manager.

The project team will rely heavily on information from partner institutions who will be identified during the early stages of the project.

The Project Manager will be Loraine Pace (Durham) who was heavily involved with the preparation of the original project proposal. It has been agreed that an average 0.5 days a week will be an appropriate level of project management resource for the project.



Figure 2.1

## Project Roles

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team Member Name** | **Role** | **Contact Details** | **Days per week to be spent on the project** |
|  |  |  |  |
| Loraine Pace | Project Manager | [Loraine.pace@durham.ac.uk](mailto:Loraine.pace@durham.ac.uk) | 0.5 |
| Rob Livermore | Senior User | [Rob.livermore@durham.ac.uk](mailto:Rob.livermore@durham.ac.uk) | 0.5 |
| Jonathan Waller | Senior Supplier | [Jonathan.Waller@hesa.ac.uk](mailto:Jonathan.Waller@hesa.ac.uk) | 0.25 |
| Suzie Dent | Data Analysis/modelling | [Suzie.dent@hesa.ac.uk](mailto:Suzie.dent@hesa.ac.uk) | 0.25 |
| BI Project Officer | Data Gathering/Analysis | TBA | 2.5 |

No specific training needs have been identified as required for this project.

## Programme Support

No specific areas have been currently identified. Any requirement/opportunity for programme support will be regularly reviewed by the Project Board.

# Detailed Project Planning

## 3.1 Evaluation Plan

The three primary project outputs will be handed over to HESA at the end of the project for use in the further development of benchmarking capability, therefore the success of the project should be measured on how useful these products prove to be in the longer term. We will continue to liaise with colleagues at HESA following the close of this project to advise on the further development of the project products and track the impact of our work.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timing** | **Factor to Evaluate** | **Questions to Address** | **Method(s)** | **Measure of Success** |
|  | Data Set & Business Use Report | Will the data set enable us to produce useful metrics for institutions | Cross referencing of the data set with the business uses of benchmarking data report. | Successful illustration of metrics (as specified by HEIs) using the data set created using information from our partner institutions. |
|  | Project Evaluation | Have we achieved what we set out to do?  Have we completed the project in the most efficient / useful way?  What could we have done better? | Project Review.  Lessons Learned Log and Report. | Successful attainment of project objectives to time and budget. |
|  | Longer term development | Has the project enabled further development of benchmarking tools | Report from HESA / outcomes from HESA Benchmarking Project | Illustrated examples of the developments our work has facilitated / enabled |

## 3.2 Quality Assurance

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Output / Outcome Name** | **Sample Data Set** | |
| **When will QA be carried out?** | **Who will carry out the QA work?** | **What QA methods / measures will be used?** |
|  | HESA | Quality Inspection |
|  |  | Quality Review |
|  |  |  |
| **Output / Outcome Name** | **Business Uses of Benchmarking Report** | |
| **When will QA be carried out?** | **Who will carry out the QA work?** | **What QA methods / measures will be used?** |
|  | Partner Institutions | Quality Review |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Output / Outcome Name** | **Knowledge Source** | |
| **When will QA be carried out?** | **Who will carry out the QA work?** | **What QA methods / measures will be used?** |
|  | HESA / project board | Quality Review |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.3 Dissemination Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Timing** | **Dissemination Activity** | **Audience** | **Purpose** | **Key Message** |
| Throughout Project | Website | All | Up to date information for all | What we are doing; current successes / failures; how institutions may help etc. |
| End of Project | Presentations to partner institutions | Partner Institutions | To demonstrate use of information given by institutions, take feedback etc. | Potential of model / metrics to facilitate benchmarking |
| End of Project | Potential for presentation to 94 planning group or AUA Planning forum (dependent upon timing) | HEIs | Inform on developments in sector, encourage institutions to engage with the continuing work of HESA | Future development. |

## 3.4 Exit and Embedding Plans

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Outputs/Outcomes** | **Action for Take-up & Embedding** | **Action for Exit** |
| * Sample Data Set * Business Uses Report * Knowledge Source * Access to Meaningful   benchmarking  data   * Understanding | Outputs will be passed to HESA to inform work to undertake full data collection of HEI structures and cost centres, and further development of benchmarking capability. | Copy of full set of project documentation to be retained on the project website and with both project partners.  Agreement to be reached regarding involvement in any future development of outputs. |
|  |  |  |

## 3.5 Sustainability Plans

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Outputs** | **Why Sustainable** | **Scenarios for Taking Forward** | **Issues to Address** |
| * Sample Data Set * Report * Knowledge Source | All three key project outputs are intended to form the foundations for implementation of the HESA collection of department to cost centre mappings |  | Any longer term involvement by Durham University in development/review of benchmarking with HESA |

# Appendices

## Appendix A. Project Budget

## Appendix B. Workpackages

**JISC WORK PACKAGE**

***Before completing this template please note:***

* *The Project Management Guidelines have detailed instructions for preparing project plans and work packages..*
* *Please expand tables as appropriate.*
* *Fill in the information in the document header – project name, document version, and date.*
* *Text in italics is explanatory and should be deleted in completed documents.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WORKPACKAGES | Month | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** | **21** | **22** | **23** | **24** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1: Select Partner HEIs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2: Project Team Liaison** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3: Liaison with Partner HEIs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4: Collect Mapping Data** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5: Guidance on Data Returns** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6: Business Use Report** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7: Information Bank** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **10:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Project start date: 01/04/2011

Project completion date: 31/08/2012

Duration: 18 months

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| YEAR 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 1: **Objective: Select Partner HEIs** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Define list of necessary qualities for partner HEIs | 01/04/2011 | 20/05/2011 | Agreed list of qualities necessary for partner HEIs to add value to the project |  | Project Team |
| 1. Circulate list and summary of project to identified interest groups | 20/05/2011 | 27/05/2011 | Communication to identified interest groups, including deadline for response and details of kick-off meeting (see workpackage 3) |  | Project Team |
| 1. Agree partner HEIs | 13/06/2011 | 24/06/2011 | Select partners from responses received and communicate outcome to all respondents | **1** | Project Team |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 2: **Objective: Project Team Liaison** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Establish schedule of meetings | 01/04/2011 | 24/06/2011 | Agreed schedule of meetings |  | Project Team |
| 1. Agree communication methods | 01/04/2011 | 24/06/2011 | Agreement of methods of communications, including purchase of any necessary equipment and completion of admin tasks (e.g. purchase of headphones and setting up of skype accounts) |  | Project Team |
| 1. Communicate | 01/04/2011 | 31/08/2012 | Inter-team communication according to schedule agreed. |  | Project Team |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 3: **Objective: Liaison with Partner HEIs** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Kick-off meeting | 27/06/2011 | 29/07/2011 | A meeting of the project team with partner institutions (once selected) to ensure a shared understanding of the project’s aims and objectives and the context within which it will operate | **2** | Project Team |
| 1. Agree and implement update schedule | 27/06/2011 | 31/08/2012 | Regular progress updates via email to partner HEIs |  | Project Team |
| 1. Arrange site visits or alternative with each partner HEI | 27/06/2011 | 26/08/2011 | Meeting dates with key contact in each partner HEI to facilitate data collection and related discussions |  | Project Team |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 4: **Objective: Collect Mapping Data** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Establish collection method | 27/06/2011 | 26/08/2011 | Template for data collection including user guidance notes |  | Project Team |
| 1. Circulate template to partner HEIs | 29/08/2011 | 09/09/2011 | Email communication of template |  | Project Team |
| 1. Implement site visit (or alternative agreed communication method) schedule | 12/09/2011 | 02/12/2011 | Full notes following one to one communication with key contacts in all partner HEIs |  | Project Team |
| 1. Receive completed data templates | 05/12/2011 | 23/12/2011 | Full set of mapped data | **3** | Partner HEIs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 5: **Objective: Feed into HESA Guidance on Data Returns** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Synthesise discussions from partner HEI site visits and ad-hoc communication to provide summarised guidance on mapping approaches, including follow up communication where necessary | 29/08/2011 | 12/01/2012 | Summary of mapping approaches taken along with recommendations for preferred options |  | Project Team |
| 1. Hand over knowledge resource to HESA team | 13/01/2012 | 13/01/2012 | Sign off from HESA team | **4** | Project Team |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 6: **Objective: Produce Business Use Report** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Synthesise discussions from partner HEI site visits and ad-hoc communication to provide an overview of the questions that partner HEIs envisage using mapped data to address | 29/08/2011 | 12/01/2012 | Report detailing business requirements for mapped data |  | Project Team |
| 1. Define illustrative benchmarking measures | 29/08/2011 | 12/01/2012 | Annex to report |  | Project Team |
| 1. Hand over Business Use report to HESA team | 13/01/2012 | 13/01/2012 | Sign off from HESA team | **5** | Project Team |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **WORKPACKAGE 7:**  **Objective: Produce Information Bank of Mapped Data** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Quality Assure mapped data set | 09/01/2012 | 03/02/2012 | Final set of mapped data | **6** | Project Team |
| 1. Feed mapped data into agreed dissemination channels. | 06/02/2012 | 24/02/2012 | Published set of mapped data |  | Project Team |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 8: **Objective:** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 9: **Objective:** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WORKPACKAGE 10: **Objective:** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Members of Project Team:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Role** |
| **Loraine Pace** | **Project Manager** |
| **Rob Livermore** | **Senior User** |
| **Jonathan Waller** | **Senior Supplier** |
| **Suzie Dent** | **Quality Control** |
| **BI Project Officer (tba)** | **Project Analyst** |