



**University of Edinburgh**

**University Restructuring Review:  
Summary Report of the Review Group**

**7 June 2005**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Restructuring in 2002**

In 2002 the University made some radical changes to its structures. It abolished its previous structure of Faculties and Departments for academic purposes and Faculty Groups and Planning Units for planning and resourcing, and replaced these with a single integrated structure consisting of three Colleges and 21 Schools. Previous arrangements for electing Heads of Department and Deans were replaced by competitive appointment to the new management positions, after external advertisement for Heads of College.

Colleges were given more devolved authority, with freedom to take decisions/make local arrangements except in areas where the University retained reserved authority, for example, where it was clearly beneficial to do so or necessary for legal reasons. Colleges were supported by College Support Teams created from existing Faculty Group Office staff (for whom managerial responsibility was transferred from central administration to the Heads of College) but with augmentation, particularly in the Schools, and with some finance and human resources staff relocated from central services.

The old central administration was split into two Support Groups, one headed by the University Secretary being responsible for administration (including corporate planning), public relations, development activity and student services, and the other headed by a Director of Corporate Services (recruited from industry) being responsible for estates, finance, human resources and management information services. The previous Library and user computing services group remained a distinct Support Group, headed by the Vice-Principal for Knowledge Management and University Librarian.

### **1.2 Review proposal**

The University Court requested an internal review of the University's new organisational structure in order to assess the effectiveness with which the new arrangements were functioning.<sup>1</sup>

The proposal was to undertake a light touch review, in a context where the new structure had generally been well received and had aroused interest (and even emulation) in other institutions. The focus of the review would be on optimising the current structure, with particular reference to the opportunities for encouraging collaborative work across the new Support Group and College boundaries.

It was not anticipated that the review's recommendations would lead to further major change. Where the Review team detected problems they were not necessarily expected to propose solutions, but rather to highlight that further investigation was needed in order to build on the structure's existing strengths or to fine-tune business processes.

The Group has nevertheless outlined recommendations and proposed solutions either where it has been straightforward to identify these or where there appeared to the Group to be a consensus around likely solutions.

---

<sup>1</sup> The initial proposal for the Review was summarised in a paper to Central Management Group on 1 June 2004, available at: <http://www.planning.ed.ac.uk/Pub/CMG/040601/structurereview.pdf>

### 1.3 Structure of the Review Group

It was originally envisaged that the review would be carried out by a Review Group split into two teams:

- one, with representation from each of the Support Groups and an external academic, to review restructuring in the Colleges;
- the other, with representatives from each of the Colleges and an external Secretary/Registrar, to review restructuring in the Support Groups.

Although two such teams were assembled<sup>2</sup> and met with relevant staff, in practice the teams worked together as a single Review Group wherever possible. This was felt to be an appropriate and beneficial method of operation within the context of ensuring that organisational cross-boundary issues would be properly considered.

### 1.4 Scope of the Review

The original proposals tasked the Review Group with seeking to:

- Identify areas in which there may be ongoing duplication of functions
- Identify areas where further integration of existing activities or support units might yield improvements in service
- Identify any academic or administrative units which may be sited within an inappropriate School, College or Support Group
- Review the strategic plan and risk register to ensure all responsibilities and risks are appropriately attributed to a Support Group, College, or to an Officer of the University
- Examine the effectiveness of the interactions of elements within the new structure with CMG, APC and PSG.

During initial discussions, and in light of some of the initial electronic responses received, the Group agreed that in addition to these points they should also seek to:

- highlight the major benefits of restructuring and the aspects that were working well
- establish whether and how the University had fully followed through the more detailed aspects of the restructuring process, including most notably the adequate codification of those areas where corporate authority had been retained and the reasons for this
- establish how well devolved support arrangements were working, and, in a linked point, the extent to which local initiatives were being pursued due to dissatisfaction with corporate services or because of inadequate funding of the same
- whether communications had improved as a result of restructuring.

Throughout the evidence gathering sessions the Group also remained open to the identification of further points for consideration.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix I, Membership of the Review Group

## 2. REVIEW PROCESS

### 2.1 Approach

Although this was to be a light touch review, the Group had been asked to provide the opportunity for every Head of School and equivalent Heads of Service in the Support Groups to meet with the appropriate review team. It had also been asked to ensure that every member of staff in the University who wished to make their views known to the Review could do so. The Group therefore took forward evidence-gathering on a number of bases:

- through a series of meetings with appropriate senior management, holders of key positions within Colleges and Support Groups and student representatives<sup>3</sup>
- inviting comments on an open basis from all staff via Review consultation webpages, via information advertised through:
  - E-Bulletin and the 'news and events' section of [www.ed.ac.uk](http://www.ed.ac.uk)
  - e-mail notice to all staff<sup>4</sup>
  - documentation, including management information, provided to the Review Group.

### 2.2 Timetable

The review commenced in January 2005 with a view towards producing a report to the Principal's Strategy Group in late April, CMG in May and meetings of Finance and General Purposes Committee (the executive subcommittee of Court) and Court shortly thereafter.

### 2.3 Reporting

Two reports have been prepared by the Review Group:

- a high-level summary of the outcomes of the review for Court and Finance and General Purpose Committee use, structured to reflect the Review Group's remit and focussed on the success or otherwise of restructuring in enabling achievement of the University's goals;
- this more detailed report, for use by Principal's Strategy Group and Central Management Group. This report contains conclusions and recommendations relating to the strict remit of the review, but also goes beyond the remit as many colleagues raised other issues germane both to the review remit and to the University's aims in undertaking the restructuring.

### 2.4 Note on terminology as used in the report

The Review Group found that, whilst accepted terminology for academic units and related functions – Colleges, Schools, Heads of School, etc. – was clear, there was more ambiguity in relation to the sub-structure of Support Groups, the senior management within the Support Groups, and also with regard to the support services provided across the institution. The reports therefore use the following terms:

- **(Support Group) Heads of Service:** this used instead of 'Heads of School equivalents' to refer to the senior manager of the main, that is, level 4 School-equivalent, Support Group sub-units, e.g., the Director of Finance, but not the Director of Procurement (a sub-unit within Finance)

---

<sup>3</sup> see Appendix II, II.a List of individuals attending evidence-gathering meetings

<sup>4</sup> see Appendix II, II.c Text of E-mail inviting comments, sent to all staff, 3 February 2005

- **support services:** this referring to any and all services provided in support of staff or students, whether provided
  - by a unit within a Support Group or a Support Group as a whole (e.g., student counselling services),
  - by a combination of corporate and devolved (to College or School) resources (e.g., financial and HR services),
  - or provided wholly by support staff within Schools (e.g., School Administrator support for Heads of Schools).

Agreed standard abbreviations of University units and committees, etc., have been used: e.g., CHSS, CMVM and CSCE for the three Colleges; CMG for Central Management Group, and so on.

### **3. Overview and Recommendations**

- 3.1** The Review Group found, from the evidence provided and gathered, that the implementation of a new organisational structure in 2002 had been strategically astute, leading to clear benefits to the institution as a whole. In particular it was obvious that the creation of Colleges and Schools, and the devolution of authority and responsibility to these academic levels of activity, had been the right way to proceed to enable the University to face a number of challenges: notably student and academic staff recruitment, research grant applications and the need for improved co-ordination and management.

This is not to say that feedback provided by colleagues to the Review was wholly positive, or to ignore the issues raised both directly and in discussion which highlight areas where improvements can and must be made. However given that the issues raised during the review were generally about the management and communication of activity within the structure, and not the structure itself, it is apparent that the overall concept of restructuring was sound and that the structure as it stands is working to the benefit of the University, both its staff and students. The Group has provided recommendations below which seek to address these issues, to enable further improvements in the structure allowing all staff to operate more effectively, with the consequent benefits to students and the core business of teaching, learning and research. The general conclusion to be drawn from the review is that there is no need to expend effort fundamentally reviewing the current structures until beyond completion of the 2008 RAE exercise.

One issue which has influenced the Group's recommendations is the actual and perceived effect on staff morale of the pace and volume of the changes implemented by the University over the past few years. To some extent this combination has obscured the real benefits that have accrued to staff – for example, much improved sabbatical entitlements in some areas – and the positive operational and strategic aspects of the new structure, such as increased flexibility in making new academic appointments. However the Group believes that if properly implemented their recommendations will enable a better understanding of and engagement with the positive nature of the restructuring.

#### **Recommendations**

##### **Recommendation 1**

**The University as a community needs to reiterate and re-embrace the vision of restructuring:**

- **of creating and flexibly responding to new academic opportunities and approaches through closer working, sharing of ideas and pursuit of interdisciplinarity;**
- **of the Head of School as the lynchpin academic leadership role in formulating and taking forward both corporate and discipline-focussed strategies;**
- **of simplifying academic and administrative processes in support of this wider academic goal**

**and to recognise its successes to date in relation to this vision.**

## **Recommendation 2**

**Restructuring should continue to be seen as a process, not an event.** To continue to benefit from the new academic structure the boundaries between academic units should be kept under constant consideration and review, and the organisational structures remain flexible, to enable development of differing academic configurations as disciplinary and interdisciplinary work naturally evolves.

- 3.2** The Group found that the new academic structure of Colleges and Schools as implemented in 2002 and developed since then is working well and delivering positive benefits. In particular it enables speedy strategic academic appointments and the re-energising of academic areas. The flexibility within the structure has enabled new opportunities to be developed from innovative groupings of previously disparate areas – for example, through drawing together the professionally-focussed areas of nursing, clinical psychology and counselling to form the School of Health in Social Sciences. Equally, the creation of Schools has allowed for strategic appointments to be made at the boundaries of disciplines or specialisms, creating opportunities for cutting-edge research and teaching in new fields.

**The College and School structure as it stands is essentially fit-for-purpose up to and beyond RAE2008.** However, boundaries between life sciences (in biology) and basic (preclinical) medical sciences in particular should be kept under constant review by the relevant Heads of College. The Group also welcomes the intention of CMVM to reconsider the internal configuration of medical units after RAE2008.

- 3.3** There exists a widespread and strongly held belief that the many and complex recent changes and change projects, such as semesterisation and curriculum review, whether associated with or enabled by restructuring, have led to initiative overload and fatigue. There was agreement that the University would benefit from a period of consolidation, particularly in the run-up to the RAE, and that there should be greater emphasis on overarching strategic oversight of the whole package of projects under way at any one time. In support of this, and to enable more effective working and the avoidance of information overload in general, the University needs to develop a strategy to maximise the effectiveness of internal communications. This should focus on ensuring the appropriate availability of high-quality and relevant information. The Group would favour this being achieved quickly so as to produce quick wins, rather than spending a longer time producing something excessively detailed.

## **Recommendation 3**

**The University collectively should focus on its identified priorities for the next few years – preparation for the RAE, introduction of pay modernisation, increasing PGT, PGR and overseas student numbers, project EUCLID – and not initiate further major changes before RAE2008 unless these are externally imposed.**

## **Recommendation 4**

**The University should develop an internal communications strategy, focussed on enabling effective and appropriate functional communications networks, both for strategic and routine matters. This to be done on an urgent basis for implementation as quickly as possible.**

- 3.4** The Group noted a strong emphasis on the need to recognise diversity within and between Schools, Colleges and, to some extent, Support Groups. However this must be balanced against the need to ensure clarity of function for external parties and students for all parts of the organisation. The relevant degree of standardisation enabling performance of both academic and corporate functions and requirements must also be ensured. A number of recommendations flow from this:

#### **Recommendation 5**

**Terminology used within the University should be revisited, with a view to greater standardisation and consistency, with a view to making operational structures more readily comprehensible to all staff, students and external parties.**

#### **Recommendation 6**

**Simplicity and some standardisation in identification and organisation of academic leadership and management within Schools should be achieved through the collective identification of a series of specific roles, these being organised and appointed to flexibly within each School.** For example, whilst recognising that different arrangements quite reasonably exist within CMVM, each School should have a Director of Teaching. It is recognised that in some Schools this would be the Head of the Teaching Organisation, whereas for other more academically diverse Schools this might be a specific academic leader co-ordinating across a number of disciplines.

Depending on the requirements of the School, this identification would include both academic management roles and academic leadership roles, such as specific Heads of Discipline.

#### **Recommendation 7**

**A University directory should be established such that it is clear which individuals with specific roles should be contacted concerning specific issues (rather than the head of unit).**

- 3.5 Despite hearing evidence of careful thought having gone into the restructuring of the Support Services, the Group remained unconvinced that the objectives of speed, simplicity and responsiveness had been fully achieved. There was no question of this being a reflection on the dedication and hard work of the University's staff, but of the University having not fully grasped opportunities for increasing effectiveness of working within the new structure. Although the overall Support Group structure is not seen to require fundamental review at this time (but see recommendation 13 below), we nevertheless believe that the Heads of Support Group should give consideration to regrouping sub-units in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. A number of other recommendations follow:

#### **Recommendation 8**

**There should be a simple clarification to the University community of the rationale for the Support Group structure, i.e., the division being straightforwardly understood in respect of: provision of information services (ISG); administration of major institutional resources (CSG); and 'civil service' administration for staff and students (ACSS).** Associated with this should be a greater effort to explain the functions of the support services in fulfilling the University's mission.

#### **Recommendation 9**

Bearing in mind the range of academic, student-focussed and corporate/legislative drivers on the provision of services, **the University collectively should provide greater clarity of overall expectations and requirements from the Support Groups.** This would enable focus in service provision and more directed reporting of value-add to the University's core business of teaching, learning and research. **The Support Groups should develop SMART targets and Key Performance Indicators in consultation with their customers and for agreement by CMG. These would be used by the University to judge performance in meeting corporate expectations.** Wherever possible the culture should be to devolve further



support and decision-making to either College or School level, always in line with the principle of subsidiarity<sup>5</sup>, to maximise local responsibility and accountability and minimise duplication and bureaucracy.

#### **Recommendation 10**

**The University needs to move faster towards business process change to deliver the vision of a simpler, faster, more responsive institution. When considering changes in business processes or their introduction, service providers should focus on delivering benefits and ease-of-use to academic staff and students.**

- 3.6** The Group found that the failure to properly codify devolved decision-making authorities and responsibilities, and service provision responsibilities (whether devolved or not), had had a detrimental effect on both the actual functioning of aspects of the new structure and on the perception of the effectiveness of restructuring as a whole. The failure to properly codify responsibilities and the locus of provision of specific services was also a factor in the continuance – or in some cases growth - of duplication. It is clear that focussed projects are necessary to clarify and codify processes in order to effect subsidiarity in decisions and services – this will also be a pre-condition for consideration of further devolution of services (whether from corporate units to Colleges or to Schools, from Colleges to Schools, or from corporate units more widely across the University.)

The Group therefore recommends:

#### **Recommendation 11**

**As an urgent priority there should be a focussed project to clarify and codify (a) who (individualised function or committee) is responsible for taking which decisions and (b) which operational structures/units are responsible for providing what services.** This will involve a functional mapping of the service provision of Support Groups, Colleges and Schools.

#### **Recommendation 12**

**A follow-on priority project to review where there would be benefits from reassigning responsibility for taking decisions (particularly transferring these from committees to individuals, including officers), or relocating responsibility for service provision.** This will almost certainly involve a reconsideration of the devolution of the powers of Senatus in light of the practical operation of the new structure.

**The Group strongly recommends that subsidiarity be the driving principle behind such reassignment.**

- Once decision-making authorities clarified, **there should be genuine acceptance and use of these authorities and responsibilities, in an atmosphere of trust, without ineffective and inefficient systems of checking and rechecking decisions.**

- Once provision of basic or standard services agreed, **a clear 'buy-in' approach should be adopted such that groups wishing to buy-in extra provision do so from the recognised service provider.**

---

<sup>5</sup> Subsidiarity is the concept that matters should be handled by the lowest competent authority. The Oxford English Dictionary defines subsidiarity as the idea that a central authority should have a subsidiary function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level. In the University context we mean that tasks and responsibilities should be allocated to the unit in which they can be performed most efficiently and effectively. This will often be the School (or equivalent), but with recognition that issues of cost, of the benefits of specialisation and avoidance of duplication, and of legal responsibility may mean that devolution is not always the answer.

With regard to the relative benefits of centralisation or devolution of activities it should also be noted that CMG agreed that devolution should only occur following acceptance of a compelling argument as to the benefits to the University as a whole. It was expected that only arguments proving greatly reduced costs or a genuinely locally specific specialisation of activity would justify devolution or decentralisation.

### **Recommendation 13**

**After undertaking this process and allowing sufficient time for changes to bed in, the University might consider investigating Support Group structures and their practical operation to see whether realignments would be of value at that stage.** This could include the possibility that a single unified service structure would be a more efficient and effective way of providing services to the institutional community of students and all staff. Consistent with recommendation 3 we believe that 2008 would be an appropriate time to consider this.

### **Recommendation 14**

Now that the major academic change projects (Curriculum, Academic Year) have been completed, and the new arrangements for the operation of SUGSC and SPGSC are bedded in, there is no longer seen to be a continuing role for Academic Policy Committee in its current form to oversee major academic change. It has also been suggested that a different structure is required for the better performance of APC's envisaged strategic role. Given this, the Group recommends the following for consideration:

- (i) Academic Policy Committee should be abolished, and academic policy issues be dealt with as appropriate, under the principle of subsidiarity, by College committees, SUGSC, SPGSC, or the two last meeting in conclave for those (few) policy issues crossing boundaries.** Appropriate reporting routes from all these committees direct to Senatus should also be clarified.
- (ii) an Academic Strategy Forum be inaugurated for the Principal and Heads of College and Support Groups to meet with Heads of Schools and of overarching Services (essentially as identified by attendance at CMG<sup>6</sup>), the Director of Planning and the thematic Vice-Principals for the discussion of strategic priorities. It is suggested that this be relatively informal, meeting on at least a quarterly basis and perhaps taking the form of a lunchtime discussion meeting.**

### **Recommendation 15**

**To enable best value-add from thematic Vice-Principals, moves should be made to ensure that thematic Vice-Principals are better integrated into /more widely consulted on planning for and within Colleges and Support Groups.** Through this process the University should seek to ensure that strategic and policy decisions are taken on a collective basis, and that there is clarity and consistency in external communications.

### **Recommendation 16**

The Group found strong opinions that bureaucracy had grown at College level, with a consequent increase in the level of resource allocated. **Heads of College should look into the balance of administrative resource between Colleges and Schools and, where appropriate, corporate functions.** However it is recognised that different resource approaches and solutions will be appropriate in the three Colleges in light of the different balances of functional responsibility between each College and the Schools.

---

<sup>6</sup> That is, Academic Registrar, Directors of Communications, Estates and Buildings, Finance, Human Resources, Planning, and Research Services. Heads of overarching services within ISG – i.e., the Directors of Library Services and of Computing Services – would also be members.

- 3.7** Understandably at the time of restructuring the University concentrated on providing development training for Heads of School. This has led to the perception that Heads of Services, who take on senior, leadership roles within the Support Groups, are being left behind in this regard - most obviously, there is no equivalent of, or inclusion in, the training programme which exists for new Heads of School. This is an area in which improvements would benefit the University as a whole.

**Recommendation 17**

**Heads of Services within Support Groups should have parity of esteem with Heads of Schools, particularly in relation to provision of training, involvement in strategic discussions, etc.**

The Group identified a need for a wider emphasis across the institution on career development / succession planning for all staff, but on balance especially with regard to administrative staff. Focus on supporting and developing administrative careers should be recognised as beneficial to the University as a whole, as those with a wide understanding of the University's operational business and loyalty to the institution could be seen to provide significant value-add. However we recognise that particularly in Schools this must be balanced against the benefits of continuity of administrative support. The Group therefore recommends:

**Recommendation 18**

**University Secretary and College Registrars should develop procedures/practices to improve administrative staff mobility across organisational structures, to enable administrative staff, and indeed all support staff, to gain experience across University structures.**

- 3.8** A few issues relating to specific organisational structures were raised. These arose from discussions of the best configuration of units to provide the most effective service in the computing and student services areas.

**Recommendation 19**

**Recognising that EUCS and MIS have differing roles in computing provision, the University should explore the possibilities for further improving upon the current arrangements for delivering computing infrastructure and support.**

**Recommendation 20**

**The University should seek clarity of roles and identification of relevant responsible individuals in the provision of student support to further improve current provision, and to move to providing as close to seamless support as is practical.**

- 3.9** The Group's final overarching strategic conclusion is that the University should explicitly move away from considering its activities in terms of a hierarchical organisational 'map'. There should be widespread recognition that Schools, Colleges, Support Groups and corporate service units all have important strategic and operational roles to play in delivering the institution's goals and mission. It is necessary for all parts and functions of the University to work in partnership in order to best achieve this. A functionally-based view could therefore usefully be embraced as the organising principle of the institution, whereby the focus would be on what units do in relation to the University's goals, as opposed to what they are or where they sit in a structural 'map' in relation to other units. This would be consistent with a subsidiarity model or approach.

## **Appendix I Membership of the Review Group**

Although two review teams were assembled in keeping with the original proposals, in practice the teams worked together as a single Review Group wherever possible. The Group membership is presented below, with a note as to which review team each member was part of.

<b>Name</b>		<b>(Review Team)</b>
Professor Mary Bownes (Co-Convener)	Vice-Principal, Widening Participation, Recruitment and Community Relations	(Support Groups)
Dr Bruce Nelson (Co-Convener)	Academic Registrar and Deputy Secretary	(Colleges)
Ms Sheila Cannell	Director of Library Services	(Colleges)
Dr Alexis Easson	Director of Planning	(Colleges)
Professor Peter Grant	School of Engineering and Electronics	(Support Groups)
Dr John Hogan (External Assessor)	Registrar, University of Newcastle	(Support Groups)
Professor Hector MacQueen	Dean of Research, Humanities and Social Science	(Support Groups)
Mr Simon Marsden	Director of Management Information Services	(Colleges)
Professor Anton Muscatelli (External Assessor)	Vice-Principal for Planning, University of Glasgow	(Colleges)
Professor Jonathan Seckl	School of Molecular & Clinical Medicine	(Support Groups)
Mr Chris Jowett (Co-secretariat)	Senior Administrative Officer	(Support Groups)
Ms Judith Miller (Co-secretariat)	Planning Officer	(Colleges)

## **Appendix II**

### **Evidence-Gathering**

#### **II.a List of individuals attending evidence-gathering meetings**

Vice-Principal Professor Mike Anderson, Senior Vice-Principal  
Mr Niall Bradley, Acting Director, Student Recruitment and Admissions  
Vice-Principal Professor Vicki Bruce, Head of the College of Humanities and Social Science  
Vice-Principal Professor Grahame Bulfield, Head of the College of Science and Engineering  
Professor Steve Chapman, Head of the School of Chemistry  
Mr Steve Cockburn, President, EUSA  
Mr Ian Conn, Director, Communications & Public Affairs  
Mr Melvyn Cornish, University Secretary  
Professor Dorothy Crawford, Head of the School of Biomedical and Clinical Laboratory Sciences  
Mr Angus Currie, Director, Estates & Buildings  
Professor David Ferguson, Head of the School of Divinity  
Professor Mike Fourman, Head of the School of Informatics  
Professor James Garden, Head of the School of Clinical Sciences and Community Health  
Dr Con Gillen, Director, Office of Lifelong Learning  
Professor Alastair Gillespie, Head of the School of Mathematics  
Mr Brian Gilmore, Director, Computing Services  
Professor Bill Gilmore, Head of the School of Law  
Mr Jon Gorringer, Director, Finance Department  
Vice-Principal Helen Hayes, Head of the Information Services Group  
Professor Andrew Illius, Head of the School of Biological Sciences  
Mr Richard Kington, Director, Accommodation Services  
Ms Elspeth MacArthur, Director, Human Resources  
Professor Angus Macdonald, Head of the School of Arts, Culture and the Environment  
Dr John Martin, Deputy Head of the College of Science and Engineering  
Professor James McMillan, Head of the School of History and Classics  
Mr Michael Menlowe, Head of the School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences  
Mr Jim Nisbet, School Administrator, Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies  
Dr Veena O'Halloran, Director of Registry  
Mr Nigel Paul, Head of the Corporate Services Group  
Mr Alastair Reid, Director, Health and Safety Department  
Dr Ian Revie, Head of the School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Dr Jeffrey Robinson, School Administrator, School of Biological Sciences  
Ms Sabrina Russo, Vice President (Representation), EUSA  
Vice-Principal Professor John Saville, Head of the College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine  
Dr Bob Smailes, Director of Research Services  
Professor David Sugden, Head of the School of GeoSciences  
Vice-Principal Professor Simon van Heyningen, Vice-Principal for Learning and Teaching  
Professor Lorraine Waterhouse, Head of the School of Social and Political Studies  
Professor Elaine Watson, Head of the Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies  
Mrs Rio Watt, Head of Registry Operations  
Dr Dorothy Welch, College Registrar, College of Science and Engineering  
Ms Sara Welham, Head of Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs, Planning and Secretariat

#### **Additional written submissions were also received from the following:**

Dr Douglas Brodie, on behalf of Edinburgh Association of University Teachers  
Vice-Principal Helen Hayes, Head of the Information Services Group  
Professor Irvine Lapsley, Head of Management School and Economics

Mr Simon Marsden, Director, Management Information Services  
Dr Bruce Nelson, Academic Registrar  
Dr Veena O'Halloran, Director of Registry and Ms Rio Watt, Head of Registry Operations  
Mr Nigel Paul, Director of Corporate Services  
Mr Alastair Reid, Director, Health and Safety Department  
Professor David Sugden, Head of the School of GeoSciences  
Vice-Principal Professor Simon van Heyningen, Vice-Principal for Learning and Teaching  
Professor Lorraine Waterhouse, Head of the School of Social and Political Studies

## II.b Key Documents

1) Principal's October 2001 Open Letter to staff	<a href="http://www.cpa.ed.ac.uk/principal/001.html">http://www.cpa.ed.ac.uk/principal/001.html</a>
2) Overview of the University's restructuring	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/Committees/senate/restructuringoverview.htm">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/Committees/senate/restructuringoverview.htm</a>
3) Restructuring in the Support Groups	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/supportgroups.htm">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/supportgroups.htm</a>
4) Website containing all major documentation for the restructuring project	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restructuring/">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restructuring/</a>
5) Delegation of Powers of Senatus to Colleges	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restructuring/AQA/WGPaper_240602.pdf">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restructuring/AQA/WGPaper_240602.pdf</a>
6) Devolution to Colleges	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restructuring/Devolution_Paper_150302.pdf">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restructuring/Devolution_Paper_150302.pdf</a>
7) Background Management Information	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/backgroundmaninfo.pdf">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/backgroundmaninfo.pdf</a>
8) University Governance web pages	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/Committees/Court/Governance.htm">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/Committees/Court/Governance.htm</a>
9) Review Group Web Pages	<a href="http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/">http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/</a>

## II.c Text of E-mail inviting comments, sent to all Staff, 3 February 2005

[ Sent on behalf of Dr Bruce Nelson and Vice-Principal Mary Bownes ]  
[ (Co-Covenors of the University Restructuring Review Group). ]  
[ This list is used for official announcements only. Please do not ]  
[ reply to this message as it is not possible for responses to be ]  
[ read or acknowledged. ]

The University Court has requested an internal review of the University's new organisational structure.

In 2002 the University made some radical changes, abolishing its previous structure of Faculties and Departments, Faculty Groups and Planning Units, and replaced these with a single integrated structure consisting of three Colleges and 21 Schools.

The aim was to increase efficiency across the University, simplifying academic and administrative processes and allowing greater flexibility overall.

The process has been generally well received and, as Principal and Vice-Chancellor Professor Timothy O'Shea points out, "has aroused interest (and even emulation) in other institutions".

With this in mind, the University Restructuring Review Group will be investigating ways to optimise the current structure; looking at how the transition to the new structure has progressed and seeking the opinions of staff on the system's strengths and weaknesses.

Arrangements for the review commenced in January 2005 and it is intended to present the review report to the Central Management Group in May 2005.

#### Staff Participation

The Principal has asked that every member of staff of the University be given the opportunity to make their views known to the Review Group. Any member of staff who wishes to make their views known is encouraged to do so by 21 February by email to [restructuring.review@ed.ac.uk](mailto:restructuring.review@ed.ac.uk) or in writing to Chris Jowett, AAPS, Old College, South Bridge, EH8 9YL.

Further information about the review may be found at the Review Group web pages located at:-

<http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/>

It is the intention of the Review Group that any comments made by staff should be mounted on the web pages in order to stimulate discussion. When submitting comments staff should therefore indicate whether or not they wish their comments to be publicly accessible and attributable to them.

#### II.d List of written submissions

Dr Ian Astley, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Professor Jonathan Bard, School of Biomedical & Clinical Laboratory Sciences  
Professor Andrew Barker, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Mr Philip Bennett, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Mrs Karen Bowman, Director of Procurement  
Mr Michael Bury, School of Arts, Culture and the Environment  
Professor Douglas Cairns, School of History and Classics  
Dr Sarah Carpenter, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Professor Brian Charlesworth, School of Biological Sciences  
Dr Roland Dannreuther, School of Social and Political Studies  
Dr Véronique Desnain, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Dr Sara Dorman, School of Social and Political Studies  
Professor Jean Duffy, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Professor Peter Ghazal, School of Biomedical & Clinical Laboratory Sciences  
Dr Don Glass, School of Engineering & Electronics  
Dr Ingrid Jeacle, Management School and Economics  
Mr Rick Kiralfy, Postgraduate Office, College of Humanities & Social Science  
Dr Robert Leighton, School of Arts, Culture and the Environment  
Dr William Mackaness, School of GeoSciences  
Professor Richard Morris, School of Biomedical & Clinical Laboratory Sciences  
Professor Alan Murray, School of Engineering and Electronics  
Professor Colin Nicholson, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Professor John Renwick, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Mr Saladin Rospigliosi, School of Social & Political Studies  
Dr Marion Schmid, School of Literatures, Languages and Cultures  
Dr John Sode-Woodhead, Office of Lifelong Learning  
Dr Jill Stephenson, School of History and Classics  
Dr Cathie Sudlow, School of Molecular and Clinical Medicine  
Professor David Sugden, School of GeoSciences  
Dr Stephen Tilley, School of Health in Social Science  
Professor Charles Warlow, School of Molecular and Clinical Medicine

For full details of these submissions please see:-

<http://www.aaps.ed.ac.uk/restreview/responses/index.htm>

### Appendix III Recommendations and suggested allocation of lead responsibility

	<b>Summary Recommendation</b>	<b>Lead Responsibility</b>
1	The University as a community needs to reiterate and re-embrace the vision of restructuring and to recognise its successes to date in relation to this vision.	Principal and PSG
2	Restructuring should continue to be seen as a process, not an event.	Heads of College
3	The University collectively should focus on its identified priorities for the next few years – preparation for the RAE, introduction of pay modernisation, increasing PGT, PGR and overseas student numbers, project EUCLID – and not initiate further major changes before RAE2008 unless these are externally imposed.	CMG
4	The University should develop an internal communications strategy, focussed on enabling effective and appropriate functional communications networks, both for strategic and routine matters. This to be done on an urgent basis for implementation as quickly as possible.	Head of ACSS
5	Terminology used within the University should be revisited, with a view to greater standardisation and consistency, making operational structures readily comprehensible to all staff, students and external parties.	Head of ACSS, College Registrars
6	Simplicity in identification and organisation of academic leadership and management within Schools should be achieved through the collective identification of a series of specific roles, these being organised and appointed to flexibly within each School.	Heads of College
7	A University directory should be established such that it is clear which individuals with specific roles should be contacted concerning specific issues (rather than the head of unit).	Head of ACSS
8	There should be a simple clarification to the University community of the rationale for the Support Group structure.	CMG
9	The University collectively should provide greater clarity of overall expectations and requirements from the Support Groups.  The Support Groups should develop SMART targets and Key Performance Indicators in consultation with their customers and for agreement by CMG. These would be used by the University to judge performance in meeting corporate expectations.	CMG
10	The University needs to move faster towards business process change to deliver the vision of a simpler, faster, more responsive institution. When considering changes in business processes or their introduction, service providers should focus on delivering benefits and ease-of-use to academic staff and students.	Heads of Support Group



11	As an urgent priority there should be a focussed project to clarify and codify (a) who (individualised function or committee) is responsible for taking which decisions and (b) which operational structures/units are responsible for providing what services, which will involve a functional mapping of the service provision of Support Groups, Colleges and Schools.	Senior Vice-Principal
12	A follow-on priority project to review where there would be benefits from reassigning responsibility for taking decisions (particularly transferring these from committees to individuals, including officers), or relocating responsibility for service provision.	Senior Vice-Principal
13	After undertaking this process and allowing sufficient time for changes to bed in, the University might consider investigating Support Group structures and their practical operation to see whether realignments would be of value at that stage. (2008 would be an appropriate time to consider this.)	CMG
14	<p>i. Academic Policy Committee should be abolished, and academic policy issues be dealt with as appropriate, under the principle of subsidiarity, by College committees, SUGSC, SPGSC, or the two last meeting in conclave for those (few) policy issues crossing boundaries.</p> <p>ii. an Academic Strategy Forum be inaugurated for the Principal and Heads of College and Support Groups to meet with Heads of Schools and of overarching Services (as identified by attendance at CMG), the Director of Planning and the thematic Vice-Principals for the discussion of strategic priorities. It is suggested that this be relatively informal, meeting on at least a quarterly basis and perhaps taking the form of a lunchtime discussion meeting.</p>	Senior Vice-Principal  Principal
15	To enable best value-add from thematic Vice-Principals, moves should be made to ensure that thematic Vice-Principals are better integrated into /more widely consulted on planning for and within Colleges and Support Groups.	Heads of College/Support Groups
16	Heads of College should look into the balance of administrative resource between Colleges and Schools and, where appropriate, corporate functions.	Heads of College
17	Heads of Services within Support Groups should have parity of esteem with Heads of Schools, particularly in relation to provision of training, involvement in strategic discussions, etc.	Principal
18	University Secretary and College Registrars should develop procedures/practices to improve administrative staff mobility across organisational structures, to enable administrative staff, and indeed all support staff, to gain experience across University structures.	University Secretary

19	Recognising that EUCS and MIS have differing roles in computing provision, the University should explore the possibilities for further improving upon the current arrangements for delivering computing infrastructure and support.	Director of Corporate Services and Vice-Principal Knowledge Management
20	The University should seek clarity of roles and identification of relevant responsible individuals in the provision of student support to further improve current provision, and to move to providing as close to seamless support as is practical.	University Secretary, and Director of Corporate Services and Vice-Principal Knowledge Management