

**DIRECTORATE FOR THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE**

<b>Title:</b>	Final report of the 'Implementation of Policy and Procedures' Steering Group.
<b>Author/Enquiries:</b>	Kay Day, Head of Faculty Administration (MHS) & Emma Hilton Wood – Head of Academic Policy (Teaching and Learning Support Office)
<b>Date/version:</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> July 2013
<b>Circulation:</b>	SEMG, TLG and MDC

**Background**

1. The 'Implementation of Policy and Procedures' Group was established as part of the Directorate for the Students Experience's (DSE) 'Cross Cutting Themes' initiative. The group was established due to concerns raised with regards to the inconsistent implementation of policies and accompanying procedures across the University. The aims and more information on the group can be found within the Project Charter, which is included for information.
2. A key objective of the group was that the inconsistent implementation of policy and accompanying procedure in the University should be addressed, with recommendations made to address this issue in the future.

**Context**

3. A number of policies were highlighted to the group as being of particular concern. These were identified as a result of themes emerging from monitoring and review activities as well as Appeals and Complaints cases. They are listed as follows:
  - Personalised Learning
  - Feedback Policy
  - Policy on Mitigating Circumstances
  - Interruptions to Taught Programmes
  - Policy on Attendance Monitoring
4. In considering these examples, the group looked at how they had been developed, the drafting and consultation process and how they had been approved. In addition, they considered the implementation, monitoring and review and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders at each stage in the process.
5. From the study of these individual case studies the group decided that in order to maximise consistency across the University the whole process from 'start to finish' must be formalised and this led to the development of a 'Framework' document and flow chart. These documents are attached for comment. The Steering Group noted that there are multiple 'risk' points in the 'long journey' through policy development, which could at any stage result in an ineffectual policy, being badly implemented with little or no stakeholder consultation or buy in. Failure at anyone of the risk points could result in inconsistent implementation of a policy and accompanying procedures.
6. At the recommendation of the Policy Implementation Group, in liaison with the Director of Teaching and Learning Support most of the previously mentioned policies and procedures are now being reviewed by TLG. Richard Reece, the Associate Vice-

President (Teaching, Learning and Students) is currently overseeing the review of the Feedback Policy, Personalised Learning Policy and the Policy on Mitigating Circumstances and Clive Agnew, Vice – President (Teaching, Learning and Students) is considering the consistent implementation of the Policy on Attendance Monitoring. Work is commencing in order to consider the effectiveness of the 'Principals for Granting Interruptions'. Initially, this work is being taken forward by the Appeals and Complaints Network.

7. The 'Framework' is currently being piloted on the 'Policy for Recording Lectures'. Although this was not developed under the framework, it will enable us to pilot the implementation plan and communication mechanisms.

### **Summary of the Stakeholder Consultation**

8. Generally, the Framework and Flow Chart have received very positive feedback from the consultation, which took place in June 2013. Overall, Stakeholders feel it has provided clarity with regards the stages of policy development and provides a method for identifying roles and responsibilities.
9. As part of the consultation process it was pleasing to see references to the development of the new taught degree regulations, as examples of good practice. Stakeholder feedback suggested that the 'open meetings', designed to ensure the dissemination of a consistent message across the University and facilitation of two way feedback should continue.
10. A key aspect of the work of the group was the proposal that each new or amended policy and procedure is accompanied by an 'Implementation Plan'. This has been piloted with the implementation of the Degree Regulations as has proved to be a very useful document. The Implementation plan is attached to this report, as an example, and will form the basis of a template which will also be rolled out with the final version of the 'Framework'. Our Stakeholders agreed that this was a good way to provide details of the communication mechanisms which will be used to consult with stakeholders, disseminate a consistent message and articulate roles and responsibilities for implementation and approval and monitoring. The Stakeholders also agreed that the plan will be helpful in identifying any training, resource, or additional business processes required, particularly where these include adaptations or development of IT supported systems or Campus Solutions.
11. The Stakeholders also stated that there was a need to firmly articulate the roles and responsibilities in terms of the implementation and monitoring of policy. Although, these roles are already stated within job descriptions, the Stakeholders felt that it was necessary to clarify these, particularly in terms of making a clear distinction between the responsibilities for 'Implementation' from 'Monitoring and Review'. The consultation also raised concerns within the University that there is a perception that there are no sanctions for non compliance with institutional policy.
12. The Stakeholders also supported the findings of the Steering Group, by agreeing that the proposed 'Framework' would formalise the policy development process and strongly articulates the need for clear and transparent consultation with staff and students, getting buy in from all stakeholders at the very earliest stages. The Steering Group believes this will also help to ensure consistent implementation as there will be increased knowledge and support for the policy in the early stages, rather than it appearing to be a forced 'top down' approach.
13. The Stakeholders agreed with the Steering Group in recognising that there is confusion with regards 'terminology'. This will need to be carefully monitored as the framework develops and more work will be required in this area, which is contained within the action plan.

14. The Stakeholders echoed the Steering Group's concerns that University Policy is difficult to find and is not easily accessible on the web. The Steering Group made further recommendations in this area, contained in the action plan.

### **Recommendations**

15. *That TLG/ MDC and SEMG approve the proposed Framework for the Development, Approval and Implementation of Policy and Procedure (Student Experience Related).*
16. *That the Framework is adopted by the University as the process by which policy and procedure, relating to the Student Experience be developed from now on. Specifically, this includes policy owned by the DSE and Graduate Education, within Business Engagement and Support Services.*
17. *That TLG/ MDC and SEMG approve the action plan, detailing further work to be undertaken to embed good practice in policy development.*