Professional Services Quality Survey

Participant Guide 2022

A Resource for current and prospective participants in the UK multi-university 'Professional Services Quality Survey'

Version 1

November 2021

DOCUMENT PURPOSE

This document sets out the purposes, processes and practices of the 2022 Professional Services Quality Survey (PSQS) and provides general guidance for participants.

For circulation amongst PSQS Participants and Prospective Participants

Contents

Document History

Please ensure you are using the most current document.

Date and version	Change Detail
November 2021, version 1	First draft for circulation and contributions among participants and partners

Document Ownership

Although this document represents a collective effort among all PSQS participants between 2013 and 2021, for comments or queries about this document, please contact:

- Dr Andrew Hindmarsh, PSQS Consultant and original architect of PSQS, previously at University of Nottingham
- Nick Pidgeon, Managing Consultant (Benchmarking), Tribal
- Mark Phillips, Programme Manager, SDA/GIDE

Contact details are provided in Appendix C.

Related Documents

This Participants Guide should ideally be considered:

- *Alongside* the SDA/GIDE proposals and any commercial terms you have agreed with SDA/GIDE.
- *For repeat participants,* your prior year(s) survey results.

1. The purpose and process of PSQS

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the PSQS for its participants is to understand the quality of their support services, as used by academic units and other functions, and thereby drive continuous improvement.

Generating empirical evidence about service quality is fundamental. Perceptions of quality can (all too readily) be driven by anecdote, assumptions, political considerations, a vocal minority, misunderstanding or misinformed expectations. The PSQS provides a platform for collecting empirical data which contributes to a consistent and cumulative evidence-base of service quality over time.

It also provides participants with the means to benchmark their quality of service data against the average of analogous services at a number of broadly similar institutions.

The final purpose of the PSQS design is to raise visibility and dialogue about service quality across an institution, the intention being to foster a better understanding and appreciation of such services while also creating an incentive and means to improve them.

SDA/GIDE is the primary partner for the project management, technical design, web hosting, and analysis and reporting capability. SDA/GIDE is a member of and abides by the standards of Market Research Society (MRS) and ESOMAR and is registered with the Information Commissioner's Office as a Data Controller.

1.2 Caveat

What the PSQS cannot do and which is beyond its immediate purpose is to determine the causes of differences in perceived quality of services within an institution or between one institution and another, whether attributable to remit, resourcing, leadership, management, efficiency, or other such factors. Within an institution, it may be possible for leaders and senior managers to know or determine such causes and act on them. Looking across multiple institutions (or at averages of analogous services) this is not the case: for example a particular service in one university may be differently funded, occupy a more advantageous position in the management structure, or be better led than in another.

2. Overall Approach and Methodology

The overall approach is straightforward.

- **Each university works with SDA/GIDE** to agree timings, content, customisations and any such matters prior to running the survey. Commercial terms (based on a common proposal and a menu of options) are between each university and SDA/GIDE.
- Although the question wording is identical across all institutions, as are the essential instructions, the **survey is customised to each institution** in terms of the set of units, their names or titles, their purposes, and any appropriate distinctive terminology (for example whether you call such services 'professional services', 'support services', or 'central services'), your university's logo and brand colours, the introductory and thank you pages, etc. The survey is therefore experienced as an entirely internal management tool.
- Over a period of about four to six weeks all **staff at a university are surveyed** across all levels and functions (academic and administrative), between about the end of April and about mid-June. The exact timing and duration is up to each university.
- Staff members are asked to **assess the services they received** only on a direct, personal basis (i.e. not as a representative or on behalf of a team or unit they may be

responsible for). The focus is on services received from a central Professional Service, though there is sufficient flexibility to accommodate some variations from that model.

- Upon opening the survey, respondents tick box(es) in a list of services for those they have had direct contact with. Alongside each service unit, they see a brief summary (about 10-15 words) of the capabilities and services provided to confirm and educate. They are then asked the exact same set of seven questions for each unit.
- Each university is also fully responsible for its own **internal communications**, promotion and utilisation of the survey and results.
- **Reporting of the results** follows quite shortly after the survey closes, depending on the analysis and reporting options chosen by each participating university. Data is gathered about respondents' roles (academic vs administrative, their unit, etc.) so that analyses also reveal perceived variations in provision to other units.
- **Benchmarked** results follow once all universities have completed their run, so may be provided somewhat after internal institution level results are available. Nottingham can provide advice and guidance to ensure the correct alignment of units for the purposes of benchmarking analyses.

3. Design Rationales

- **Target population**. During the original design of the PSQS we considered a range of options on how to define the survey target population, from narrow (heads of large departments) to global, encompassing all university staff at all sites. Looking at the narrowest target population, Heads of Units are arguably more likely to have political agendas or to deal with Professional Services only when service issues are escalated or in response to crises. They may not reflect the experience of staff who use Professional Services on an on-going basis who experience for example consistent high levels of service quality. Looking at the widest target population increases cost and complexity and may mean some staff have limited involvement or awareness of the full range of services. To avoid the potential for skewed results of the narrow approach, the survey was designed for use across all staff in a university, while also incorporating means to reduce complexity and educate respondents over time.
- **Respondent organisational knowledge.** Respondents may have unclear, incorrect or incomplete knowledge about their own university. There may also be uncertainty and misunderstanding about which unit is responsible for a given function, and staff may be unaware of the full range of services. The PSQS was designed to avoid the effects of such factors and serves an educative function by providing for each named unit a concise explanation of the service each unit or team is meant to provide.
- **Reporting and taking actions**. Some universities provide results only to heads of services and the Senior Management Team while others make results fully available to all staff. The approach that is right or best for any university will depend on its culture and practice regarding such management performance tools and staff surveys. Participating universities are therefore in full control of how their results are shared within their institution and benchmarking does not allow for individual universities to be identified. Participants can prompt responses to results and actions as they choose.
- **Benchmarking***.* Most universities maintain a similar range of capabilities and functions (from accommodation to research support to timetabling) but have different ways of organising, managing and delivering those functions. The PSQS was designed to allow benchmarking of functions regardless of local management structures.

4. Experiences to Date

The experience of each university varies, as lessons are learnt year on year, improvement plans acted upon, and the Professional Services Quality Survey (which may go by different names at each university) becomes embedded in organisation culture and practice.

- We can briefly summarise - at high level - the Nottingham experience, where the survey has run since 2013.
- An invitation to participate from the Vice-Chancellor is sent to all University staff in late May, highlighting the value and importance of individual views in seeking the highest service quality levels.
- The response rate for the last four years has been about 15%, with about 1,000 responses received. Each respondent evaluates several units and the total number of evaluations has been 5-6,000 per year – a substantial data resource.
- In October the results and reports are made available to all staff through a variety of means, including a Tableau viewer where staff members can see all results for any or all units (including open text comments), and compare those to results for all services and the benchmarked average for the analogous service at other participating universities.
- Heads of services are required to reflect on their own unit's performance and to develop action or improvement plans as appropriate. The University Executive Board receives a report of outcomes, as well as summaries of the action plans agreed with Heads of Units.
- The PSQS results are also incorporated into other processes, for example Professional Service reviews, and have high visibility internally.
- The PSQS has increasingly become built into the organisation culture. It keeps Heads of Services mindful of the importance of a focus on service quality (and the ease of identifying failure to do so). For the Board (which receives results and action plans), it allows issues and problem areas - and indeed high quality provision – to be readily identified and to gain a better sense of the 'overall health' of services and the organisation.

5. About the PSQS in 2022

The design of the survey will remain the same as in previous years so as to retain consistency and to allow for year on year comparability.

Design, hosting, project management, analysis and result reporting will continue to be provided by SDA/GIDE. Their own support services are consistently regarded as excellent and the product as being very good value for money by all participating universities

Surveys on the SDA/GIDE platform are designed to be responsive to the device being used so will work on mobile devices such as tablets and phones. As the survey has some long response lists, completion on very small screens is not recommended.

SDA/GIDE surveys are hosted on servers in a secure data centre with regular backups and recovery procedures.

Once the survey is closed each institution's data file will be downloaded by SDA/GIDE and quality checked (eg removal of blank submissions, duplicates, incompletes etc). The data will be transferred to SPSS or similar software for analysis. Participating universities may choose to have a copy of their data file in order to undertake analyses themselves.

Costs for 2022

The basic costs for running the survey in 2022 are £2,850 + VAT and include:

- Online survey design and hosting
- Prepare and deliver survey data file for analysis
- Benchmark tables and charts in Excel/pdf format

A range of additional and reporting options are also available at additional cost including, for example, pdf reports with executive summary.

6. 2022 PSQS Kick-off meeting

All those interested in participating in 2022 will be invited to a kick-off meeting (to be arranged) to compare prior experiences, and to share issues and ideas. Some points from previous meetings include:

- Survey timing, duration and response rates. This year, start times will be variable to accommodate the upheaval caused by the pandemic. The longest running survey duration has been about one month. Response rates varied from 14% to about 20%.
- Response rate management. Monitoring response rates actively using the online facility provided by SDA/GIDE is important. This shows when numbers begin to trail off, indicating the benefit of a reminder to prompt completion, as well as which units may not be responding, suggesting that (if communications were cascaded rather than sent globally) that the Head of the unit may not have forwarded the invitation or not given a sufficient level of encouragement or rationale for participating. Some institutions sent weekly reports to heads of units, giving them the number and % of their staff who had completed the survey. It may also be effective to send a single report showing response rates across all units to Heads, so that units with lower response rates may be additionally motivated.
- Order of units evaluated. Following a discussion on possible biases, it was agreed to change the survey so that, regardless of the order in which the units are listed, they are completed in random order.
- Respondent behaviours. SDA/GIDE data captured about how respondents proceed through the survey, which showed that respondents take 2-3 minutes to complete the opening questions (i.e. introductory text, indicating which unit they work in, the type of role they hold, etc.) then about one minute for each service evaluated. The time taken per service reduces the higher the number of services evaluated, presumably as people become familiar with the questions. Unsurprisingly, the data showed much variation around these averages - obviously people can be interrupted in the middle of completion and some will spend more time thinking about the answers and some will speed through the survey. Also, the data showed that only 13% of respondents did more than 10 evaluations, with most institutions having an average of 4-6 per person.
- Using this, it is possible to include a statement in the survey along these lines: 'How long the questionnaire will take to complete depends on the number of services evaluated. Evidence from previous years suggests that on average it will take 4-15 minutes but possibly longer if more than 10 services evaluated.'
- Analysis, Reporting and Action Plans. There is wide variation in responses to reporting, both the institution results and the benchmarking. Most provide a tailored summary report to their Executive Board. Some, including Nottingham, also produce their own results explorer tools using Tableau to provide wider access to results. Nottingham provides all University staff with access to all results for all units, including open

comments. Most require some form of ‘action plans’ from service units, either by exception (eg for units below their relevant benchmark, University average or whose results are poor or declining) or universally.

PSQS methods and practice

7. Before You Begin

7.1 Identify the right people and their role and scope of authority

a) Identify the person to serve as the Lead Business Contact. This person would typically manage the following activities and tasks:

- Confirm and own the institution’s readiness to participate.
- Ensure the appropriate level of visibility to the university Senior Management Team and the university staff in general of any relevant activities.
- Provide a point of escalation for any queries or issues that may arise.
- Identify the person to serve as the Lead Operational contact.
- Determine whether or how to further engage with any other participant organisation directly after the survey results are available, for example to bilaterally share information on practice in a given area, or to endeavour to understand causes of high service quality and good practice.

b) Identify the person to serve as the Lead Operational Contact. This person would typically manage the following activities and tasks:

- Determine the ideal time period during which the survey will run.
- Lead on determining and internally confirming the right service unit names and descriptions and communicating these correctly to SDA/GIDE.
- Serve as the nominated SDA/GIDE contact for the duration of the project.
- Determine and confirm on behalf of the institution any customisation, e.g. of language and terminology, logos, introductory and thank you messages, etc.

  Liaise with the University of Nottingham contact, who will advise on identification and agreement of benchmarking alignment.
- Determine on behalf of the institution the reporting needs and requirements.
- Facilitate all commercial arrangements (POs, invoicing, payment processing, etc.).

c) Agree which decisions each person above can take independently and which decisions may need to be escalated to the senior management team (or equivalent) owner. The kinds of decisions that may need to be escalated include:

- The granularity or number of units to be included, as this can be controversial.
- The options taken among the reporting options provided.
- How widely results are circulated within each university, and how.
- The responses and actions that might be expected of heads of services.

7.2 Arrange for SDA/GIDE to be on your approved supplier list (if necessary)

1) Given that the key services will be provided to each institution by SDA/GIDE, you may need to arrange for SDA/GIDE to be on your approved supplier list.

2) SDA/GIDE will also provide each institution with a full proposal and commercial and legal terms, for example notifying the lead operational contact if any additional actions are required to ensure the work conforms to the relevant ethical guidelines. Additionally, if universities have their own research guidelines and protocols, they

should contact SDA/GIDE, who will ensure their activities conform to any guideline and protocols.

8. Setup

8.1 Professional Service Unit List

The professional service unit list is the list of units that will be identified in the survey for participants to evaluate. You can define the list in any way you like, but the individual units should be recognisable by the participants and make sense as a coherent set of people or activities that can be evaluated together.

While it is tempting to break down the various services into small units so that any issues can have their source narrowly identified, this can actually undermine the validity of the survey. Depending on the nature of what they do, a very small unit which only interacts with a small proportion of staff might receive fewer than 20 evaluations making interpretation more difficult. Also, presenting participants with a very long list of units, each of which would require separate evaluation, may lead participants to choose to evaluate a sub-set of the units they interact with.

Experience thus far has suggested that 40-60 units is probably a sensible range for a large institution.

Consideration should also be given to how the units should be presented in the survey. Rather than a long list of units, it is probably better to present an organised list based on their natural hierarchy. Thus, when participants are selecting which units they will evaluate, they will see a general heading (Finance, perhaps) and then a list of financially related units (Management Accounts, Purchasing, etc.). This will probably fall naturally out of your internal structures but, as long as the structure makes sense to the participants, it does not have to.

There are some units whose main purpose is not a service to staff (e.g. student service units) but this is not a good reason to exclude them from the survey. It would be rare for such units never to deal with staff and it would send a rather odd message if some units were excluded from the survey. However, the core purpose of such units needs to be taken into account when any results are reviewed.

8.2 Professional Service Unit Descriptions

The service unit descriptions serve three purposes:

- *Confirm.* Quickly give the respondent confidence that the unit whose service quality they intend to assess is in fact the one that provided the service they have in mind.
- *Differentiate*. Allow the respondent to distinguish between purposes of units whose name or remit are easily confused, for example ‘Marketing’ versus ‘Market Research’.
- *Educate*. Let respondents quickly see the *full set* of purposes or capabilities of units whose service they intend to assess, as well as those of other units.

To serve these purposes most effectively, it is important to keep the descriptions brief. Ideally, they should be between about five and seven words. This is because respondents are only skimming the descriptions for key words, to confirm and/or differentiate between units. Studies of web reading shows people can spot key words very quickly in phrases of five to seven words. When the descriptions get much longer than seven words, respondents need to focus more closely on reading the descriptions rather than completing the survey. The longer the descriptions, the more likely the respondent will curtail or fail to complete the survey, lowering response rates and value of the exercise as a whole.

There is also value beyond the PSQS in the effort to summarise the purposes or remit of the unit for the PSQS in phrases no longer than about ten words, in that the phrase can be used in other contexts, such as the unit's (internal) website, in e-mail signatures, or other forms of internal communications. Over time, this gradually builds up a stronger basis of knowledge about which unit is responsible for what activities, and links it to the PSQS.

We'd also recommend that a single person reviews and revises all descriptions so that they are written and presented in a single, consistent and coherent style, which will be better understood by respondents than the idiosyncratic writing style of different heads of units.

Finally, the longer the unit descriptions are, the more pages or the longer the page will need to be on which respondents select which units whose service quality they will assess. Evidence from earlier years shows that the longer that page, or the more pages are required, to select units to assess, the lower the proportion of respondents who complete the survey. *In terms of the unit descriptions, less is more.*

An example partial list of units and descriptions is provided as Appendix B.

TIP! We recommend a staff member with an enterprise-wide remit or experience – typically in a Strategic Planning unit – drafts the unit descriptions against the guidance above, and circulates them to heads of the relevant units to confirm or revise, rather than to request they be volunteered, in effect meaning every head of unit or service faces a 'blank sheet'. This practice will set out good examples of the length of description expected and the standard of precision required, and expedite the completion of the list.

It is also important to tell heads of units that subsequent (or repeated) revisions once the list has been submitted to SDA/GIDE, especially for minor punctuation and capitalisation errors which should have been identified prior to submission, will delay setup of the survey and beyond a certain point will incur additional costs for the institution.

8.3 Setting the Survey period

To obtain the best results, it is important to give careful consideration to the timing and duration of the survey. For example, be sure the survey period doesn't overlap fully with:

- Dates when large numbers expected to be on holiday
- Other staff surveys
- Marking periods

8.4 Terminology and Language

You should ensure the terminology used in the survey is aligned to your university.

- Confirm the correct references to the category of service units, i.e. 'Professional Services', 'Central Services', 'Support Services', etc.
- Confirm that references to staff members ('employees', 'colleagues', etc.) reflect your organisation's practices.
- You can title the survey internally as you wish: there is no need for participating institutions to use the 'PSQS' term internally.

8.5 Paper Surveys (for staff without computer access)

In addition to an on-line survey you may wish to run a paper alternative for staff who do not have ready access to a computer (cleaners, grounds staff, etc.). In deciding whether or not to do this you will need to bear in mind that:

- The cost and effort of printing and distributing questionnaires and entering responses into a database will not be trivial.
- You will probably have to restrict the number of evaluations included in the paper version so as to keep the size of the paper version reasonable.
- You are likely to achieve a much lower response rate for paper surveys.

Experience to date is that providing a paper version to a particular staff group yields a response rate of about half the online version and creates considerable costs. As an alternative it is worth considering some form of kiosk for use by such staff.

8.6 The Web Survey – Introductory and Closing Text

The introductory and closing text of the web survey should say something about the purpose of the survey within your institution, effectively setting the tone, the principles (e.g. not seeking redress for personal issues, responding as an individual and not a representative of a unit), an atmosphere of constructive collegiality, etc. It may also allude to other intended uses of the results, for example as part of service reviews, to target support and improvement, or to improve staff satisfaction.

8.7 Testing the Web Survey

- SDA/GIDE undertakes a range of testing to ensure the survey is ready to be deployed for each institution. It is each university's responsibility to confirm their *internal* readiness to run and support the survey.
- Make sure the purpose is clear and understood by test subjects. You may want to involve a small number of staff to review the introductory and final text of the survey, the unit list and descriptions, and the invitations to participate in the survey.
- You may want to involve your IT unit to ensure that large number of internal messages will not get intercepted by institutional or individual spam filters.

8.8 Email addresses

It is important to check in advance that the necessary all staff email lists are available and can be used without any limits on the numbers of emails being sent at any one time.

8.9 Internal Communications

Participants may find benefit in enlisting the support of their internal communications team, for example to develop and execute an internal communications plan.

A good communications support plan would cover the full range of communication channels and media in order to maintain a sufficiently high visibility throughout the survey and to compete effectively with the many other activities which demand staff members' attention and may divert or distract them from doing the survey.

A good communication plan will also follow through the entirety of the PSQS cycle internally. For example it should cover:

- advanced publicity that the survey is coming
- how University staff will be informed of the results becoming available and how to gain access to them
- any highlights from the results, for example acknowledging areas of outstanding service
- what actions are being taken based on the results

- acknowledging the value of the contribution people have made by participating and creating a positive attitude towards participation in the next years' survey.

9 Running the Survey

9.1 Invitation Email

You will need to decide who the invitation email should come from (probably the Vice-Chancellor) and seek their approval for the wording.

The text of the email, in addition to including the link to the survey and any words of exhortation you wish to include, should give a contact for technical queries with the survey (an in-house contact, rather than the company running the survey) and for queries about the nature and purpose of the survey.

You will also need a reminder email to be used after the survey has opened.

9.2 Monitoring response rates

SDA/GIDE will provide your Operational Lead with access to an online response rate monitoring facility, which lets you see responses broken down in several ways, i.e. by frequency (responses per day, total responses), business units respondent categories and by questions.

Most importantly, this lets you see when response rates plateau, especially when that plateau is short of a desired overall response rate. At such points you may choose to prompt a new wave of respondents, for example by invitations via another channel, or targeted at units with lower respondent numbers or proportions.

If you want to monitor responses in terms of the proportion of potential respondents in a unit (whether academic or administrative) then you will need to provide SDA/GIDE with staff numbers for each department so the percentage responses rate can be calculated.

9.3 Achieving a good response rate

Apart from the email invitation to all staff to participate, there are a number of additional activities we recommend to optimise the likelihood of a good (high) response rate.

- *Advance notification of heads of units.* Make sure heads of units have advance notification of the purposes, benefits, launch date and duration of your university's run of the PSQS. They can then use regularly scheduled internal department and/or team meetings to raise awareness. They can also find opportunities to make explicit their interest and support for the survey, so that upon receiving the invitation as many staff as possible know what it, why it is being done, and why their participation matters.
- *Active monitoring of response rates.* As indicated above, there are means of actively monitoring rates and intervening periodically to spur a surge in responses. A passive approach - where a low response rate is only noticed at the completion – leaves little scope to remedy any issues, and a low response rate may cast questions over the validity of the results, especially for units with a very low response number.

10 Key Activities and Milestones

10.1 Within each participating university

Apart from initial dialogue with SDA/GIDE for example about timing, unit names, custom terminology, reporting options, etc., and with the University of Nottingham's Strategy, Planning and Performance Division in a coordinating and facilitating role, each University has to undertake the following enabling activities, roughly on the schedule set out below.

The dates below are all indicative, and will depend in each instance on the schedule determined and agreed between each institution and SDA/GIDE, as well as with the other participating institutions.

Some coordination across participants is important so benchmarking results are available reasonably close to when the analysis of each institutions own results are completed.

Activities or Milestone	**Approx date**
Provide names of units to be assessed and concise description of the purpose of each to SDA/GIDE. Decide whether a paper version is required for any staff. Previous participants: provide information on units whose names have changed or any reorganisations and confirm which of the current units should be linked back to those in previous surveys (for year on year analyses).	Mid-April to Early May
Optionally, provide the URL or text of a 'thank you' page respondents see when they click the final submit button.	April/May
Provide details of which service units should go into which benchmark groups (liaise with Andrew Hindmarsh)	April/May
Check and 'sign off' the online survey prior to the launch date	April/May
Ensure procedures and the necessary information is in place (including the content of the email) for emailing staff inviting them to complete the survey	April/May
Send email to staff inviting them to complete survey and undertake any other promotional activities and awareness raising. Optionally distribute paper surveys.	May - June
Send reminder emails to staff if necessary	
Confirm which of the analysis and reporting options your institution would like	June
Final 'sign-off' to any outputs (Excel files and written reports) provided	September - October

10.2 Undertaken by SDA/GIDE

Activities or Milestone	**Approx date**
Develop and test online surveys for each participating institution, provide the final URL (link) to the survey	March – May
Monitor response rates and provide weekly updates to each institution	May - June

Close the surveys on the specified dates, download the response data, clean and check the data and prepare the file for analysis	June
Data analysis and provision of results in Excel format	July - September
Production of summary reports (if required) on individual institutions' findings and benchmarked findings	September - October

Appendix A: The Professional Service Quality Survey Questions

These questions were set out in 2013 and have been retained unchanged, though we have in each year considered whether any changes were necessary or would be beneficial.

1. I understand the role and remit of this department.
2. It was clear who I needed to contact to assist with my enquiry/request.
3. In general, any queries were answered fully, or I was directed to an appropriate place for an answer.
4. In general, services provided have been useful (e.g. resources, communications, advice, actions or documentation - including online).
5. In general, services provided were timely (e.g. resources, communications, advice, actions or documentation - including online).
6. Any policies relating to my enquiry were clearly written.
7. Staff in this department do their best to meet my needs/requirements.

Appendix B: Example List of Unit Titles and Descriptions

Below is a partial list of units and descriptions comprising the Registrar's Department at the University of Nottingham, for illustrative purposes.

Division	**Unit**	**Description**
Registrar's Office	Registrar's Office	The personal office of the Registrar
Academic Secretary's Office		Quality and standards administration, casework (high level complaints), Information Governance (FoI and DPA compliance, administration and advice); Council and Senate secretariat
Campus Life		Providing specialist support for students, including counselling, mental health and wider healthcare services; childcare services for staff and students; pastoral support in university accommodation; supporting students (and staff) in finding appropriate accommodation; maintaining good relationships between students and local communities
Careers and Employability Service		Enhancing career development and employability
External Relations	Admissions	Managing and maintaining central admissions systems, policies, procedures, and centralised decision making
	Communications	Promoting and defending the University's reputation, through the media and a variety of other channels (strategic, research, Faculty and crisis communications and media training)
	Corporate Marketing	Promoting the University and its services, managing the University's reputation and profile, and delivering integrated marketing and communications activities (including management of the University's design and print roster and the internal creative design service)
	Internal Communications	Communicating and engaging with staff and students
	International Recruitment	Promoting the University to prospective EU and international students and to external stakeholders; supporting the recruitment of EU and international students; providing advice to Faculties and Schools to develop international recruitment

	Market Intelligence	Supporting strategic planning of the University and its Schools through acquiring, analysing and interpreting information about our macro and micro environments
	Political and Public Affairs	Raising the status and profile of the University with policy makers and influencers across the national political arena (political affairs, stakeholder management, external engagement, policy development and announcements)
	Student Recruitment Marketing	Promoting the University to prospective students by developing and implementing integrated student recruitment marketing campaigns, institutional conversion plans and supporting faculty strategies
	Student Recruitment (UK only)	Supporting the recruitment of students to the University through events, enquiry management and bespoke student recruitment projects
	Web and Digital	Developing and supporting websites, social media and video
	Widening Participation	Broadening the range of students attending university through ‘outreach’ and ‘in-reach’ programmes
Human Resources and Professional Development	Human Resources	Providing strategy, policy, procedures and advice regarding individual and managerial staff
	Professional Development	Providing staff and postgraduate students with opportunities to undertake personal, professional and educational activities
	Safety Office	Supporting the provision of a safe working environment
Legal Services	Legal Services	Providing legal advice and representation
Libraries and Research and Learning Resources	Library Services	Delivering library services to staff and students
	Manuscripts and Special Collections	Managing and providing access to collections of archives, manuscripts and rare books
	Learning Technology	Providing systems and technologies to support teaching and learning

	Transforming teaching programme	Support for teaching enhancement activity, and advice and guidance on teaching awards and funding applications
Sport		Providing opportunities for students and staff to participate in sport, health and fitness and leading the development of intra-mural sport, representative sport and elite performance
Strategy, Planning and Performance	Strategy, Planning & Performance	Strategy development support at all levels; HE policy advice and student planning, performance and management information reporting; specialist analytics; statutory student returns;, student surveys
Student Services	Support for Students	Student Service Centres and online support
	Academic Process Management	Curriculum, timetabling, marks processing, placements, and policy guidance
	Event Management	Registration, examinations, and graduation
	Specialist Support	Student finance, funding, accessibility, immigration, and statutory reporting

Appendix C: Contact Information

For any questions or additional information, please contact:

Mark Phillips
Project Manager, SDA/GIDE
40 Borough High St, London SE1 1XW
mark.phillips@gide.net
Tel: 0207 183 5803
Mob: 07776 194280
www.gide.uk

Nick Pidgeon

Head of Surveys and Benchmarking, Tribal
Suite 402, The Atrium, 20 Wollaton Street, Nottingham NG1 5FW
Nick.Pidgeon@tribalgroup.com
T +44 (0)115 9347378
M +44 (0)7803 247592