

## **Fund for the development of good management practice**

### **Projects funded from the 1999-2000 bids**

### **Feedback from the Special Management Advisory Panel**

### **Invitation to bid for 2000-01**

---

**To** Heads of HEFCE-funded higher education institutions including universities in Northern Ireland and London University heads

**Of interest to** Senior managers and department heads within higher education institutions

**Publication date** July 2000

**Enquiries to** John Rushforth, Chief Auditor, HEFCE  
(Fund manager)  
tel 0117 931 7416  
e-mail [j.rushforth@hefce.ac.uk](mailto:j.rushforth@hefce.ac.uk)

Pramod Philip, Audit Consultant, HEFCE  
(Fund administrator)  
tel 0117 931 7380  
e-mail [p.philip@hefce.ac.uk](mailto:p.philip@hefce.ac.uk)

---

## **Executive summary**

### **Purpose**

1. This document provides feedback on the first round of bids to the Fund for the Development of Good Management Practice. It summarises the projects selected to receive funding under the 1999-2000 bidding round. It includes contact details to obtain further information on individual projects.
2. This document also contains an invitation to apply for funding under the 2000-01 bidding round.

### **Key points**

3. The Fund for the Development of Good Management Practice was established in 1999. This £10 million special funding programme runs for three years from April 2000 to March 2003. We expected to allocate £4 million in the first year.

4. Using a two-stage application process, applications were assessed by the Special Management Advisory Panel (see Annex A for membership). In the first year (1999-2000) bidding round, 156 applications were received, requesting a total of over £25 million of funding. The Panel selected 31 of these to receive HEFCE funding totalling £4.4 million, as detailed in this report.

### **Action required**

5. The closing date for applications under the second year's bidding round is midday on **15 September 2000**. Annex D gives the format for the application.

### **Background**

6. In April 1999 we published HEFCE 99/28 'Fund for the Development of Good Management Practice', which set out initial proposals. The responses to consultation and the advice of the Special Management Advisory Panel were incorporated into the later 'Invitation to bid' document. The membership of the Panel is shown at Annex A.
7. In August 1999 we published HEFCE 99/54, 'Developing good management practice: Invitation to bid for funds', which informed the HE sector of this £10 million special funding programme running from April 2000 to March 2003 and of our expectation of allocating approximately £4 million in the first year.

### **Purpose**

8. The Fund's purpose is to accelerate the implementation of management improvements across the higher education sector through:
  - identifying good practice
  - providing esteem and recognition for good practice and its further development
  - encouraging work on the development and implementation of recognised good practice, particularly involving collaboration
  - enabling new developments designed to enhance effective management and governance.

The outputs and outcomes of the projects funded by this initiative will be disseminated widely, in order to offer maximum benefit to the sector.

## **Details of projects funded from the 1999-2000 bids and feedback from the Special Management Advisory Panel**

### **Decisions of the panel**

9. The panel recommended that 31 projects receive HEFCE funding totalling £4.4 million.
10. With about £4 million available in 1999-2000, the panel regretted that many good projects could not receive funding this year. However the panel hoped that this would not dissuade applications, encouraging applicants to liaise as necessary with HEFCE officers and consider submitting a revised bid under the 2000-01 bidding round.
11. A list of all of the projects funded under the 1999-2000 bidding round is shown at Annex B.

### **Application and assessment process for the first year's bidding round.**

12. A two-stage application process was used. The stage one bid was an outline document whereas the stage two bid requested more detail, particularly regarding outcomes and performance measures.
13. The applications were assessed on the basis of the criteria detailed at Annex C.
14. We informed applicants of the results of their stage one applications in December 1999. There were 34 stage one applications selected to proceed to stage two of the bidding process. We gave these applicants feedback and suggestions for improvements for their stage two bids.
15. Feedback was available, on request, for unsuccessful applicants.
16. We are conscious of the costs of bidding. The Special Management Advisory Panel developed the two-stage application process as it allowed an outline bid to be quickly formulated and initial feedback to be provided. A number of bidders welcomed the two-stage approach.

### **Content of applications**

17. The majority of stage one bids received were well-presented submissions relating to well-defined projects. The funding requested in individual stage one bids ranged from £9,500 to £1.5 million.

18. Applications for funding covered a wide range of projects, including the following subjects:

- human resources
- staff development
- estates/utilities
- financial management
- business process re-engineering
- benchmarking
- corporate governance
- marketing of HE courses
- student records administration
- information technology
- risk management
- alumni networks
- postgraduate applications.

19. Some of the applications related to specific matters that would be relevant to only a few institutions, such as the purchase of a new accounting system. The fund aims to support management development work that will benefit the HE sector as a whole, so these institution-specific subjects could not be funded.

#### **Details of projects awarded funding**

20. Details of each project can be found at the 'Fund for the Development of Good Management Practice' pages on the HEFCE web-site under 'Good practice'. These web pages also contain contact details of project leaders. Anyone wanting further information on a particular project is invited to contact the project leader directly.

#### **Collaboration**

21. HEFCE is keen to encourage collaborative working in this initiative and the sharing of information. Collaboration allows the work of a project to benefit from the breadth of experience of several partner institutions and permits a wider dissemination of the project's findings. A number of mutually beneficial links had been established between the projects of the stage two applicants.

#### **Attributes of successful applications**

22. The panel noted that many stage one applications did not state and explain the outputs, outcomes and performance measures of the project. As guidance for future applicants, the panel believes that outputs represent specific deliverables, the end products, of the project work; for example, a series of management workshops and printed reference material. The outcomes of the project are the impacts of beneficial changes created by the project within the participating institutions and HE sector. Outcomes are usually measured, as part of the project work, via suitable performance indicators and ideally with quantified targets; this allows the project's participants to clearly see whether the project has fulfilled its intended aims.

23. Applications selected to receive funding were able to demonstrate most, if not all, of the following attributes (excerpts from successful bids are given for illustration):

Attribute	Illustration
Clearly defined project outcomes	<p>'Many of the improvements will have an impact on overall performance, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improved student experience, with likely impact on student numbers</li> <li>• improved staff satisfaction with likely impact on effectiveness</li> <li>• improved utilisation of people</li> <li>• improved capacity management with the potential to increase student numbers...' </li></ul>
Significant financial benefits (with quantified estimates) demonstrating value for money of the investment being made by HEFCE and the project participants	<p>'Should these across-sector indicators achieve only marginal improvements of say 1 per cent, this equates to a benefit to £1 million.'</p>
Significant non-financial benefits, well explained	<p>'Specialists who feel more respected are likely to identify more fully with the institutions where they work, to take a greater interest in students' all-round achievements and be more ready to contribute to activities outside their immediate teaching duties.'</p>
The clear commitment towards the success of the project from senior officers (VC/Principal/Pro-VC/Director/Registrar) of the organisation	<p>'The project has the full support of the University, which includes the Policy and Resources Committee, and direct and indirect contributions to the resourcing of the project will be made available.'</p>
Significant contributions from the project participants in terms of staff time and/or financial resources	<p>'The participating institutions will meet 50 per cent of the direct costs of the project. The institutions will provide the costs of materials and speakers for training sessions and the time of staff development officers and/or other administrative staff involved in the preparation of training sessions. In addition, the university will incur the indirect costs of project manager.'</p>
Formation of a collaborative consortium to perform the project work, giving breadth to the work of the project and facilitating dissemination of good practice	<p>'The project will involve three "node" institutions. Each of these node institutions would engage other universities in a regional consortium, thus involving around 15 institutions as partners in the bid. The outcomes will be disseminated and shared within the consortium and also nationally.'</p>
An effective dissemination strategy for projects undertaken primarily at one HEI	<p>'The dissemination strategy has four main strands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• web pages giving details of progress on the project</li> <li>• a printed final report, with detailed recommendations, sent to HEIs</li> <li>• a local dissemination conference involving around 80 delegates from local HE/FE providers and public sector organisations</li> <li>• a presentation of the project's findings at the annual conference.' </li></ul>

Attribute	Illustration
Incorporation of a sector perspective at an early stage in the project, perhaps by consultation with or participation of a sector representative body	'Working with SCOP as a full partner in the core group will provide comprehensive involvement of the higher education college sector.'
Likelihood of benefits continuing well after the proposed cessation of HEFCE funding	'The purpose of this project is to "pump-prime" a data collection exercise from which benchmark data can be derived. This will be continued using funds to be collected from membership fees.'
A well-defined project plan or timetable demonstrating the work to be performed by the different strands of the project	'...Month 0-3: project planning, scoping, recruitment Months 2-9: prototype software systems Months 3-15: population of project databases, ongoing Months 12-15: user trials, evaluation and feedback with pilot groups Months 18-24: roll-out to wider membership....'
Well-defined performance indicators, ideally with quantified targets	'Quantifiable benefits accruable by May 2002 include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 200 academic modules available across all 12 faculties</li> <li>• 1,000 core learning and teaching documents</li> <li>• 1,400 supporting learning and teaching documents</li> <li>• 1,000 students with significant experience</li> <li>• 50 training events.'</li> </ul>
Results of any pilot work on the subject	'During the three years of prior operation, several areas for improvement have been identified, for example, documentation of administrative procedures, business analysis techniques and staff training. This process has resulted in reduced costs and improved services.'

## **Invitation to bid for 2000-01**

### **Key points**

24. This is the second year of this three-year special funding initiative. Bids for funding to develop and implement good management practices in higher education are invited.

### **Eligibility to bid**

25. All higher education institutions funded by HEFCE are eligible to bid. Consortia of institutions and higher education sector representative bodies are also eligible to bid. In such cases, it is necessary to identify an individual higher education institution through which any HEFCE-awarded funds are to be routed.

26. If appropriate in the circumstances, it is expected that the bidder(s) will be able to demonstrate that the project has the active support of relevant professional bodies.

27. Further education colleges directly funded by HEFCE are not eligible to bid as lead institutions. However, they are encouraged to participate in a project performed in collaboration with a higher education institution or a HE sector representative body.

### **Funding available**

28. We expect to allocate £4 million this year. We expect the size of projects to be broadly similar to those funded in the previous round. However, we are prepared to fund substantially larger collaborative projects if there is a clear benefit to the majority of institutions.

### **Project subjects**

29. The project can address any subject relating to management or governance within HEIs. Projects that are similar to those already receiving funding will need to demonstrate clear additionality; for example, the use of a different approach, application to different types of institutions, or taking further some aspects of work already completed.

### **Duration of funding**

30. HEFCE funding will be awarded for up to three years after final funding decisions are announced. HEFCE funding will follow the time-profile of the expenditure on the project.

### **Post-award management and monitoring**

31. Details of project monitoring will be agreed with individual projects according to the nature of each project. HEFCE aims to put as low an administrative burden as possible on projects regarding post-award monitoring.

## Number of applications

32. A maximum of **two** bids, in any annual bidding round, is permissible per HEI/representative body, acting as project leader. Institutions and representative bodies may participate in as many consortia as they wish. A bid by sector representative body 'A' with HEI 'B' acting as the route for HEFCE awarded funding will not count against B's own quota of two permissible bids.

## The application process

33. In order to keep the costs and time of bidding as low as possible, we will again use a two-stage application process:
- a. **Stage one** – At stage one, outline bids are invited. Stage one bids will be evaluated by the Special Management Advisory Panel. There are two possible conclusions:
    - i. The panel recommends taking the bid forward to stage two. The applicant will be asked to submit a detailed stage two 'business case' application and will be advised of the format to be used. The applicant will be given recommendations of how to develop the project. Synergies between other similar projects also selected to proceed to stage two will be identified by the panel and HEFCE officers, and the applicants will be encouraged to make contact to examine whether collaboration may be mutually beneficial.
    - ii. The panel feels unable to recommend the bid to progress to stage two. The bidder will be advised of this decision soon after the panel meeting and feedback on the reasons for the panel's decision is available on request.
  - b. **Stage two** – The panel will consider the stage two bid, in conjunction with the earlier stage one bid document. There are three possible conclusions:
    - i. The bid is recommended for funding as drafted.
    - ii. The bid is recommended for funding on condition of some alterations in the project work and/or a different level of funding from that originally requested.
    - iii. The bid is not recommended for funding and a detailed explanation of the panel's reasons for this decision will be given to the applicant.
34. It should be noted that the statistical probability for success of a bid short-listed to stage two is high. However the panel will not recommend funding for a stage two bid if there are significant reservations that were explained by the panel at the stage one assessment that had not been satisfactorily addressed in the stage two bid.



### 35. Timetable: 2000-01 bidding round

Date	Event
Midday 15 September 2000	Closing date for receipt of stage one bids by HEFCE
End of November 2000 or early December 2000	Announcement of decisions of the Special Management Advisory Panel regarding the outcomes of the stage one bids
Midday 31 January 2001	Closing date for receipt of stage two bids by HEFCE
April 2001	Announcement of final funding decisions by the HEFCE Board
May 2001	Commencement of HEFCE funding for projects in receipt of awards

### Application form

36. The application template is given at Annex D.

Please send **ten** copies (as single-sided, stapled sets only) of completed applications to:

Pramod Philip  
Audit Service  
Higher Education Funding Council for England  
Northavon House  
Coldharbour Lane  
BRISTOL BS16 1QD

We are unable to accept bids by e-mail or fax. Please allow adequate time for postal deliveries in order that bids will arrive before the closing date.

### Application queries

37. HEFCE officers will be happy to advise applicants where possible on any aspect of their applications. Please contact either:

- Pramod Philip, tel 0117 931 7380, e-mail [p.philip@hefce.ac.uk](mailto:p.philip@hefce.ac.uk)

or

- John Rushforth, tel 0117 931 7416, e-mail [j.rushforth@hefce.ac.uk](mailto:j.rushforth@hefce.ac.uk)

## **Annex A**

### **Membership of the Special Management Advisory Panel**

#### **Chair**

Sir Brian Fender  
Chief Executive  
HEFCE

#### **Members**

Mr Peter Agar  
Deputy Director General  
Confederation of British Industry

Professor John Brooks  
Vice-Chancellor  
University of Wolverhampton

Dr John Cater  
Chief Executive  
Edge Hill College of Higher Education

Mr Steve Egan  
Director of Finance and Corporate Resources  
HEFCE

Mr Eddie Newcomb  
Registrar and Secretary  
University of Manchester

Professor Adrian Smith  
Principal  
Queen Mary & Westfield College

#### **Secretariat**

Mr John Rushforth  
Chief Auditor  
HEFCE

Mr Pramod Philip  
Audit Consultant  
HEFCE

## Annex B

### List of projects awarded HEFCE funding via the Fund for Development of Good Management Practice

Lead HEI/representative body	Project title (project reference number)	HEFCE funding
University of Aston	Cost-efficiency analysis of central administrative services within the higher education sector. (GMP107)	£188,082
University of Birmingham	English Universities Benchmarking Club. (GMP127)	£250,000
University of Birmingham	Hybrid information management skills for senior staff. (GMP128)	£100,000
Birkbeck College, University of London	Administration/IT requirements for adult part-time students. (GMP52)	£63,548
Bishop Grosseteste College	Management in small HEIs network. (GMP70)	£105,000
University of Cambridge	Letters of appointment for contractors. (GMP140)	£24,000
University of Cambridge	The quality of estates contractors' work. (GMP139)	£12,000
Consortium for Higher Education Energy Purchasing (CHEEP)	Data collection and benchmarking of energy and water usage at HEIs. (GMP6)	£150,000
Consortium of Art and Design Institutions in the South-East (CADISE)	Collaborative management skills for CADISE senior executives. (GMP73)	£131,600
Edge Hill College of Higher Education	Using information and communications technology to manage change in a collaborative teaching and learning environment. (GMP75)	£132,052
University of Essex	Review of central academic and administrative services. (GMP14)	£146,150
University of Essex	Best practice for senior management through inter-institution collaboration. (GMP22)	£134,513
University of Huddersfield	Developing management in HE through mentoring and action learning. (GMP111)	£38,500
Lancaster University	Data protection and personal data: good management practices for higher education. (GMP154)	£148,970
University of Leeds	Knowledge management to support reach-out and partnership activities. (GMP151)	£267,746
University of Newcastle upon Tyne	Project management framework for the implementation of information systems in higher education. (GMP65)	£59,000

<b>Lead HEI/representative body</b>	<b>Project title (project reference number)</b>	<b>HEFCE funding</b>
Nottingham Trent University	Developing fair and effective student complaints procedures. (GMP138)	£76,920
University of Nottingham	Intellectual property management and commercialisation. (GMP114)	£75,000
NWUPC (North-West Universities Purchasing Consortium)	NWUPC Procurement Management Development Programme. (GMP45)	£200,000
University of Reading	Evaluating Information Technology related change (EVINCE). (GMP89)	£172,000
Royal College of Music	The employment of musical instrument teaching specialists. (GMP41)	£169,900
SCOP (Standing Conference of Principals)	Effective governance in higher education colleges. (GMP141)	£100,000
Sheffield Hallam University	Evaluation of the benefits of the EFQM Excellence model. (GMP143)	£250,000
University of Sheffield	Management of contract researchers. (GMP64)	£240,000
St Mary's Strawberry Hill/AMHEC (Association of Managers in Higher Education Colleges)	Benchmarking initiative. (GMP5)	£250,000
Staffordshire University	Flexible working options within the higher education sector. (GMP150)	£181,036
Standing Conference of Heads of Media Services	Benchmarking for media services. (GMP4)	£33,020
University of Teesside	Strand 1: Disaggregation of student/teaching loads and income and expenditure account to programmes of study.  Strand 2: Cost benefit analysis of support services. (GMP116)	£166,000
UCoSDA (Universities' and Colleges' Staff Development Agency)	Developing senior managers. (GMP10)	£136,600
University of the West of England	Networked Learning Support Framework. (GMP86)	£245,219
University of Wolverhampton	Developing mentoring arrangements for academic managers. (GMP144)	£170,211
	<b>Total HEFCE funding awarded under the first year (1999-2000) bidding round.</b>	<b>£4,417,067</b>

## **Annex C**

The Panel assessed bids using the following criteria, grouped into 'quality attributes' and 'project management attributes'.

### **Quality attributes:**

- Scale of likely financial and non-financial improvements
- Extent of collaboration and/or the likelihood of roll-out and application within the sector – thereby creating wide-ranging benefits
- Probability of sustained improvements, continuing after the end of the project.

### **Project management attributes:**

- Level of commitment (staff and resources) of the project's participants
- Project management issues, including timescale for implementation and value for money
- Robustness of performance measures.

## Annex D

### Stage one bid to the Fund for the Development of Good Management Practice

Note that the stage one bid is intended to be an outline bid only; we suggest that the length of answers to sections 3 to 9 be about one side of A4 paper each.

***Please submit TEN copies – as single-sided, stapled sets only, to include the sections below.***

#### Section 1: General information

Project title	
Lead HEI or representative body	
Project leader	
Post held	
Department	
Institution	
Address	
Telephone number	
Fax number	
E-mail address	
Total funding requested from HEFCE £	
HEI through which HEFCE awarded funds are to be routed	

Section 2: Summary of the overall purpose(s) of the project (maximum 100 words).

Section 3: Explain the main deliverables and outcomes of the project, explaining both the financial and non-financial benefits.

Section 4: Explain why this project represents good practice.

Section 5: Detail the performance measures that will be used to evaluate the project, giving quantified targets where possible.

Section 6: Project timetable, showing the different strands of the work to be performed.

Section 7: List of partner institutions/representative bodies involved. Give the contact person at each and explain how the partners are involved in the project work.

Section 8: Analysis of the costs of the project – analysed by category of expenditure and year 1/2/3. Show the costs being borne by the project's participants and funding requested from HEFCE.

Section 9: Give details of any preliminary/pilot work already undertaken and how this will benefit this project.

Section 10: Optional supporting statement (maximum 1,000 words).