

Project progress report

This Report is to enable progress monitoring of process improvement projects by the Operational Excellence Steering Group. An initial report should be completed by the Improvement Champion on completion of the Rapid Improvement Workshop, and then updated at 3-monthly intervals. The initial report and subsequent updates should be sent to the Chair of the OE Steering Group.

Project title

Improved Process for Allocation of Examination Invigilators

Improvement champion(s): **David Wilson & Lisa Burton**

Progress stage: **Implementation**

Project reference/version: **1**

OESG approval date: **January 2009**

RIW dates: **31st March – 1st April, 2009**

RIW facilitator(s): **Catherine Gordon**

Brief

Objective:

To relieve the invigilation burden for WBS faculty thereby increasing their capacity for mainstream academic activities, and to provide a more cost-effective solution to examination-invigilation, by formalising the role of doctoral researchers as invigilators and improving the process of deploying them in this role.

Business rationale:

The University's invigilation procedures assume that faculty are the appropriate workforce to invigilate all examination sessions. In WBS, if faculty do not wish to/are unable to invigilate an examination the onus is upon them to find an appropriate substitute, who may be a fellow member of faculty (preferred) or a doctoral researcher, and to notify WBS' Academic Services Office. This gives rise to a process of invigilator allocation which wastes time and effort and is not as cost-effective as it could be.

Invigilation is an unpopular task with faculty, which in turn makes the process more difficult to manage for all concerned. This happens for a number of reasons. First, the process of identifying faculty substitutes gets pushed down to individual members of faculty, who may not be in the best position to find substitutes easily thus wasting time and effort in the process of identifying invigilators to fill exam slots. Secondly, Academic Services thereby lose control of a process for which they are held accountable by the UoW Exams office. Thirdly, because the standard substitutes – doctoral researchers - are not formally acknowledged as an invigilator 'workforce', the process of enlisting them is uneven and (as recompense is involved) inequitable, and they remain untrained in the skills required to invigilate effectively.

The process being proposed is to replace the present policy and process for faculty invigilation of examinations in WBS, by one which institutionalises and formalises support from doctoral researchers, who would be paid for this service and trained to provide high quality exam supervision on a voluntary basis. It is estimated that this would reduce the number of WBS faculty-invigilated sessions by around half. The proposal assumes that, as at present, WBS faculty would continue to be required invigilate those sessions which include any examination for which they are NIE, and would continue to serve as Senior Invigilators at those sessions when required.

Benefits expected

Benefit	For whom?	How & why?
Release of work capacity	<p>Faculty</p> <p>WBS Exams Office</p>	<p>Reduction of faculty time spent on invigilation duties in order to release capacity for other core duties such as research/ teaching. Also to release faculty time for script-marking during exam periods to facilitate meeting Exam Board deadlines. Reduced requests to cover for colleagues</p> <p>Simplifies invigilation allocation process, utilising doctoral researchers who often are more willing invigilation volunteers. Reduces time spent 'negotiating' with faculty for unfilled duties.</p>
Simpler process	<p>Faculty</p> <p>WBS Exams Office</p> <p>Doctoral researchers</p>	<p>Faculty required to invigilate far less than previously and can be asked to plan much further in advance.</p> <p>As above. Plus allocation of doctoral researchers is a far simpler process than faculty allocation.</p> <p>One point of contact (WBS Exams Office) rather than multiple/ parallel negotiations through supervisors/ faculty/ WBS EO.</p>
Better customer service	<p>Faculty</p> <p>Doctoral researchers</p> <p>Examinees</p>	<p>Faculty allocated are generally those who are willing and able to attend, rather than those 'coerced' to cover for colleagues or invigilating under duress.</p> <p>Doctoral researchers often more diligent invigilators, leading to enhanced service to Academic Office and exam candidates.</p>
Cost savings		See attached table
Other	Doctoral Researcher development and financial support?	Enhanced development opportunities for doctoral researchers (as customers of WBS) to gain experience in this role and payment for duties undertaken.

Resource estimates

Resource	How much?	Why?
Champion & implementation team	N/A	N/A
Additional Budget	Please refer to table on final page.	To remunerate doctoral researchers as invigilators
Applications development	N/A	N/A
Other professional development	None. Training to be done in-house by WBS EO	N/A
Space	N/A	N/A
Equipment	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A

Success criteria

Measure	Target	Progress	Comment
Release of faculty capacity by reduction in number of faculty required to invigilate	75% reduction	Unknown as yet as process just started on trial basis for May-June 2009 examinations	
Simpler process for invigilators: faculty and doctoral researchers	75%		
Improved reliability of invigilation workforce	100%		
Improved invigilator performance of doctoral researchers	100%		
Simpler process for WBS EO	75%		

Implementation plan

Action	When?	Progress	Owner
'To be' process transferred onto MSVisio	20/4/09	100%	CG
Establish list of potential PhD invigilators and check with Doctoral Programme	Already exists on annual basis	100%	LB
Trial run of new process through Summer 08/09 exam period	May 2009	100%	LB
Establish central 'pot' for increased PhD invigilator payment	1/5/09	100%	LB
Establish with Exams Office briefing sessions for new faculty invigilators, new-to-Senior Invigilator faculty and doctoral researchers, to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What invigilators do - Roles & Responsibilities - Emergency procedures - Handling students with authority 	Summer 2009	Not started	LB/ AH
Establish central repository for all slots (PhD and staff)	Summer 2009	Not started	LB
Communicate new process to all stakeholders	5/10/09	Not started	LB with advice from DW/ SS/ RB



Instigate discussions with Exams Office re 'bigger picture' and possible changes	TBC	Not started	DW/ JH
Review process and determine customer satisfaction levels and cost implications	Summer 2010	Not started	LB

Implementation team members

Name	Team	Initials
David Wilson (IC)	DO	DW
Lisa Burton (Proj. Mngr)	AS	LB
Jo Wale	AS	JW
Jane Varley	DPO	JV
Winfred Mfuh	DPO (PhD)	WM
Alan Gamble	ISSU	AG
Andrea Humber	UoW (EO)	AH
Lorraine Tipper	UoW (EO)	LT
Stephanie Stray	ORMS	SS
Rhoda Brown	ACC	RB

At project completion

Project team statement



OESG Comments and Conclusion

Report sign-off

Improvement champion	date
OESG chair	date

Number of invigilation sessions allocated to faculty

	No of faculty invigilating in 07/08	No of faculty invigilating in 08/09 *	Resulting extra payments to PhDs in 08/09 in relation to 07/08	No of faculty invigilators forecast for 09/10 *	Resulting extra payments to PhDs in 09/10 in relation to 08/09*
Dec	30	30	-	13	£476.00
Jan	14	16 NB	-	10	£168.00
Mar	14	10	-	5	£140.00
Apr	14	14	-	13	£28.00
May	11	4	£196.00	4	-
Summ	88	43	£1,764.00	43	-
Jul	3	3	-	3	-
Sept	3	3	-	3	-
TOTALS	177	123	£1,960.00	94	£812.00
		* inc guesstimates July & Sept		*guesstimate	*guesstimate
NB - Increased no. of papers sat in Jan in 08/09					