



Process under review	Student Central referral process		
Draft or final	Draft	Version date	25 th November 2013
Sponsor		Author of ToR	

* Reference ID: OBIS will assign reference identification if this process review is linked to a project being submitted to the IT portfolio.

1 Background

Provide a brief description outlining why this process review is needed and the benefits it will deliver to the University.

The 'Student Central' (SC) team has recently been created and brings together former 5 units that provide support to students (and staff). The 'front line' student facing staff within SC are Student Central Advisers (SCA), this role is a redevelopment of a role within the former Academic Management Office. These are key roles in terms of handling student (and staff) enquiries, but in some cases (e.g. where more specialist advice or services are required), students are referred on.

Depending on the nature of the enquiry, students may be referred on to e.g. other specialist staff within SC, to other support services within the Directorates (e.g. Wellbeing services, Disability services, etc.), to the Student Union Advice Team, or to Faculty staff (e.g. Academic Adviser, Subject Co-ordinator, Student Support Co-ordinator).

There is currently no formal/documented referral process, beyond the use of a 'referral card'.

The management and performance of this process impacts the student's experience, and therefore the opportunity is sought to devise an efficient and effective referral process.

This should be seen as part of a cultural shift in the University towards a 'no wrong door' approach to student enquiries: to increase the extent to which colleagues and teams feel confident and supported in taking *ownership* of an enquiry and making an informed, intelligent onward referral or signposting decision.

2 Process review objective

A summary of your key objective encapsulated in one sentence. Followed by sub objectives if deemed necessary.

To develop an efficient and effective SC referral process, with the key aim being to enhance the experience of student users of the SC service.

3 Scope

Identify the scale of the process review in size, people affected, and other impacts

Teams/roles involved in the process:

Student Central Advice Team.

Other SC teams/roles, including: Student Disputes Officer, Student Records Team, Financial Aid Team, Research Degrees Team, International Students Advisory Team, Course & Student Administration Team, Taught Programmes Team.

Other ASA Directorate teams/roles, including: Wellbeing Services, Disability Service, Careers, etc.

Other Directorate teams/roles, including: Accommodation service, Brookes bus, OBIS,

Faculty roles, including: Programme Leads, Subject Co-ordinators, Student Support Co-ordinators, Academic Advisers.

Student Union Advice Centre.

4 Criteria for Success

What constitute as a successful outcome from this process review

A process which enables efficient and effective handling of student enquiries, to reach an appropriate and timely conclusion, whenever it is necessary for the SC Advice Team to refer on enquiries.

Our aim is to resolve 80% of queries at the first point of contact, with 20% being referred on to specialists within SC or elsewhere. This is an aspiration rather than a firm target: the more important thing is to be truly needs-led and accurately diagnostic in our responses to students.

Over time we want to see an increase in the number of queries resolved at the first point of contact: this will indicate that we are succeeding in reducing the extent to which students have to go from 'pillar to post' to get an answer to their queries.

We also want to find ways of measuring the *value* of our service in terms of *outcomes* for students: we want to be able to find a way of recording and measuring the contribution that we have made to the student experience for each student that we see.

5 Proposed approach

Provide an outline of what will be involved and how this process review will be carried out

Bring together a team made up of representatives of all stakeholder group to start with a 'blank sheet of paper' and define the process.

6 Who is involved (Stakeholders)

Outline key stakeholders who will be involved in the actual process review

Representatives of all constituencies listed in section 3 above, together with student representatives.

7 Time Scales

Outline key timescales

13th December 2013 workshop, with the aim of completing the process review by early Spring 2014, for (phased?) implementation in the run up to September 2014.

8 Resourcing

Provide an indication of the anticipated required for this resources for this process review

Staff time and provision of refreshments.

9 Ancillary/supporting notes