



HEFCE Leadership, Governance & Management Fund Project LGMF-062

(www.heidi.ac.uk)

Project Closure Report

Version 1.1

Academic Planning & Performance Office
University of Leeds
Contact: 0113 343 1839 or see www.leeds.ac.uk/dsu
Original project Leader (David Belk)
Original project manager (Andrew Busby)
22nd May 2007

heidi Project Closure Report

Introduction

heidi stands for Higher Education Information Database for Institutions. The project's aim was to implement a new web-based management information tool that would reduce the burden on higher education institutions of extracting and manipulating data for planning and reporting purposes.

The idea was based on a system already developed by the Leeds University Academic Planning & Performance Office (www.leeds.ac.uk/dsu). The Leeds system, called LUMIS, used Microsoft® Access to pull HE statistics together from various sources for simpler tabulation at literally any time. heidi built on the initial functionality and provided an entirely new web interface offering enhanced data extraction and manipulation facilities.

heidi was developed by three partner organisations: Leeds University, the Higher Education Statistics Agency (www.hesa.ac.uk) and the British Universities Finance Directors Group (www.buafd.ac.uk). The project received the financial backing of the Higher Education Funding Council for England's Leadership, Governance and Management fund (www.hefce.ac.uk/lgm/build) with a grant of £322k, the largest ever made from the fund. The Scottish Funding Council (www.sfc.ac.uk), the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (www.hefcw.ac.uk) and the Department for Employment and Learning, Northern Ireland (www.delni.gov.uk) also made funding contributions.

The system went live successfully in April 2007.

Executive summary

This report is a snapshot of the LGM funded heidi project at the time it finished (April 2007) and includes an initial assessment of the project's performance, specific follow on recommendations, the initial lessons learned as well as what the project delivered and any outstanding risks remaining.

At project closure 115 institutions (two thirds of the HE Sector) and 10 approved stakeholders had subscribed to use the service; based on the original business case, this implies a one off saving of £4.5m and an annual saving of approximately £2.0m in staff time and system maintenance for the Sector, compared to the original project budget of £653k.

In terms of timescale the project finished 2 weeks over (3% on a duration of 19 months) compared to its original plan.

In terms of finances the project is predicted to finish £24k (4% on a budget of £653k) over compared to its original budget.

Other than two sets of data originally planned for inclusion (TQI/NSS, plus HEMS indicators) in terms of project scope there were no major reductions compared to the original funding bid.

The overall project recorded and fielded 2,105 project issues, managed 265 project risks, built up a list of 598 contacts and held seven User Group and five Steering Group meetings as well as requirement capture workshops. Over twenty presentations to national conferences, regional groups and other stakeholders were given.

Performance Against Original bid

As institutions have only just started to implement and use heidi most of the key performance indicators in the original bid are hard to estimate at this point in time. Instead these will be measured in the post project review, currently scheduled in two stages (July 2007, covering management of the project and delivery and summer 2008, covering the business case and the ongoing service).

The following indicators have been measured though:

KPI	Performance	Notes
30% of HE Sector adopts system by end July 2007, growing at 25% per annum subsequently with a target of 80% overall	Achieved and exceeded by a significant margin. 65% of HE Sector subscribed as at 30th April 2007	Given the very high initial take up the targets for future years will be tougher to achieve
Project costs; completed within +/- 10% of budget	Achieved overall, 4% over	Caveat; based on the actual costs plus estimate for the final month of the project (April 2007)
Project timescales; completed within +/- 10% of plan	Achieved. Project ran 2 weeks (3% compared to original plan)	

In addition some individual comments and quotes on the project are included below:

"I am very positive about the project. It is one of the best run projects I have ever been involved in." Alexis Easson, Director of Planning and Deputy Secretary, University of Edinburgh and member of the heidi User Group

"This is one of the best communicated projects I have been involved with." Phillip Russell-Lacy, Assistant Registrar, Data Quality and Management Information, University of Sheffield and member of the heidi User Group

"My view of the project and the project management is very positive - feedback has been positive about the development of heidi...thanks in particular for the open approach." Nicola Owen, Academic Registrar, University of Warwick and member of the heidi User Group

A list of institutions and approved stakeholders subscribed to use heidi is included as Appendix 4.

Project Deliverables

A summary of what the project delivered is included as Appendix 1

Follow on Recommendations

A list of recommended further actions is included as Appendix 2.

Initial Lessons Learnt

A list of initial lessons learnt is included as Appendix 3.

Thanks

Appendix 5 is just to say thank you to all those involved in or who have assisted with the project.

Risks

Appendix 6 notes any risks still open at the end of the project and that should be monitored as part of the operation and further development of heidi.

Appendix 1 Project Deliverables

Data; the project delivered data in the following areas:

- HESA Student and Staff
- HESA Destinations
- HESA Staff Student Ratios
- HESA Finance
- HESA Key Financial Indicators (based on the HESA Finance data and developed with BUFDG)
- UCAS (applications and accepted applications)
- GTTR (Graduate Teacher Training Agency)
- NMAS (Nursing and Midwifery Admissions Service)
- Estates Management Statistics
- Performance Indicators
- Funders Forum Metrics
- TDA (Training and Development Agency for Schools)
- RAE 2001 *
- NSS (National Student Survey) *
- TQI (Teaching Quality Information) *
- Institutional Accounting Policies and Financial statements (links to) *
- HEMS Indicators *

* work on these data sets was only partially finished by project closure; this was due to a mixture of difficulties within the project and with external data providers.

Technical; the following system functionality was delivered:

- Extract and tabulate statistics from different sources
- Ability to create, amend and delete reports
- Ability to create own ratios
- Ability to create, amend and delete groups of institutions, cost centres, JACS subjects etc.
- Basic statistical functions in reports (e.g. totals, medians)
- Links to web sites
- Graphs and charts, based on heidi statistics (e.g. Pie, Bar)
- Ability to export data to Excel, PowerPoint, XML
- Username and password management, securing of heidi itself
- Online Help and FAQ

Operational; the following processes and infrastructure was delivered:

- An upgrade to the existing HESA technical infrastructure (servers, database management etc.) in order to host the heidi service
- E-mail and phone operational support for the ongoing service
- Training materials and seminars on implementing heidi, with BUFDG seminars under development
- System functionality to support local operation at each HE institution using heidi; i.e. support, username administration (e.g. creating new users), administration of security permissions on reports, system configuration
- Project web site (www.heidi.ac.uk)

Appendix 2 Follow on Recommendations

Recommendations for follow on work are as follows, including specifically an owner of each action on the ongoing Advisory Group.

Note; a large number of detailed ideas and requests for further development of heidi have been collected - for brevity only significant ones are outlined here, or where there is a potential link into another project.

Recommendation	Action
HESA run a specific timed project, 'heidi2', as the next step in the development of the service, with a delivery date of August 2008	HESA (Robin Sibson)
UPA (University Personnel Association) have expressed interest in heidi from a pay and reward data perspective. This is potentially a large distinct project.	HESA (Robin Sibson)
Possible FE Sector use; also dependent on HESA's future role in this area.	HESA (Robin Sibson)
Monitor ideas and developments for future LGM funded projects; examples good practice in implementing and using heidi, other specific major developments	HESA (Robin Sibson)
The effects of major changes in HESA data collections will clearly need to be planned in to heidi developments; e.g. new student record, effects of new JNCHES pay spine on the staff record	HESA (Andy Youell)
Public Access implementation; activation of restricted access to heidi for members of public to access key HE statistics, e.g. summary student numbers, currently provided via the HESA web site, by 31 st July 2007.	HESA (Andy Youell)
Data; completion of loading of HEMS indicators, plus the TQI/NSS and RAE data sets, plus BUFDG related institutional information, by 31 st July 2007.	HESA (Andy Youell)
Specific follow up work, via individual contact rather than general survey, to analyse the reasons institutions did not subscribe to use heidi as an aid to future developments and marketing strategy	HESA (Angela Dunn)
Revise the marketing strategy and develop a specific operational marketing plan to achieve the next subscriptions target set by the Advisory Group and to evaluate other sources of heidi income.	HESA (Angela Dunn)
Develop a specific subscriber (i.e. customer) retention strategy to ensure once subscribed an institution does renew in 2008. This should	HESA (Angela Dunn)

include specific targets for retention and should be interwoven in the ongoing operation of heidi rather than being a specific one off action each year.	
The interest in Key Financial Indicators heidi has generated could lead to a BUFDG LGM project to produce a 'KFI handbook' for institutions	BUFDG (Phil Harding)
As agreed in the original funding bid, BUFDG deliver the 150 subsidised heidi training seminar places on both Key Financial Indicators and using heidi	BUFDG (Phil Harding)
Plan, organise and undertake the Post Project Review in conjunction with JISCInfoNet, including user survey to test business case and other key performance indicators.	Leeds (David Belk)
With the project being well received it could be worth applying for any Sector awards where it meets the entry criteria; e.g. the UCISA award for excellence	Leeds (David Belk)
A mix of events, documents, discussions would be useful to enable institutions or group of institutions to share and develop heidi good practice, both in terms of the use of data it contains its functionality. This would help to maximise institutional benefits.	Leeds (David Belk) and User Group Chair

Appendix 3 Initial Lessons Learnt

Over and above the lessons below the project is happy to provide informal advice for those embarking on similar tasks.

Lessons are broken down into six categories; HEFCE Leadership Governance and Management fund funding bids, general projects and project management, heidi specific lessons, technical lessons, data lessons and other.

The list will be developed further as part of the post project review, and supplemented with more detailed data and technical (e.g. systems development) points from the HESA team.

HEFCE LGM Funding Bids

- For a project funded by the HEFCE LGM fund, and involving administrative staff, overheads cannot be charged under fEC (as they are already re-charged via academic staff overheads to Research Councils and receive HEFCE funding), though they can be included as a 'contribution in kind'
- Very large HEFCE LGM fund bids involving benefits to all HEI's, not just HEFCE funded ones, may need to ask for pro rata contributions from Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish funding councils from the start and thus it is worth checking this with HEFCE at an early stage in the bidding process.
- HEFCE LGM funded projects, in particular large and/or IT ones, are expected to carry the risk of project overruns in timetable and budget among project partners and cannot go back to HEFCE for further funding
- Risk taking; the heidi project took the risk of wasting time by starting work on the stage 2 bid after the HEFCE LGM stage 1 bid submission but before the result was received. Similarly project work was started when the bid result was expected, but before it had been received. Taking this risk paid off in heidi's case, resulting in a time gain of at least 5 weeks, and though this cannot be recommended for every funding bid it is worth considering on a case by case basis.
- If sourcing data from external providers, where possible find out whether they will charge at the beginning of the project and include in the budget if necessary
- One potential heidi benefit not included in the business case was for the HE Sector in an era of global competition it should help give the institutions an edge internationally – better management information in the Sector generally.
- Care should be taken in preparing bids when estimating the staff time needed for data work, especially data quality assurance work, in an environment with strong rigorous quality standards.
- Where IP (Intellectual Property) is involved, especially across multiple project partners, try to be clear from the start of the funding bid process as to IP ownership and resolve any specific issues during the bid. This was a lesson for both the project partners and for HEFCE.

- When planning include a fair slice of time for LGM fund administration and financial monitoring. This proved time consuming, especially with a large project with multiple project partners.

Projects & Project Management

- Benefits of collaboration; project partners (Leeds, BUFDG, HESA) each brought their own skills, expertise, knowledge, understanding, influence, networks and contacts to the project. The synergy was strong.
- The importance of the User Group role; the project was fortunate to have a strong, active and committed User Group, whose role was vital in capturing and prioritising institutional requirements, and as a sounding board for the team.
- Project management methodologies; the project used a cut down version of Prince2, developed by the University of Leeds Information System Services (www.leeds.ac.uk/iss). This proved highly effective (clear and understood structure and responsibilities – speedy, effective and satisfactory resolution of issues) whilst keeping bureaucracy to a minimum
- Experience; Leeds already had the benefits of undertaking a smaller and very similar HEFCE LGM funded project, SiriusWeb (www.siriusweb.leeds.ac.uk), with the same project manager. This provided very useful experience and a proving ground for the approach used in heidi (i.e. taking an institutionally developed piece of software and building it into a web based service for the HE Sector as a whole)
- Communications, Communications, Communications; heidi was a small but complex project given the number of stakeholders (170 HEI's along with other key stakeholders) – as a result clear, simple and timely communication was vital and formed a large part of the project management work. Project stakeholders were invariably very complimentary about this aspect of the project. Examples – single monthly update to User Group, update to all stakeholders after each User Group/Steering Group meeting, regular project health check every 3 months with key stakeholders, highlight report every two weeks for the Steering Group
- External advice; targeted, careful use of project management advice from external consultancy can reap huge benefits and reduce risks significantly for a relatively small outlay, as well as helping keep the project on the straight and narrow during the more challenging times that are inevitably part of any undertaking of this nature
- Proven concepts; heidi was based on a proven piece of software, LUMIS, already developed at the University of Leeds and in use at other Universities. Using a proven idea gave the project a head start both in general and design terms, reduce the risk levels and proved easier than starting with the proverbial clean sheet of paper.
- Use of requirements capture workshops have enormous benefits, in particular with reference to determining priorities and user buy in

- The importance of a Deputy Team Manager on the supplier side if the Senior Supplier/Team Manager is senior and has significant other responsibilities as well as the project
- Where projects produce a service or product that is 'optional', i.e. customers don't have to adopt it, include a specific distinctive and separate marketing stage in the project plan, and start it early in the project (several stakeholders commented on the timing of this, and how engagement with those who would use heidi could have been more timely)
- Start operational requirements capture (e.g. support, training, system administration) as early as possible in the project, shortly after even in parallel with business requirements capture. Some stakeholder comments that it would have been better to discuss models for this (e.g. the local administrator role) earlier in the project
- There was too long a gap in one stage of the project between Steering Group meetings – one more would have been useful. Lesson: have a Steering Group meeting part way through a stage if it is a long one
- The data specification sign off should have been done at an earlier point in the project – probably one User Group earlier – and issues raised by the User Group previously were missed, leading to the team having to amend data specifications at a late stage in development. Lesson: make sure sign off points are correct and properly planned
- Requirements capture workshops; though very useful did not produce sufficient data requirements detail in some areas – it would have been better to split them, one for data, one for system features, and/or held one across two days to maximise time available (the project was constrained by travel – most User Group members had to travel significant distances to meetings). The risk of making workshops too lengthy, and hence getting into too detailed system design issues, should also be noted.
- Remember to plan and organise quality assurance testing arrangements at external data providers well in advance, and arrange contingencies if they don't have the time to do the work.
- User Group formation; be careful when creating a project User Group not to have a single member representing a significantly different area compared to other members of the User Group as it causes difficulties when user generating requirements and may not be in any case representative of Users as a whole.
- Be aware of the risk of project team members on fixed term contracts leaving before the end of the project and if possible mitigate this risk to ensure continuity through into the operation of a live system.

Heidi specific

- Project plan data work differently according to data ownership (external organisations beyond the project partners take longer as are more complex/more involved). In particular, data sets that are a key input to the project but are sourced externally present a risk as the prioritisation of such work in the external organisation is beyond the projects control. In the context of heidi, risk management mitigation measures could have

included starting the non HESA data work earlier, more active/detailed project management in this area of work and/or establishing if the data can be sourced elsewhere (e.g. some data sets are basically just a different analysis of existing HESA data).

- HEMS statistics; the requirements capture workshops did not reach a definitive conclusion on this aspect of the data requirements for heidi - this should have been followed up explicitly and in a timely manner rather than left open as it was explicitly in the scope of the original project. This resulted in a change in scope very late in the project when a final definite decision was reached to include them.
- Owners or providers of HE data are usually concerned and highly sensitive about the security, misuse and/or misunderstanding and the legal restrictions (Data Protection Act etc.) of their respective data. Projects need to take this into account.
- Analysis of HESA Information Provision requests may have been useful in helping evaluate heidi data requirements.
- It would probably have been useful to have more data in the free trial version, so as to make it easier to conceive how heidi itself could be used and make more real its potential benefits.
- Don't forget the diverse nature of the University administration – not just Planning and Finance but Careers, HR, Research Administration, Student Recruitment & Marketing – and thus wider stakeholder consultation in bid would have been better
- Placement of heidi flyers at various UUK events proved effective and useful.
- After the end of the free trial some way of showing heidi to those who missed out on trying heidi for various reasons could have been planned. Alternatives such as asking institutions to particular presentations worked well but this could have been planned in advance, as could other options such as demonstration videos.
- Communications at a very broad level with Pro-Vice Chancellors in institutions proved difficult and in the end no routes were found. Lesson – have to go through route above (VC's, via UUK) or other similar routes such as Finance Directors (BUFDG) or Registrars (AHUA).

Data

- Quality Assurance, Quality Assurance, Quality Assurance; both in data and technical terms the heidi free trial version proved exceptionally stable, with very few support issues and no data inaccuracies. The time to quality assure proved longer than planned, but was worthwhile from a stability/first impression of the service when it was launched on free trial.

Technical

- Use of testing labs as part of the User Group meetings – giving User Group members chance to actually use heidi with the team present – would have helped with the feedback and usability testing. Several User Group members flagged this.

- An incremental approach to developing the heidi software worked well; there were 4 iterative builds of the software, and the User Group tested each build. This led to useful feedback and corrections early on in development, rather than leaving User Group testing right until the end of development.

Other

- Try to conduct negotiations on any legal agreements separately to the day to day work of project managers and team managers; the project manager especially is not the best person to undertake this work as he/she has to maintain a working relationship with others involved. Project leader/sponsor is more appropriate.
- Marketing lessons; a long, quite detailed and individual (e.g. presentations to key BUFDG groups and Planning forums) marketing strategy and operational plan proved very effective in persuading the initial group of subscriptions once heidi was opened for subscriptions. Though time consuming, the effort was well worthwhile.
- Data Protection; when collecting individual contact details, e.g. registering for information on the project, make sure Data Protection is covered to avoid having to go back to individuals later with an opt out question
- Use of a heidi branded desktop calendar, distributed to institutions, proved a popular and useful marketing technique to raise awareness.
- User of heidi flyers; with suitable catch phrases, proved both amusing and secured peoples attention
- Once generic marketing had been exhausted the use of individual phone calls direct to known contacts in organisations paid significant dividends and proved highly effective (i.e. if feasible, beyond a certain point use targeted marketing to maximise adoption of an optional system)

Appendix 4 Institution Status List as at 30th April 2007

	HE institutions	Approved stakeholders
Indicative subscription	115	10
...of which, subscription processed	109	9
Declined to subscribe	28	
Undecided	11	
Not on Free Trial	12	

HE institutions subscribed:

Anglia Ruskin University	Liverpool John Moores University
Birkbeck College	Liverpool Hope University
Bishop Grosseteste College	London Metropolitan University
Bournemouth University	London School of Economics and Political Science
Canterbury Christ Church University	Loughborough University
Cardiff University	Middlesex University
City University	Napier University
College of St Mark and St John	Newman College of Higher Education
Dartington College of Arts	Queen Margaret University College, Edinburgh
Edge Hill University	Queen Mary and Westfield College
Edinburgh College of Art	Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication
Glasgow Caledonian University	Royal College of Art
Glasgow School of Art	Royal Holloway and Bedford New College
Goldsmiths College	Sheffield Hallam University
Harper Adams University College	Southampton Solent University
Heriot-Watt University	Swansea Institute of Higher Education
Imperial College of Science, Technology & Medicine	Thames Valley University
King's College London	The Arts Institute at Bournemouth
Kingston University	The Institute of Cancer Research
Leeds Metropolitan University	The University of Surrey
The Manchester Metropolitan University	The University of Sussex
The Open University	The University of Teesside
The Queen's University of Belfast	The University of Warwick
The Robert Gordon University	The University of Worcester
The Royal Veterinary College	The University of York
The School of Oriental and African Studies	Trinity and All Saints College
The University College for the Creative Arts at Canterbury, Epsom, Farnham, Maidstone, Rochester	Trinity College, Carmarthen
The University of Aberdeen	Trinity Leban
The University of Bath	UHI Millennium Institute

The University of Birmingham
The University of Bradford
The University of Brighton
The University of Bristol
The University of Cambridge
The University of Central Lancashire
The University of Chichester
The University of Dundee
The University of Edinburgh
The University of Essex
The University of Exeter
The University of Glasgow
The University of Greenwich
The University of Huddersfield
The University of Hull
The University of Keele
The University of Kent
The University of Lancaster
The University of Leeds
The University of Leicester
The University of Liverpool
The University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne
The University of Northampton
The University of Paisley
The University of Plymouth
The University of Portsmouth
The University of Reading
The University of Salford
The University of Sheffield
The University of St Andrews
The University of Stirling
The University of Strathclyde
The University of Sunderland

University College London
University of Bedfordshire
University of Bolton
University of Central England in Birmingham
University of Durham
University of Glamorgan
University of Gloucestershire
University of London
University of the Arts, London
University of Wales Institute, Cardiff
University of Wales, Bangor
York St John University

Approved Stakeholders

BUFDG
Department of Employment and Learning NI
Equality Challenge Unit
HEFCE
HEFCW
Research Councils UK
Scottish Funding Council
Southern Universities Management Services
Training and Development Agency for Schools
UCAS

HE institutions who declined to subscribe:

Bath Spa University	The North-East Wales Institute of Higher Education
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College	The Royal College of Nursing
Cranfield University	The University of East Anglia
Cumbria Institute of the Arts	The University of East London
De Montfort University	The University of Manchester
Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies	The University of Nottingham
London South Bank University	The University of Oxford
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine	The University of Southampton
Norwich School of Art and Design	The University of Wales, Newport
Oxford Brookes University	The University of Wolverhampton
Roehampton University	The University of Winchester
Royal Academy of Music	University of Chester
St. Mary's University College	University of Derby
Stranmillis University College	Writtle College

Institutions who did not take part in Free Trial:

Central School of Speech and Drama	Royal Welsh College of Music and Drama
Courtauld Institute of Art	The School of Pharmacy
Leeds College of Music	The University of Buckingham
Liverpool Institute of the Performing Arts	The University of Wales, Lampeter
London Business School	University College Falmouth
Royal Agricultural College	University of Wales, Aberystwyth

Appendix 5 Thanks

Thanks should be given to all of the following for working on, advising on or just being plain supportive throughout the funding bid and project. heidi is a credit to them.

Firstly, by definition this is a very long list, but among those involved special mention should go to:

Dr David Belk and Andrew Parkinson at Leeds, Sally Green at Sheffield and Stephen Chadwick from Durham, for their respective work at the Planning offices at Leeds, Sheffield and Newcastle that developed the precursors (e.g. Lumis and Cams) for the heidi software, and for the idea of turning what had been developed locally into a national service for the benefit of the HE Sector.

Professor Robin Sibson, Chief Executive at HESA, and Chair of the Steering Group, for championing heidi both at HESA and at the national level in the HE Sector.

Karel Thomas at BUFDG and Rachael Millichope, formerly of HESA (now Pershore College), for a great deal of work and ideas on the successful funding bid to the HEFCE Leadership, Governance and Management fund. Karel in particular, through BUFDG's interest in Key Financial Indicators, gave the project additional impetus when it seemed originally not to be feasible.

Andy Youell, Jackie Hood and David Smith (all at HESA), for managing and driving through the core technical and data work (project '414') undertaken by the team at HESA and ensuring a very high quality standard was achieved.

Those who were specifically recruited by HESA to undertake the bulk of the detailed technical and data work on project; Nicola Ierubino, Roger Westwood, Kyle Summers and towards the end of the project Jane Close.

Secondly, the formal list of those involved in the project:

Heidi project leader

Dr David Belk, Head of Academic Planning & Performance, University of Leeds

Project Steering Group

- Project Leader; Dr David Belk (Leeds)
- Project Director (and Steering Group Chair); Professor Robin Sibson (HESA)
- BUFDG Representative; Phil Harding (Chair, BUFDG)
- Senior User(s); User Group Chair (Stephen Chadwick, Durham) and Deputy Chair (Andrew McConnell, Huddersfield)
- Senior Supplier; Andy Youell, HESA
- Quality Assurance; Richard Puttock, HEFCE LGM Fund Observer

Project User Group

(there were changes in membership through the project, hence the long list and the duplication for some organisations)

- Chair; Stephen Chadwick (Director of Strategic Planning & Change Unit, Durham)
- Deputy Chair; Andrew McConnell (Director of Finance, Huddersfield)
- Christine Couper (Director of Planning, Greenwich)
- Heather Somerfield (Registrar and Clerk to the Governors, Newman College)
- Tony Wade (Deputy Director of Finance, Liverpool)
- Phillip Russell-Lacy (Assistant Registrar, Data Quality and Management Information, Sheffield)
- Karel Thomas (Executive Officer, BUFDG)
- Alyson Walsh (Research and Statistics Unit Manager, UCAS)
- Judy Akinbolu (Analytical Services Group, HEFCE)
- Alexis Easson (Director of Planning, Edinburgh)
- Judy Evans (Senior Assistant Registrar (Management Information), Brighton)
- Martin Haynes (Planning, Cardiff)
- Jon Renyard (Director of Academic Services, Arts Institute at Bournemouth)
- Ceri Jones (Marketing Officer (Recruitment), Arts Institute at Bournemouth)
- Steve Phillips (Senior Policy Adviser, GuildHE, subsequently UCCA)
- Peter Fielding (Head of Financial Accounting, Lancaster)
- Camille Stallard (Head of Finance & Planning, Gloucestershire)
- Emma Woollard (Director of Finance, Portsmouth)
- David Mihell (Market Research Manager, Leeds)
- Dan Rieser (UUK)
- Nicola Owen (Academic Registrar, University of Warwick)
- Chris Jagger (Director of Estates, Nottingham)
- Sue Deeley (Head of Data and Information, UCAS)
- Scott Spiers (Statistics Manager, UCAS)
- Jovan Luzajic (Data Analyst, UUK)
- Mike Shewry (Senior Statistics Officer, Scottish Funding Council)
- Frances Good (Head of Statistics & Information Systems, HEFCW)
- Hannah Falvey (HEFCW)
- Sue Hybart (Director of Planning, Cardiff University)
- Andrew McKie (Senior Planning Officer, Leeds)

Project team

All of the following to varying degrees worked on the project over its duration.

HESA –

All the staff at HESA, under the direction of Professor Robin Sibson, contributed in one way or another to the project

BUFDG –

Karel Thomas and Eleanor Lingham

Leeds –

Kamille Stone, Alison Cook, , Margaret Suttill, Susie Marshall, Andrew Mckie, Sue Edwards and the rest of the Academic Planning & Performance Office

Other individuals of note

Particular thanks to Peter Bollands from PSB Associates who provided external project quality assurance and advice on the management of the project and helped the Project Manager significantly to keep things on the straight and narrow.

Os Finnie (General Manager, Finance at Leeds) and Berenice Smith (Director of Finance, Leeds) for their support for the funding bid and the subsequent project.

Pramod Phillip and Alistair Townsend at the HEFCE LGM fund team for a great deal of advice and assistance with the original funding bid.

In a similar manner the Welsh, Scottish and Northern Ireland funding councils for their respective financial contributions to the project.

Michael Yuille (Finance Director, Liverpool and formerly BUFDG Chair), for his formal support for the funding bid.

Helen Clapham at Leeds for some particularly useful advice on the marketing of heidi to institutions.

Patrick Bellis at JISCInfonet for the support for the funding bid and the upcoming work to aid the post project review.

Leeds University Information System Services (www.leeds.ac.uk/iss) for a good project management methodology, adapted from Prince2, used for the management of the project

The Chairs of the various regional Planning Forums (Scotland, Wales) and BUFDG regional groups that gave the project the opportunity to present at their meetings.

The various non HESA data providers for allowing their to be included in heidi.

Finally, all those others across the Sector who have helped the project across institutions and Sector bodies; for brevity, they are not listed (the final project stakeholder list had nearly 600 individuals on it).

Appendix 6 Open Risks

Risk No	Date Identified	Author	Description	Likelihood to	Impact (1 to 3)	Likelihood mpac	Proximity	Countermeasure(s)	Owner
54	14/04/2005	Stephen Chadwick	There is a risk that the data produced by the system will not be correctly used or manipulated due to lack of data knowledge and hence poor decisions made as a result. Includes mis-calculation of ratios, institutional mergers and name changes and in particular comparison of data across multiple years and detailed comparisons across institutions (e.g. different institutions allocating the similar costs to different cost centres)	2	1	2	long term	Reduce; emphasis on institutional good practice in use of heidi data and also sharing that good practice. Reduce; BUFDG and HESA training seminars and onward training. Reduce; build up knowledge via heidi data FAQ's and help about data peculiarities and anomalies. Transfer; ensure that Terms and Conditions of Use are built into the system so that there is no HESA liability for misuse of data. Prevent; do not include data in HEIDI across years where definitional changes have resulted in major incompatibilities between years.	Andy Youell & Karel Thomas

179	29/03/2006	Jackie Hood	There is a risk that the training materials and channels provided will be insufficient for HEIDI resulting in excessive support queries, particularly in the area of data.	1	2	2	medium term	Reduce; use a train the trainer approach with institutional administrators. Reduce; dynamic, regularly updated data documentation and FAQ's to try to minimise support queries. Reduce; highlight data where source is similar, e.g. DLHE/TQI. Contingency; extra seminars as part of ongoing operation of heidi.	Andy Youell
238	09/11/2006	David Belk	There is a risk that the new User Group's enthusiasm and commitment will fade or not start resulting in heidi not developing in line with institutional requirements	1	2	2	long term	Reduce; active User Group involvement in heidi2 requirements generation and prioritisation, use of workshops etc. Contingency; to Advisory Group.	Chair User Group
255	23/01/2007	David Belk	There is a risk that institutions will not fully implement or make best use of heidi even if they do subscribe resulting in the benefits outlined in the business case not being realised	2	2	4	medium term	Reduce; good support and documentation for implementations; road map and plenty of guidance, including case studies. Reduce; ongoing User Group involvement in the operation of heidi, with the promotion and sharing of good practice and institutional experience (e.g. via heidi User Events or forums). Reduce; high quality training available and well delivered, and available on an ongoing and refresher basis. Reduce; analyse and measure benefits in post project review and assess whether further action is needed.	Andy Youell

266	05/04/2007	Andrew Busby	There is a risk that given the high level subscription levels the operational support and running of heidi will be overloaded resulting in a poorer service and putting retention at risk and/or less time for further development.	2	2	4	medium term	Reduce; review processes and operational arrangements to assess impact. Contingency; reduce development work if necessary. Contingency; given higher income than predicted, increase staff time available for support.	Robin Sibson
-----	------------	--------------	---	---	---	---	-------------	--	--------------