



Student Support Services Annual Review

The report should be brief, with bullet points in each section.

The [Student Support Services Annual Review policy](#) contains an overview of the process.

Services are asked to focus on activities over the past academic year, the student experience and activities that relate to student use of the service.

Reader/Peer Reviewer Report on Service Value Assessment: Academic Year 2018/19

Service:	Chaplaincy
Submitted by:	Shereen Benjamin
Date:	17/10/19

Reflection on Previous Review

<p>1. Summary of the impact of activities from the previous academic year on the student experience and how these contribute to University Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Has the service demonstrated impact on the student experience from its priorities?</i> <p>Yes – mostly measured/assessed through quantitative measures of engagement – qualitative indicators are harder to assess</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Are there any outstanding areas for further consideration/barriers identified to achieving these?</i> <p>No – everything is picked up from last year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Has the service demonstrated links between its priorities and activities and the University’s Learning and Teaching Strategy, Student Experience, Plan Strategic Plan and/or to other key University strategies as appropriate?</i> <p>Yes – the Chaplaincy works across the well-being of staff and students so they might have reflected a bit more on how those link to each other (which would reflect well on them as one of the few support units in a position to work with both)</p>

Measures of Success

<p>2. Reflection on user engagement and feedback, usage, partnership working and externality</p> <p><i>(Users are defined as students and academic/business units)</i></p> <p><i>Has the service a) gathered appropriate data and b) fully reflected on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>User engagement and feedback. Is feedback on user feedback (closing the feedback loop) appropriate?</i>

a) Yes: although these are sometimes hard to delineate in precise terms. Numbers engaging with the Chaplaincy are high (measured overall by headcount in a snapshot week each year and at particular activities) and growing, suggesting staff and students find its work of value. There aren't huge amounts of data, but it would probably be inappropriate given the nature of the Chaplaincy activities, to require questionnaires and surveys from users.

b) Yes: as a people-focused service, closing the feedback loop is done at a personal level either electronically or face-to-face.

- *Analysis of service usage*

a) Yes – in addition to the snapshot week, data has been gathered relating to discrete activities, and to users at KB

b) Yes – the available service use data clearly drives the identification of future priorities and activities, and the limitations of using headcount as the chief KPI relating to service usage is discussed

- *Does the service have appropriate key performance indicators/success measures for student experience and internal customer service activity? Are there other measures/indicators it could be using? Are the targets stretching enough?*

Analysis of engagement with the various activities and facilities is persuasive; there is discussion of the difficulties in identifying appropriate KPIs and a plan for addressing this (via a new appointment as there has not been capacity this year)

- *Partnership working: with Schools, Colleges and other services. How is the service supporting the delivery of academic business?*

Report notes that all the Chaplaincy's work is collaborative; supporting the delivery of academic business is mostly arm's length (e.g. supporting staff to think about issues such as integrating "compassion" into their teaching, and more generally supporting staff and student well-being)

- *External benchmarking including professional body guidelines. Have any accreditations been successful, or are there opportunities for accreditation not currently being pursued?*

There is no external accrediting body for the Chaplaincy; report notes that they are approached by external bodies (other universities, STV) to advise on good practice

3. Staff development activity

Has the service

- *demonstrated a strong commitment to staff development at all levels;*

Yes – all team members (including Honorary team members) have engaged in development activities

- *fully reflected on the effectiveness of staff development activity, identifying any skills or knowledge gaps and*

Yes – gaps have been noted, along with a planned response

- *is development activity aligned with service objectives?*

Yes

Opportunities and Enhancements

4. Reflection on service, changes, new ways of working and efficiencies

Has the service effectively used reflection to identify appropriate changes, new ways of working and efficiencies?

Yes – it's clear from the report that the Chaplaincy actively seeks out new activities and types of activity in relation to user needs, and considers how to manage the introduction of new activities through merging, reducing or discontinuing existing activities; there is reflection on the impact of changing work patterns for administrative staff

Actions

5. Key priorities for the coming academic year

Has the service identified achievable and relevant priorities?

Yes – six priorities identified, but some of these are about maintenance of existing (and growing) services, so it looks manageable. One priority will be dependent on a new appointment.

6. Risk analysis

Has the service identified risks to achieving its goals and appropriate mitigating actions? Has it identified challenges? Is it engaging with issues likely to have a positive impact on student experience?

First time I've seen acts of God/all Gods/no Gods identified as a risk! Fair enough, it's the Chaplaincy.

Yes, the main risk identified is the challenge of continuing growth in demand on the Listening Service, and a range of strategies are planned to mitigate this.

7. Commendations and areas for consideration

List commendations arising from the report:

Provision: The Chaplaincy is possibly unique in that it a) works with staff and students on the well-being of both, and b) is relatively unconstrained and has considerable flexibility in the activities it chooses to undertake.

The interrelationship between staff and student well-being, and supporting staff to enhance the student experience, is something the University increasingly recognises.

The Chaplaincy would be well-placed to contribute its understandings from its work to wider University conversations about establishing and maintaining academic community. There is evidence across the report that the Chaplaincy makes good use of its flexibility and is working creatively to explore and develop responses to student and staff needs and requests as they evolve.

Report: The report is clearly written and succinct. It is very easy to see how reflection on current work enables new priorities and activities to emerge. The Chaplaincy notes that they would like to do more to develop KPIs to aid with evaluation (and I agree that this will be helpful), but it's nonetheless clear that evaluation is taking place via other means.

List areas for further consideration arising from the report (limit these to three to five achievable and targeted actions):

This may already be happening, but I wasn't sure whether the Chaplaincy is feeding in to ongoing strategic discussions e.g. around student support, the response to the Staff Survey, and (when it starts) curriculum review. It seems that the Chaplaincy would be well-placed to contribute to these if not doing so already. (This may be partly happening through the Compassionate University discussions, but I couldn't quite tell.)

October 2019



7 Student Support Services Annual Review

The report should be brief, with bullet points in each section.

The [Student Support Services Annual Review policy](#) contains an overview of the process.

Services are asked to focus on activities over the past academic year, the student experience and activities that relate to student use of the service.

Reader/Peer Reviewer Report on Service Value Assessment: Academic Year 2018/19

Service:	Chaplaincy
Submitted by:	Ronnie Millar
Date:	17.10.19

Reflection on Previous Review

<p>1. Summary of the impact of activities from the previous academic year on the student experience and how these contribute to University Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Has the service demonstrated impact on the student experience from its priorities?</i> Yes. The report clearly articulates how the Chaplaincy has actioned its priorities from last year, in particular with the development of the Listening Service, their responsiveness to drop in and crisis situations, and the growth of the Chaplaincy presence at KB. The salaried post for Mindfulness has been appointed. • <i>Are there any outstanding areas for further consideration/barriers identified to achieving these?</i> Mindfulness in Schools will depend on Schools providing funding. The reduction in the role of Chaplaincy at the Opening Ceremony and Graduations, is noted (and outwith the hands of Chaplaincy). • <i>Has the service demonstrated links between its priorities and activities and the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy, Student Experience, Plan Strategic Plan and/or to other key University strategies as appropriate?</i> Yes, with specific reference to the Learning and Teaching Strategy and Strategy 2030.
--

Measures of Success

<p>2. Reflection on user engagement and feedback, usage, partnership working and externality</p> <p><i>(Users are defined as students and academic/business units)</i></p> <p><i>Has the service a) gathered appropriate data and b) fully reflected on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>User engagement and feedback. Is feedback on user feedback (closing the feedback loop) appropriate?</i> The Chaplaincy solicits and receives feedback from a variety of activities and sources, and this is reflected upon in the report. Examples of 'closing the loop' are given especially in regard to suggestions as to changing the Chaplaincy's name. • <i>Analysis of service usage</i> Key trends are identified, with specific reference to headcount, Listening service and Mindfulness and Compassion courses.

- *Does the service have appropriate key performance indicators/success measures for student experience and internal customer service activity? Are there other measures/indicators it could be using? Are the targets stretching enough?*
Headcount is the main KPI used by Chaplaincy, but it is easy to imagine that further KPIs would be difficult to establish for the service in view of the nature of support delivered. The report does identify that a Director of the Listening service would be able to develop this aspect of the Chaplaincy's work including KPIs.
- *Partnership working: with Schools, Colleges and other services. How is the service supporting the delivery of academic business?*
The report demonstrates a wide range of partnership working within the University (Schools and other Support Services), local public and third sector agencies and other Universities- UK and international.
- *External benchmarking including professional body guidelines. Have any accreditations been successful, or are there opportunities for accreditation not currently being pursued?*
There is no scheme of external accreditation available to the Chaplaincy. The report does illustrate the Chaplaincy's contribution to good practice nationally.

3. Staff development activity

Has the service

- *demonstrated a strong commitment to staff development at all levels;*
- *fully reflected on the effectiveness of staff development activity, identifying any skills or knowledge gaps and*
- *is development activity aligned with service objectives?*

The service has demonstrated a strong commitment to staff development and development activity is aligned with service objectives. Gaps in knowledge and skills for staff involved in the Listening service and honorary Chaplains, but the report indicates action being taken to fill these gaps.

Opportunities and Enhancements

4. Reflection on service, changes, new ways of working and efficiencies

Has the service effectively used reflection to identify appropriate changes, new ways of working and efficiencies? **Yes. The return to the McEwan Hall is welcomed. The report reflects appropriately on how the Jiggered café programme has been adapted (stopped for UG students, but well received by PGR students and staff) with positive impact, especially at WGH. The Books and /or Babies meetings are innovative and to be commended. The service has shown flexibility in dropping some themed conversations for others and responding to demand.**

Actions

5. Key priorities for the coming academic year

Has the service identified achievable and relevant priorities? **Yes**

6. Risk analysis

Has the service identified risks to achieving its goals and appropriate mitigating actions? Has it identified challenges? Is it engaging with issues likely to have a positive impact on student experience?

The service has identified risks, particularly in relation to increasing demands (e.g. on the listening service) with resource limitations impacting on the response to these demands, though with achievable responses identified (e.g. Director of the Listening Service). This will depend on additional resources being made available.

7. Commendations and areas for consideration

List commendations arising from the report:

Commendations:

- **The continued use and development of the Listening Service**
- **The Chaplaincy capacity not only to respond to individual student and staff needs but also attend to the wider health needs of the University community as a whole in its Compassionate University work**
- **The wide range of partnership working within and without the University and the range of activities the Chaplaincy facilitate or contribute to.**
- **The development of activities at Kings Buildings**

List areas for further consideration arising from the report (limit these to three to five achievable and targeted actions):

- **Further reflection on developing suitable KPIs – possibly across other university chaplaincy services?**