Dear Principal, Senior Lay Member, Vice-Principal of Research and Enterprise and Rector,

Thank you for your letter, shared with us and the University community on 18th November 2022. We appreciate that you have taken the time to respond to the points raised in detail and recognised the major disruption caused by the implementation of our new finance services underpinned by the People and Money (P&M) system.

The letter acknowledges the deeply problematic state of the P&M system implementation, issues in communication around the new system, and misjudgements in the risk assessments made during the extended P&M process. These issues and admissions, among many others, clearly indicate a need for a thorough external review of the change implementation process for P&M. We welcome that the need for such an external review was clearly recognised in the letter.

We welcome the desire expressed in the letter to improve change management as a whole across the University and demonstrate accountability for the recognised failures of this change process. However, the letter provides no details or framework for this review; neither does it indicate how the results of the review will be considered alongside the "lessons learned" exercises being conducted by the University Senior Leadership Team. Based on feedback from the university community and discussions among elected Senate members, we would like to follow up the commitment to review by outlining key expectations for the review, its timelines, span, composition of the review team, and specific questions we believe it needs to address.

Timelines: We request that the process of identifying the chair of the review panel should begin immediately. The overall timeline for completion of the review should be set out by the chair, once they have had opportunity to understand the scale of the task, and the volume of information to be considered. We would expect a chair to have been identified by Tuesday 7th February, 2023, and for an update to be provided at our next ordinary Senate meeting on February 8th 2023.

Review Team: The chair of the review team should have demonstrable experience in conducting large scale organisational change reviews. They should be independent of all previous stages of the P&M process, Oracle and any other commercial organisation with an interest in the Oracle or similar systems, and other change projects led by members of the University Senior Leadership Team within Edinburgh or other institutions.

If the chair is not experienced with change reviews/audits specific to major software implementation, we would request an additional independent individual with expertise in these specific changes to be included in the process where required.

We would anticipate the chair would require support from a number of individuals from within the University to be able to understand the scope of the issues with P&M, as well as administrative support in the identification and accessing key documentation, meeting minutes etc. As such, we would envisage a review team including a number of elected members of senate, key members of professional service staff, and administrative support from the Principal's office.

To support the time commitment required for the review and to ensure it is given due priority, an appropriate fractional buyout should be offered to the Schools or Professional Service groups of participating staff in order to not increase their workloads unduly.

Impact on other P&M activities: The resources to complete the review should not be taken from existing efforts to fix the immediate and substantial issues with P&M.

Documentation: The review panel should be granted full, timely, and unredacted access to all documentation that are deemed relevant to the scope of the review (see below), independent of FOI considerations.

Reporting: The final report should be made available to all members of the Court and Senate. In the ideal case, the full report will be openly available to all employees of the University, and at least a detailed summary should be made public in a timely manner.

Scope: We believe the review needs to consider all stages of the decision making related to P&M. Specifically, we would like the review to cover:

- Management and reporting structures,
- RACI (Responsible, accountable, consulted, informed) framework – or equivalent – for all key stages linked to the management structure
- the initial problem identification with the old systems,
- the business case for change and alternatives considered for the specific change process adopted,
- procurement process: inclusive of selection criteria, value for money analysis, CSR and sustainability etc. and the rationale for P&M over competing options,
- Prioritization of functionality for P&M as part of selection and rollout (e.g. application of MoSCoW or similar framework)
- project timelines and modifications,
- risk assessments and risk mitigation for each stage of the project based on risk registers (or equivalent),
- employee engagement plan,
- results of employee engagement activities problem identification and responses,
- intended project audit plans,
- decision-making, staffing, and approach to crisis response as faults were identified,
- impact (personal, financial, etc.) of system failures on staff and students,
- impact on university partners and suppliers,
- impact on university research outputs and teaching,
- impact on university finances.

Change audit framework: While the chair can be expected to adopt their own audit model and structure, in order to indicate the kind of formal framework for the extent of review we consider appropriate, we have included in this letter (Appendix A) one example change audit model.

Key questions: Critically, we believe the following strategic questions should be answered:

1. Is P&M fit for purpose?
    a. How many of the system requirements agreed to as part of the procurement of P&M are currently failing?
    b. To what extent were these failings anticipated as part of pre-implementation staff consultations and risk assessment processes?
    c. What actions were taken in response to these warnings and who was responsible for ensuring the adequacy and effectiveness of these actions?
    d. Were the specific requirements of grant management assessed against the functionality of P&M, before implementation?
    e. How can the current inability to track payments, see balances, etc, within grants, and the inability to transfer between restricted and unrestricted funds - both of which are essential to grant management - be explained or justified?
2. Why was it necessary to shut down the old finance system for 8 weeks in the transition to P&M?
    a. Who was responsible for this decision?
    b. What was the extent of the pre-testing, training and risk assessment, and on what grounds were these considered adequate for the transition to proceed?
    c. What fail-safes were put in place? And why have these not worked?
    d. Why did the transition proceed without clearer assurance that the system and staff were prepared to undertake the switch within a tolerable allowance of disruption?
3. What plans were in place for the rapid response to arising issues, who was responsible for their implementation, and why were these plans so inadequate to deal with the scale of the issues?

a. Why did it take as long as it did for the magnitude and impacts of the issues to be recognised and acknowledged, and were the responses commensurate to the volume and seriousness of the impacts?
4. What plans are in place for the long-term review, development and support of P&M activities?
a. How will core functionality be evaluated, tracked and, where required, fixed after the initial implementation problems are resolved?
b. Given current experience, is this resourcing of these activities sufficient?
c. If not, how will this be extended and developed?
5. Overall, is the University of Edinburgh approach to planning, implementing and reviewing, major change projects sufficient for purpose?

Current & Future Change Projects: We would ask that the University respond to the report, and detail how the findings will be integrated within the University of Edinburgh change management approach, and that this be brought to Court and Senate for review and discussion, and to be subject to comment by the review chair.

Finally, we ask the Senior Leadership Team to consider pausing all other major change projects on going within the University (e.g. Curriculum Transformation); until the review is complete, and the subsequent proposals and reflections on change management can be implemented into these projects.

Thank you for your time in reading this letter, and we look forward to working constructively with the University Senior Leadership Team in reviewing P&M.

Signed, the Elected members of Senate:

Dr Adam Budd (HCA)
Dr Aidan Brown (School of Physics and Astronomy)
Dr Alan Convery (School of Social and Political Science)
Dr Andrew Connor (ECA)
Professor Antonella Sorace (School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences)
Dr Arianna Andreangeli (Law School)
Dr Ashley Lloyd (Business School)
Dr Ben Goddard (School of Mathematics)
Dr Benjamin Wynne (School of Physics and Astronomy)
Professor Caroline Heycock (School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences)
Dr Charlotte Desvages (School of Mathematics)
Constantinos Eleftheriou (CMVM)
Professor Daniel Friedrich (School of Engineering)
Dr Darrick Evensen (School of Social and Political Science)
Professor David Ingram (School of Engineering)
Professor Diana Paton (HCA)
Professor Edward Mitchard (School of GeoSciences)
Dr Ingrid Young (CMVM)
Professor Jane Calvert (School of Social and Political Science)
Dr Julian Bradfield (School of Informatics)
Professor Ken Rice (School of Physics and Astronomy)
Dr Mark Williams (School of Physics and Astronomy)
Professor Margarete Heck (Deanery of Clinical Sciences)
Professor Marialuisa Aliotta (School of Physics and Astronomy)
Professor Mary Brennan (Business School)
Dr Matthew Novenson (School of Divinity)
Professor Melissa Terras (ECA)
Dr Michael Barany (School of Social and Political Science)
Dr Murray Earle (Law School)
Dr Nadia Tuzi (School of Biological Sciences)
Dr Pablo Schyfter (School of Social and Political Science)
Dr Pau Navarro (MRC Human Genetics Unit)

Dr Peter Adkins (LLC)
Dr Rebecca Marsland (School of Social and Political Science)
Dr Simone Lamont-Black (School of Law)
Prof Steff Lewis (Usher Institute, CMVM)
Dr Steven Morley (Edinburgh Medical School)
Dr Stuart Gilfillan (School of GeoSciences)
Dr Tamara Trodd (ECA)
Dr Tom Booth (Department of Psychology)
Professor Tony Carbery (School of Mathematics)
Dr Uzma Tufail-Hanif (Deanery of Clinical Sciences)

Appendix A

Table A.1: Key information for change evaluation

1	**Governance**
a	A paper/presentation on the agreed Governance Structure including key members of Governance body
b	Subsequent meeting minutes, actions and reports/papers to Executive Management
c	Statement of Agreed Success Criteria against which to judge progress/slippage of Change
d	RACI (or similar) document showing clear lines of Accountability and Responsibility for elements below
2	**Project Plan**
a	Project Group Members
b	Reporting requirements to Governance Group and Operational Management
c	System Selection
i	*Business requirements*
ii	*Technical specifications including Integration with other systems*
iii	*User Interface specifications*
iv	*Cost*
v	*Security*
vi	*Evaluation of Potential Suppliers against requirements*
vii	*Sign Off on chosen solution*
viii	*Meeting Minutes/Actions and Reports including Risks*
3	**Engagement Plan (Change Management)**
a	Engagement Group members
b	Engagement Strategy
c	Stakeholder Map
d	Reporting requirements to Project Group/Governance Group
e	Meeting Minutes/Actions and Reports including Risks
4	**Finance**
a	Business Case and sign off
b	Independent Reports to Governance Group
c	Reports/Recommendations on changes to Business Case to Operational Management
d	Authority/Sign Off on significant changes to Business case
5	**Risk Management**
a	Agreed Risk Matrix/Methodology
b	Risk Register with entries and updates
c	Reports/Actions to Governance / Project/Engagement Groups
6	**Audit/Evaluation**