

Behaviour Change Management Programme Pilot

Funded by
The Scottish Funding Council

Executive Summary

The Behaviour Change Management Programme (BCMP) pilot was a 6-month project funded by the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) to support the objectives of the Universities and Colleges Climate Commitment for Scotland (UCCCS), with a view to roll-out across the UK as an EAUC fee-based Member Service (**Appendix A Funding Proposal**). The purpose of undertaking this pilot was to provide UCCCS signatories with the skills and knowledge to influence the behaviour of their staff and students in order to succeed in delivering meaningful change through their campus operations and more importantly through their fundamental role of education. The aim was to encourage a holistic approach to behaviour change within two pilot institutions, Reid Kerr College (RKC) and the University of the West of Scotland (UWS) and create comprehensive change management materials for the further and higher education sector.

The pilot was delivered on time and within budget and has delivered benefits to the pilot institutions. Although in hindsight, following an Independent Evaluation (**Appendix B Evaluation Report**), it has been identified that the Programme was perhaps a little too ambitious in both scope and timing. Within these constraints however, the pilot has provided a valuable experience from which to learn in developing a programme for UCCCS signatories and wider EAUC members.

RKC and UWS reported that they benefitted from the pilot and anticipate further benefits in the future. Additionally, all the Delivery Partners they worked with were very helpful and good to work with. They also reported that each of the individual modules in the Programme had strengths and the potential to be of value to other FE and HE institutions.

The joint activities, particularly through the senior management teams, between the pilot institutions have been of benefit in strengthening the relationship between them. This was an unexpected outcome from the process and should be looked at in the future development of the Programme.

However, there were some weaknesses identified. Time was the biggest barrier and this constraint prevented the pilot's potential being fully realised. This will require further work in the form of an Impact Assessment at the end of the academic year. Additionally, more staff time was required above the initial timescales outlined in the project plan and this highlighted a weakness in the Programme.

Unfortunately the pilot did not respond to the individual strategic priorities of the institutions and future roll-out should therefore include an entry-point level in which institutions can be assessed prior to engagement and to assess the correct modules are undertaken. The Programme modules have provided some value but the pilot institutions have indicated that building a case for expenditure is difficult, so would require a tailored assessment rather than being a one-size fits all package.

The main recommendations include further development of the Programme, informed by this pilot and to evaluate the Programme's value to institutions in any subsequent evaluation and development. An entry-point level is required to ensure that institutions receive value-for-money and the modules most relevant to them and their strategic aims.

More lead-in time is then required for the Delivery Partners to identify the interdependencies for the individual institutions from the Programme before commencement and support is required to the institutions to participate in the review and action planning processes.

The future aim of the Programme should be to improve the understanding of behaviour among partners and integrate approaches to behaviour change more effectively in each of the services and to encourage collaboration between neighbouring institutions.

Wider Context

"Behaviour change" affects all areas of work and to get true buy-in it must be integrated throughout all subject areas, particularly within the UCCCFS topic areas. Additionally it should not be a hierarchical issue but an approach adopted across all levels of students and staff from Senior Management Teams (SMT) to practitioners and student groups.

During the course of this pilot, there has been an uptake in behaviour change activity within and outwith the sector. It is increasingly recognised that to create meaningful and sustainable change across institutions, there needs to be a holistic approach to behaviour change.

This will also go some way to helping government bodies and organisations meet challenging targets set to address climate change, education for sustainable development and ultimately carbon reductions. The sectors have a critical role to play in how this is achieved.

Achievements

From the proposed programme with two pilot institutions, this pilot has been ambitious. Behaviour change cannot be achieved overnight. It will be a gradual process achieved over time. However, the Behaviour Change Programme Management pilot has run on time and within budget. The pilot achieved:

Successful recruitment of two pilot institutions, Reid Kerr College (RKC) and the University of the West of Scotland (UWS), both of which did not have regular institution-wide engagement on sustainable development prior to the pilot starting despite their close geographical proximity.

Through the various modules of this Programme, various Delivery Partners led the pilot institutions through the Programme. ESD Consulting engaged with the SMTs successfully to ensure they understood their role in the process and to engage them with sustainability measures that could then be addressed through their policy and strategy documents and the management of these areas. As a by-product of this work, RKC and UWS became closer and began to collaborate. The result of this was that both institutions agreed it would be beneficial to hold an additional joint SMT workshop for the first time, run by ESD consulting.

Staff and students were surveyed to gather an overview of the attitudes towards their surroundings and specific sustainability and environmental activity. From the results, a change management report was compiled for each institution which could then be incorporated into the SMT meeting and used to inform their current position.

From a grassroots perspective, NUS Services Ltd (NUSSL) successfully initiated *Green Impact* in both institutions. Delivered throughout the academic year, this will encourage practical change within departments across each of the pilot institutions to reduce their carbon emissions and provide a competitive edge to make meaningful long term changes. Training students to become carbon auditors also provides additional skills and potentially embeds positive behaviour throughout the rest of their lives.

The *Communicating Sustainability* training developed and delivered by Delaney & Hart was widened out to the whole sector as well as being tailored to the individual pilot institutions. This proved successful and was delivered an additional time for the Scottish sectors as a UCCCFS CPD event. It is important when trying to encourage change to equip individuals with the appropriate skills and knowledge to influence and communicate effectively and something as simple as this can often miss the intended target and halt progress.

Following this, a Campaign Toolkit was produced by NUSSL and Action for Sustainability to support the other findings of the Programme modules and to specifically complement the rest of the behavioural aspects. These provide institutions with materials which they can use and tailor as required. Statistics from the website since their launch show there is interest in them (734 visits) and feedback has been received from outwith the

sector on their use. This has been registered when attending stakeholder meetings and attending external events.

A new Topic Support Network (TSN) was launched for the sector to integrate amongst the existing seven TSNs. It was decided that whilst it was important for this group to meet to discuss behaviour change, it was just as important that there was representation at the other TSNs, to embed the principals into specific subject matters. On the first meeting, it was also decided that the name should change from Behaviour Change TSN to Promoting Positive Behaviour as for many there is a negative connotation to the term 'change'.

Finally, a Guidance Sheet is being produced to address and acknowledge the different modules which can be used when addressing behaviour change. The guidance has been linked to the primary focus and assessment required for this programme and reflects the principles used here.

Problems

Whilst some of the benefits have already been realised from this pilot, far more development is needed before it is ready to be rolled-out to the sector wide.

Time constraints were one of the biggest issues for the Programme and as a result, it was felt there were issues with the modules being rushed through. As there were links identified from the initial Delivery Partner meeting, certain modules needed to be completed before the next main area could commence. It was felt that there was not time to properly link the interdependencies throughout in the time available for the pilot, given that some were learned through the process. A delay in getting the Programme started and the festive break meant there were only effectively four months to ensure this work was completed. While the project delivery team rose to the challenge of starting the pilot quickly, more benefits would have been realised if there had been more time to properly develop the modules once the confirmation of funding was received. Lead-in times for SMTs and the relevant trainer was a definite constraint. The Independent Evaluation also states that the Programme clearly needs to be linked to an institution's specific strategic aims.

The student and staff attitudes survey responses were poor. It was understood that this is often the case however timings of the surveys need to be addressed. An extension of the deadline to respond to the survey to encourage more respondents caused a slight delay in finalising the change management reports.

Scotland (and the rest of the UK) was hit with adverse weather conditions at the end of 2010 and this had knock-on effects. With almost all of the Delivery Partners being based outside of Scotland, it was difficult to travel and institutions were also closed. The Partners tried to work around this to the best of their ability however progress was slowed by the need to postpone face-to-face meetings etc. In particular, this caused issues with the *Green Impact* workbooks being finalised and launched on time. Fortunately, this module of the Programme will run longer than the length of the pilot and is not so adversely affected by delays.

Another observation is of the impact of the Campaign Toolkit materials produced by Action for Sustainability. These materials will be useful moving forward but given the timeframes of the pilot they were being produced at the same time as other modules. While there were benefits, such as the types of issues coming out of the change management report being incorporated into the campaign messages, the pilot institutions were not able to fully utilise them throughout the pilot. Therefore, there is not yet a true evaluation of the impact of these materials.

Finally, one of the Delivery Partners was unexpectedly ill and unable to complete the Guidance Sheet as originally planned. Given the short timescales of this ambitious Programme, it was difficult to deal with this slippage as we were uncertain of an expected return date. Action was therefore taken to replace the Partner responsible for the work. The delay has meant that this element of the project is still being finalised but ultimately will be completed as first planned.

Changes

There were no major changes to the initial structured proposal submitted. However, following the development and some lessons learned throughout the pilot, some activity was slightly amended to best utilise time and resources.

The Behaviour Change TSN was scheduled to run 2-3 times during the pilot period. However, following the first meeting of the TSN, convened by Dr Rehema White of the University of St Andrew's, it was agreed that this would not be the best use of everyone's time (**members listed in Appendix C**). The name of this TSN also changed to Promoting Positive Behaviour as the group felt that the word 'change' has a negative connotation, which people disengage from.. As there was some budget allocated for the meetings, we decided to reallocate funds and deliver an additional *Communicating Sustainability* training event. This additional event was open to the sector.

Following the sessions with the SMTs at each of the pilot institutions, it was felt that there was a need to engage with the teams further for additional development. It also brought about a session of senior managers from both institutions meeting together for the first time in a joint session. This collaboration had never happened before and has been an unexpected benefit of the pilot, which will be considered in any future development of the Programme.

The Sustainability Group was replaced by ESD Consulting to complete the Behaviour Change Guidance Sheet due to the consultant being signed off with illness.

Lessons

Six months to deliver a pilot of this magnitude was ambitious. While it appeared perfectly achievable on paper, there were a number of lessons learned as the Programme developed. Apart from the Guidance Sheet, which is soon to be completed, all milestones were met and some benefits have already been realised.

In knowing this however, it would be far more beneficial to run such a pilot over a 12 to 18 month period to see the real benefits. By allowing the Delivery Partners and pilot institutions more time for pre-planning and development, it would mean materials are available from the start and interdependencies would be clearly identified before running for the full academic cycle. It would have been useful to have a few months to work with the Delivery Partners to explore possibilities before engaging with the pilot institutions and commencing the Programme.

The pilot institutions have managed to fit in this work on top of pre-existing workloads, whereas pre-planning time would have afforded the pilot institutions time to allocate time and resources at the beginning of the year. Strategic direction of each institution should also be factored into the process and time needs to be factored as to when to engage with institutions. As the pilot developed, it was clear that more coordination time was required from key contacts than previously thought. Therefore, it seems as though some of the Programme was rushed to ensure timescale were met, rather than being of specific benefit and positively influencing the institution. Again, more time could have also catered for the unexpected slippage caused by the adverse weather conditions.

It is too early to undertake a full Impact Assessment as it is too early in the process to fully realise the benefits. Therefore an Impact Assessment is planned before the end of the academic year, following completion of *Green Impact*.

If the Campaign Toolkit materials were produced before the beginning of the Programme, they could have been integrated from the start and better utilised throughout the Programme to complement other modules and the true benefits could be assessed. Likewise, if the Programme was able to run for the full academic cycle, more effective development could have been measured to the shape the future of the Programme.

Behaviour change will not happen overnight and requires time to achieve buy-in and agreement. Influencing people to create change is far more effective and efficient than telling them what to do.

Delivery Partners such as ESD Consulting operate as a solo consultancy. The benefit of the work seen has been as much to do with the personality of the individuals as it is the work. To roll this out on a larger scale has significant impacts on time and resources and will need to be developed further to account for this.

Following an Independent Evaluation, it has been determined that there is a need for an entry-level point for institutions to assess their strategic direction and what the motivation is for being involved in the Programme. This will help tailor the Programme modules to the needs of the institution. Time and resources are scarce for everyone and best value for money is crucial if this programme is to move forward.

Target Audiences

The development of the Behaviour Change Management Programme pilot is primarily to support signatories of the UCCCfS in achieving change through their activity and delivering against their Climate Change Action Plans. However, the benefits have been recognised on a much larger scale. If rolled-out to a wider audience, this programme has the potential to be of benefit to the whole UK further and higher education sectors.

Interest has already been seen outwith the sector through delegates booked onto the *Communicating Sustainability* training as well as internationally. We would be happy to share any of the findings and best practice to help make positive changes towards sustainability.

Organisational Linkages

Already we are looking at what has been produced through this pilot and what else is available both within and outwith the sector that could complement the Programme to ensure a more holistic approach to change. A number of recommendations have been made through the independent evaluation. Links to the lessons learned from *Transition Edinburgh University* as means of effective communication channels and *Universities that Count* as a diagnostic tool to identify priorities for action have been identified.

Also identified is potential partnership with the Higher Education Academy through their *Green Academy*. This would incorporate an ESD element into the Programme and would provide a greater holistic approach. It is, however, tailored to the higher education sector, so other methods need to be identified for supporting the further education sector. *Green Academy* is currently in a pilot stage and is proposed to be launched in autumn 2011, so there is huge potential to coordinate both programmes for the benefit of the wider sector.

Budget

Project Budget Headings	Total Actual	Total Budget	Variance
Development and delivery of ESD Leadership in Sustainability training - ESD Consulting	£11,190.00	£11,625.00	£435.00
Development and delivery of Communicating Sustainability training - Delany & Hart	£5,405.00	£5,405.00	£0.00
Development and delivery of WorkWare SUSTAIN benchmark / performance improvement tool - Alexi Marmot Associates	£12,690.00	£12,690.00	£0.00
Provision of UCCCfS Campaign Toolkit - Action for Sustainability	£5,298.00	£5,298.00	£0.00
Provision of UCCCfS Campaign Toolkit - NUS	£1,500.00	£1,500.00	£0.00
Pilot of Green Impact in Scotland, including development of scheme for college sector - NUS	£8,000.00	£8,000.00	£0.00
Provision of case studies as of UCCCfS Climate Change Guidance series – ESD Consulting	£587.50	£587.50	£0.00
Project Management Costs - Travel, Venue Hire, Catering & Expenses - EAUC	£2,149.50	£2,114.50	-£35.00
Event Management, including facilitation of a Behaviour Change Topic Support Network - EAUC	£1,500.00	£1,000.00	-£500.00
Post Project Evaluation and longer-term impact assessment - EAUC	£1,600.00	£1,700.00	£100.00
TOTAL	£49,920.00	£49,920.00	£0.00

Recommendations

Following the independent evaluations, the main recommendations for the EAUC to further develop the Programme are:

- Develop a programme of support informed by the pilot; and
- Evaluate the programme's value to institutions in any subsequent evaluation.

This new programme should:

- Include a review and action planning process for participating institutions;
- Offer a menu of services, based on those of the pilot;
- Ensure proper coordination between services throughout the Programme;
- Offer geographical collaboration of institutions looking to participate;
- Support institutions to participate in the review and action planning processes; and
- Communicate the value of the programme to participants, the wider sector and key sector stakeholders.

The new programme should also:

- Improve understanding of behaviour among partners and integrate approaches to behaviour change more effectively in each of the services; and
- Encourage [cross-sector] collaboration between neighbouring institutions.

Next Steps

The next stage of the Programme will be to liaise with the current Delivery Partners to agree the outputs of their respective modules and to negotiate associated costs. This will take place during April-May 2011.

The EAUC is currently advertising a Member Services Manager position. When in post, as the Project Manager of the BCMP pilot, I will work very closely with them to ensure a thorough and consistent handover over the project for further development into an EAUC member services package.

Sarah Lee
BCMP Project Manager
16 March 2011

Appendix A

Please see attached *Behaviour Change Programme Management pilot Funding Proposal* submitted to the Scottish Funding Council.

Appendix B

Please see attached *Independent Evaluation Report* undertaken by Osbert Lancaster Ltd.

Appendix C

Initial start up meeting of the *Promoting Positive Behaviour Topic Support Network* held at Reid Kerr College on 1 November 2011 with video conferencing to St Andrews University.

Promoting Positive Behaviour TSN

Name	Job Title	Institution Name
Lynn Wingate	Accommodation Officer	University of Glasgow
Rehema White (Convenor)	Lecturer (Sustainable Development)	University of St Andrews
Steve Reicher (Speaker)	Social psychologist	University of St Andrews
Miss Hanna Plant	Environment Graduate	University of St Andrews
Barbara Aitken	Environment Officer	University of St Andrews
David Stuchfield	Energy Officer	University of St Andrews
Viola Retzlaff	Travel and Transport Co-ordinator	University of Glasgow
Claire Roxburgh	Environment Manager	University West of Scotland
Judith Paxton	HR Director	Reid Kerr College
Sarah Hayward	UTC Project Manager & Scotland Project Officer	EAUC
Sarah Lee	UCCCFs Programme Manager	EAUC
David Somervell	Sustainability Advisor	University of Edinburgh

Appendix D

Delegate lists of those who attended the *Communicating Sustainability* training.

COMMUNICATING SUSTAINABILITY

18th October 2010

University of Edinburgh

Title	First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Institution Name
Ms	Amy	Gray	Waste & Environmental Manager	University of Aberdeen
Mr	John	Kingsland		University of Aberdeen
Mr	Chris	Osbeck	Travel Plan Co-ordinator	University of Aberdeen
Ms	Fleur	Ruckley	Waste & Environment Manager	University of Edinburgh
Ms	Shona	Buchanan	Assistant Energy Manager	University of Edinburgh
Ms	Helen	Dunlop	Staff	John Wheatley College
Mr	Jamie	Peters	Climate Change Project Manager	University of Aberdeen
Mr	John	Salter	Environmental Manager	Elmwood College
Mr	Bert	Young	Campus Sustainability Officer	University of Glasgow
Mr	Rhys	Howell	Research Assistant (Santander Project)	University of Edinburgh
Ms	Annabel	Cooper	Communications	Heriot-Watt University
Mrs	Trudy	Cunningham	Environment & Sustainability Officer	University of Dundee
Miss	Amy	Clarke	Transition Edinburgh University Intern	EAUC Shoppers
Mr	Tony	Kopsch	Head of Estates and Facilities	Edinburgh's Telford College
Ms	Margaret	Baird	Officer	Forth Valley College
Mr	Michael	Snyder	Engagement Officer	EAUC Shoppers
Ms	Carol	Brennan	Academic Director (Marketing)	Queen Margaret University
Mr	Andy	Drysdale	Strategic Planning Manager	Scottish Agricultural College
	Lisa	Black	Travel Plan Officer	SEStran
Mr	Daniel	Gilmour	Research Officer	University of Abertay Dundee
Ms	Charlotte	Bozic	Glasgow Caledonian University	Glasgow Caledonian University

Mr	Mark	Thomson	Building Manager	Stevenson College Edinburgh
Miss	Emily	Nicholl	Engagement Assistant	Transition Edinburgh University
Ms	Caroline	St Johnston	Administrator (Climate Change)	Sustainable Development Commission Scotland
Ms	Tessa	Clark	Project Researcher	Heriot-Watt University

COMMUNICATING SUSTAINABILITY 23 February 2011

Glasgow Caledonian University

Title	First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Institution Name
Dr	Ann	Galbraith	Environmental Advisor	University of Glasgow
Ms	Sheila	Scott	Research Fellow	Glasgow Caledonian University
Mr	David	Jack	Environment and Energy Manager	Heriot-Watt University
Mr	David	Taggart	Category Manager	NHS
Mr	Mark	Watson	Senior Inspector, Historic Scotland	
Mr	Frank	Scheurich	PhD Student	University of Glasgow
Mr	Anthony	McGale	European Policy Manager	
Mrs	Ruth	Evans	Development Officer	Community energy scotland
Mr	Gordon	MacDonald	Energy & Environmental Manager	NHS
Miss	Heidi	Burdett	PhD student	University of Glasgow
Mr	Robert	Kilpatrick	Operations Director	University of Glasgow
Miss	Louisa	Coursey	Business Advisor	SCARF
Ms	Heather	Robertson	Energy Efficiency Advisor	Catrine Community Trust
Mr	Hugh	Hutchison	Powerdown Officer	Catrine Community Trust
Ms	Zarina	Ahmad	Energy Efficiency Advisor	Catrine Community Trust
Miss	Kathryn	Carruthers	ULR	EAUC Shoppers
Miss	Lorraine	Hartley	commodity Manager	The pension service
Mrs	Abigail	Betney	Sustainable Transport Advisor	Energy saving scotland
Miss	Christine	Sangster	Outreach Energy Advisor	Energy saving scotland
Mrs	Vivienne	Ball	Application Support Specialist	NHS
Ms	Katie	Ward	Acting Senior Project Manager	The city of Edinburgh Council
Mr	Andrew	Elliot	Head of Corporate Services	NHS
Mr	Jack	Davies	Project Manager	Scottish Enterprise
Mrs	Helen	Lewis	Sustainability Specialist	Scottish Enterprise
Mr	Kenny	Allen	Estates Manager	Glasgow Caledonian University
Ms	Yanna	Constantinou	Acquisitions Manager	Better World Books
Ms	Lauren	Christopher	Carbon Reduction Assistant	Manchester Metropolitan University
Ms	Laura	Hurst	Waste and Recycling Assistant	Manchester Metropolitan University
Miss	Sarah	Hayward	Project Manager and Scotland Project Officer	EAUC
Mr	Stephen	Smith	Consultant	Delaney and Hart