



Friday 27 February 2015, 3.00pm Thetford Room, Roger Needham Building

Present: Dr Rachael Padman (Chair), Prof. Ian Leslie, Prof. Graham Virgo, Dr Alan Blackwell, Mr John Norman, Dr Martin Bellamy, Mr Chris Edwards, Dr Ian Cooper (secretary)

Apologies: None

USER NEEDS COMMITTEE

1. Welcome

Dr Padman welcomed members to the inaugural meeting of the User Needs Committee and welcomed Dr Steve Smith, attending for paper UNC-04.

2. Review of the Committee's Terms of Reference

Members discussed the draft terms of reference in paper UNC-01. There was concern that the final sentence of the first paragraph might not properly belong in the terms of reference, however it was noted that it was likely to be the only statement a non-expert would recognise.

The ISC paper "IT Governance: minimum standards of IT Provision and Integration" (ISC 51) was introduced and a discussion was held around the committee's responsibilities. It was the role of the committee to approve and advocate minimum standards, not to set these.

The terms of reference were agreed subject to an amendment being made in the final paragraph to read that "*if a member in class (v) ceases to be in statu pupillarii ...*"

Action: Secretary

3. Constitution of the Committee

The constitution of the committee, set out in UNC-02, was discussed.

Dr Padman had approached Ms Helen Hoogewerf-McComb, in her capacity on ISC. It was agreed that Ms Hoogewerf-McComb should be co-opted in class (v).

Action: Secretary

Dr Padman had approached Prof. P John Clarkson, who expressed his willingness to be co-opted in class (vi) but was on leave until October 2015. It was agreed that Prof. Clarkson would be co-opted and that papers would be provided in the interim and that he would attend the committee on his return.

Action: Secretary

Prof. Leslie reminded members that it had been agreed his term would last for six months, starting 1 January 2015.



4. How UIS organization design will enable user engagement

4.1 UIS divisional structure

Dr Bellamy introduced the design of the UIS leadership team, outlined in paper UNC-03. The new divisional structure had two outward-facing roles: Deputy Director for Research & Institution Support, and Deputy Director for Education, Administration & Student Services. Regular conversations would be held across the University, starting at the operational level. These engagements would ensure the strategic needs of institutions were considered in forward planning.

The roles of Relationship Managers, Service Owners and Service Managers were discussed. Service Owners would have strategic responsibility for one or more services, gather input and devising forward plans. They would have to determine how to address situations where comparable services exist (for example, Adobe Connect, jabber and Lync/Skype for Business provide some common features) and would be responsible for recommending the default service. Service Managers would hold the day-to-day operational responsibility, ensuring that performance and availability targets are met.

The way the new UIS divisional structure would focus on users was covered, with the Director of UIS having overall accountability for user experience.

4.2 UIS process for gathering and responding to feedback

Dr Bellamy stated that UIS is still in the early stages of developing ideas on how to gather and respond to feedback. The intention was to build a mechanism to annually survey across the suite of services but also to sample randomly on a monthly cadence to gain feedback on recent experience, primarily to consider service delivery issues. It would be useful for this committee to be provided with a report on surveys of user opinions.

The intent was to survey individuals but it was acknowledged that it would not be possible to routinely have a dialogue with 30-50,000 users; survey sampling methodology was important to consider. There was unease at the suggestion of institutions acting as proxies for their user base but there was also evidence of very low response rates. In some cases those few responses would have been considered to be representative. It was suggested that a very simple survey may help, e.g. "what one thing annoys you about IT services?"

There was general support for survey activity and this would be reviewed by the committee over time.

4.3 User panels

Dr Padman introduced the concept of user panels akin to the advisory panels established within HEDIIP, with a list of individuals who could be called upon to provide input on specific projects. Existing engagement groups established with UIS were discussed and it was felt that the Schools/UIS engagement group was not a user panel.

It was agreed that academics needed to be involved in user panels but that this was a difficult group to engage with. Dr Bellamy stated that the Deputy Directors for Research & Institutional



Services, and Education, Administration & Student Services would be actioned to develop the consultation methodology.

Action: Director UIS

Project board constitution would be considered at the next meeting of this committee.

Action: Secretary

5. User Experience Portal demonstration

Dr Smith introduced the user experience portal pilot activity. This committee was not the project board for the work but it was being consulted to consider the area should be explored in more detail.

A discussion about the use of portal technology was held and it was agreed the most powerful aspect of the pilot system presented was the promotion of underlying API functionality to extract and present data from a multitude of underlying systems. An appropriate platform may provide a useful bridging tool to address known issues in existing systems while the University's Enterprise Resource Planning environment is updated.

In terms of future direction, the committee suggested that focus should be given to activity that students frequently undertake.

It was agreed that the Director of UIS should decide on the appropriate way forward for the initiative with the expectation that the TDF would be used to fund the activity.

Action: Director UIS

6. Other Business

6.1 Meeting frequency

It was agreed that the committee would meet twice per term with the expectation that individual meetings would be cancelled should there be insufficient business.

Action: Secretary