



**Friday 23 September 2016, 2.00pm Huntingdon Room, Roger Needham Building**

Present: Dr Rachael Padman (Chair), Mr Andrew Aldridge, Dr Martin Bellamy, Prof Alan Blackwell, Mr Amatey Doku, Mr Chris Edwards, Mr John Norman

Apologies: Prof P John Clarkson, Ms Emma Rampton

In Attendance: Dr Mark Ferrar, Dr Ian Cooper (secretary)

**USER NEEDS COMMITTEE**

**1. Welcome and apologies**

Dr Padman welcomed Mr Doku, the new President of CUSU. Apologies had been received from Ms Rampton.

The order of the agenda was amended to enable Dr Ferrar to attend to discuss the development of the Information Services Strategy and Establishing Minimum Standards.

**2. Minutes of previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2016 (UNC-21) were accepted subject to minor correction to a date heading in the actions table.

**3. Actions and matters arising**

**Action point 1.6 – next steps on User Experience Portal (on hold)**

No update in Dr Ferrar's absence.

**Action point 2.2 – review experience gained from finance system work in addressing user needs (closed)**

Mr Edwards reported that there had been benefit in the activity by identifying high priority items and that this had informed subsequent, more representative, work.

**Action point 2.4 – Circulate PD33 for user experience specialist to Committee (closed)**

A PD33 had not been circulated as the appointed individual had chosen to work as a contractor rather than as an employee. The appointment would commence on 3 October 2016; the appointee had previously worked as user experience specialise for Camelot.

**Action point 2.5 – Provide an update on the library of resources for user centric design (ongoing)**

Mr Norman reported that work in this area would continue as his team grew.

**Action point 4.1 – Include the Committee in redevelopment of documentation on project board constitution (closed; on agenda)**

A discussion took place as reported under item 4.



**Action points 4.3 – Schedule and scope of user centric design events (closed; on agenda)**

A discussion took place as reported under item 5.

**Action point 4.6 – Chair to discuss the formation of a Digital Advisory Board with the Registry (ongoing)**

Dr Padman reported the discussion was ongoing.

**Action point 5.2 – List of services into which the simple user feedback question could be inserted (closed)**

Mr Norman reported that it was still an aspiration to conduct simple net promoter score follow up. It appeared that a follow up email with an embedded survey question might be technically easier to deliver than a popup following service use. A follow up report will be brought to the Committee's meeting in October 2016.

**Action point 6.1 – Committee membership (ongoing)**

Dr Padman reported that work was ongoing to consider an appropriate appointment to Class ii but that she and Ms Rampton had not managed to have a detailed discussion prior to the meeting.

**Action point 6.2 – Programme of the University's IT providers to join the Committee's discussions (ongoing)**

Work to invite other major IT providers from the University to participate in discussions at the Committee's meetings was ongoing.

**Action point 6.3 – Service level definitions addressing elements of minimum standards (closed)**

Mr Edwards reported that he had discussed the matter with Dr Bellamy and that conversations were ongoing. A further discussion on minimum standards took part as reported under item 7.

**Action point 6.4 – Review whether a "pain point" question could be added to the UAS IT satisfaction survey (closed)**

Mr Norman reported on recently initiated survey activity that largely followed the UAS survey. A total of around 14,500 emails had been distributed to staff across the University and colleges inviting participation, to which around 2,700 responses had been received. A 20% response rate was anticipated by 30 October. A large number of comments had been received and a qualified individual was in place to assist with the categorisation. It was suggested that Mr Norman might wish to consult with the Computing Laboratory ethics committee on the reporting of results and to consider academic oversight of the categorisation process. Mr Norman was asked to bring reports from both surveys to a future meeting of the Committee.

**Action point 7.1 – JN**

**4. User needs in project governance and delivery (UNC-23)**

Mr Edwards spoke to the discussion paper that had been tabled as UNC-23. It was agreed that the existing ISC guidance on project management required updating, in particular as not all activity requires PRINCE2 methodology. The Members agreed that the Committee was not the body to oversee the update but should have an opportunity to provide input, and that UIS should initiate work to make the update. Mr Edwards was asked to keep the Committee informed.

**Action point 7.2 – CE**



Within UIS, project documentation templates were being updated to introduce user needs as a mandatory element of governance. In addition, the initial decision-making group for future activity (the Work Request Analysis Panel; WRAP) should start to consider whether user needs were being included and being considered. It was suggested that a statement of user needs be developed for new activity and that these are reviewed to determine their effectiveness.

A discussion about the identification of appropriate users took place. It was noted that the users of some products were not necessarily those using computer interfaces; not all users would be internal to the University (for example, the needs of those applying to the university as students or staff); it was important to find actual users rather than project staff acting as proxies.

There appeared to be no “best practice” in the community that could be taken to assist in the formulation of work within UIS.

Mr Edwards was asked to formulate a plan for work to be undertaken within UIS and to present this at a future meeting.

**Action point 7.3 – CE**

Dr Padman reported that she would flag that a discussion on this topic had taken place at the next meeting of the ISC.

**Action point 7.4 – RP**

## **5. User-centric design events (UNC-24)**

An event had taken place in December 2015 but despite the best intentions of the Committee no further events had been booked. An individual to facilitate arrangements had been appointed to Mr Norman’s team but had left, leaving a gap. Support was required to ensure future activity happened.

A suggestion of inviting The Baroness Lane Fox of Soho was raised. With her background in establishing digital government strategy, and more recently as Chancellor at the Open University, views on digitalisation in Higher Education could be useful. It was agreed that an event with such an esteemed speaker would be a larger event than previously and would likely require facilitation from the central University.

A further possibility was a joint event with the Cambridge Centre for Teaching and Learning.

Mr Doku indicated that one of the current CUSU Sabbatical Officers had interests in digital education. Their engagement with the work of the Committee would be beneficial and it was recognised that the individual would only be available for the limited time of their time in office. The secretary would arrange for a meeting to discuss ways forward.

**Action point 7.5 – IC**



## 6. Development of the Information Services Strategy

Dr Ferrar provided Members with an overview of the Strategy under development. User needs were explicitly mentioned at a number of points in the draft document but it was felt that further articulation of benefits to users throughout was desirable. A number of “big bets” (targeted investments to engineer outcomes to move forward) were included, which focussed on technical elements in their draft form but would be expanded to include user benefits.

## 7. Establishing minimum standards (UNC-22)

Dr Padman initiated the discussion by outlining the need to understand what UIS has planned. The University cannot mandate standards if it does not also provide a mechanism by which institutions can meet them.

Dr Bellamy outlined a number of services that UIS has in its portfolio. With the deployment of an appropriate groupware solution there was a need to look at these from the perspective of an institution in order to provide a joined-up solution.

The “minimum standards” needed to be a universal minimum that moves over time in a managed way, that apply to every individual at the University. It was anticipated that some components in the minimum standards (for example, relating to cybersecurity risks) would need to be mandatory for all IT providers.

Prof Blackwell commented that the phrase “end user compute” was difficult to understand. Dr Ferrar offered to have a discussion outside of the meeting in order to determine a more understandable phrase.

### **Action point 7.6 – MF & AB**

In order to understand how minimum standards could be defined it would be necessary to understand how institutions would pay for appropriate IT and information services. The UIS Relationship Managers were perceived to have a helpful role to facilitate this work.

Dr Bellamy recommended that UIS formulates a concept of service offering for comment at the Committee’s meeting in December 2016.

### **Action point 7.7 – MB**

## 8. Any other business

There was no further business.



**Dates of future meetings**

All meetings will be held in the Huntingdon Room at the Roger Needham Building unless otherwise indicated:

- Wednesday, 26 October 2016, 2.30-4.30pm
- Tuesday, 13 December 2016, 2.30-4.30pm
- Thursday, 16 February 2017, 2.30-4.30pm
- Wednesday, 5 April 2017, 2.30-4.30pm
- Tuesday, 23 May 2017, 2.30-4.30pm



**Summary of action points**

Ref.	Action	Who	Status
Actions from previous meetings			
1.6	Determine appropriate next steps for the User Experience Portal – assigned to Dr Ferrar, Chief Architect	MB	On hold
2.2	Review benefit of engagement with users of the finance system in designing a system considering users' needs	CE	Closed
2.4	Draft PD33 for the user experience specialist to be provided to the Committee prior to being raised and advertised	JN	Closed
2.5	Provide a paper to the Committee to give an update on the library of resources, and data-driven design, being developed within the UIS	CE, JN	Ongoing
4.1	Include the Committee in consultation while UIS reviews and revises project board constitution documentation	CE	Closed
4.3	Identify a schedule and scope for user centric design events and the facilitation resource required to plan and book them	MB JN	Closed
4.5	Circulate proposed initial survey questions to the committee by correspondence and identify one college and one department to pilot the initial survey	JN	Closed
4.6	Discuss the proposed formation of a Digital Advisory Board with the Registry	RP	Ongoing
5.2	Provide the list of services on which the feedback question can be inserted	JN	Closed
6.1	Discuss Committee membership, the potential for a further ISC Member to participate, and comments received from School Secretaries	RP & ER	Ongoing
6.2	Consider representation on the Committee and a programme of major IT service providers across the Collegiate University to join discussions	RP & IC	Ongoing
6.3	Discuss the definition of service levels for UIS services with the Director, to address some of the elements of setting minimum standards of IT	CE	Closed
6.4	Review whether a "pain point" question can be added to the UAS IT satisfaction survey	JN	Closed
New actions from 23 Septembers 2016 meeting			
7.1	Present reports from the UAS IT satisfaction and general staff IT satisfaction surveys at a future meeting	JN	



Ref.	Action	Who	Status
7.2	Keep the committee informed of the development of project guidance, to incorporate user needs	CE	
7.3	Present UIS's internal plan for incorporating user needs in all governance	CE	
7.4	Flag the discussion on the required update of project guidelines to the ISC	RP	
7.5	Meet with CUSU Sabbatical Officer to discuss digital education and how they might input to the Committee's business	IC	
7.6	Discuss and agree an appropriate phrase to convey the concept of "end user compute"	MF & AB	
7.7	UIS to formulate a service offering for an appropriate minimum "end user compute" offering based on existing service portfolio elements	MB	For December 2016 meeting