UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Information Services

Tuesday 17 May 2016, 2.15pm General Board Office, Old Schools

Present: Dr Rachael Padman (Chair), Mr Andrew Aldridge, Prof Alan Blackwell, Prof P John Clarkson, Mr Chris Edwards, Mr John Norman, Ms Emma Rampton

Apologies: Dr Martin Bellamy, Ms Priscilla Mensah

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

USER NEEDS COMMITTEE

1. Welcome and apologies

Dr Padman welcomed Ms Rampton to her first meeting of the Committee, and Dr Ferrar who was primarily in attendance for item 6 on the agenda. Apologies had been received from Dr Bellamy and Ms Mensah.

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2016 (UNC-17) were accepted subject to correction of Prof Blackwell's title.

3. Actions and matters arising

Action point 1.6 – next steps on User Experience Portal (on hold)
Dr Ferrar commented that he anticipated that the information gleaned from developing the Information Services Strategy would assist in this area and that some form of cohesion around the services for students in particular would be helpful. The action point would be retained to ensure that Committee was reminded to return to the point at a later date.

Action point 2.2 – review experience gained from finance system work in addressing user needs (ongoing)
Mr Edwards reminded members of the scope of work regarding problems users had reported with extracting information and reports from the finance system. The first phase of work to improve finance reporting had completed at the end of April 2016 and feedback on these tools was being assessed. Mr Edwards was asked to provide a write up for the next meeting.

Action point 2.4 – Circulate PD33 for user experience specialist to Committee (ongoing)
The 2015 Planning Round had upset expectations but there was expectation of progress in the next few weeks; the work had passed from Mr Edwards to Mr Norman and the PD33 would be circulated to members between meetings. Whilst an individual had not been recruited resources had been brought in to provide assistance on individual pieces of work.

Action point 2.5 – Provide an update on the library of resources for user centric design (ongoing)
Mr Edwards reported that some progress had been made and that the work was now ongoing.

Action point 4.1 – Include the Committee in redevelopment of documentation on project board constitution (ongoing; on agenda)
An update on activity was included under item 4 of the agenda.

Action points 4.2 & 5.1 – Committee membership (closed)
Following the meeting on 8 February Prof Prager had had to retract his offer to serve on the Committee, leading to a vacancy under Class ii of the Committee's membership. Potential membership from arts and humanities or social sciences was discussed; Ms Rampton commented that she had received some concerns from School Secretaries. The benefit of an additional member of the ISC sitting on the Committee was raised. Dr Padman and Ms Rampton agreed to discuss the action offline

Action point 6.1 – RP & ER

Action point 4.6 – Chair to discuss the formation of a Digital Advisory Board with the Registrary (ongoing)
Dr Padman reported the discussion was ongoing but not a high priority.

Action point 5.2 – List of services into which the simple user feedback question could be inserted (ongoing)
Mr Norman reported that there had been less progress than hoped in testing the system in order to capture immediate sentiment via Net Promoter Score. Work on a proof of concept had been shared but further work was required to identify where it was possible to embed it within the enterprise systems. The topic was discussed further under item 7 on the agenda.

Action point 5.3 – Discuss planned survey work with JSCS to identify commonality (completed)
Mr Norman had spoken with Mr Bartlett at the JSCS. The work they had undertaken was helpful to discuss but not the same scope being considered by the Committee. The topic was discussed further under item 7 on the agenda.

4. Considering user needs in project activity

This matter had first been discussed a year previously, though the original action was to re-write the existing advice endorsed by the ISSS. Mr Edwards reported that the work had grown into something more useful, covering the full needs of engagement to ensure all appropriate groups were considered when setting up projects. Work had been delayed somewhat due to the recruitment of the Head of Programme and Project Office, which was filled by Chris MacLeod in February 2016. Revised guidelines and templates were now being put in place and the work, led by Mr MacLeod, was about halfway to completion. Mr Edwards reported that feedback from recent projects had been good.

Ms Rampton referred to the case of the re-implementation of the PeopleSoft 9.2 governance. A steering committee had been established with strong user representation (Ms Rampton confirmed after the meeting that this included student representation). There had been frustration with

paperwork, which had been redesigned by Ms Rampton and others to help ensure that user needs were heard by the board. The recommendation was for UIS to mandate how IT related projects are run and to establish a suite of "non-negotiable" paperwork. This was in line with Mr Edwards' expectations.

The issue of needs of the relatively small number of heavy users vs. the needs of the large volume of infrequent users was raised. Mr Norman outlined work his area would be investigating (in Moodle, in the first instance, but CamSIS could be reviewed in the future) by examining system log files to try and understand what activities users were undertaking.

Members asked for this item to be reviewed again at its next meeting and asked for the UIS user-centred design staff to review the proposed materials. Existing materials, including the project board recommendations should be reviewed by the BSSC and ISC; Dr Padman requested that Members had an opportunity to see the materials prior to such review.

5. Review of UNC activity (UNC-18)

Dr Padman outlined that the agenda item was motivated by the need to provide the ISC with an annual report of the Committee's activity but also as an opportunity to take stock of what had been discussed in the Committee's first year of work. The supporting paper was an attempt to map out the items discussed at each meeting against the Committee's Terms of Reference.

It was agreed that the Committee had an interest in all IT-related projects across the University, not just those run by the UIS. There was usually UIS representation on large-scale IT projects elsewhere, and many services were ultimately hosted by UIS. Appropriate project board constitution was considered important to ensure that all IT projects considered user needs.

A discussion on the membership or attendance by other major providers of IT services within the Collegiate University took place. It was considered more likely that there should be a programme of discussions in the Committee's meetings, to which the major providers should be invited to attend. The question of College representation at the Committee had arisen elsewhere and it was felt that the most appropriate role for this would be the Chair of the CITMG. Dr Padman and the Secretary would discuss the matter in advance of the Committee's next meeting.

Action point 6.2 – RP & IC

Considering the balance of work brought to, and considered by, the Committee there was a perception that the best was being done with the limited resources available to UIS. However, to fully meet the aspirations of the IT Review further investment would be required. Dr Padman requested that the UIS should keep the Committee involved in matters relating to funding addressing user needs in order that it can help ensure a strong application to the 2016 Planning Round.

6. Progress on addressing "minimum standards of IT" from the IT Review (UNC-19)

Dr Padman introduced the discussion, which had been prompted by work in the Clinical School. Dr Ferrar suggested that there would be problems in attempting to define "minimum standards" (which would also require continual update). The work to assemble the Information Services

Unconfirmed

Strategy was expected to contribute to an understanding of requirements, and a maturity model could be developed to assist institutions to understand where their systems sat on that maturity scale. There was concern that a model might not in itself be sufficient and that there were some institutions which would struggle while others, with the money to invest, would find it easier.

The group discussed principles A3 and A4 from the IT Review and felt that with hindsight, despite the best intentions when written, these might now be difficult to unpack into useful work.
Mr Edwards believed that a useful starting point would be the articulation of service levels for UIS services and confirmed that he would speak about the matter with Dr Bellamy.

Action point 6.3 – CE

Dr Ferrar also stated that work on the end user computing strategy and identity & authentication areas would feed into the definition of a set of core principles – a set of expectations that were the very minimum for a user's experience at Cambridge. There should be tangible progress in October 2016. Prof Blackwell also recommended that further guidance on user experience design should be provided, so that there was an aspiration for excellence in the design of new systems.

7. Progress report on survey activity (UNC-20)

Mr Norman outlined the context of work being considered. There were insufficient staff available to meet individual users to conduct face-to-face interviews, so an online survey had been considered. Responses from an initial sample of users indicated a promising response rate, though when the process was expanded to a wider group (who had not been notified in advance) the response rate dropped significantly. The responses provided gleaned some interesting data, which was included in the report.

A survey of the satisfaction of UAS with their IT provision was due to take place shortly
Mr Norman would review whether it was possible to add a "pain point" question to the existing survey.

Action point 6.2 – JN

The University of Oxford had expressed interest in adopting or adapting an IT survey run by Yale, and similarly this was being considered as a candidate for Cambridge. The survey would be reviewed to determine whether appropriate user needs questions could be added. The timing of the survey would also need to be considered.

8. Any other business

Future meetings

The Committee had been scheduled to meet twice each term but it was observed that one meeting per term had often been cancelled due to the lack of business. It was felt useful to retain the current frequency of meetings in the diary. Where possible an indication of which of the two meetings was likely to be cancelled would be helpful.

Dates of future meetings

The Secretary would circulate options for dates to meet in the 2016/17 academic year.

Unconfirmed

Forward look

- Michaelmas Term 2016
    - Report from CE on the improvements to reports from the finance system derived through improved engagement with users.
    - Project board constitution and ensuring user needs are addressed in project activities.
    - Report from UIS (Dr Ferrar) on findings from IS Strategy development work, guiding "minimum standards of IT".

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	Ongoing
2.4	Draft PD33 for the user experience specialist to be provided to the Committee prior to being raised and advertised	JN	Ongoing
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	Ongoing
4.2	Identify an appropriate individual to serve on the Committee under Class ii following Prof Leslie's term	RP, GV	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	Ongoing
4.4	Table a paper with proposals on an initial user survey	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 Registrary	RP	Ongoing
5.1	Ask ISC to consider nominations of Prof Prager and Ms Rampton under Class ii	IC	Closed
5.2	Provide the list of services on which the feedback question can be inserted	JN	Ongoing
5.3	Share planned user survey work with the JSCS to identify any lessons learned or commonality	JN	Complete
New actions from 8 February 2016 meeting			
6.1	Discuss Committee membership, the potential for a further ISC Member to participate, and comments received from School Secretaries	RP & ER	
6.2	Consider representation on the Committee and a programme of major IT service providers across the Collegiate University to join discussions	RP & IC	

Unconfirmed

Ref.	Action	Who	Status
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	
6.4	Review whether a "pain point" question can be added to the UAS IT satisfaction survey	JN	