Change & Digital Portfolio Review Committee – Extraordinary Meeting

Thursday 15ᵗʰ June 2023, 0900-1030

Minutes

Present Members:
Aimie Chapple (Chair); Andy Smith; Sarah Lawson; Kate Pearce; Alan Harper; Sophie Harrison; Fiona Strawbridge; Tom Crummey; Lloyd Naylor; Donna Swann; David Cooper; Iain Fowler; Kathryn Woods; Claire Glen; Ian Dancy; Matthew Swales; Beth Beasant; Katja Lamping; Ric Passey; James Hetherington

Apologies:
Paul Clark; Mark Emberton; Ivan Parkin; Ian Galloway; Sarah Cowls; Donna Dalrymple, Ayman Benmati, Clare Goudy

In attendance:
Christoph Lindner; Stuart McLellan; Margaret Spink; Bella Malins; Richard Stephen; Megan Gerrie

Officer(s):
David Samuel – Secretary (acting)

Part I: Strategic Items for Discussion

1.   Digital Strategy

1.1.   Ric Passey and Andy Smith presented the first draft of the Digital Strategy to the committee. The following points were made during the presentation:
   a.   The strategy aims to balance the short and long term aims of the ISD.
   b.   The vision anchors around user experience and a connect university.
   c.   Should be principled around partnership.
   d.   The intention is to make things standardised and provide reusable tools.

1.2.   The following points were raised in discussion:
   a.   Ian Dancy raised the concern that in the current format it is quite hard to understand.
   b.   To address ID's point Aimie Chapple suggested we outline the major maturity milestones in the strategy – the blueprint overtime with

milestones. In addition perhaps colour coding to outline ready vs pre-selections vs design vs build.

c. Stuart McLellan suggested that the strategy should talk about the experiences we are trying to improve.

d. Margaret Spink added that it should connect the idea of user experience and service to the technology.

e. Kate Pearce suggested that the group should consider how the strategy will help drive decisions and that it should illustrate the relative weight of the objectives and how much progress has been made.

f. Clare Glen thought the top section could be well understood and that it should highlight the direction of travel, adding however that the current draft feels a bit static.

g. Ian Dancy added that in the strategy document accessibility should feature more prominently. It should also emphasise how it will "make life easier" for users. It should also be explained how connected experience connects to campus experience. Finally the point was made that after delivering a strategy the institution will expect to see a masterplan for delivery.

h. Aimie Chapple said we should consider how to build trust with users by making life easier. We should also find the right community to tell the story together so that we explain the technology/function to people who are receiving it and explain why these things have worked in other sectors.

i. Margaret Spink made the point that the strategy will need to be backed up by regular communication to stakeholders outlining what's been done and how it is better.

j. Clare Glen would like to see it translated into language that academics can understand.

2. Admissions Transformation Programme

2.1. Andy Smith and Sophie Harrison provided a summary of the Admissions Transformation Programme progress to date and additional clarity and risk management following UMC feedback.

2.2. The following points were raised in the discussion:
a. Christoph Linder gave a strong endorsement for ATP from an academic's perspective.

b. Bella Malins made the case that year on year applications are increasing and the system can't keep up. Other Universities are offering quicker turnaround times than UCL.

c. James Hetherington asked what the efficiency gains are. Andy Smith said they are hard to calculate but reduced stress on the Admissions Team, reduced workload and reduction in risk. However it is currently hard to articulate cashable savings.

d. Aimie Chapple requested that the delivery team try to track savings in a tangible way. Aimie also stated that her hope is that this work can help

   UCL create insights the help us improve strategy regarding
   student numbers.

e. Christoph Linder requested a demo of the new system is possible.
f. Sophie Harrison made the point that there are protections for UCL with regard to withdrawal agreements for the first phase. However any future commercial agreements between UCL and the supplier are still to be confirmed.
g. Beth Beasant asked if work can be done to identify staff that will interface with the system and to get those people involved to give assurances to Deans.

APPROVED – The committee endorsed the LBC with the caveat of the comments above. It is approved to continue to spend to budget until YE. However, UMC will need to grant full approval.