



Change & Digital Portfolio Review Committee

17th July 2023, 1500-1800

Minutes

Present Members:

Aimie Chapple (Chair); Andy Smith; Sarah Lawson; Kate Pearce; Ric Passey; Alan Harper; Sophie Harrison; Fiona Strawbridge; Lloyd Naylor; Donna Swann; David Cooper; Iain Fowler; Kathryn Woods; James Hetherington; Claire Glen; Iain Dancy; Donna Dalrymple; Katja Lamping; Alexandra Potts; Margaret Spink, Thomas Turner, Megan Gerrie, Marie Gallagher, Tom Crummey, Paul Clark, Ivan Parkin

Apologies:

Mark Emberton, Ian Galloway, Matthew Swales, Beth Beasant, Ayman Benmati

In attendance:

Kathleen Armour, Rosie Ingham; Marc Biebuyck; Daniel Farrell, Leigh Kilpert

Officer(s):

David Samuel (acting secretary)

Part I: Preliminary Business

1. Minutes (7-01 & 7-02)

- 1.1. The Change and Digital Portfolio Review Committee approved the minutes of the meetings held on 20th April 2023 & 15th June 2023 (extraordinary)

2. Matters Arising

- 2.1. There were no matters arising from the minutes

Part II: Strategic Items for Discussion

3. Financial Summary & 23/24 Allocation

- 3.1. Sophie Harrison presented a summary of the 23/24 Financial Position

- 3.2. Regarding the 23/24 allocations Aimie Chapple highlighted the fact that the demand for money is greater than the supply. Therefore, we should scrutinise the requests to determine whether to accelerate timelines or deliver over a longer period of time, dependant on what the benefits are
- 3.3. Andy Smith pointed out that new work creates operational cost pressures and that we need to work together to better understand the operational impact of new things and retiring old services
- 3.4. Margaret Spink asked how the committee should deal with the scenario whereby the benefit/saving will be in a different department to the work
- 3.5. Kate Pearce explained that for those scenarios oversight and buy-in from UCL's other committees is vital
- 3.6. Margaret Spink then asked what the timescales were for reviewing the current priorities for each Change Portfolio.
- 3.7. Aimie Chapple explained that there is currently no timeline. However, we need to ask each Portfolio Lead to review the work in their respective portfolios and report back on if we have achieved our outcomes. Aimie also stated that she will work with portfolios to put a schedule in place
- 3.8. Ivan Parkin raised the issue that decision making needs representation from academics and students
- 3.9. **ACTION:** Aimie Chapple volunteered to put a proposal together regarding engagement – **Aimie Chapple**
- 3.10. Kathy Armour warned against involving too many people in the decision making at the risk of inertia setting in

4. Kathryn Woods presented the Education Change Portfolio's LBCs (Curriculum Management & Learner Engagement)

- 4.1. Kathleen Armour and Daniel Farrell articulated the benefits of Curriculum Management as risk reduction, cost avoidance, improved data and information for strategic decision making, and the mitigation of the risk of reputational damage
- 4.2. Aimie Chapple said it would be good to see a hypothesis of what the benefit measure will be
- 4.3. Katie Pearce said she would like to understand more about where the savings are coming from
- 4.4. Aimie Chapple said once we better understand the benefits this group can establish if we can or should go faster
- 4.5. Tom Crummey would like clarity on the ongoing costs
- 4.6. Kathryn Woods acknowledged that they will need to be established
- 4.7. For Learner Engagement there was a request to approved the first tranche of £183K

5. Claire Glen presented the Research Innovation & Operation LBCs (Contracting Transformation & Cost Recovery)

- 5.1. Tom Turner requested the portfolio should speak to Fiancne about how to track the financial improvements

6. BREAK

7. Margaret Spink gave a verbal update on Functions

- 7.1. Margaret explained that this work will allow for clearer career paths, better accessibility , streamlining, more transparent ways of working and repeatability
- 7.2. A key activity will be to establish the design principles
- 7.3. The hope is that the outcome will be a credible, affordable, optimised user experience
- 7.4. Aimie Chapple expressed concern that the portfolio needs to hold money back for this initiative
- 7.5. Kathryn Woods asked why we had to do this now. Aimie Chapple explained that the university needs to save money to make the pay awards it wants to deliver

8. Alan Harper presented the EASE Lean Business Case on behalf of the Faculty IT Change Portfolio

- 8.1. The Chair was supportive of this initiative but advised that we may want to disrupt the path of this work in the future if higher priority work is defined

9. Marc Biebuyck presented the Service Management Lean Business Case

- 9.1. Margaret Spink identified this initiative as an enabler for the Functions work. Allowing direct access to “get stuff done” and part of the drive to have a standardised toolkit
- 9.2. Mark Biebuyck explained that three vendors met the universities requirements but that they are still being reviewed in order to make a value based recommendation
- 9.3. The portfolio is asking for £200K to complete the procurement to recommendation stage and completion of the business case
- 9.4. Aimie Chapple said it makes sense to go forward. However she would like to better understand the key milestones and benefits. With the clear benefits and measures recorded and hypotheses for those that are less clear
- 9.5. Aimie would also like to know if the market leading supplier would be willing to underwrite some of the saving projections they have identified
- 9.6. Andy Smith pointed out that this business case will need to go to the FPPC and UMC due to its size

10. David Cooper and Tom Crummey presented the Network Paper and Modernising and Securing Our Core Network and Transform Campus Network LBCs

- 10.1. **ACTION:** The business case will be resubmitted to the CDPRC in October following the completion of RFP – **David Cooper & Tom Crummey**
- 10.2. James Hetherington voiced strong support for network modernisation. Pointing out that it will aid research within the institution
- 10.3. Tom Crummey pointed out that we need to move quickly and increase investment otherwise we will never finish. Tom also pointed out that there is no solution that will allow us to leave the network alone for a long period of time e.g. 20 years. However, we can update our design principles as part of this work
- 10.4. Aimie Chapple asked how much disruption this work would cause. David Cooper explained that the practical outage would be designed to cause minimal disruption. In terms of disruption to the end users, the change would require end users to learn what they can do now from/with the network
- 10.5. Kate Pearce would like to know how much we are committing to by starting this work. Not just the delivery cost but the impact on operational spend, to run the network and to decommission the old
- 10.6. Aimie requested that when the Network team come back to CDPRC they need to be able to tell the committee how the work can be paced. Also to work with Finance to establish the best spend profile.
- 10.7. The chair also requested network as a service to be considered as an option as part of the RFP
- 10.8. The paper was endorsed by the group

11. Chair Aimie Chapple led a final financial review

- 11.1. **ACTION** – All Portfolios to review ongoing work. Is there anything we should scale differently? – **Portfolio Leads**
- 11.2. **ACTION** – Based on last years percentage budget allocations, if your change portfolio had to operate with that envelope again in 23/24 what would that look like? Can anything be stopped or re-prioritised – **Portfolio Leads**

David Samuel
July 2023