# Information Services Governance Committee

## Wednesday 18th June 2014

## M I N U T E S

**Present:**
Professor Michael Arthur (Chair)
Professor Anthony Smith
Professor David Price
Mr Rex Knight
Professor Dame Hazel Genn
Professor Jonathan Wolff
Professor David Lomas
Professor Graham Hart
Professor Alan Thompson
Professor Richard Catlow
Professor Alan Penn
Professor Mary Collins
Professor Sir John Tooke
Professor Anthony Finkelstein
Mr Philip Harding
Dr. Michael Cope
Mr Gavin McLachlan (GM)
Ms. Bridget Kenyon (present for items on Information Security) (BK)
Dr. Fiona Strawbridge (present for item on e-learning) (FS)

**Apologies:**
Dame Nicola Brewer
Professor Steve Caddick
Professor Mary Fulbrook


**1      14/06/01 Minutes of the previous meeting**

*Discussion:*

1.1     The IT governance structures were discussed.  It was noted that the governance structures are working well especially the domain governance groups which are led by senior members of the UCL community (Professor David Price for Research IT, Professor Anthony Smith for Learning & Teaching, Rex Knight for Administrative IT and Web IT).  The recent addition of a meeting between the domain group leads before the ISGC meeting was welcomed.  The need to issue the minutes of the meetings in a timely manner was highlighted and it was recognised this needed to improve.

*Approved:*

1.1     The minutes of the meeting held on the 20th November 2013 (paper **14/06/01)** were approved

**2      14/06/02 Proposed FY 14/15 IT project portfolio**

*Noted:*

2.1    The papers detailing the proposed FY 14/15 IT project portfolio (paper **14/06/02)** were noted.

*Discussion:*

2.2    Concern was expressed about past under-investment in infrastructure, including IT, which has left UCL with a 'structural deficit' although it was noted UCL is not unique and many other universities suffer a similar problem.  Improving the student experience, the provision of accurate data and staying ahead in research were thought to be high priorities.

2.3    The project costings in the portfolio list currently show the external cost of a project but do not show the internal costs including the cost of employed staff working on a project.  For future portfolio reviews, the committee asked for total cost including internal costs to be shown as well as just external costs.

2.4    The importance of the Research Information Management project was highlighted by several members of the committee although it was noted the most urgent element is the replacement of the current grant costing tool (Pfact).  It was noted that other universities had taken in excess of 6 years to implement similar research information management systems.

2.5    The committee asked for the name of the first phase of the RIM project to be renamed to reflect the focus on replacing Pfact.

2.6    The use of an over-booking (allocating more budget to projects than actual budget available within the portfolio) was welcomed and has resulted in project portfolio spend being closer to budget recently.

2.7    The great improvement in Research IT Services over recent years was highlighted and the team thanked for their excellent work.

2.8    The recent trend toward capital only research grants, including those for IT intensive research, was highlighted as a risk.  The lack of any on-going recurrent support may inhibit the full exploitation of these valuable IT facilities for future research.

2.9    The committee recognised the critical need to improve UCL web experience.

2.10   The urgency of the project to re-implement or replace the current HR and associated systems (in particular PAR) was highlighted.  The committee asked if this project could be accelerated.

2.11   The urgent need for improved management information was highlighted.  This is acknowledged and the new finance system (MyFinance) will greatly improve financial reporting.  The new HR system will also include a much improved reporting module and the new strategy for student information systems includes enhanced reporting.  However limited budget means there is limited scope to progress the work to integrate these into an overall 'data warehouse' this year.

2.12   The committee discussed how possible future strategic initiatives, such as new IT or data intensive institutes, could be fed into the overall IT planning process.  The nature of such initiatives often makes forward planning difficult but where possible ISD should be made aware of such initiatives so they can be incorporated into the planning process.

2.13   The importance of planning agility was highlighted especially when a consortia of universities and other research institutes is often needed for grant success.

2.14   The importance of e-learning and digital enablement was emphasised and the high profile of e-learning in the new UCL 2034 strategy was widely welcomed.

*Approved:*

2.15   The proposed FY 14/15 IT project portfolio was approved.

3.    **14/06/03 Update on the UCL datacentre strategy**

*Noted:*

3.1    The update on the UCL datacentre strategy (paper at **14/06/03**) was noted.

*Discussion:*

3.2    The committee commended the datacentre strategy.  Its importance to the continued delivery of effective IT services for research and teaching were highlighted.  Recent progress procuring a new shared off-site facility was welcomed.  This facility will be shared with King's, QMUL, LSE, Crick and Sanger.

3.3    It was noted the scale of UCL's datacentre requirements had helped the other partners, in particular the Crick, to achieve an outcome they could not have achieved on their own.

4.    **14/06/04 Update on Information Security**

*Noted:*

4.1    The Information Security Update (paper at **14/06/04 -** Highly Restricted) was noted.

*Discussions:*

4.2    Restricted

5.    **14/06/05 Proposed Information Security Strategy**

*Noted:*

5.1    The Proposed Information Security Strategy (paper at **14/06/05**) was noted.

*Discussions:*

5.2    BK provided a summary of the submitted paper

5.3    Members of the committee were keen to ensure UCL learns from past mistakes including those of others.  It was noted that UCL is well integrated into the information security community both within and without the HE sector and this provides a wealth of information about information security incidents and mitigation strategies elsewhere.

5.4    It was noted that information security plans also need to cover intellectual property (IP) as well as sensitive data (such as personally identifiable health records).

5.5    A roadshow to increase awareness of information security risks and responsibilities was proposed.

5.6    The need to take an asset centric approach to information security rather than an organisational perspective was highlighted.

*Approved:*

5.7    The proposed Information Security Strategy was approved.

6.    **14/06/06 Update on the use of current e-learning tools and next steps for e-learning technologies**

*Noted:*

6.1    The Update on the use of current e-learning tools and next steps for e-learning technologies (paper at **14/06/06**) was noted.

*Discussions:*

6.2    FS summarised the submitted paper.

6.3    The committee were keen to understand how Moodle, UCL's virtual learning environment (VLE), might be taken forward.

6.4    The need to integrate the e-learning plans with the UCL 2034 strategy and link to CPD plans was noted.

6.5    The value of sharing best practice around the institution was highlighted as a way to increase digital fluency amongst the academic community.

6.6    There was discussion about how the connected curriculum concept could be used to better integrate online and e-learning into pedagogy at UCL.

6.7    It was noted that 'flipped lectures' have proved useful in some areas although this is not universal.

6.8    The need for increased direct support 'on the ground' was highlighted to help teaching staff fully exploit the available technology.

6.9    The need for further investment in e-learning and related technologies was recognised.  Including investment in expert local support within faculties and departments as well as technology.

6.10   The need to improve the use of technology and digital channels to better engage students was noted.

**7.     14/06/07 AOB**

*Discussion:*

7.1    There were no AOB items

<div align="right">

MIKE COPE
Director of ISD
Information Services Division (ISD)
email: mike.cope@ucl.ac.uk
27th June 2014

</div>