

University of Glasgow

Student Lifecycle Project Board

Minute of the meeting held on Monday 5 December 2011 at 1500 hours in the College Conference Room, Wolfson Medical School Building

Attendees: John Chapman, Carol Clugston, Frank Coton, Robert Fraser, Tom Guthrie, James Harrison, Neal Juster, Christine Lowther, Sandy Macdonald, David Newall (Convener), Dorothy Welch

In attendance: Michael Arthur, Barbara Mueller, Lee McClure, Janice McLellan, James Brown and Robin Gordon (attended part of meeting)

1 Welcome

David Newall welcomed James Harrison, Vice-President of the SRC, to the meeting.

2 Minutes of meeting held on 3 November 2011

The notes of the last meeting were approved as an accurate record.

3 Matters arising

The Board noted paper SLP11/ 13 detailing progress against actions from the last meeting.

- A policy paper on fees (SLP11/14) had been prepared by Neal Juster, Christine Lowther and Fiona Docherty with proposals to address the difficulties encountered in the summer in relation to tuition fees. The report, which was subject to minor change, set out details of how fees would be set, how discounts would be applied and the approval process to be followed should there be any change to the fee structure for a degree programme. The paper would be presented to SMG on 15 December.

Action: NJ/CRL

- Janice McLellan confirmed that the variable stipend amounts highlighted by the College of Science and Engineering had been investigated and the Colleges had been made aware of how the rounding works within MyCampus. The College would communicate the outcome to the students involved and an explanation would be added to the Frequently Asked Questions.

Action: JM

- Tom Guthrie provided feedback on managing student attendance. In particular, it was not clear how an Adviser of Studies or Course Co-ordinator could check individual students to see if they were attending. Barbara Mueller confirmed that an options paper for absence monitoring had been prepared and sent to the HoASAs for comment and preference. Course co-ordinators, administrators and advisers would be notified of absences. The requirement for an interface between MyCampus and the Adviser Early Warning System was not currently in scope but this would be a future development. Monitoring of IT usage was highlighted as being a helpful indication of attendance.

All other matters arising had either been addressed or would be dealt with later in the meeting under separate agenda items.

4 Immediate issues

The Board reviewed the action being taken to address immediate priorities in MyCampus:

- *Exam Mark Recording UAT/Exam Results*

An update on User Acceptance Testing (UAT) for Exam Mark recording was provided. A demo was held in November which was attended by 75 staff. The UAT was very positive and in the period up to Christmas, a series of workshops were being held for staff that would be loading exam marks onto MyCampus. This incorporated both loading results directly to MyCampus and also by spreadsheet upload. A brief report on this was requested for the SMG on 15 December, together with a record of all staff who had participated to date in the workshop sessions.

Action: CRL

James Harrison also asked that the SRC be given sight of the process.

Action: BM

Sandy Macdonald reported that it had been a struggle at times to validate that the right people were attending the workshops and David Newall agreed that the report/record of participants should also be sent HoASAs and HoSAs for their information.

- *Direct Debit*

Advance Notification to students had been circulated with the first payment date of 16 December. Collection of payments would be over a six month period. Those students who had opted not to pay by Direct Debit would be contacted and encouraged to pay by 9th January to avoid any late charges. Cases of failed direct debits and bank charges incurred would be looked at on an individual basis - there had only been a handful of these cases to date.

- *SFC Reporting*

Michael Arthur reported that extensive testing had been done and coding/calculations were working. SLP were working closely with Planning Services to resolve issues relating to data mapping. The SFC return deadline was 16 December.

- *Ad hoc reporting/Bi-Query*

As an interim measure ad hoc reporting would be done in Bi-Query. This would be launched shortly for testing.

- *Incomplete Registration*

Christine Lowther reported that the team had been looking at incomplete registrations as Planning Services would need to make a call on this information being included in the SFC return. A significant number of students in MVLS (i.e. students with bursaries) had still to complete registration. The mass rollback had not yet been completed and this would be taken forward after the start of Semester 2. There were still a number of students who have yet to complete the process and Christine Lowther would arrange for Schools to be advised so that they can chase/encourage people to complete registration.

Action: CRL

5 Project Plan

- *Direct admissions*

David Newall welcomed James Brown and Robin Gordon to the meeting for discussion of paper SLP11/15. It had been intended that Direct Admissions would be available in October 2011 however this had not proven possible. A number of additional requirements, particularly relating to the administration of Postgraduate Research admissions had been identified which would require additional configuration. To allow for this and thorough UAT has meant that the module would not be available until mid to late January 2012 at the earliest. While there would be benefits in switching to MyCampus Direct Admissions mid-cycle there would also be significant challenges in moving data from the Legacy system to MyCampus. James Brown set out four options for the Board to consider. The Board agreed that the University should retain the current system for the remainder of the session and to implement Direct Admissions in July 2012

(Option 4). In the second semester of this year, a pilot of the MyCampus Direct Admissions system, focusing on Erasmus/Study Abroad and Part-time UG students would be run (Option 2).

In response to a query raised by Tom Guthrie, James Brown confirmed that the paper based system for visiting students would also be replaced by Direct Admissions.

- *Gradebook*

Michael Arthur reported that Oracle was developing functionality for Marks and Exams and following a recent demonstration the Project Team believed that this new functionality rather than Gradebook better suited the University's requirements, as it was a UK based model. If the University were not to commit to Gradebook this would save on duplication of effort, would ensure a better functional fit longer term and free up development resource over the next year. The Board agreed that it was not sensible to implement Gradebook at this time and that the University should wait instead for the new functionality, within Marks and Exams, to be delivered. It was noted that students would still be able to get their final grade marks for courses through MyCampus.

- *Bundles*

It was noted that the installation of Bundles 20 to 23 was underway with a view to having these fully loaded by Christmas. Testing would take place in early January before Bundle 24 was released for installation. By the end of January, the team would be current with all bundles and fixes released by Oracle. There would be no change to what staff would see on MyCampus, but Barbara Mueller stated that there was a risk that any bundle/fix could break something that worked previously, as such monitoring and testing throughout the upgrade was extremely important.

6 Lessons Learned

The Board noted Paper SLP 11/16 which set out the summary of key issues. David Newall thanked Frank Coton and the group for the work done in compressed timescales. Frank Coton reported that a broad range of input from staff and students had been sought during the process and 8 themes had been identified, within which several areas for improvement were listed:

1. User Interface;
2. Student Finances;
3. Enrolment;
4. Access to Information;
5. System Performance;
6. Data Management;
7. Communication;
8. Training & Support

The group had already met with members of the Project Team to discuss what actions could be taken within each theme listed. There were practical steps that could be taken in the coming year that would have a positive impact before next summer. There were also some actions that would be taken forward but would require a longer timescale to complete.

The Lessons Learned Group had set out some overarching issues requiring to be addressed and these would also be discussed at SMG. Included among them was the need to establish clear communication lines and accountabilities throughout the University for ensuring that agreed procedural and system changes are implemented.

Staff and students had been asked to express their priority on the themes in a document that was available via SharePoint (MyGlasgow). So far there was very little variation across the themes and most saw all of them as a priority. Staff veered more towards training/communications/data management as a priority whereas students thought the user interface and enrolment was of higher priority.

Financial issues remained and there was clearly a need to address the unusual fee situations at the University or risk alienating students. Consideration should be given to the enrolment timeline used by Queen's University Belfast where they allow students to enrol for classes before financial registration.

It was highlighted that some of the enrolment issues had been caused by students being able to go into the Course Catalog to choose courses rather than being taken through 'My Requirements'.

Paper SLP11/16 would be made available to the meeting of Senate on 8 December.

Action: FC

The Lessons Learned Group would have a further two meetings before the end of the year to tie up the final report.

The Board was asked for comments. Christine Lowther confirmed that it had been a really useful process and reiterated the importance of addressing the overarching issues to ensure that any changes are correctly implemented. Sandy Macdonald commented that it was a well balanced report and a very valuable exercise. Planning was underway to determine short, medium and longer term deliverables and it would be vital that in parallel the appropriate accountabilities are established within the business community.

Frank Coton agreed that the overarching messages would be reinforced at SMG, as the way forward stands or falls on what we, as an organisation, do. The responsibility was everyone's not just the SLP team.

Neal Juster asked that the need for the whole community to be involved in the way forward be emphasised. Frank Coton confirmed that when this is presented to Senate that the emphasis will be on the way forward and for this to be successful the community must get behind the project. Tom Guthrie commented that for this to happen there needs to be reassurance that the system is fit for purpose.

Engagement of the community also needs to be properly resourced to ensure that this would not be seen as an 'add on' and Colleges/Schools/University Services could arrange the appropriate backfill in a timely manner.

The 8 themes were discussed in more detail. The Project Team was asked to prepare a report on the actions proposed for the next meeting of SMG on 15 December.

Action: CRL/SM

Resource needs would be discussed at the January Board meeting.

Action: CRL/SM

7 Risks

Paper SLP11/17 was noted.

8 Budget

Paper SLP11/18 was noted.

9 Next Meeting Date

The Board would next meet on 13 January 2012 at 1400 hours in the Henry Heaney Room, Library.