



## Information Services Governance Committee

Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> June 2014

### MINUTES

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 20<sup>th</sup> 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 D μ V W U X F W X U D O G H I L F L W ¶ D O W K R X J K L W Z D V 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

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 s K D U H G Z L W K . L Q J ¶ V 4 0 8 / / 6 ( & U L F N D Q G 6 D Q J H U

3.3 , W Z D V Q R W H G W K Data Centre Requirements / 14 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 K R Z 0 R R G O Virtual Learning Environment (VLE), Tm reformacent secuBT 1 r7.78 Tm [( ) TJ ET EMC /P [(en)3 TJ 3.61 Tm [(

6.7 Although the SURY not universal.

6.8 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

MIKE COPE  
Director of ISD  
Information Services Division (ISD)  
email: [mike.cope@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:mike.cope@ucl.ac.uk)  
27<sup>th</sup> June 2014