

GOLDSMITHS
University of London
ACADEMIC BOARD/COUNCIL
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND SYSTEMS COMMITTEE
Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2011

Present: Mr Hugh Jones (in the Chair), Mr Richard Bolley, Dr Basem El-Haddadeh, Mr James Haywood, Dr Sarah Kember, Ms Mary Nixon, Dr Michael Young, Dr Juliet Sprake, Mr Michael Waller, Miss Rosemary Harrison (Secretary).

Apologies for absence: Dr Mark Bishop, Dr Virginia Brooke, Ms Vivienne Rose,

By invitation: Mr Spiros Andreou, Ms Rachael Johnson and Dr Mira Vogel for the business to which Minute 6 refers.

OPEN BUSINESS

1 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed Mr James Haywood and Dr Michael Young, who were attending their first meeting.

It was noted that Dr Virginia Brooke, who had sent apologies to the present meeting, had submitted some comments on the issues under discussion (11-259).

It was noted that the planned update reports on Pyramid and I-Grasp were not available, but that progress was being made, in particular on enquiries to establish whether a retention scheduling facility could be made available within Pyramid.

The Chair asked for the report to the next meeting to include an overview of other Pyramid developments in addition to the problem of Retention Schedule implementation.

2 MINUTES

Resolved:

that the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 March 2011 be approved.

3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

(i) Offsite Processing applications (*Item 11, 2 November 2011 Items 3 and 9, 1 March 2011*)

(a) Intend

It was noted that the Chair had approved this proposal on behalf of the Committee, following further enquiries concerning data security.

(b) Parabilis E-Marketing

It was noted that this had still not been approved because of delays by the provider in sending information concerning data security. The company was being periodically reminded by IT Services.

(c) Royal Bank of Scotland (cards)

It was noted that this had still not been approved because although data security checks are complete, the company had been slow to provide legal compliance information (with no information at all being provided from Autumn term to April) and had now provided information which raised important queries.

(d) Capita Unit E Fault Resolution and Development

This had still not been approved pending further information from Capita about the content of the database fields actually involved in the process, which prevented Goldsmiths from assessing contractual requirements.

(ii) Overview of systems under development in relation to Records Management Strategic Aims (*Minute 7, 1 March 2011 refers*)

It was noted that it had not been possible to complete this analysis in time for the present meeting; this would be taken forward in 2011-12 in a wider strategic context.

The Committee noted that in future discussions it would need to give greater emphasis to the importance of information architecture issues in planning to meet the needs of the College.

(iii) Storage and retrieval of information delivered through fair processing notices
(*Minute 10, 1 March 2011 refers*)

It was noted that there had been no further developments in respect of developing the capacity of the new student records system to hold, against each item of information, a record of the statement of processing purposes for

that personal data which had been communicated to the Data Subject (which defined for all normal business purposes the permitted uses of the data by the College). It was still envisaged that this would be addressed at a future stage of the project.

4 RETENTION SCHEDULE IMPLEMENTATION FOR STUDENT WORK ON TURNITIN

(Minute 4, 1 March 2011, refers)

Received:

a proposal for an amendment to the Interim Retention Schedule (11-212).

Noted:

that for technical reasons it was impossible to implement the College's standard policy, set out in the Interim Retention Schedule, for the retention of student work on Turnitin.

Resolved:

that the retention period applied to student work on *Turnitin* and *Grademark* be six years from the end of the academic year following the uploading of the work to the system.

5 CLOUDMAIL AND ASSOCIATED APPLICATIONS

(Minute 5, 1 March 2011, refers)

Received:

a report from the Head of Corporate Governance and Information Management on progress concerning outsourced email, together with revised draft protocols for the storage of information in the cloud, in anticipation of the possibility of cloud applications being made available before the next meeting (11-75R).

Noted:

- (i) that crucial requirements in terms of the College meeting its legal obligations remained to be met before a contract could be entered into, but that the fact that the College would from now on be negotiating in parallel with more than one provider increased the potential for obtaining a successful outcome, as well as for doing so in a way that minimised destructive delays and uncertainties;
- (ii) that, even when operated under a minimally acceptable contract, all technical options involving the holding of personal data in locations outside the

jurisdictions of the European Data Protection Directive (for example American service providers subject to the US PATRIOT Act) involved some risks in relation to Data Subject rights, which needed to be managed through institutional policies on the use which would be made of the service.

Resolved:

- (i) that the draft Policy attached at Appendix A to paper 11-75R, for the use of applications provided under an institutional cloud computing provider, be approved, subject to the successful conclusion of an institutional contract with an appropriate provider, it being noted that amendments might need to be made by Chair's action once the particular provider was known;
- (ii) that, in the event of such contract being signed, an amendment be made to the General Regulations with effect from 1 September 2011, to include this Policy in the list of cross-reference in the preamble to the IT Services General Regulation.

6 I-TUNES U AND RELATED FACILITIES

(Minute 5, 1 March 2011, refers)

Received:

a discussion paper from Dr Kember, in collaboration with Ms Johnson, Dr Sprake, Mr Spiros and Dr Vogel (11-213).

It was noted that the paper proposed the introduction of I-Tunes U for recording of staff lectures in audio form, primarily as a vehicle for showcasing the work of the College on the web. The staff involved would be volunteers, and where students asked questions they would be heard in the recording only when the question was repeated by the lecturer, thus reducing legal complexity in the operation in this initial phase.

It was envisaged that there would be both public access to recordings on the College website and internal dissemination *via* links from the VLE.

The Committee noted that experience of the provision of facilities of this kind in the USA had shown no evidence that there was reduction in attendance at lectures as a result; however repetition of the learning experience was particularly helpful for students enrolled on lecture courses not given in their mother tongue, and could be a convenient replacement for current lecture recording arrangements for anyone with a disability.

The Committee noted that additional staff resource would be required within Media Services to make the facility operational, with cost options varying according to the level of service required, and that the arrangements were being planned as part of consideration of expanded facilities in Media Services more broadly.

The Committee was of the view that it would be beneficial for their business to include more frequent consideration of learning and teaching issues, and noted that this was already provided for by the terms of reference of the Learning and Teaching Quality Committee, which referred explicitly to the role of Information Management and Systems Committee in matters of student learning.

Resolved:

that the proposal set out in paper 11-213 be approved in principle, and that the Senior Management Team be asked to consider allocation of the resource needed.

On a related issue, the Committee noted that, prior to the discussion at the last meeting concerning recording of teaching events, the Department of Design had become involved in a pilot which involved non-recorded teaching events with an institution to which distance learning was being delivered. It was noted that this would not require a change to the resolutions set out in Minute 6 of the last meeting. The person giving such a web-conferencing session would open it with an announcement that Goldsmiths would not be recording the session, and asking participants not to record individually.

The Committee noted the need to address a broader range of issues raised by web conferencing, which had also been identified in the previous meeting. The Head of CGIM reported that, following the process of investigation on which she had reported to the meeting last term (paper 11-76), she had identified a potential consultant who might be engaged to consider both the data protection and intellectual property issues raised by a broader range of web conferencing activities. This would enable an appropriate institutional information compliance framework to be built up, anticipating the range of situations where recording was identified as beneficial. (The College would thus be able to develop this area safely before the internal Department of CGIM reached the necessary permanent staffing level to progress issues raised by learning technologies adequately.)

The Committee noted that both audio recording and video recording engaged an almost identical range of legal issues, as both involved the recording of personal information.

7 INFORMATION RISK REGISTER

Received:

a discussion paper by the Head of Corporate Governance and Information Management (CGIM) on the possible future form of the College Information Risk Register (11-214).

The Head of CGIM reported that she had encountered major difficulties in differentiating between the severity of different risks, due to:

- the fact that differentiation between levels of risk occurred at a more granular level than could be represented in a summary table such as that in 11-214 (ie different instances of the risk in a particular entry could carry radically different levels of severity);
- a lack of comprehensive information, at this stage in the building of the Business Classification Scheme, about the dataprocessing which was actually occurring in each department.

She drew attention to the fact that absence of a detailed corporate overview of information held by an organisation and its processing constituted a major risk in itself, in that it prevented more direct and substantive risks from being managed effectively.

In discussion, members of the Committee suggested that the legislation involved in individual risks should be made more evident in the Information Risk Register. The Head of CGIM explained that in designing the current experimental order of risks in the register she had created category data in the spreadsheet based on this criterion which, although currently in hidden columns, could in future be made visible in distributed versions.

The Committee also asked for more information about the extent to which actual incidents of breach had been recurrent, while noting that judgements about this were severely limited in their accuracy due to a lack of information about the real level of compliance being achieved across all departments. It was noted that there was, similarly, a dearth of centrally-collated information about good practice which could, where it existed, be usefully disseminated to assist other practitioners.

This discussion led to consideration of a related issue, namely the communication mechanisms needed to effect changes in behaviour to mitigate the information risks identified in any future register.

The Head of CGIM pointed out that an appropriate level of direct interaction between her department and others across the College had been prevented by the long-term staffing problem of CGIM. This inhibited the gathering of information about current and future information use to inform policy development, and also prevented a sufficient level of customised advice from being available. (However, a start had been made on this experimentally by the issue to Heads of academic departments, on 14 December 2010, of a short checklist of actions to avoid risks commonly associated with their typical activities.¹) The staffing problem also meant that inadequate support was available to deal with *ad hoc* queries.

Members of the Committee suggested a system of communication in which one risk likely to affect a large number of departments was highlighted in an "Information risk of the Month" publicity campaign (or some similar innovation).

¹ Appendix B to the circular to Heads of Departments "Information Management for the Changing Environment" of 14 December 2010.

8 UPDATE ON IT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Received:

a progress report from the Director of Information Technology (11-215).

In presenting the paper, the Director of IT highlighted the following particularly important current developments:

- (i) Virtual Desktop and Active Directory, which would provide staff with much easier access to their work from off-campus locations, as well as reducing expenditure on software licensing (through greater reliance on the more cost-effective option of concurrent user licences) and on hardware replacement (through moving to a "thin client" environment);
- (ii) Migration of servers to a new data centre with better data security;
- (iii) Rollout of Voice-over IP beyond the New Academic Building, with pilots including the departments of Sociology and Education.

9 JISC SURVEY OF INFORMATION COMPLIANCE

Received:

a report on the JISC Survey of information legislation and management in the UK higher education sector during the calendar year 2010, primarily concerning Freedom of Information, together with a summary of Goldsmiths' Freedom of Information request trends (11-216).

10 MINUTES OF THE IT USER GROUP

Received:

the minutes of the meeting of the IT User Group held on 3 May 2011 (11-247).

11 FORTHCOMING MEETINGS

Noted:

that meetings of the Committee in 2011-12 would be held on:
11 October 2011 at 2.00pm
7 March 2012 at 2.00pm
23 May 2012 at 10.00am

RMH, May 2011