HEIDS
Higher Education Information Directors in Scotland

Minutes of HEIDS Meeting
Held on Wednesday 3 September 2003
University of Edinburgh
[Corrected]

Present:

Chair		
Paul Dean	Napier University (NU)	PD
Secretary		
Gordon Hunt	RSAMD	GH
Malcolm Bain	University of St Andrews (UoStA)	MB
Stuart Brough	University of Strathclyde (UoSe)	SB
Jim Buchan	UKERNA	JB
Morag Carnall	Queen Margaret University College (QMUC)	MC
Brian Gilmore	University of Edinburgh (UoE)	BG
Fraser Greig	University of Abertay (UoAy)	FG
Bill Harvey	SHEFC	BH
Peter Kemp	University of Stirling (UoSg)	PK
Louis Lee	University of St Andrews (UoStA)	LL
Linda McCormick	University of Glasgow (UoG)	LM
Andrew McCreath	Robert Gordon University (RGU)	AM
Tom Mortimer	Glasgow School of Art (GSA)	TM
Richard Murphy	University of Dundee (UoD)	RM
Brian Robertson	University of Aberdeen (UoAn)	BR
Tony Shaw	University of Paisley (UoP)	TS
In Attendance		
Sarah Price	JISC RSC Scotland North & East	SP
Charles Sweeney	JISC RSC Scotland South & West	CS

1. Apologies

David Beards	SHEFC	DB
Louise Garden	Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU)	LG
Alun Hughes	UHI Millennium Institute (UHI)	AH
Tony Osborne	University of Stirling (UoSg)	TO
Graham Pryor	University of Aberdeen (UoAn)	GP
David Rundell	Heriot Watt University (HWU)	DR

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes were accepted as a true record.

3. **Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda**

There were no matters arising.

4. **RSCs**

Charles Sweeney and Sarah Price gave a presentation on the role of the RSCs in Scotland and their new role in supporting HE.

The RSCs will provide support to HE Colleges. In Scotland there are seven institutions that loosely fit this description: RSAMD, GSA, ECA, Bell, QMUC, UHI and SAC. These institutions will receive all RSC services. Other HEIs may be able to receive some services if time and resources allow. Training courses in particular may be available to all HEI staff.

The additional funding required for the RSCs to undertake HE support is coming from JISC and does not involve an additional top-slice of HE funding. It was noted that future development of RSC support for HE depends on the success of these intial developments. BH noted that it might be feasible to ask the RSCs to undertake strategic work on behalf of the sector as they have done for FE in areas such as VLE and ICT strategy.

PD thanked Charles and Sarah for their presentation.

5. **Forensic Investigation Services**

TS reported that discussions had been held with JISC Legal Information Services (JLIS) who were keen to participate in developing procedures for dealing with inappropriate use. TS had developed a procedural document and had circulated it to a small consulting group of RM, PD, AM, TM and GH. JLIS were preparing guidance notes, which together with the procedural document would be put to their legal advisers. The document proposes a four stage process of recording the request for investigation; securing the equipment; internal investigation to determine the need to call in outside assistance and then a formal investigation.

There was some discussion on what status the final version of the procedural document would have. It was agreed that it would be necessary to gain high-level institutional support via the Universities Scotland (US) Secretaries' Group. BH suggested that SFC could take a lead in gaining sectoral approval for the procedure and offered the assistance of SFC's lawyers in reviewing the procedure. It was agreed that BH should be asked to involve the SFC in the promotion of the procedure to the sector as the first in a series of legal issues that require an agreed sectoral approach.

It was noted that the procedure does not cover server-based data and that this will need to be considered.

It was agreed that the next HEIDS meeting would consider the complete document (including the item from JLIS) taking into account advice received from JLIS legal advisors. The procedure will then be recommended to University Secretaries with the advice that the SFC audit branch is willing to be involved in the adoption of the procedure as sectoral policy.

Action: TS

6. MAN Issues

a. Resilience Working Group

LM tabled a paper on risk analysis from the Working Group. JB had produced a paper on resilience for the SPARK project. UoG and UoE are using SRIF money for resilience work the benefits of which are likely to be available to their respective MANs. AM reported that an AbMAN/FATMAN scenario had been worked out at a recent workshop. It was noted that there would be recurrent costs for resilience and that institutions would need to opt-in. LM reported an agreement in principle from Bob Day that any work done on resilience could be incorporated into SuperJANET5. It was agreed that it was up to institutions to feed the need for resilience into discussions on SJ5 requirements. Given the activity that was taking place it was agreed that the work of the Resilience Working Group had been overtaken by events.

b. SuperJANET5

It was agreed that HEIDS should make a group response to the SJ5 requirements analysis by the end of October. Ideally the HEIDS response should be available in time to feed into institutional responses. Institutional responses should explicitly support the HEIDS response if possible. PD agreed to draft a response and circulate it for comment and discussion, taking into account the unique situation and requirements of Scotland.

Action: PD

7. Reports from other groups

a. SHEFC

BH reported that the final report of the Joint SFEFC/SHEFC E-Learning Group was now available. There had been no substantive changes to the text of the draft. The report was now endorsed as official SHEFC policy. The key message was that while institutions would need to decide their own position there was definite scope for collaboration. Activities stemming from the report would develop over the next twelve months.

b. Universities Scotland

PK reported that the FoI Group continues to make progress. The model publication scheme would appear in the near future. The Group was also looking at training across the whole institution since every request for information made in a 'fixed' form is an FoI request unless it falls under data protection. An institutional records managers' group has been created.

c. JISC

BH reported that the consequences of expansion of RSC support to post-16 education in England were unclear as yet. Interviews for the new Chair of JISC were scheduled for early November. BG reported JISC's concerns at the rising costs of its own programmes as overall funding is unlikely to increase. Costs would need to be contained and extra sources of funding found. SJ5 funding had been agreed by HEFCE but no discussions had yet taken place in Scotland.

d. JNUG

BG reported that JNUG had last met on 5 June. After the demise of SNIJUG, JNUG would be willing for HEIDS to be its official representative in Scotland. PD agreed to liaise with the RSCs to ensure that such representation was workable and then write to JNUG offering HEIDS as Scottish representative. It was noted that JNUG was changing the way it operates.

Action: PD

e. UCISA

LM confirmed that regional groups were not a part of the UCISA groups discussions. LM invited comments on the changes to the UCISA groups structure.

f. UKERNA

JB reported that the UKERNA Scottish representative had not yet been appointed. The SPARK project was progressing well with 22 sites added to the JANET network and the remaining 37 to be added in the next fortnight. 9 of the sites were already routing traffic across JANET.

8. **Reports from meetings attended**

a. Regional Broadband Consortia Meeting

MB reported that the DTI was setting up regional organisations in England to mirror the consortia and appointing chief executives from the commercial world.

b. Launch of Joint SFEFC/SHEFC E-Learning Report

TM reported that the emphasis on educational technology among senior staff could change the way we think about IT in the future. It was noted that HEIDS had not specifically looked at learning technology and that a sub-group mught be appropriate. PD agreed to bring a proposal to the next meeting.

Action: PD

9. **Discussion on options for multi-service help desks or one-stop-shops**

This discussion was held over until the next meeting. PK agreed to give a presentation on developments at Stirling at the next meeting to focus discussion.

Action: PK

10. AGM

a. Chair's Report

PD reported on a good year for HEIDS, with improved attendance at meetings and some new faces. Discussion had moved away from mainly MAN-oriented issues and guests from SCURL, FE and the RSCs had all attended meetings. The useful tradition of asking the host institution to give a presentation had been started. Commercial presentations held after HEIDS meetings had been poorly attended and would not be encouraged but host institutions were still free to arrange these if they wished.

b. Officers and Constitution

PD and GH were re-elected unopposed as Chair and Secretary and the constitution was re-approved.

11. Any Other Competent Business

There was a brief discussion on how institutions were coping with virus attacks and it was agreed that information on what action institutions were taking would be shared confidentially on the mailing list.

Action: All

12. Edinburgh Presentation

BG gave a presentation on current issues at Edinburgh, covering wireless networking, e-Science and e-Learning, and authentication issues. It was agreed that the presentation would be mounted on the HEIDS website.

Action: BG/RM

13. Dates of future meetings

26 November 2003   Robert Gordon University

25 February 2004   University of St. Andrew's

2 June 2004   University of Paisley