

HEIDS

Higher Education Information Directors in Scotland

**Minutes of HEIDS Meeting
Held on Wednesday 6 June 2003
Airthrey Castle, University of Stirling**

Present:

Chair		
Paul Dean	Napier University (NU)	PD
Secretary		
Gordon Hunt	RSAMD	GH
Malcolm Bain	University of St Andrews (UoStA)	MB
David Beards	SHEFC	DB
Stuart Brough	University of Strathclyde (UoSe)	SB
Morag Carnall	Queen Margaret University College (QMUC)	MC
Robert Douglas	UHI Millennium Institute (UHI)	RD
Fraser Greig	University of Abertay (UoAy)	FG
Peter Kemp	University of Stirling (UoSg)	PK
Louis Lee	University of St Andrews (UoStA)	LL
Andrew McCreath	Robert Gordon University (RGU)	AM
Tom Mortimer	Glasgow School of Art (GSoA)	TM
Raymonde Murphy	Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU)	RA
Richard Murphy	University of Dundee (UoD)	RM
Tony Osborne	University of Stirling (UoSg)	TO
Brian Robertson	University of Aberdeen (UoAn)	BR
David Rundell	Heriot Watt University (HWU)	DR
Tony Shaw	University of Paisley (UoP)	TS
In Attendance		
Michael Turpie	Perth College	MT

1. Apologies

Jim Buchan	UKERNA	JB
Louise Garden	Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU)	LG
Brian Gilmore	University of Edinburgh (UoE)	BG
Bill Harvey	SHEFC	BH
Alun Hughes	UHI Millennium Institute (UHI)	AH
Linda McCormick	University of Glasgow (UoG)	LM
Graham Pryor	University of Aberdeen (UoAn)	GP

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes were accepted as a true record.

3. Matters arising not elsewhere on the agenda

Section 3 TM will check which letter to DB he was going to circulate.

Action: TM

Section 3 PD to ask DB to circulate the KETF report.

Action: PD/DB

Section 3 Forensic Investigation Services

TS reported that he had recently made use of a forensic investigation service, Vogon (www.vogon-international.com). The process is in two stages; an initial scan of the disk/s followed if necessary by a report and the supply of sealed images of the disk/s. The Police had confirmed the IT staff position that they should not access the disks themselves and it was noted that such an approach may put IT staff at odds with institutional managements. TS indicated that the Police would be willing to make a presentation to HEIDS on their approach to these investigations. TM reported that he had made use of IOMART's NetIntelligence (www.iomart.com) and reiterated that Police advice was that IT staff should on no account access the disks themselves since if evidence is damaged they could be accused of tampering.

It was agreed that there was scope for collaboration in this area and that HEIDS was an appropriate forum. TS agreed to contact the JISC Legal Information Service to ascertain what advice they are giving. TS also asked for volunteers to collaborate in developing model procedures which could be recommended to institutions. It was noted that the Secretaries' Group of Universities' Scotland should be involved as institutions may need to contribute funding for collaborative action. DB agreed to investigate the availability of SHEFC funding in the area of governance.

Action: TS/DB/All

4. MAN Reprourement/SMVCN

a. Status report from the Resilience Working Group

LM's paper was discussed. AM noted that it had also been discussed at SMCG. It was noted that Abman, Fatman and UHI were investigating taking action together with the possibility of SPARK money and that Glasgow and Edinburgh were going ahead with making their own arrangements using SRIF funding. Some concern was expressed that action was being not being taken collectively and it was agreed that LM should be asked for clarification of the current position.

It was agreed that HEIDS should continue to push for a collective solution and that each institution needs to take a view on the relative importance to them of resilience at the BARS and at the level of institutional links. RM noted that a risk assessment was still needed. SB commented that all institutions also needed to undertake their own risk analysis.

Action: PD/GH to contact LM for clarification

5. Provision of training

PD reported that collaborative staff training for IT was being organised in the Yorkshire area and asked if there was any interest in similar arrangements in Scotland. PK noted that there might be a route to training through the RSCs and DB mentioned SFEU and MLAC training courses. It was agreed that the most effective way forward would be for institutions to be prepared to share

their training courses with others when there were spaces and that the HEIDS list should be used to make offers of training places available.

6. Reports from other groups

a. SHEFC

DB reported that the FE ICT strategy was now focusing on e-procurement, online assessment and staff development, and a new programme of technology transfer was about to be launched to support colleges in adopting ICT innovations. The Council had recently held a meeting of all (HE and FE) Scottish JISC representatives. There was general agreement that JISC needs to be more ruthless in the data sets it licences and look more closely at FE use of data sets. DB also mentioned that planning was developing for SuperJANETV. Funding might be £50m over 5 years from 2005/06 and is likely to be less capital-intensive. The Office of the e-Envoy is looking at aggregating network procurement and this may have an effect on SuperJANETV. The final report of SHEFC's e-Learning Working Group has been drafted and is likely to recommend that all institutions should be developing e-learning but that it should be through incremental change driven by learning and teaching demands. It is not anticipated that top-sliced funding will be provided but collaborative development would be advisable to target new markets.

b. JISC

DB reported comments by Malcolm Read that Scotland provides 10% of the total JISC budget and should be more vocal in its demands. He had also commented that while HE issues were common across the UK, FE issues were more specific to the region. PK commented that HE issues were increasingly not common across the UK as differences in policy emerged between the Scottish Executive and Westminster, particularly in the areas of teaching v. research and fees. It was agreed that HEIDS members should be aware of the need to lobby JISC reps on Scottish issues.

c. Universities Scotland

PK reported on Freedom of Information (Fol) developments. The Executive has announced that the implementation date is 1 January 2005, meaning that publication schemes will have to be submitted by the end of May 2004. The US Fol group chaired by PK will undertake an intensive education phase from the start of the next academic session. Guidelines for records management and a generic publication scheme are in advanced stage of development and will be available by the end of the year. PK urged all institutions to accept the generic scheme. The Scottish Information Commissioner intends to be rigorous about the application of the public interest test and expects exemptions to be applied sparingly. Document management systems will be essential to manage records effectively. AM suggested that this might be another area for collaboration.

d. UKERNA

DB reported that the post of JANET officer in Scotland had not been filled and would be re-advertised. He asked members to encourage staff to apply for the post.

e. RSCs

PK reported that both RSCs have had their funding confirmed but that the North and East RSC is moving to Telford College. Extra funding (£32k for each RSC p.a.) has been allocated by JCALT for specific support of HE colleges and generic support for the other HEIs. PK suggested that BH might welcome input from HEIDS. The HEIs deal direct with JISC for their services and the imposition of an intermediary in the shape of the RSCs might not be welcome. PD agreed to write to BH as HEIDS Chair expressing concern at this development. PK noted that the smaller HEIs might welcome the extra support. PD suggested that institutions give their opinions via the HEIDS list. AM noted that there may be some advantages such as a co-ordinated approach to training.

7. Reports from meetings attended

a. UCISA Executive

PD reported that discussions on the future of the UCISA groups was progressing. The hardware group may move from being a group to being a service, creating space for the UCISA group structure to be modernised. In England Charles Clarke is taking a personal interest in DFES groups on e-learning.

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

This discussion was held over until the next meeting.

9. Any other competent business

RM asked if any institutions had a code of conduct for IT staff. RGU has one under development and HWU has one on their website.

RM also asked about network connection policies. These are in place or under development at UoAy, UoSg, NU and UoAn.

RM asked for any comments on hacking. AM reported that a penetration test had been carried out at RGU and BR noted that at UoAn individual departments have an absolute responsibility to keep their patches up to date.

PD asked about automatic save and shutdown procedures for fire alarm situations. No institution has such a system although UoAn can send out a shutdown command to all PCs in computer suites.

TM reported on Gael mind-mapping software which is now freely available via the Chest site, funded by TechDIS.

10. ICT in FE

MT gave a presentation on current developments in ICT in FE and the work of the Scottish FE ICT Managers' Network. MT invited the Chair of HEIDS to

attend FE ICT Managers' Network meetings and in return it was agreed to extend a similar invitation for the Chair of the FE network to attend HEIDS meetings.

11. Stirling University's Top Ten Issues

PK gave a presentation on the top ten issues for IT at Stirling. There was general agreement that these were key issues facing everyone. PK agreed to put the presentation on the HEIDS website.

12. Dates of future meetings

3 September 2003	University of Edinburgh
26 November 2003	Robert Gordon University
25 February 2004	University of St. Andrew's
2 June 2004	University of Paisley