



## CITSCAPES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Thursday, 7 February 2001, 11:30 am – 2:30 p.m.

University of Gloucestershire, Room PKTC 015 (Elwes Building – Teaching Centre)

#### 1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

- Welcome:** Les Watson welcomed all attending members.
- Present:** Les Watson, Allan Martin, Peter Kemp, Lyn Oates, Tom Browne, Karen Barton, Maria Lee, Terry Mayes, Judy Stradling, Jill Atewell, Stuart Boase and André Reibig.
- Apologies:** Jean Couper, Robert Letham, Andrew Comrie. Paul Thomson, Rachel Corrie and Danny Atwere.
- Chair:** Les Watson.

#### 2. Membership:

- a. AR reported that Lesley Blundell is no longer working for NILTA and for Swindon College.

**Action I: AM will contact NILTA for a new representative.**

- b. AM raised that Rob Letham is no longer on JCALT and can therefore no longer be our representative of this body. However, it was felt to invite Rob to stay on the Committee for the purpose of continuity and valuable input.

**Note:** Subsequently to this meeting AM has invited RL to continue on the Committee. Unfortunately, RL feels unable to do so. AM thanked RL for his service on the Advisory Committee.

#### 3. MINUTES OF THE 6<sup>TH</sup> ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING OF 27 SEPTEMBER 2001

- a. The minutes were approved.
- a. Matters Arising:**
- TB and AM will deliver a presentation about CITSCAPES at the UCISA TLIG Conference 8-10 April in Leeds.
  - AR and KB will make presentations at IT&ILit Conference 2002.
  - AM will contact Alison Mackenzie to invite collaboration with the 09/00 Project (Big-Blue Project).
  - AM will contact Hilary Johnson to discuss a dissemination link with SCOUNL.
  - Action I still outstanding: AM will e-mail JISCMail to rename the ITIL mailing list into 'IT&ILit@jiscmail.ac.uk'.

#### 4. Minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase II Management Board Meeting 30/11/01 and 09/01/02 (for information)

- a. ML and LW enquired as to why particular feedback on chapters of the Phase I Final Report was still being requested even after the report has been submitted to JISC.

AR pointed out that a number of chapters were not completed at the time of the previous Advisory Committee Meeting, 27 September 2001. AM added that some chapters would still need modification. PK suggested not to further modify the Final Report, but to focus on the current activity strands. This was agreed by the Committee.

## 5. CITSCAPES PHASE I

### 5.1. PHASE I FINAL REPORT

- a. AM reported that the Final Report of Phase I was accepted by the JCALT Committee Meeting, 15 November. This version was sent to the Advisory Committee by AR.
- b. AM reported Rachael Corrie (JISC Secretariat) phoned AM and provided feedback on two aspects of the report. Firstly, the new content structure of the Report was regarded as useful. Secondly, the JCALT Committee suggested that the report be mounted on the website, which would be used as an interactive tool to access the different parts of the report. The CITSCAPES Management Board agreed that this would help to enhance the usefulness of the report, although it was felt that paper based publications of case study reports or individual chapters of the final report could be produced for dissemination workshops etc. As a witness to the JCALT meeting, ML backed up that the report received indeed positive feedback.
- c. However, AM was under the impression that a major reorganisation of the website was desired by JISC. ML pointed out that JISC simply suggested that individual chapters of the report be mounted on the website. ML added that JISC might still be interested in a major improvement of their own website to disseminate results from other projects more effectively and that AM is very welcome to talk to them about this issue. The Committee felt that after some editorial amendments have been made, the report should be mounted as soon as possible on the website.

**Action II:** The Management Board will decide on how to publish individual chapters of the report on the website in due course.

### 5.2. Case Studies

- a. AM stated that the proofreading of case Study **Stirling** and **Oxford** is still in progress. LO offered to complete this task. The reports will be published on the project website in due course.
- b. Case study **Glasgow** is discussed under item 5.3.

## 6. CITSCAPES Phase II

### 6.1. Draft Overview Study

- a. The **Overview** Study England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland was discussed in detail. It was felt that the study was very informative and well organised. However, ML noted some reservations about the method to analyse FE policy initiatives by regions. The implementation might be slightly different for each country but, for example, Curriculum 2000, Centres of Vocational Excellence, Ufi, ILAs, JISC etc are all applicable to Northern Ireland and the report should reflect this. It was suggested that contact be made with the RSC in Northern Ireland about the issues raised in the study. ML offered to send AR suggestions and further information.

**Note:** Subsequently ML has sent AR more specific feedback on the draft overview study which AR forwarded to DA and AC for their consideration.

- b. JA enquired whether the report could be made available to other external organisations and individuals working in the ICT skills training sector. It was also felt that since the document contained such a wide range of useful information in the field of Information and Learning Technology beyond ICT skills training only, the paper would make a very useful project publication and should also be mounted on the website in due course. PK suggested that this document would be useful to all JISC services and that prior to any publication either Rachel Corrie or Andrew Wistreich (FE Regional Support Centre Co-ordinator) be contacted to give advice on how to disseminate the report. This was agreed subject to minor corrections and the adding of the CITSCAPES logo, copyright and authorship.

**Action III:** It was suggested that DA and AC are to make some final amendments to the Overview study for internal publication.

**Action IV:** AM will contact JISC for advice about the possibility of making the report available to external organisations.

## 6.2. FE Survey

- a. JA reported that the **questionnaire** is in the process of being piloted. Since LSDA is moving its offices, the Survey will be sent out by the end of February. It is hoped that some of the survey results would become available by the end of March.
- b. AR passed on details about new contacts at FE Colleges to JA.
- c. JS inquired whether her late comment on the questionnaire would still be considered useful for the survey. AR responded that her comments were passed on to DA and it was hoped that these would still arrive in time for the mailing of the Survey.

**Note:** Subsequently, DA confirmed to AR that JS comments were passed on to the LSDA survey team in time for the mailing of the questionnaire. DA also confirmed that the survey would be posted by 28 February.

## 6.3. Case Studies

- a. AR and SB have exchanged experiences and insights about the development of the case studies. Both felt that the nature of ICT skills provision in FE is quite different and in some ways more complex than in HE. Both will also work in tandem on the development of graphical models of provision for each college.
- b. A first draft of the **Gloscat** case study was tabled. SB reported that he is in the process of making further adjustments to the draft. It was felt that more specific examples and links could be added to the report. SB noted the level of support from JS and others. The Members regarded the draft as very useful, but more concrete emphasis could be placed on the Key Skills provision. A glossary of terms, acronyms and abbreviations would also be worth adding to the report and to the project website glossary.

**Note:** This draft report is attached for comment.

**Action V:** The Members of the Advisory Committee are encouraged to send feedback on the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the Gloscat study directly to SB <stuart@boase.org.uk> by the end of February.

- c. AR reported on the progress of the **Lauder College** case study. This report is due for completion at the end of March. A number of interviews are still to be carried out and notes to be written up. AR stated that he received excellent support in his study by Christel Law, Andrew Comrie and other college staff. AR hopes to e-mail LO with a first draft by 22 February.
- d. A discussion took place about the 'objective' character of the case studies. PK suggested that the reports should reflect the findings of the Researchers and not necessarily the views of the senior management team of the institutions. TM pointed out that the Committee members are predominantly from an HE background; he felt that this would pose a challenge for the understanding of issues raised in the FE case study reports. This would involve engaging and revising some of the assumptions that have been taken for granted during Phase I of the project. PK suggested that the last section in each report should be written from combined HE-FE perspectives, even if this could be difficult to realise.
- e. AM tabled a first draft of the self-written **Glasgow University** case study. He highlighted that this self-assessment could be made a little more exciting by shedding light onto the decision making process that brought about the IT induction programme at Glasgow University.

**Note:** The 1<sup>st</sup> draft of Glasgow case study is attached for comment.

**Action VI:** The Members of the Advisory Committee are encouraged to send feedback on the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the Glasgow study directly to AM by the end of February.

- f. AM and LO are currently identifying suitable candidates for the Wales and Northern Ireland case studies.

**Action VII:** LO, AM and ML will continue their efforts to find suitable candidates for 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> major case studies.

- g. AM noted that the fact that no **auxiliary case studies** were completed during Phase I of the project highlights that such a mode of completion is fraught with difficulty. The Committee accepted that auxiliary case studies were an over-optimistic expectation.
- h. AM and LO reported on the development of the **templates** for the self-written case studies. A meeting took place between LO, AM, AR and SB on 6 February where the following actions were proposed:
  - 1. A call will be put out to the sector inviting volunteers to write up case studies. No financial incentives will be made at this point. The contact lists used for the mailing of the survey will be used for this call. Other means such as mailing lists are also considered as media of raising interest in this task.
  - 2. Abstracts would be requested, which could be published at a later stage as separate documents. A selection process would be carried out in order to identify suitable self-written case studies. The selected authors would be supplied with a template and guidelines.
  - 3. The template should have a contents table with specific examples to encourage the authors to adhere to a general structure and to focus on the issues. AR noted that the insights gained from the Phase II survey and from the detailed case studies would be beneficial in the development of the general guidance for the completion of these studies.

4. AM suggested that two members of the Advisory Committee act as referees for each study and some other person would provide telephone or e-mail support for the individual in charge of completion. JS noted that the BECTa web site does already contain a number of case studies, which would be worth consulting regarding structure and style.
5. LO and AM will write a letter to call for self-completed case studies, which will be circulated to the committee.

**Action VIII: LO and AM will co-ordinate the call for self-completed case studies and continue the development of the template.**

- i. It is hoped that these short reports would give examples of innovative strategic and practical initiatives at FE colleges and to provide accounts of good practice in student ICT skills training.
- j. ML inquired about how the self-written case studies would be integrated into the project work of Phase I. TB suggested that the report abstracts would be very helpful in this respect. The IT&ILit Conference could also be used to extend the call for self-written case studies into the HE sector.

#### **6.4. Website, Resource Database, Tools**

- a. A CITSCAPES awayday focusing on the development of the website as a prime vehicle of project dissemination took place at the University of Gloucestershire on 6th February 2002. The awayday was attended by LO, AM, TB, AR, Raj Bhaskar (University of Glasgow) and Robin Livesey (University of Gloucestershire). A paper "CITSCAPES Awayday: Dissemination by Website" by AM reporting the discussion and outcomes of the awayday was tabled. This paper is attached as document 'citscapes\_awayday.doc'.
- b. ML reported, as an attendee at the JCALT meeting which had accepted the Final Report of Phase I, that in her view JCALT had not intended a major rethink of the website concept but only the mounting on the web of the various chapters of the report. However, she also pointed out that JISC were in the process of rethinking the role of its own and project websites as providers of information and services to the HE and FE sectors. AM accepted that CITSCAPES management may have read more into the JCALT advice than was intended, but pointed out that this was not necessarily a bad thing, since the adoption of a website as a primary medium of dissemination did in fact raise all the questions which had been discussed at the awayday, and that having addressed those questions placed CITSCAPES in a better-informed position on broad issues of project dissemination and impact. This could lead to CITSCAPES making an input to the rethinking of the role of project websites underway at JISC. AM reported that Jane Williams of JISC Assist had shown great interest in the awayday, and was keen to discuss the outcomes; and that he would be visiting JISC Assist on 8 March to discuss with Karen Ford both the CITSCAPES awayday and JISC's intentions. PK noted that this might be the beginning of a major activity for JISC, which would benefit HEIs, as well as highlighting the importance of website impact analysis.
- c. Actions 1A,1B, 2, 3, 4 and 5 recommended in the awayday report paper were adopted by the Committee. Action 1C was not adopted as it would require further funding, and the benefits of a database-founded structure were not as clear as might be assumed. TB and PK emphasised the need to carry out actions 1 and 2 in parallel, as it was important that the Phase I Final Report be mounted as soon as possible.

**Action IX: AM to co-ordinate implementation of website development actions, and to discuss website issues with appropriate JISC personnel.**

- d. AR pointed out that the item **Resource Database** had to be postponed twice at Management Board Meetings. He suggested further maintenance, which was agreed.
- e. AR reported that the **Tools** set out in the Phase I Report, would still require modification. Although it is intended to use the dissemination workshops and the IT&ILit Conference as a platform to adjust these tools for FE, suggestions about these items by the Members are still very welcome.

#### **6.5. Dissemination Workshops**

- a. AR presented a **draft programme** as discussed at the last Management Board Meeting 9 January 2002. LW suggested revisiting issues surrounding the website at these occasions. This suggestion and the programme itself were welcomed by the Members. The morning session would be a joint session of FE and HE participants. The afternoon session, which will focus on the tools, will be split into two forums
- b. It was hoped that the first workshop could take place in April at Lauder College Dunfermline with subsequent events being planned in Cheltenham (2 May) and in London (June).

**Action X: The Management Board will pursue the organisation of the workshops.**

#### **6.6. Workplan**

- a. The revised workplan was tabled and the Committee welcomed the fact that this document will be updated as the project evolves further.

#### **7. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING**

It is intended to hold the next meeting in June with the assistance of LSDA in London.

**Action XI: AR will e-mail the Committee Members about possible dates.**