



Where the IMP are we going?

Progress Report on the IT Metrics Project

Jane Littlehailes

Head, IT Support Staff Services

Overview

- Origins of project
- Terms of reference
- Progress
- To do
- FAQ
- Questions

Mists of time ...

- Recommendations 5 and 6 of OUCS Review 2003

- <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/ictc/oxonly/it/roucs/rev2003.shtml>

- (5) That OUCS, authorised by Council through the ICT Committee, defines minimum basic standards for ICT infrastructure in all departments and colleges, these standards to include minimum levels of service and kit.
- (6) That OUCS defines minimum levels of competencies for IT support staff in the University and colleges to be approved by the ICT Committee in consultation with the Personnel Committee and the Conference of Colleges.

ICTC in charge

- Agreement on *measuring* support and skills
- *Standards* caused more debate
 - Concern about differing needs of departments, colleges, divisions
 - Now agreed, proceeding with care
- Commitment to consultation and briefing
- IT Metrics Project Working Group set up

Consultations and Briefings

- ITSS
- ITSSG
- CITG
- UITUG
- OUCS
- ICTC
- ICTC Sub committee
- Colleges Working Group on IT
- ISIDORE Project Team
- OSIRIS Project Team
- Personnel Committee
- Union and other staff representatives

IMP WG Members

Lou Burnard	Assistant Director OUCS, Group Manager Information and Support Group, Chair IMP
James Dore	New College, Chair IT Support Staff Group (ITSSG), representing the Information and Communications Technology Committee (ICTC)
Alan Gay	Deputy Director OUCS, Group Manager Infrastructure Group
Steve Hunter	Assistant Director of Management Information Services (MIS)
Jane Littlehales	Head, IT Support Staff Services (ITS3)
Robin McCleery	Zoology
Sandra Nicholson	Personnel Officer, Personnel Services
Nigel Rudgewick-Brown	Director Clinical School IMSU
Robert Taylor	Physics, Queens College, Chair Colleges' IT Group (CITG), representing Conference of Colleges
Jeremy Worth	Archaeology, Member ITSSG, representing University IT Users' Group (UITUG)

IMP Working Group Terms of Reference

- to agree with ICTC the scope and purpose of the project
- to review currently available methods of assessing the expertise of IT support staff
- to review methods of assessing hardware and software requirements for the support of a basic IT infrastructure within colleges and departments
- to identify from those methods a set of indicators or metrics generally agreed to be adequate for the purpose of defining the level of support available within a given unit of the university
- to propose, using these metrics, a mechanism whereby colleges and departments may assess their existing levels of support.

Scope and Skills

- to agree with ICTC the scope and purpose of the project
 - As outlined in the Terms of Reference
- to review currently available methods of assessing the expertise of IT support staff
 - SFIA as shown this morning
 - Some development needed
 - Current focus on consultation, agreement

To review methods of assessing hardware and software

- “Infrastructure Metric”
- Main area of work
- No existing metrics – has to be home-grown
- Includes
 - Availability of network
 - Formal availability of support
 - ISODORE, OSIRIS compliance
 - Strategy, policy
 - Risk analysis, etc.

Infrastructure Metric

- Interviewing ITSS at representative colleges and departments
 - As suggested by ICTC following previous surveys
 - Different sizes, ages, divisions, etc.
- Assistance from ITSSG, OUCS
- IMP WG will see first draft of descriptions 2 July
- Aim to have all descriptions written by September

What does a metric look like?

- Categories (subcategories), levels and descriptions
 - Category: backup
 - Level 1 description
 - Back up to local copy once a year
 - Level 5 description
 - Back up twice a day to local copy
 - Overnight backup held offsite
 - Keep one years worth of updates
 - Use Infobasis software
-

How will it be used?

- Self assessment (individual or unit)
- Agreement from
 - Line manager (or similar) for SFIA
 - To be decided for Infrastructure Metric
- Compare against
 - Last years figures
 - ICTC recommendations
 - Personal goals
 - Etc.

Standards

- No timescale yet
- Recommendations will come from ICTC
- Different for different units
 - E.g. backup of medical trials data vs student filestore
- General uncertainty on what we currently have or need
- Need to gather data first

To do

- By start of Michaelmas term aim to
 - Create Infrastructure Metric
 - Reach agreement on SFIA with personnel, Unions, etc.
 - Put all minutes, papers, etc. on web
- Then
 - Draw up implementation plan
 - Gather data
 - Generate recommendations
 - Keep consulting

FAQ



Do I/my dept/my college *have* to take part?

- Up to ICTC but recommendation came from high up
 - Process will help identify what the unit provides
 - Easier for someone else to take over in emergencies
 - Reduces wheel inventing
 - Improve sharing of resources
-

SFIA FAQ

- Will I get more money?
 - No direct link to pay and grading
 - How individuals use data is up to them
 - Will I get sacked?
 - No direct link to redundancies
 - How your boss uses data is up to them!
 - SFIA *should* be used to
 - Find skills gaps and identify training needs
 - Find experts for special projects
 - Help create job descriptions
-

Summary

- ICTC overall charge of project
- IMP WG doing work
- Consultation ongoing
- Implementation starting Michaelmas 04/Hilary 05

Questions please!

