

COURSE AND UNIT INFORMATION PROJECT FORUM
SUPPORTING MATERIAL

17 February 2004

ISSUES ARISING FROM DISCUSSIONS

Major Functional Groups:

- 1 Business process improvement
- 2 Consistency, accuracy and currency of data available
- 3 Quality of data available
- 4 Other issues

Major Solution Groups:

- 1 Technical
- 2 Business Process
- 3 Policy, Procedures and Management

Definitions of Terms Used:

Severity	The extent to which the issue has the potential to impact the university (severe embarrassment, student / staff difficulties, legal culpability, reputation, public perception etc)
Effort to Fix	Assuming no impediments, the amount of work it would take to resolve the issue (technical change or development, change in business process, review and restructure of web sites, review and enhancement of staffing in some areas etc)
Difficulty to Fix	Assuming the effort is guaranteed, how significant are the impediments to implementing a resolution (change in policy, resourcing major technical development effort, hiring or contracting new staff, change in how people work, change in standards for publishable materials etc)
Functional Group	A functional area in which the issue is a problem
Solution Group	A business area in which the resolution lies

Please note: The values in the columns below are estimates only and may change as more information becomes available.

The following major issues concerning course and unit development, approval and publication have arisen during discussions over recent weeks:

#	Issue	Estimated Severity	Estimated Effort to fix	Estimated Difficulty to fix	Funct Group	Sol ⁿ Group
1	Issues on ownership of data (responsibility for maintenance)	High	Low	Medium	1	3/2
2	Several unapproved minor changes result in an unapproved major change	High	Medium	Medium	2	1/2
3	Fees information inconsistent	High	Medium	Low	2	1/2
4	Many web pages provide similar information and there appears to be little consistency of data and quality across pages	High	Low	Low	2	3/2

#	Issue	Estimated Severity	Estimated Effort to fix	Estimated Difficulty to fix	Funct Group	Sol ⁿ Group
5	Different versions of the same information on the web and in printed material (formal and informal)	High	Low	High	2	3/2
6	Lack of consistency in textbook lists between web pages and the bookshop	High	Low	Low	2	3
7	Some important web pages are not dynamic (displayed information is not drawn from a database when requested – it is static in the page)	High	Medium	Medium	3	1/3
8	Communications and follow-up of process steps poor	High	Medium	Low	3	1/2
9	Timing of business processes often not co-ordinated	High	Medium	High	1	2
10	Inconsistencies between approved course outline and published information	High	Low	Low	1	2
11	Differences between what is marketed and what is finally offered	High	Medium	Medium	3	3
12	Errors introduced into fee approval by process	High	Low	Low	1	2
13	Quality of data entered is poor	High	Medium	Medium	3	1/3
14	Support for workflow	Medium	Medium	Medium	1	1
15	Process of entering Course/Unit Design information is time consuming and results in the same information being entered multiple times and potentially by different people – some avoid doing it	Medium	High	Medium	1	1/2
16	Requirement to publish information before it has been approved	Medium	Low	Medium	1/2	3/2
17	Lack of consistency of terminology on web pages and printed material	Medium	Low	High	2	3
18	Duplication of data	Medium	Medium	Medium	2	1
19	No consistency of formatting of data presented on the web	Medium	Medium	Low	2	3

#	Issue	Estimated Severity	Estimated Effort to fix	Estimated Difficulty to fix	Func ⁿ Group	Sol ⁿ Group
20	Knowledge and understanding of processes poor	Medium	Medium	Low	1	1/3
21	Need a data dictionary of university data	Medium	Medium	Low	2	1
22	Graduate Attribute data not managed well	Medium	Medium	Low	2/3	1/3
24	Some information displayed on the web is not current or not complete	Medium	Low	Medium	3	1/3
25	No editorial checking of language used in descriptive text for suitability to purpose and intended audience	Medium	Low	Medium	3	3/2
26	Some important systems do not support course / unit versioning and calendarisation	Medium	High	High	4	1
27	StudyUNE shows information for the year being marketed – should also show for other years	Medium	Medium	Low	2	1
28	Must be able to react quickly to change in course / unit design and streamline the change process	Medium	Medium	High	1	2
29	Complexity of the approvals process	Medium	Medium	Medium	1	2/3
30	Web search engine and navigation poor	Medium	Medium	Low	3/4	1

ISSUES ACROSS GROUPS

		Solution Groups		
		1	2	3
Functional Groups	1	14,15,20	1,9,10,12,15,16,28,29	1,16,20,29
	2	2,3,18,21,22,27	2,3,4,5,16	4,5,6,16,17,19,22
	3	7,8,13,22,24,30	8,25	7,11,13,22,24,25
	4	26,30		

SEVERITY ACROSS GROUPS

		Solution Groups			
		1	2	3	
High = 4 Medium = 2 Low = 1	Functional Groups	1	6	24	10
2		16	18	20	
3		18	6	18	
4		4	0	0	

GROUPING OF RELATED ISSUES

	Group	Issue	Severity	Effort	Difficulty	Solⁿ Group
1	Ownership of and responsibility for data	1	H	L	M	3/2
		3	H	L	M	1/2
		4	H	L	L	3/2
		10	H	L	L	2
		13	H	M	M	1/3
		18	M	M	M	1
		21	M	M	L	1
24	M	L	M	1/3		
2	Timing of business processes	9	H	M	H	2
		16	M	L	M	3/2
3	Workflow	8	H	M	L	1/2
		14	M	M	M	1
		28	M	M	H	2
		29	M	M	M	2/3
4	Oversight of processes	2	H	M	M	1/2
		8	H	M	L	1/2
		12	H	L	L	2
5	Quality of information presented	3	H	L	M	1/2
		4	H	L	L	3/2
		5	H	L	H	3/2
		6	H	L	L	3
		7	H	M	M	1/3
		10	H	L	L	2
		11	H	M	M	3
		12	H	L	L	2
		17	M	L	H	3
		19	M	M	L	3
		24	M	L	M	1/3
		25	M	L	M	3/2
		27	M	M	L	1
30	M	M	L	1		
6	Other issues	2	H	M	M	1/2
		15	M	H	M	1/2
		20	M	M	L	1/3
		22	M	M	L	1/3
		26	M	H	H	1
		30	M	M	L	1

#	Issue	Example
1	Issues on ownership of data (responsibility for maintenance)	Who is responsible for ensuring course rules on the web are current?
2	Several unapproved minor changes result in an unapproved major change	
3	Fees information inconsistent	Fees in handbook and on school information not the same.
4	Many web pages provide similar information and there appears to be little consistency of data and quality across pages	StudyUNE and School/Faculty web pages look much different and present information with different levels of technology.
5	Different versions of the same information on the web and in printed material (formal and informal)	The handbook and School web pages contain different semester offerings of a unit.
6	Lack of consistency in textbook lists between web pages and the bookshop	One source has the title in full, the author and the publisher and edition number and the other has an abbreviated title and author only.
7	Some important web pages are not dynamic (displayed information is not drawn from a database when requested – it is static in the page)	Unit descriptions stored in PDF files.
8	Communications and follow-up of process steps poor	Unit co-ordinator is not told when new unit approval has been finalised.
9	Timing of business processes often not co-ordinated	Handbook information required before fees have been finalised.
10	Inconsistencies between approved course outline and published information	Course approval documentation not used as source for published information.
11	Differences between what is marketed and what is finally offered	Unit marketed as running internally in semester 1 but is changed to external.
12	Errors introduced into fee approval by process	Rekeying information introduces errors.
13	Quality of data entered is poor	Units database has very sketchy information on graduate attributes.
14	Support for workflow	Have a system that would manage the process of course and unit approvals, alert people when necessary and put information into systems automatically.

#	Issue	Example
15	Process of entering Course/Unit Design information is time consuming and results in the same information being entered multiple times and potentially by different people – some avoid doing it	Information entered several times into several systems (approval documentation, units database, SIS)
16	Requirement to publish information before it has been approved	Courses and units need to be marketed overseas in March but the approvals process will not be complete until July.
17	Lack of consistency of terminology on web pages and printed material	Subject vs Unit Course vs Program Course vs Award
18	Duplication of data	Unit information kept in several databases.
19	No consistency of formatting of data presented on the web	Course and unit information presented differently on each faculty/school web site.
20	Knowledge and understanding of processes poor	Many do not know the approvals process from end to end – do not know, for instance, that everything goes to Council for approval.
21	Need a data dictionary of university data	Need to know where to go to get authoritative unit information.
22	Graduate Attribute data not managed well	No check that attributes on approval documentation are actually being achieved by delivery of unit.
24	Some information displayed on the web is not current or not complete	Old web pages still present.
25	No editorial checking of language used in descriptive text for suitability to purpose and intended audience	Description for international student will differ from that required for domestic school leaver.
26	Some important systems do not support course / unit versioning and calendarisation	Web information on units does not differentiate between versions or semesters taught.
27	StudyUNE shows information for the year being marketed – should also show for other years	Need to be able to see different versions of courses in StudyUNE.
28	Must be able to react quickly to change in course / unit design and streamline the change process	Entrepreneurial courses / units need to be mounted quickly to capture the market.
29	Complexity of the approvals process	Many steps and iterations.
30	Web search engine and navigation poor	Difficult to find the information you want.