

Development User Group, Thursday 3 December 2009

Present

Alasdair McLaren (AM)	Resolution Case Management (Res)
Beverly O'Sullivan (BO)	Brixton Advice Centre
Christian Bodden (CB)	Leeds Metropolitan SU
James Hunt (JH)	AdviceUK (AUK)
Jenny Haigh (JHA)	Huddersfield SU
Mala Wainwright (MW)	Greater Manchester Immigration Aid Unit (GMIAU)
Sylvia Velasquez (SV)	Migrants Resource Centre
Tobias Stapf (TS)	Toynbee Hall

Apologies

Michael Bates (MB)	Birmingham Law Centre
Ryszard Opasiak (RO)	Harlow Welfare Rights
Sarah Duvigneau (SD)	Law Centres Federation (LCF)

Non-attendees

Baljit Badesha (BB)	Nucleus Legal Advice Centre
---------------------	-----------------------------

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction
2. Survey
3. Word Processing demonstration
4. Development requests from observational framework & DUG
5. Prioritise Development for next year - 2010
6. A.O.B

Welcome and Introduction

Introductions from everyone as MW & TS are new to the DUG.

Survey

AM showed the group the raw data from a survey conducted by Res during July 2009. As mentioned in the previous minutes the survey led to the abolishment of the 40 minute 'kick-out' for in activity. The survey was divided into the following:

Helpdesk

Ease of setting up

Aware of changes to the system

Opportunity to make improvements

Training

Content and feel

Best feature

Worst feature

Rating of system

Broadly speaking the response was positive but there were negative comments as well. The survey raised several discussion points. A user manual, AM confirmed that a manual would be fully released with a couple of weeks with completed instalments being released immediately. TS brought up the speed of the system. AM said that Res had been monitoring the system of the speed for the last couple of months. They noticed that at certain point

during the month the processor on the web server was close to 100% and had added extra resources to reduce the strain on the server.

AM said that going forward there would be two surveys one would be two types, both would be sent out annually and would concentrate on the system and the other one concentrate on users knowledge of the system. They would staggered so that an agency receives a survey every six months. JH said going forward if future survey threw up changes to AdvicePro should they be put through the DUG first? CB said that an email to the DUG group would suffice.

Word Processing

AM said that the delay in the release of the Word processor was down to the steering group (made up of AUK & Res) who still need to work out the economic impact of the Word Processor. AM also said that the new Word Processor would need some set up for it to work, with this in mind Res are going to release this in phases and work closely with centres to make sure it installed properly. AM gave a demonstration of the Word Processor. Whilst demonstrating the Word Processor AM had showed us a up graded of 'Recent Cases Filter' the DUG said that this would be useful.

Action: AM to add 'Recent Cases Filter'

Development requests from observational framework & DUG

1778 The DUG agreed this would be useful.

1784 AM explained that the message board is for important technical messages from Resolution. It was not designed for internal use. The DUG felt that there were other forms of communication which were available.

1785 AM said that this was included in AdvicePro's next release 2.8.

1800 AM needed more information to what exactly the user meant

Action: AM to contact user for more information

1803 AM confirmed this is available.

1814 AM said there was nothing in the processor at the moment to do that but confirmed that the new Word processor will be able to do this. MW said that this was a major selling point.

1815 AM confirmed that this was a small change, DUG agreed to go ahead and make the change.

Action: AM to make changes

1821 DUG confirmed that this was an outcome that was already available.

1827 This can be easily added but we need a list of wards.

Action: JH to get a list of wards

- 1831 CB confirmed that this would be very useful.
- 1834 AM said that this could be done through a report on Ad hoc reporting. JH said that these reports would be useful for agencies, AUK needs to communicate the ability of Adhoc.
- 1840 CB said that Leeds SU would find this very useful. AM suggested a database of Landlords across the network like the Creditors database. MV agreed.

Action: AM to look into implementing such a database

- 1866 AM & the DUG said that the tool was working properly it was never designed to incorporate two postcodes at once. The DUG went onto discuss the possibility that the postcode field could become validated (only recognised postcodes can be entered). AM said that would be possible but the LSC has a specific code for no fixed abode this would be hard to incorporate. The DUG said it would be something to investigate.
- 1868 JH said that this would, from an AdviceUK perspective, move away from a standard set of outcomes across the sector. Any reporting done would prove meaningless. The DUG agreed that from a centre perspective, managers would lose control of what was entered. The DUG went onto discuss about outcomes in general, there need to be more 'soft' outcomes. CB said it should be an agenda item on the next DUG.

Action: DUG to collect outcomes from funders so we can get idea of what soft outcomes are required

Action: JH to put 'Outcomes' on next agenda

- 1869 This relates to a query from the Capitalised group, AM showed on AdvicePro where these features reside.
- 1871 AM confirmed this can be added.

Action: AM to add to drop down list

P Marples DUG agreed this would be useful.

Action: AM to change

P Jones AM said that you can change cost limits but these are manually done. AM went onto say that when this was designed Res were not sure what the LSC were doing with cost limits by keeping it manual centres could set them.

AM will need to look into to see if this is possible. MW said that she can ask one of her colleagues to discuss with AM

Action: AM to contact MW

AM said this maybe due to the LSC changing codes between the dates mentioned.

Action: AM to look into

AM said that this was possible already in ad hoc reports.

Action: JH to contact P Jones

TS asked about the helpdesk targets which Res have to meet. JH said they were contained within the each centre's EUA. JH said he could put this up on the website and send it out to users.

Action: JH to arrange for Res helpdesk targets to be sent out

JH said that he had been contacted by a number of agencies who wanted the prospect of 'volunteers' logins. JH said that it would be discussed at the forth coming Steering Group meeting between AUK & Res. JH said both AUK & Res don't know how it would work in practice or if it was at all economically variable but it would be discussed, this will be a long term project. The DUG agreed that this should be explored.

MW said that the navigation needs to be bigger so it is easier to use and would encourage usage. AM said it is worthwhile.

Prioritise Development for next year - 2010

The DUG discussed the recommendation for the Steering Group which is meeting on 9 December 2009. CB started by saying that the outcomes were very important, that they made sense to the matter type selected and that there were more. As there was an extensive discuss at the last DUG the ground work had been done. The recommendation is as follows:

The outcomes should be matter specific; there should also be a selection of 'soft' outcomes. The matter types to sub matter types to outcomes need to be customisable, users need to be able to 'hide' sections they don't use. The outcomes need to be comprehensive and be able to satisfy funders requests.

Action: AM to look into the technical aspect of the recommendation

Action: JH to email rest of DUG the recommendation

Action: DUG to agree comprehensive outcomes

A.O.B

JHA & MV gave a list of points to AM to look over.

Action: AM to add to observation list