REVIEW OF WEB CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Committee:	Resources & Finance Committee
Date:	19th June 2017
Author:	Annette Wade – Customer Services Manager

[S26]

1.0 ISSUE

1.1 To ensure the content of the Council's website is customer focused, consistent, current, relevant and readable.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 Option 2 be approved and included in the Council's web governance policy.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 The Council's website has been revamped as part of the Council's transformation programme.

3.2 In response to feedback from members, staff and a public consultation, new menus, navigation and promoted search have been introduced to enable customers to easily find what they are looking for. All web pages have also been reviewed to ensure that the information on the website is customer focused, current, relevant and readable.

3.3 The new clearer design and navigation was approved by the Transformation Sub Committee.

3.4 As more and more people transact online customer expectations increase and they associate the quality of a website with the quality of the service they expect to be provided. It is the Council's shop window and therefore essential that it's content and style remains consistent, easy to use and clear current and relevant if we want to encourage on line contact and increase customer satisfaction.

3.5 The Council existing content management system is being reviewed to ensure it is fit for purpose and the most efficient use of resources.

4.0 OPTIONS

4.1 Option 1 – Existing Content Management System

4.1.1 The existing Web Content Management process has evolved over a number of years and is inconsistent across the Council. The role was devolved to the services but only half of the services have nominated web updaters and the others submit content updates and amendments via the ICT service desk for the web team to do for them.

4.1.2   There is no overall web governance policy and each service updater has a different style and skill level leading to inconsistency throughout the site. More importantly changes are made to the live site and there are no quality controls in place, any one trained to update the site can put anything up, amend the styling such as font and colour of the text and remove pages without strict change control.

4.2   Option 2 – Workbench Model

4.2.1   There is a new module within the Council's web content management system called workbench. This allows web updaters to create/amend content in draft outside of the live environment and includes a workflow function which provides moderation and quality check prior to publication.

4.2.2   The work bench model would still allow the services to create, amend and have full control over the content of their pages, however, these would be reviewed by the web team prior to publication to ensure consistency in style, layout, navigation and functionality.

4.3   Option 3 – Web team - Full control of content

4.3.1   Only the web team can create amend or delete web pages. All requests are for new and amended web content will have to be logged with the ICT Service Desk and actioned by the web team

5.0   ARGUMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1   Options 1 and 2 are nil cost options, however option 1 has increased potential to generate a call to the Council if information is inconsistent, out of date, difficult to find and is not clear and easily understood.

5.2   Option 3 is likely to cost the Council a minimum of £15,000 per annum.

5.3   A full benefits analysis is attached see Appendix A

6.0   APPENDICES

6.1   Benefits Analysis – Appendix A

Background Documents	Location	Contact Officer
	Room 113	Annette Wade
	The Grange,)	Customer Services Manager
	Ely	(01353) 616310
		E-mail:
		annette.wade@eastcambs.gov.uk

Option	Pros	Cons
1 - Existing Content Management System	– Quicker less bureaucratic for the updaters. – Ownership	– Inconsistency – style and navigation – Lack of customer focus – Knock on effect of removal of pages. – Too many PDFs/pages too long – Unprofessional – Web team having to unpick/redo. – No control. Web team have no idea what has been done/changed – Inability to work on a draft
2 - Workbench Model	– Training for updaters – refresher re-enforce standards – Quality control – Consistency in navigation and style – Ability to work on a draft and publish at a later date – Web team do not know the service so view from customer perspective – Encourages customer focus and engagement	– Additional layer/takes longer – Control, cannot do exactly what they want
3 - Web team – Full control of content	– Consistency in style navigation – Increased resilience for web team if additional staff recruited	– Too bureaucratic – Lack of ownership by the services. – Additional work – quantity unknown however highly likely to require additional resource.