



Queen Margaret University

EDINBURGH

making it happen
espida
by getting real

**Case study trialling the use of the espida
methodology in relation to records management
project proposals**

A project led & funded by JISC infoNet

Acknowledgements

Queen Margaret University would like to thank all those involved with the JISC infoNet project and all staff who contributed to the scorecards and cost template.

Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Executive Summary | 1 |
| 2. Introduction | 2 |
| 2.1. Background to Queen Margaret University | 2 |
| 2.2. Existing Systems at Queen Margaret University | 3 |
| 2.3. SharePoint 2007 | 3 |
| 3. Methodology | 4 |
| 3.1. SPRSU and IS | 4 |
| 3.2. Records Management Working Group and Intranet Project Board | 4 |
| 3.3. Full Economic Costing | 5 |
| 4. Results, Findings and Discussion | 6 |
| 4.1. Scorecards | 6 |
| 4.1.1. Customer and External Stakeholder Perspective | 6 |
| 4.1.2. Internal Business Process Perspective | 6 |
| 4.1.3. Innovation and Development Perspective | 6 |
| 4.1.4. Financial Perspective | 6 |
| 4.2. Cost Template | 7 |
| 5. Conclusion and Recommendations | 8 |
| 5.1. EDRMS at Queen Margaret University | 8 |
| 5.2. Experience of the Espida Methodology | 8 |
| 6. Appendix | 9 |
| 6.1. espida Value and Cost Templates | 9 |

1. Executive Summary

The espida methodology assists project proposers to tease out the benefits that arise from information projects. JISC infoNet were looking for institutions to use this methodology in relation to an electronic document records management system (EDRMS) project, and Queen Margaret University (QMU) met the criteria as they were looking to use Microsoft Office SharePoint as the basis of a corporate document/records management solution. By taking part in the project, QMU was able to gain greater clarity regarding the suitability of document or records management technology.

QMU has a well-established staff intranet based on SharePoint Portal Server 2003. This integrates well with their existing IT infrastructure, based as it is on core Microsoft technologies. The current intranet has facilitated the move towards electronic working practices, with the emphasis being on document management and elements of collaborative working. It is QMU's wish to extend the current infrastructure to take advantage of the greatly enhanced functionality available with Microsoft SharePoint Server 2007, particularly in relation to workflow and electronic records management. This will better enable QMU to support fully the business needs of their new 21st century campus. This project therefore examined the suitability of the document and records management functionality that Microsoft SharePoint 2007 can offer.

The scorecards that form the main part of the espida methodology were primarily put together by the Strategic Planning and Research Support Unit (SPRSU) and Information Services (IS) departments, however ideas from both the Records Management Working Group and the Intranet Project Board were incorporated into the scorecards. The Internal Business Process Perspective scorecard was seen to be the most relevant to the implementation of Microsoft SharePoint 2007 at QMU. Several primary outcomes were identified with a probable likelihood of occurring.

There were some important discoveries made when putting together the costing. Whilst SharePoint 2007 does provide a front end to document and records management solutions, it was recommended that QMU should consider purchasing an additional solution as SharePoint 2007 does not provide areas such as archiving and scanning. Although QMU knew that SharePoint 2007 did not provide a fully comprehensive system, it was useful to clarify what extra steps may need to be taken. The likelihood is that QMU will upgrade to SharePoint 2007 and utilise the functionality it does provide in the first instance. QMU would then be in a better position to evaluate and identify what it requires over and above this in terms of a full EDRMS.

Given the necessary upgrade to SharePoint 2007, it would be both prudent and cost-effective to base an EDRMS solution around SharePoint 2007. By completing the scorecards QMU now has a methodology that helps to see both the positive and negative outcomes of the proposal, which is vitally important as implementing an EDRMS will involve a big change in working practices.

2. Introduction

The espida project at the University of Glasgow developed a methodology to assist project proposers to tease out the benefits that arose from information projects. This was a very tricky area because such benefits were rarely financial or readily expressible in financial terms. Importantly the methodology helped proposers to see both the positive and negative outcomes of what they proposed which is important in projects that involve change in working practices. If negative outcomes are not identified they cannot be properly managed to minimise their impact and can derail an otherwise worthwhile project. The methodology also made it relatively straightforward to compare different ways of achieving the same goals (option appraisal).

The main emphasis of the JISC infoNet funding was firstly to find institutions who were currently considering implementing document or records management technologies within their organisation, secondly have a genuine institutional need to undertake this kind of analysis, and thirdly for whom the timing of such analysis is appropriate.

Ideally they were looking for institutions who were considering one of four models of implementation. QMU met the criteria as they were looking to use Microsoft Office SharePoint as the basis of a corporate document/records management solution. By taking part in the project, QMU was able to gain greater clarity regarding the suitability of document or records management technology.

2.1. Background to Queen Margaret University

QMU has a long-established reputation of delivering professionally focused learning and research which is of value to the community and enhances people's lives. The institution was established in 1875 by Christian Guthrie Wright and Louisa Stevenson, who wanted to combat children's ill health and train women from all backgrounds to create better standards of health for their families.

The range of subject expertise at QMU has expanded over the years to address the changing needs of society, and they received full degree awarding powers in 1998, becoming a University College in 1999. It currently occupies a distinctive place in the Scottish higher education system, with a particular focus on healthcare, social sciences, the creative industries, media, communication, food, hospitality, tourism and consumer studies. Within these fields of study, QMU offers a range of professionally related academic programmes and socially relevant research. Many of the subjects in which QMU is active, especially those related to the allied health professions, have only been taught in universities over the last 30 years. QMU is a leader in the development of the research-led knowledge bases for these disciplines, with emphases on interdisciplinary and interprofessional approaches. All of QMU's activity is focused on the generation of accessible and applicable knowledge. It is in this regard that QMU, a relatively small and highly-focused university, envisions itself playing a distinctive and crucial role in 21st century higher education.

QMU gained full university title on 16 January 2007, making it Queen Margaret University. It also relocated to the first new university campus for 21st century Scotland in September 2007, on the south-east side of Edinburgh, by Musselburgh. The new campus is a vibrant new academic village with high-tech buildings and attractive landscaped spaces, featuring an innovative learning resource centre at the heart of the development. The new title, together with the new campus development, will maximise the positive impact of Queen Margaret on the communities it serves.

Finally in the Sunday Times 2007 league tables, QMU was named as one of the top 10 ten modern universities in the UK, and the joint top modern university in Scotland.

2.2. Existing Systems at Queen Margaret University

QMU has a well-established staff intranet based on SharePoint Portal Server 2003. This integrates well with our existing IT infrastructure, based as it is on core Microsoft technologies – at present Windows Server 2003, Active Directory, Exchange Server 2003, SQL Server 2000 and Microsoft Office 2003. The current intranet has facilitated the move towards electronic working practices, with the emphasis being on document management and elements of collaborative working.

QMU was therefore ideally suited to undertake the JISC infoNet espida project. Already using SharePoint 2003 for the staff intranet, the next step was to start the move to SharePoint 2007 in Spring 2008. Having already developed extensive records management procedures with the University of Edinburgh, clarifying the suitability of electronic records management technology was of strategic importance to the institution.

2.3. SharePoint 2007

SharePoint 2003 enables document management through content approval, version control and point of access for staff to the latest version. In comparison, SharePoint 2007 enables document/record management and is enhanced through workflows and information management policies. The searching tool provides extensive content indexing and searching capabilities, whilst the workflows can be created on any list in a SharePoint 2007 site. Workflow reports use the information to help monitor progress.

The upgrade to SharePoint 2007 from SharePoint 2003 is therefore unavoidable. QMU is conscious to keep abreast of ongoing developments with Microsoft technologies, especially in view of Microsoft's policy of discontinuing support for aging product versions. Importantly, there is a wish to extend the current infrastructure to take advantage of the greatly enhanced functionality available with Microsoft SharePoint Server 2007, particularly in relation to workflow and electronic records management. This will better enable QMU to support fully the business needs of their new 21st century campus. This project therefore examined the suitability of the document and records management functionality that Microsoft SharePoint 2007 can offer.

3. Methodology

3.1. SPRSU and IS

The role of the Strategic Planning and Research Support Unit (SPRSU) is to facilitate planning and decision-making throughout the University at all levels, and to provide strategic policy development and planning information to enable the institution to deliver on its objectives.

The role of the Information Services (IS) department is to help QMU in all aspects of how technology should support the effective provision and management of information needed for all purposes by students, staff and management. Their areas of responsibility currently include software innovation, including business applications and technical development of the staff intranet.

The project team responsible for the espida project was made up of members from SPRSU and IS, who had the combined skills and experience to undertake this project. This included work with the University of Edinburgh in putting together records management procedures for QMU, and expertise with, and responsibility for, QMU's SharePoint intranet and other web-based applications.

The scorecards were primarily put together by SPRSU and IS. After the initial start-up meeting in Newcastle, both the Web Communications Analyst and Business and Research Support Adviser put together first drafts of the scorecards independently of each other, then met to discuss their findings. After these were combined, the revised scorecards were discussed with the Head of SPRSU, minor adjustments were made and these were then shared with the University of Sheffield. At this point SPRSU and IS were in a position to discuss the scorecards with a wider range of staff at QMU.

3.2. Records Management Working Group and Intranet Project Board

After the initial scorecards were drawn together by SPRSU and IS, members of both the Records Management Working Group and the Intranet Project Board were asked to attend a briefing session on the project. Several colleagues were able to attend, including the Deputy Director of Human Resources, Head of Recruitment and Admissions and the Director of Marketing and Communications.

The meeting centred around a general discussion of an EDRMS, and what potential advantages and disadvantages would come out of implementing one. It was decided that it would be best not to go through each of the scorecards individually and instead incorporate the thoughts of the discussion into the scorecards afterwards. The main points that came from the discussion were:

- The importance of receiving staff buy-in to comply with EDRMS procedure, for example tagging documents.
- Having an EDRMS solution that is compatible with as many existing systems as possible e.g. ISIS, QMU's student records database.
- The importance of educating and training staff in SharePoint 2007.
- Setting realistic timescales for implementation of SharePoint 2007.
- To increase staff usage of the intranet prior to the implementation of SharePoint 2007.
- Being able to convert existing documents into a suitable EDRMS format.
- The creation of EDRMS policies.

- Undertaking a full audit of existing IT storage across the institution prior to the implementation of SharePoint 2007.

After the briefing session, the Business and Research Support Adviser amended the scorecards to take into account the points raised in the discussion. The scorecards were then finalised with the Web Communications Analyst.

3.3. Full Economic Costing

In order to complete the cost template on the scorecards, SPRSU liaised with the Finance department to undertake a project costing, based on the full economic costing (fEC) model. This meant that all direct and indirect costs associated with undertaking the work had to be included, and overhead rates for both estates and indirect costs had to be established and applied on an FTE basis. This process allows for the total cost of the project to be far better informed.

4. Results and Findings

4.1. Scorecards

Following the start-up meeting, it was decided that only minor changes to the scorecards would be made, as they had been developed following a long period of consultation by the University of Glasgow.

The new QMU Strategic Plan 2007-2012 was consulted and several key issues, including our aim to be one of the best small and agile universities in the UK, were incorporated into the scorecards.

4.1.1. Customer and External Stakeholder Perspective

The primary outcomes of the scorecard on the Customer and External Stakeholder Perspective were speedy and up-to-date delivery of information and a higher profile within the university sector for records management activity. With QMU's new campus designed to exceed current environmental standards and set a new benchmark in sustainable design, it was felt that improving business processes will further enhance the institution's reputation across the sector. A suitable forum for discussion of the project with sector colleagues would be the Scottish Higher Education Information Practitioner's (SHEIP) group. With representation from all HEIs across Scotland, as well as the Universities Scotland Secretaries' Group, this would be an excellent opportunity for QMU to promote their work and that of JISC infoNet.

4.1.2. Internal Business Process Perspective

The Internal Business Process Perspective scorecard was seen to be the most relevant to the implementation of a document and records management solution. Several primary outcomes were identified that were intrinsically linked together, as reduced staff time spent looking for information and relevant information being available, would therefore lead to a reduction in time to answer information requests, particularly with regards to legislative requirements such as the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

4.1.3. Innovation and Development Perspective

The Innovation and Development Perspective scorecard was perhaps the most difficult to complete. It was felt that until the upgrade of SharePoint 2007 had taken place it would be difficult to gauge the contribution that will be made to the intellectual capital of QMU. However of particular concern would be any negativity surrounding the modification of existing systems as well as receiving staff buy-in to comply with new procedures. Careful preparation would therefore be required.

4.1.4. Financial Perspective

The majority of items within the Financial Perspective scorecard were seen to be cost saving as opposed to income generating. Due to the relocation of QMU and the reduction in the available storage space at the new campus, an off-site storage company was appointed in 2007 where departments were able to archive materials in line with the QMU records retention policy.

Additionally, QMU now operates Multi Function Devices (MFDs), so called because they can be used as printers, photocopiers and scanners. They give the facility to

allow staff and students to use a single device for all of the above functions, and it is no longer necessary to go to a separate area to do your printing and copying.

The MFD devices are able to scan directly to email or the network shared drive and stores the document in graphical or PDF format. Using the built-in software for Microsoft Office available on thin-client, staff and students are able to convert the document to editable text using optical character recognition (OCR).

Therefore the implementation of Microsoft SharePoint 2007, combined with the ability to scan and store documents electronically, should result in cost savings in relation to space with less off-site archiving.

4.2. Cost Template

A good business case is a communication between the proposer and the funder and is composed of clearly defined costs and benefits. In order to get as clearly defined costs as possible, it was decided to cost the project on a full economic cost basis through the QMU Finance department.

As the project was examining the suitability of the document and records management functionality that Microsoft SharePoint 2007 can offer, the cost template was put together based on the associated costs of upgrading to SharePoint 2007. This was because no additional cost is attached to the basic functionality that the upgrade brings.

The project is estimated to take place between April 2008 and September 2008, with the majority of input from the IS department. This will involve four members of staff spending between 10% and 50% of their time over the 6 months of the project. There will also be minor involvement from SPRSU in helping with various aspects of the project.

The overall cost of implementing SharePoint 2007 was valued to be £62,910, comprising of £28,760 for capital costs (initial set-up costs) and £34,150 for revenue costs (including staffing and institution overheads).

Although this cost is relatively small as it involves an upgrade from SharePoint 2003, there were some important discoveries made when putting together the costing. Whilst SharePoint 2007 does provide a front end to document and records management solutions, it was recommended that QMU should consider purchasing a full EDRMS solution such as those provided by Meridio (<http://www.meridio.com>), EMC Documentum (<http://software.emc.com>) and Open Text (<http://www.opentext.com>). Further advice on this could come from the University of Glasgow as they are using EMC Documentum for their EDRMS implementation.

Although QMU knew that SharePoint 2007 did not provide a fully comprehensive system, it was useful to clarify what extra steps may need to be taken. The likelihood is that QMU will upgrade to SharePoint 2007 and utilise the functionality it does provide in the first instance. QMU would then be in a better position to evaluate and identify what it requires over and above this in terms of a full EDRMS.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Experience of the Espida Methodology

Using the espida methodology has been, on the whole, a smooth process. Prior to the start-up meeting in Newcastle it had been difficult to get a full understanding of what was expected, but working through it and discussing various options helped a great deal. If other people were to use the espida methodology, a similar approach would definitely be recommended.

It was interesting to hear other staff's opinions on the scorecards when these were discussed at the meeting. On their own they were found to be complicated and required explanation, so much so that it was felt that an open discussion around an EDRMS would be more beneficial. The espida Handbook was considered too detailed to circulate, so a brief summary paper was put together instead.

If QMU was to go through the same exercise again, getting wider staff input would be helpful. The number who attended the meeting wasn't vast, and involvement nearer the start of the project would have allowed for better informed scorecards. Also the scorecards themselves were sometimes difficult to apply to the example that was being used; rather than trying to fit the QMU situation around the contribution, the scorecards could have been revised to give a more informed picture or the relevant field just left blank.

To conclude, the espida methodology is a useful aid to project management as it helps present an overview of a proposal, and indeed could be revised if the project is undertaken and a re-evaluation of outcomes was required. It was certainly a worthwhile exercise to undertake, and of particular use was the ability to present the positive and negative outcomes to colleagues, and use these as a basis for starting a discussion. It should also be noted that although the number of positive outcomes far outweighed the negative outcomes, there is no indication of the weighting of these. It would therefore be useful to include an additional column in the scorecards for "impact", for example saying whether it would be a minimal, controllable or maximum impact.

5.2. EDRMS at Queen Margaret University

Given the necessary upgrade to SharePoint 2007, it would be both prudent and cost-effective to base an EDRMS solution around SharePoint 2007. By completing the scorecards, QMU now has a methodology that helps to see both the positive and negative outcomes of the proposal, which is important in projects that will involve change in working practices. It is important to note that as the document and records management functionality of SharePoint 2007 is included within the upgrade, the cost template in Appendix A shows the cost of implementing and training staff on SharePoint 2007 in general, which will include the document and records management functionality.

The scorecards have helped identify several internal benefits to upgrade to SharePoint 2007, including improved data quality, speedy and up-to-date delivery of information and a decrease in paper records. However they have also identified several disadvantages, so it is therefore recommended that QMU progresses with the upgrade to SharePoint 2007 in April 2008, but with caution that the implementation to a full EDRMS should be carefully planned so as to avoid any resistance to change.

6. Appendix

6.1. *espida* Value and Cost Templates



espida Value and Cost Templates for Queen Margaret University

Notes on the Impact Scorecard

Outcome

A description of the proposed outcome for the particular objective.

Outcome Indicator

This is an indication of how it shall be known that the outcome has come to pass.

Category

This suggests the degree of outcome proposed. This can either be 'primary', 'secondary' and 'additional'.

Likelihood

The likelihood of impact coming to pass is measured as either: low (<25%), medium (25-75%), probable (>75%).

+/-

Is the proposed outcome a positive or negative one?

Timescale

The return can either be in the short-term, mid-term or long-term.

Longevity

This field indicates if the outcome will be short-lived or remain in place for a longer time period. There are no definite categories for this characteristic.

There are four Scorecards for the project at Queen Margaret University. Each scorecard details the objectives of one of four perspectives (customer and external stakeholder; innovation and development; business process; and financial). The Scorecards were developed by the University of Glasgow and have only been slightly tailored to reflect the differences between the two institutions. Time was taken to ensure full alignment between the new QMU strategic plan and the investment context described in the Scorecards.

| Customer and External Stakeholder Perspective | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| The contribution that will be made to satisfying the needs and aspirations of a wide range of types of external stakeholder and thereby enhancing the reputation and standing of the University. | | | | | | | | |
| | Contribution to: | Outcome | Outcome Indicator How will you know that it has happened? | Category | Likelihood | + / - | Timescale | Longevity |
| C1 | Enrichment of local, national and international culture, the community, and a reflection of these within the University | | | | | | | |
| C2 | Recognition of, and confidence in the University's brand and a reputation as being among the best new small and agile universities in the UK | Higher profile within university sector for records management activity | Other universities approaching QMU for advice | Additional | Medium | + | Long-term | Mid-term |
| C3 | Strong customer satisfaction and high quality service delivery (students, parents, public, etc.) | Improved data quality | Feedback on service from students | Secondary | Low | + | Long-term | Long-term |
| | | Speedy and up-to-date delivery of information | Number of successful replies and reduction in time to undertake business activities | Primary | Medium | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| C4 | Academic attractiveness to potential students (in particular international recruitment and 'part-time' programmes), staff, academic partners (local further education colleges) and funding agencies | Higher profile within university sector for records management activity | Other universities approaching QMU for advice | Additional | Medium | + | Long-term | Mid-term |
| C5 | Commercial attractiveness to potential sponsors and collaborators e.g. relationships with local schools and employers | Speedy and up-to-date delivery of information | Increase in collaboration activity | Primary | Medium | + | Long-term | Long-term |
| | EVALUATORS' SUMMARY | With QMU's new campus designed to exceed current environmental standards and set a new benchmark in sustainable design, improving business processes will further enhance the institution's growing reputation. | | | | | | |

Internal Business Process Perspective

The contribution that will be made to the way that the University does things and its capacity to change and/or expand to take advantage of new opportunities.

| | Contribution to: | Outcome | Outcome Indicator How will you know that it has happened? | Category | Likelihood | + / - | Timescale | Longevity |
|----|---|---|--|------------|------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|
| P1 | Information accessibility and open communications with staff and customers | User-friendly central records management system | Reduction in local management systems | Primary | Medium | + | Long-term | Long-term |
| | | Relevant information available | Number of requests for information | Primary | Probable | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| P2 | Operational efficiency and productivity (within existing resources) | Reduced staff time spent looking for information | Feedback from staff/ performance mgt | Primary | Probable | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | | Resistance to change from staff | Negative feedback to upgrade | Primary | Medium | - | Short-term | Mid-term |
| | | Time taken to learn new system | Delay in implementation | Primary | Medium | - | Short-term | Mid-term |
| P3 | Effectiveness of decision making and responsiveness of leadership | Improve management of institution | Feedback from staff | Additional | Probable | + | Short/ Mid-term | Long-term |
| P4 | Process potential and organisational flexibility to take advantage of future change e.g. developing IT/IS capacities to achieve the greatest possible efficiency in our management and support functions. | Enables future upgrades and integration | If Microsoft/partner release new version | Secondary | Probable | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | | An EDRMS solution that is compatible with existing systems | Successful tender or selection process | Primary | Probable | + | Short-term | Long-term |
| P5 | Compliance with legislation and regulation | Reduction in time taken to respond to FOI/DP enquiries | Comparison with previous requests | Primary | Medium | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | | Raise awareness of FOI and DP | Completion of online tutorials | Secondary | Low | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | | Recognition from OSIC and ICO | QM noted for good working practices | Additional | Low | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | EVALUATORS' SUMMARY | Use of the document and records management functionality that Microsoft SharePoint 2007 can offer will result in considerable benefit to all stakeholders who rely on quick and accurate delivery of information. | | | | | | |

Innovation and Development Perspective

The contribution that will be made to the intellectual capital of the University and to a working environment in which the generation of new ideas is the norm for both individuals and groups.

| | Contribution to: | Outcome | Outcome Indicator How will you know that it has happened? | Category | Likelihood | + / - | Timescale | Longevity |
|----|---|--|--|--------------------------|------------|-------|------------|------------|
| 11 | Intellectual capital of staff and the organisation through internal generation or external procurement | Expertise in field | Ability to implement system | Secondary/ Additional | Probable | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| 12 | Motivation, fulfilment and satisfaction of staff and development of a climate of continuous improvement | Feeling of belonging in a modern and forward looking university | Staff surveys/ questionnaires | Secondary/ Additional | Medium | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | | Modification of existing systems | Negativity towards changing systems | Primary | Probable | - | Mid-term | Mid-term |
| 13 | Quality and potential of research activities and outputs, including generating research and transferring knowledge for the public good | Research data being quickly available to academics and to other schools | Feedback from academic and administrative staff | Secondary | Medium | + | Short-term | Long-term |
| | | Enabling better systems to give expertise to users | Better educated staff | Primary | Medium | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| 14 | Quality and potential of teaching | Offers opportunity to business learning and intranet improvements | More information available to students | Secondary | Probable | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| 15 | Responsiveness to change (flexibility and ability to manage change), including the design of the new campus which explicitly calls for 'flexible working' | Informed decision making | Reflected in working practices and operational plans | Secondary | Medium | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | | Receiving staff buy-in to comply with procedures | Resistance to change | Primary | Probable | - | Short-term | Short-term |
| | EVALUATORS' SUMMARY | Potentially large benefits could be offset by high likelihood of resistance to change, so careful preparation will be required | | | | | | |

| Financial Perspective | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| The contribution that will be made to the 'bottom line' of the University, either through revenue generation or savings in operating costs. | | | | | | | | |
| | Contribution to: | Outcome | Outcome Indicator How will you know that it has happened? | Category | Likelihood | + / - | Timescale | Longevity |
| | <i>Income Generation through:-</i> | | | | | | | |
| F1 | selling assets | | | | | | | |
| F2 | licensing/rights to assets | | | | | | | |
| F3 | teaching and research | More time to undertake teaching and research | Feedback from staff, increase in research applications | Primary | Medium | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| F4 | contracts, grants, fees, donations | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Cost Saving in relation to:-</i> | | | | | | | |
| F5 | labour, time | Reduced staff time spent looking for information | Feedback from staff and performance management | Primary/ Secondary | Probable | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| F6 | space | Decrease in paper records | Measuring amount of shelf space | Primary | Medium | + | Mid-term | Long-term |
| | | Less storage space | Filing allocation at new campus | Primary | Probable | + | Short-term | Long-term |
| F7 | direct expenditure | There will be a saving as it fits in with existing IT infrastructure | Costing that has been undertaken | Primary | Probable | + | Short-term | Long-term |
| | EVALUATORS' SUMMARY | Expected cost savings due to improved electronic storage and less likelihood of having to retain paper copies. | | | | | | |

Cost Template

| <i>Type of cost</i> | <i>Amount</i> | <i>Basis of Costing³</i> |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Capital¹ | | |
| Equipment | | |
| New server | £10,000 | Estimated cost |
| Licence | £260 | Quote from Akhter Group |
| Consultancy | £5,000 | 5 days at £1,000 per day |
| Training for IS staff | £10,000 | Estimate of training cost |
| Train the trainer | £3,500 | Previous experience of train the trainer exercise |
| Sub-total | £28,760 | |
| Revenue² | | |
| Staffing (April 08 – Sep 08) | | Costed on fEC basis |
| IS input | | |
| Web Communications Analyst | £7,940 | 50% FT |
| Development Co-ordinator | £3,920 | 20% FT |
| Database Administrator | £1,790 | 10% FT |
| Assistant Database Analyst | £1,590 | 10% FT |
| SRPSU input | | |
| Business and Research Support Adviser | £750 | 5% FT |
| Overheads | | |
| Estates costs | £1,990 | Costed on fEC basis |
| Indirect costs | £16,170 | Costed on fEC basis |
| Sub-total | £34,150 | |
| <u>TOTAL</u> | <u>£62,910</u> | |

Notes:

¹ Capital are initial set up costs (by their very nature, one off). They can also be depreciated.

² Some recurrent costs could be discounted or depreciated.