

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

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. The process of filling out the scorecards**
- 3. A summary of the main factors of the example scorecards**
- 4. Discussion of the results**
- 5. Conclusion**
- 6. Appendix A: Completed scorecards**

1. Introduction

The University of Sheffield's Department of Corporate Information and Computing Services (CiCS) participated in a study to evaluate the espida methodology, a framework produced by the University of Glasgow that can be used to express "project costs and benefits in a systematic way for investment in information and IT".

The University of Sheffield was asked to undertake the following:

- To fill out a completed set of outcome scorecards for the chosen proposal.
- To develop a summary of the main factors leading to the results (included in this report).
- To develop a completed cost template for the proposal.
- To report on the University's experience of using the methodology, including details of how it was applied and any relevant observations.

The University developed two examples (available as Appendix A) using the espida methodology. The first was to use the work that had previously been undertaken by the Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS) project, and the second a current proposal for the creation of a records store for hard copy paper records. The latter has not yet been accepted as a formal project within the University.

The decision to develop two examples shows how the framework could be used to develop proposals for two different types of projects, with differing end benefits. The records store project is a traditional records management affair, with 'traditional' end benefits - storing hard copy

'inactive' paper records outside the office environment. It utilises traditional records management concepts such as the provision of a storage and retrieval service and the application of retention and disposition. It also highlights more physical, and therefore tangible changes to peoples working conditions (the removal of records from office space). The EDRMS project focuses on benefits such as improved collaboration, improving business processes and better management of electronic content. Here the potential is for quite far reaching long term changes and associated challenges, but perhaps in a far less tangible way than the other project associated with physical paper records.

With the EDRMS project a large body of work had already been compiled because the University of Sheffield purchased a system over 18 months ago. A large amount of work had taken place examining the perceived benefits of procuring such a system. The value of incorporating this work into espida were two-fold. Firstly to see how the methodology could be utilised to develop a proposal for an EDRMS, and secondly to see whether this approach would enable us to re-focus and re-energise the project some 18 months after starting it. By undertaking these two examples, it has been possible to contrast the application and outcomes of applying it to two very different types of projects. This has raised issues which might not have been raised had just one example been undertaken.

Any errors in applying the methodology or in the approach taken as a result of misapplying espida are solely the responsibility of the records manager at the University of Sheffield. Thanks go to all colleagues within the University who assisted in the evaluation and consideration of the methodology.

2. The process of filling out the scorecards

Understanding the accompanying guidance

It is of prime importance to read, digest and understand the guidance that accompanied the methodology in order to have a clear understanding of how to apply the methodology and how the process of filling in the scorecards should be undertaken. This was critical to providing guidance to other staff involved in the process. In particular it was necessary to gain a clear understanding of the 'perspective' and the 'elements of the perspective' in order to develop the filled in 'outcomes' and 'outcome indicators'. Familiarisation with the concepts contained within the guidance took time, and it is recommended that all those involved with the process, and in particular those who are facilitating the use of espida ensure that they have a clear understanding

that they can then articulate to colleagues. The guidance was well written, and the concepts were clearly articulated, and it was constantly referred to throughout the process to guide and inform. The examples set out within the main guidance were useful in showing the type of information that should be contained within the templates. The worked example of the holiday set out in the training exercise though was a little disappointing. It would, from this University's perspective, have made the process of understanding the templates more directly relevant if one of the two examples in the main guidance were used as a worked example.

Developing the outcomes and outcome indicators

The guidance recommends that in order to produce a clear set of aligned 'outcomes' and 'outcome indicators' it is necessary to engage all interested parties in their development. The unavailability of certain colleagues through diary clashes precluded the setting up of one large meeting to discuss the actual 'outcomes' and 'outcome indicators'. In both cases these were filled in by the records manager. In the EDRMS example the outcomes were taken from reports compiled at the start of the project, several years ago whereby an investigation was undertaken into EDRMS and possible benefits for the University in utilising such software. At the time widespread consultation took place to gain insight into the technology, the possible benefits and how it could be applied within the University. Consultation also took place with interested parties within the University to establish how it might be utilised. This was then put forward in a conventional report format. In the context of the other example, (the records storage facility), again the records manager set out the main 'outcomes' and 'outcome indicators' that were relevant to the setting up of such a project. In both cases a long period of time and reflection was required to fill in these two areas. Careful consideration needed to be given to the wording of the proposed benefits and any disadvantages highlighted. The challenge of articulating succinct and measurable outcomes for some of the core elements of providing "records management" should not be underestimated.

A meeting took place with a colleague responsible for introducing benefits realisation into project proposals within CiCS. This was particularly useful in that it helped to clarify what exactly were the 'outcomes' and the 'outcome indicators'. As stated previously it is difficult for the totally uninitiated to set out benefits, even after reading through the guidance notes and worked examples. Initial drafts did not articulate properly what the actual outcomes were that related directly to the elements of the perspective. Consulting with someone who had practical experience of undertaking such a task helped greatly in this process. Once this had been done, it

became easier to say how such outcomes would be measured. This is still not an easy process, and quite often measures will be qualitative than quantitative. This did not assist as much in the articulation of negative outcomes which was a particularly challenging issue to address. Given the very nature of project proposals the natural instinct is to provide a positive spin or good news story for those considering the proposal. However it is a strength of the methodology that it asks proposers to articulate negative outcomes. The value of doing so is clear. Once these have been articulated one can attempt to mitigate them. For decision makers themselves the risks associated with negative outcomes or issues can be freely discussed and evaluated against the positive outcomes set out. The benefits of having negative outcomes articulated were particularly noted by the decision makers during discussions of the methodology. Again it is likely that the consideration of negative issues associated with a new project would be easier to undertake in the context of a meeting of interested parties.

Within the guidance it is suggested that a meeting should take place in order to discuss the 'outcomes' and 'outcome indicators', and that the framework forms the basis of the discussion. In some cases this is probably the best approach to take to ensure all possible outcomes are addressed, and that the bias of having just one view or approach set out within the scorecards is mitigated. However it is argued that widespread engagement of interested parties might not be particularly suitable for all projects. Contrast the two examples undertaken. Would there be much point in undertaking widespread consultation about the setting up of a traditional records store, the benefits or outcomes of which are unlikely to be radically different from the traditional arguments set out for such projects? Such consultation would be unlikely to advance new or original ways of trying to align the benefits to strategic aims and objectives, or articulate the benefits of such a facility to decision makers. Conversely the introduction of EDRMS could, as previously stated, have far reaching consequences and challenges, and have a far more significant impact on individuals and business processes. Here it would be quite appropriate to canvas a variety of views and opinions when attempting to articulate outcomes. When consulting with colleagues about the completed scorecards, it was observed that the timing of such a meeting to address 'outcomes' and 'outcome indicators' would be important. It was thought by many who were consulted that to engage what could potentially be a significant amount of staff time at the very outset might not be the most appropriate way forward. In some respects it was seen as a classic 'chicken and egg' situation in that in order to take full advantage of the espida methodology you require input from a number of interested parties right at the outset, something which is not likely to happen unless some type of proposal is likely to get approval. Indeed many

projects germinate from individuals who propose and articulate benefits of undertaking projects without widespread engagement or consultation with other colleagues. Whilst it is acknowledged that this is what espida is trying to mitigate against, the reality is that in many cases this consultation and engagement with colleagues at such an early stage is simply not possible.

A critical factor when developing the content within the framework is understanding who the intended audience is. This is referred to in the guidance that accompanies espida, but is worth reiterating here. Throughout the development process it was important to consider to whom we were making the case. Indeed if there are inconsistencies in the content it could well be because of this. The records manager did not have a clear view from the outset whether this was being directed at line management, the head of department (HoD) or senior figures within the University. The final approach was aimed somewhere around HoD level. This is important because it is likely to have a bearing on what outcomes are included, and also whether the actual perspective and elements are manipulated.

Completing the 'category', 'likelihood', 'timescale' and 'longevity' indicators

The filling out of the other fields - likelihood, positivity and negativity, timescale and longevity were straightforward for both examples. Depending upon the nature of the projects being proposed these may be more or less challenging than they were here. The reasoning behind most of the statements is likely to be reasonably straightforward. For those having to interpret the filled-in templates though, further explanation should be incorporated in some way. Working through a couple of examples will explain this statement. For example the outcome in the records store scorecard highlighting an outcome of more appropriate use of office space contributing to operational efficiency and productivity. If records are taken away from an office environment, the impact is likely to be almost immediate, and reasonably long-term (the records don't tend to go back to the department). The likelihood of the measure coming to pass is very high, and this should have a positive impact on the environment or office to which this is applied. In the EDRMS example a possible negative outcome of contributing to responsiveness to change may be the challenges associated with new ways of working. This is likely to be a primary outcome of introducing new software or processes associated with new software. It is very likely to have a high likelihood and short term timescale if the use of the software is unavoidable, but is likely to only be a medium term issue if the system is supported by appropriate training and documentation, and if the system has been set up and configured appropriately with user input. This is something that should be taken into account by proposers when deciding how to deliver

the completed scorecards to decision makers, but it is not a reflection on the actual terms used or the contextual information they are supposed to convey.

Filling out the cost template

The cost template was relatively straightforward to fill in given the amount of work that had already taken place with these two projects. However this is likely to be the template that will be most challenging to complete. Capital costs and the basis for the costing were quite straightforward to establish for both examples. The more difficult costs to establish, as highlighted in the accompanying guidance, were those for undertaking the project through to fruition. In the case of developing a record store, there is likely to be little staff time involved, other than project management or attendance at meetings. Staff costs will usually begin after the centre is built. Here the template highlighted a key difference in using it for different projects. The nature of a records store produces costs that are relatively straightforward to set out whilst the introduction of an EDRMS provides a completely different challenge for the following reasons. Within the context of a large scale EDRMS deployment there will be significant, possibly open ended costs that will be difficult to establish at the outset, unless there is a clear vision of how the institution intends to roll out the application. The institution might well consider that initial work is undertaken within existing resources, but this is not sustainable in the medium and long term. The main problem is that an EDRMS roll-out is essentially a project that never finishes. Setting up pilots is only the start of the process. The resource required to support and administer the roll-out is in some respects the major limiting factor of the system, not the requirements or wishes of the end-users to whom you wish to roll the system and functionality out to. In this example it is only post procurement where it has been possible to develop a view of the likely staff resources required. There are many questions that are worth considering in the context of resourcing an EDRMS project, and failure to consider them properly at this initial stage may well have a significant bearing on the overall success or failure of such a project. Failure to provide an honest and reasonably accurate view of the likely long term resourcing costs will, in the context of an EDRMS project, provide a seriously flawed view for decision makers because it is such a significant element. Within espida cost is not necessarily deemed to be the most important issue in deciding whether to proceed with a project or not. However the ongoing costs to resource an EDRMS project are likely to be so significant that rigorous analysis of other EDRMS installations and the long term costs associated with them must be undertaken. Such a project should not be considered until such work is done and the consequences of proceeding are fully understood.

It is worth noting here that the term 'scorecards' is potentially misleading. Colleagues were expecting to be able to put a figure on the completed cards which would indicate whether a certain approach, or set of benefits had a 'value' that could then be compared or contrasted against another 'value'. As stated in the guidance this is not the point of the methodology for very good reasons, and the terminology used may therefore wish to reflect this.

In terms of practically filling out the form, the 'box' style approach was, in some ways, quite limiting. Certain benefits do not fit into the rather limited amount of space for a text based document. It was not clear whether this was consciously designed into the framework to encourage brevity and distillation of thought.

3. A summary of the main factors of the example scorecards

The results of the scorecards were, in many ways to be expected. This is due in large part to the fact that the records manager was primarily responsible for filling in much of the content and for choosing the examples. Much work had already been undertaken on the EDRMS project, and it was encouraging to see that this could be incorporated with relative ease into the framework. The output highlighted that the methodology enabled the articulation of clear benefits to some of the perspectives (those which one would have expected) and conversely showed that some arguments for a proposal simply could not be made. So for example, the records store project aligned strong primary outcomes in contributions to the internal business process perspective and cost savings within the financial perspective. It also highlighted interesting secondary outcomes within the customer and external stakeholder perspective - something which might not have come across to decision makers if it had not been articulated within the espida framework. The output also highlighted that the argument for the development of a records store is unlikely to be strong in its alignment to some elements of the innovation and development perspective or the ability to generate income. A summary of the EDRMS project proposal as expressed through espida also shows where its strengths and weaknesses lie. Here it aligned strongly to the contribution it might make to internal business processes, and to innovation and development. Again it was likely to have some secondary benefits in the area of cost savings (although not as much as one might initially think), and would certainly be challenging in terms of the costs associated with the project.

4. Discussion of the results

Overall impression

Once the framework documents were completed discussions took place with interested colleagues. Some were the decision makers who might be asked to use the espida framework in their decision making process, and others would be beneficiaries or end users of the proposed projects, and who would contribute to the development of 'outcomes' and 'outcome indicators' if the development of them were undertaken in the traditional manner recommended by the espida guidance. Colleagues with expertise in project management, project support and benefits realisation were also consulted. Discussions took place to discuss a range of issues ranging from the practical nature of the information being supplied to an evaluation of the methodology against current project proposal frameworks already in place at the University of Sheffield. Some of the analysis has already been incorporated into earlier parts of the report, but this section attempts to bring together other observations and comments. Much of the discussion centred on the broader issues surrounding espida, not necessarily upon the specific results recorded by the University of Sheffield's completion of the scorecards. This is not to say that the completion of the scorecards was irrelevant, but by filling in the scorecards one could make more general observations about the process, methodology and value of espida, which are more significant than a narrower discussion of the merits of our outcomes and outcome indicators.

From the decision makers perspective there was generally widespread approval of the framework. Notwithstanding the explanation required to set the context, it appeared that the way the information was set out was clear for consumers, and that it provided a clear and informative overview of the specific benefits of undertaking a project. In particular the matrix type view of the information was seen as simple to understand and consider. The way that espida articulates different perspectives and not just a homogeneous view of the possible benefits of a project was seen as beneficial in a number of ways. It provided clarity and structure to arguments and ensured that outcomes could be set clearly against agreed criteria (the perspectives). It also tended to show graphically where certain proposals clearly contributed to a perspective and where they didn't. If they didn't then the boxes next to the perspective should be blank. Secondly the teasing out of particular issues relating to outcomes was seen as beneficial. It can be relatively straightforward to say that there will be outcome 'x' or 'y' but expanding on the outcome through criteria such as how likely was it to happen, over what timescale and what the proposed longevity of the outcome might be were generally viewed as useful for decision makers.

Application of the methodology

The stated aim of the methodology is set out clearly in the guidance that accompanies it. It is designed to be used by higher and further education establishments in order to articulate clearly to decision makers (and other interested parties) project proposals. In so doing it is designed also to contextualise the proposal as much as possible by providing information that will be of use to those who have to prioritise and approve projects. It is quite clear from undertaking the evaluation that this methodology could be utilised in other organisations, not just the higher education sector. Much of the framework would be of relevance to any organisation in trying to establish control over such issues. It is likely that such frameworks will already be in place in many organisations, and that the complexity of these frameworks will also differ, depending upon the organisations.

Contrast with the University of Sheffield approach to project proposal

In considering and evaluating the methodology it has been necessary to consider its merits as a stand alone piece of work, but also to compare it to current systems in place at the University of Sheffield. This was an area particularly considered during the discussions with other colleagues who have experience of project management and project support. There were several elements where it was felt that, if included, they might strengthen the methodology and in particular contribute to the stated aim of providing a rounded picture for decision makers. It is felt that this report should not have been given over to a detailed 'compare and contrast' analysis, principally because it would not have benefited the wider constituency, yet it is inevitable that an element of this has taken place. Again some of the comments and observations have been incorporated into the report earlier on, but below are a couple of specific observations which are as a result of looking in particular at how the University of Sheffield undertakes project proposal. Many projects do not exist in isolation, and it would be useful to know about other key user groups, and dependencies for the proposed project. At a practical level, the methodology does not expand fully on how the actual project is likely to be undertaken, what resources might have to be engaged to undertake the project and crucially the timescales over which resources might have to be deployed. This would be critical to making a decision on whether to proceed with any project. It could be argued that this information may be present once the project has been approved (for example in project initiation documentation), but this would be too late. Such information is central to resource allocation, prioritising projects and establishing the likelihood of proceeding with a project.

One of the issues highlighted in comments was that the framework didn't appear to articulate the changes necessary if outcomes were to be realised. Simply putting in place a new computer

application such as EDRMS or developing a new records store will not automatically produce the outcomes articulated. Changes therefore are critical to the delivery of the outcomes. The merits of including this within the methodology should be carefully considered. Its inclusion would go somewhat further down the line to applying more rigorous benefits realisation, but it may provide decision makers with better information concerning the size and challenge of the task.

Whether to redefine the perspective or elements of the perspective for the target audience

As discussed earlier, it was stated that it was important to know to whom the proposal was being directed. In turn this could have a bearing on whether one redefines the 'perspective' or 'elements' of the perspective. This decision could be critically important to ones use of the methodology, and to illustrate why, the example of our own department here at Sheffield can be used. The department here has a clear strategic aims and policies. Within this framework the department has set out programmes of work to support and contribute to the strategic policies and aims. These have been produced and aligned with University strategic aims and objectives. It would therefore be quite reasonable to develop a set of perspectives and elements (still using the overall headings such as *Internal Business Process, Customer and External Stakeholder* etc.) to the CiCS view as set out in its strategic documentation. This would have the benefit of being more directly relevant to the department and its aims and objectives. It would produce a tighter alignment of project proposals to the department's aims and objectives rather than higher level University aims and objectives. It is likely that proposals that didn't align at this lower level would therefore be easier to distinguish. One remark made during consultation suggested that one could align the giving out of free ice cream to University strategic views if done carefully, whilst it might be more difficult to do so to the more specific departmental objectives. The remark, though made in jest, makes a serious point and highlights the argument well. The reason this realignment to more specific departmental objectives wasn't done in these examples was that firstly it wouldn't have then evaluated the carefully constructed framework set out by espida for projects to address strategic issues, and secondly it would have taken too long to re-align the framework. However careful consideration should be given to this point if one decides to use this methodology.

5. Conclusion

It is highly likely that most organisations will already have, to some degree, certain elements of this approach already integrated into their project proposal and decision making systems. Nevertheless it is worth examining whether espida provides anything additional or new to existing approaches. The methodology is generally intuitive and simple to use. It provides a

useful tool for articulating project proposals and for providing a simple view of proposals to decision makers. It is flexible and can be used in different ways. There is little cost other than staff time, but the engagement of this time in producing a coherent set of results should not be underestimated. It provides a lighter touch and introduction to some of the more rigorous benefits realisation models currently on offer. A quick compare and contrast type approach can probably be undertaken within a few days if what one wishes is to roughly articulate a project proposal. However in order to realise the full benefits of the methodology it is worth taking the time to get it right. This is likely to mean that a document is developed over a couple of weeks to a month. The outcome of a more considered approach is likely to be a more robust and well argued project proposal that will provide a solid and realistic foundation for the project if approved. At the start of this report it was stated that the greatest challenge lay in articulating outcomes and benefits of undertaking records management projects. There is a tendency to use traditional arguments in traditional ways when justifying why records management will benefit organisations. Generally records management practitioners tend not to challenge these traditional assumptions and outlooks for a number of reasons. For example we may choose not to in case we undermine our own positions or we see the building blocks of the profession as unalterable truths. Maybe then this is where espida's real strength lies. It asks those who use it to start to question and challenge the principles on which traditional principles are built. This provides risks, in that we may find certain arguments do not stand up to rigorous analysis. Conversely however it may provide opportunities and answers to some of the challenges facing the records management profession in the 21st century.

Matthew Zawadzki, Records Manager

The University of Sheffield,

Department of Corporate Information and Computing Services,

October 2007



espida Value and Cost Templates
for the University of Sheffield EDRMS

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.

Each scorecard details the objectives of one of four perspectives (customer and external stakeholder; innovation and development; business process; and financial). The following Scorecards reflect the aims of a research-intensive higher education institution.

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 Universities in the world	UoS viewed as a leader in Records Management within the HE sector	Increase in number of visits to UoS by those undertaking EDRMS, quantitative	Additional	Med	+	Med term	Long term
			Feedback from other institutions and organisations, qualitative					
C3	Strong customer satisfaction and high quality service delivery (students, parents, public, etc.)	Improving business transactions between end users and the University, for example through quicker response times	Improved satisfaction in student surveys, user feedback, qual	Primary	Med	+	Med term	Long term
			Measurement of response times, quant	Primary	Med	+	Med term	Long term
C4	Academic attractiveness to potential students, staff, academic partners and funding agencies							
C5	Commercial attractiveness to potential sponsors and collaborators	Improved business transactions with sponsors and collaborators	Improved SLA indicators and quicker response times, quant	Secondary	Med	+		
		Adapting business processes will require changes in working practice	Training resource for staff using the new system, quant	Secondary	High	-	Med term	Long term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY	Improving business processes contributes to a better experience for those interacting with the University and will directly contribute to the Shared Vision of 'Meeting and exceeding customer expectations'.						

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	Improved ability to collaborate using workflow	Usage of workflow module, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
		Sharing information across departmental boundaries	User feedback, qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
		Improved availability of management information	Quicker decisions that rely on access to relevant information, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
P2	Operational efficiency and productivity (within existing resources)	Reduction in duplication both paper and electronic	User feedback relating to business practices and transactions, qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
		Quicker transactions within business processes	Improved SLA indicators, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
P3	Effectiveness of decision making and responsiveness of leadership	Ability to access information more quickly	Measuring usage of Livelink to store information, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
		Ability to access correct versions	Measuring usage of Livelink to store information, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
P4	Process potential and organisational flexibility to take advantage of future change	Re-engineering of business processes using Livelink	User feedback and usage, quant and qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
		Ability to shorten business processes by using workflow module	User feedback and usage, quant and qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
P5	Compliance with legislation and regulation	Improved electronic record keeping	Assigning of retention and disposal to specific records, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
		More efficient management of server space	Statistical feedback on server capacities and use, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY	Use of Livelink, Workflow and RM modules can directly contribute to the current University Information Strategy and University IT Strategy. In particular it contributes to the ability to collaborate and share information more effectively						

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
I1	Intellectual capital of staff and the organisation through internal generation or external procurement							
I2	Motivation, fulfilment and satisfaction of staff and development of a climate of continuous improvement	Re-engineering of business processes to utilise Livelink functionality	User take-up of Livelink, quant	Primary	High	+	Short term	Med term
		Resentment to re-engineering current processes	User feedback, qual	Primary	High	-	Short term	Med term
I3	Quality and potential of research activities and outputs							
I4	Quality and potential of teaching							
I5	Responsiveness to change (flexibility and ability to manage change)	Quicker re-engineering of business processes	User feedback. Reviewing business process change, qual	Primary	High	+	Short term	Med term
		Resistance associated with new ways of working	Take up of system, quant	Primary	High	-	Short term	Med term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY	Incorporation of the Livelink software, particularly through the use of webforms and workflow, are likely to improve significantly the ability of the University to re-engineer and improve current business processes.						

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							
F4	contracts, grants, fees, donations							
	<i>Cost Saving in relation to:-</i>							
F5	labour, time	Quicker business transactions and processes	Measurement of current processes against re-engineered processes, quant	Primary	Med	+	Short term	Long term
		Reduced expenditure on staff	Increase in workload for individuals, qual	Secondary	Low	-/+	Med term	Long term
F6	space	Reduction in hard copy records retained	Fewer paper records being held by departments or within RM storage, quant	Secondary	Med	+	Med term	Long term
		Ability to relocate staff without large scale records accommodation	Liaison with Departments, qual	Secondary	Med to long term	+	Med term	Long term
F7	direct expenditure	Reduction in costs associated with storing hard copy records	Reduction in revenue spent on physical records management (paper, files, filing cabinets, shelving), quant	Secondary	Low to Med	+	Med term	Long term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY	Directly contributes to the Information Strategy objectives of reducing cost and effort of managing and using information, although these will be secondary benefits and not the primary reasons for introducing the technology.						

Cost Template

<i>Type of cost</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Basis of Costing³</i>
Capital¹		
Equipment	£100,000 + VAT	Estimate based on consultation with Head of Technical Services
Space/building modification		
Software	£124,000 + VAT	Cost for 1000 user licences based on ITT information
Sub-total	£263,200 (inc. VAT)	
Revenue²		
Maintenance	c.£30,000 + VAT	5% of software costs per annum
Consultancy and training	c.£20,000 + VAT	Costs per course vary. Min c. £500 per day. Course run at UoS £2,000. Consultancy c. £1000 per day plus expense of c. 15%
Sub-total	£58,750	These are estimated costs per annum. It is by no means certain that these costs would decrease over the first three years of roll-out
Staffing Staff 1: .5 x FTE Project Manager, full time Staff 2: 1x FTE Database Administrator, full time Staff 3: 1x FTE Records Manager, full time Staff 4: 1-1.5 FTE x Business Process Analyst / Liaison Officer / Trainer Other Staff: .5x FTE Database developer	Approx 1-2 FTE has been engaged in all aspects of roll-out since procurement. If one uses an average of £40,000 inc. on-costs, staffing costs could realistically be in the region of £160,000 to £200,000 per annum	Staffing costs are based on practical experiences of last 18 months but also on anecdotal guidance of costs associated with rolling out and maintaining an EDRMS. The staff costs associated with roll-out are likely to be significant. Whilst not all roll-outs are likely to be afforded such resources, the highlighting of a significant human resource element to a successful implementation is critical. Without it the project is likely to fail.
Sub-total	£200,000	
<u>TOTAL</u>		
	<u>£521,750</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.

³ Basis on which the figures are provided so that it is clear what is included and what uncertainties are inherent in the figures.

Note to accompany costings

These costs have been developed from two main sources. Firstly they are real costs associated with the recent procurement project. Secondly there are costs that, from our experience of the procurement and implementation process are likely to be incurred as a result of trying to implement any significant EDRMS project.

Capital costs are likely to be one-off, unless further licences or hardware are bought. Revenue costs are likely to remain significant whilst the project is being developed and implemented. It is likely that these costs would not diminish significantly over a roll-out and implementation timetable of 3 to 5 years. It is possible that there may be some decline in the amount of consultancy and training costs during that time, although issues such as upgrades, specific configuration and training of staff at lower levels (a hidden cost of training) would remain.



espida Value and Cost Templates
for the University of Sheffield North Campus
project

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.

Each scorecard details the objectives of one of four perspectives (customer and external stakeholder; innovation and development; business process; and financial). The following Scorecards reflect the aims of a research-intensive higher education institution.

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	Better University archives	Increase in accessions to the University's administrative archive, quantitative	Secondary	High	+	Mid-term	Long-term
			Increase in visitor numbers, number of enquiries answered and number of documents retrieved, quant	Secondary	High	+	Mid-term	Long-term
C2	Recognition of, and confidence in the University's brand and a reputation as being among the best Universities in the world	Higher profile for University Records Management and archive as a centre of excellence	Increase in number of researchers referencing University archive material, quant	Secondary	Medium	+	Mid-term	Long-term
			Increase in number of visits to University and requests for RM staff to speak at engagements, quant	Additional	Medium	+	Mid-term	Long-term
C3	Strong customer satisfaction and high quality service delivery (students, parents, public, etc.)	Increased satisfaction with services (both internal RM and external archive)	Customer feedback, qualitative	Secondary	Med	+	Mid term	Long term
			User statistics, quant	Secondary	Med	+	Mid term	Long term
C4	Academic attractiveness to potential students, staff, academic partners and funding agencies	Higher profile of a well managed University archive	User feedback, qual	Additional	Med	+	Mid-term	Long-term
			User statistics, quant	Secondary	Med	+	Med term	Long term
C5	Commercial attractiveness to potential sponsors and collaborators	Improving standards in information and records management	Number of departments using facility, number of boxes within facility, quant	Primary	High	+	Short-term	Long-term
			User feedback, qual	Secondary	Med	+	Mid-term	Long-term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY	The development of storage accommodation will have a secondary benefit of improving University archive collections. It will enforce the view externally that robust procedures and processes are in place for the management of University records and information						

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	Improved physical management of records	Greater number of records held in the RM system, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long-term
			User statistics and feedback, qual					
P2	Operational efficiency and productivity (within existing resources)	More appropriate use of physical space	Greater number of records held in RM system, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long-term
		Embedding good record keeping practice within Departments	User statistics, and feedback, qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long-term
P3	Effectiveness of decision making and responsiveness of leadership							
P4	Process potential and organisational flexibility to take advantage of future change	Ability to respond favourably to changes in the University estate	From liaison with departments who are required to undertake departmental relocations, qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
P5	Compliance with legislation and regulation	Improved compliance with external and internal record keeping legislation and guidance	Records assigned appropriate retention periods and increased numbers of records held, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long-term
			Number of records held in system, quant	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long-term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY	Development of accommodation will improve the core record keeping activity associated with paper records – establishing what records departments have, where they are and how long they need to be retained for.						

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
I1	Intellectual capital of staff and the organisation through internal generation or external procurement							
I2	Motivation, fulfilment and satisfaction of staff and development of a climate of continuous improvement	Improved physical working environment	User feedback, qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
		Improved health and safety environment	User feedback, qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
I3	Quality and potential of research activities and outputs	Access to better archive records	Increase in numbers of UoS researchers using archives, quant	additional	low	+	Med term	Long term
I4	Quality and potential of teaching							
I5	Responsiveness to change (flexibility and ability to manage change)	Ability of departments to adapt to physical change	User feedback, qual	Primary	High	+	Med term	Long term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY	Development of accommodation will enable staff to re-establish control and management over records currently held within their offices						

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	Potential to sell space and RM services to third parties	Number of third parties using service, quant	Additional	Low	+	Med term	Long term
F3	teaching and research							
F4	contracts, grants, fees, donations							
	<i>Cost Saving in relation to:-</i>							
F5	labour, time	Reduced staff time in managing physical records	Increase in nos. of boxes in facility, quant User feedback, qual	Primary	High	+	Short-term	Long-term
F6	space	Ability to relocate to accommodation with smaller storage areas Ability to utilise existing space more appropriately	User feedback, qual Increase in departments using storage facility, quant	Primary Primary	High High	+	Short-term	Long-term
F7	direct expenditure	Costs associated with departmental storage of records	Reduced purchasing of storage facilities for departments or use of 3 rd party external storage services, quant and qual	Primary	High	+	Short-term	Long-term
	EVALUATORS' SUMMARY		The development of accommodation will reduce quantities of records being held in high cost office accommodation. It will directly assist in the storage of records for departments who relocate.					

Cost Template

<i>Type of cost</i>	<i>Amount</i>		<i>Basis of Costing³</i>
Capital¹			
Equipment	Racking	£70,000	Estimates gathered from racking companies. This figure is based on utilising mobile racking and producing a box capacity of approx. 8000. Estimate of approx 250m2 of space to utilise. Budget estimate from Estates Department.
Space/building modification	Building costs	£13,500	
	Electrical installation costs	£8,750	
	Fire alarms and emergency lighting	£6,000	
	Service installations	£1,500	
	Preliminaries	£9,347	
Assets/resources/materials – boxes, ladders and trollies		£5,000	
Contingency		£12,000	
Professional fees		£11,100	
	Sub total	£137,197	
VAT @17.5%		£24,009	
	Sub total	£161,206	
Revenue²			
Equipment	PC, phone and network connection	£230 (+VAT) per network connection PC £450 (+VAT)	Guidance from CiCS
	Sub total	£1,000 (inc VAT)	
Staffing	1 FTE inc. on-costs	£25,000	
<u>TOTAL</u>		£187,206	

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.

³ Basis on which the figures are provided so that it is clear what is included and what uncertainties are inherent in the figures.