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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Methodology

The aim of this part of the project was to conduct a survey of HEIs to determine the scale, scope and nature of use of SharePoint within HEIs. A population of 159 HEIs was used (based on data from the website of Universities UK (www.universitiesuk.ac.uk)). 40 HE organisations were interviewed (38 HEIs, ~25% of the population; 2 other relevant organisations in the HE field), concentrating on IT Directors/Managers. The HEIs interviewed are a reasonable match to the population of UK HEIs (based on type of organisation and geographical location).

Use / non use of SharePoint and scale of use

31 (78%) of the HEIs were using SharePoint and of these 29 (94%) were using the 2007 version.

Of the 9 HEIs not using SharePoint, 5 were considering its use and 4 had rejected it on the grounds of functionality, bugs, configuration issues/difficulty, training overhead, governance overhead or policy.

18 (58%) of current users had a strategy for SharePoint, 1 user was developing a strategy and a further current non-user had a strategy (viz. preparing a business case) for using SharePoint.

Scale of use - SharePoint users

Number of uses across the whole of an HEI = 30
Number of specific areas of an HEI where SharePoint is used = 65
Number at specific stage:
  - consider = 4
  - planned = 17
  - pilot = 16
  - roll out = 7
  - live = 44
  - not specified = 7

Scale of considered use - SharePoint non-users

Number of uses considered across the whole of an HEI = 10
Number of uses considered in specific areas of an HEI = 9
Number at specific stage:
  - consider = 15
  - planned = 1
  - pilot = 3

Most of the HEIs using SharePoint (26 ~84%) were using it for multiple purposes, and nearly half of the non-users (4 ~44%) were considering it for multiple purposes.
Where and how SharePoint has been used

Ranking of areas within the HEI where SharePoint is used:

No. HEIs

23 across whole HEI
12 governance & management area
9 research area
9 physical resources (IT/estates) area
7 other specific area
7 student administration & services area
7 teaching & learning area
4 financial services area
2 commercial & development area
1 human resources area

Ranking of purposes for use of SharePoint

No. HEIs

23 intranet
23 collaboration
15 document management
5 business intelligence
5 records management
5 corporate website
5 business process mgmt
3 other
2 virtual learning
2 knowledge management

Most uses are for staff only.

Where and how SharePoint has been considered for use by non users

Ranking of purposes for considering use of SharePoint

No. HEIs

6 collaboration
3 document management
3 virtual learning
2 corporate website
2 intranet
1 business process management
1 records management
Drivers

The 2 drivers that stand out are: improved services / systems / management (19 occurrences) and collaboration (17 occurrences). And the SharePoint product per se was a driver (13 occurrences - e.g. seen as a stable, long term product some HEIs had previous experience of SharePoint, others were trying it out).

Procurement process

For all of the users of SharePoint in this survey, it was available in their existing MS bundle / campus agreements, though for some users additional licence top ups were required for extra functionality. No HEIs who use SharePoint had undertaken a formal procurement process. Three of the non-users also noted that they had SharePoint in their existing MS bundle / campus agreements.

SharePoint use - successes and barriers

Ranking of successes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. HEIs</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>achieved / improved activity / service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>people factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SharePoint functionality and technical features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>organisational factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>too early to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking of barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. HEIs</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SharePoint functionality and technical features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>people factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>organisational factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>too early to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SharePoint features - benefits and weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Benefits (no. HEIs)</th>
<th>Weaknesses (no. HEIs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Forms &amp; Integration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Intelligence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise search</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic functionality and technical factors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational factors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People factors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites / Content Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relatively large number of HEIs citing weaknesses of SharePoint’s functionality / technical characteristics may be due to the fact that the interviewees were mostly directly or indirectly responsible for its implementation and/or the fact that specific functionality/technical issues are likely to become more apparent in the early stages of implementation than some other issues.

Stakeholder views

Stakeholder views are mixed, some liking SharePoint others not. If an implementation is set up in a way that meets user requirements and is easy to use than users are happy with the product - some may not be aware that they are using it! Stakeholder groups where there may be more resistance to SharePoint include IT staff (e.g. fears of deskilling) and academic staff (e.g. anti-Microsoft feelings).

Key lessons learnt
(in rank order)

- 19 Organisational factors
- 11 Implementation factors
- 11 Technical / Functionality Factors
- 9 People factors
- 1 Too early to say

Things to do differently
(in rank order)

- 11 Organisational factors
- 9 People factors
- 6 Technical / Functionality Factors
- 4 Implementation factors
- 2 Too early to say

Reasons for non use

5 HEIs were considering / potentially considering using SharePoint. 4 HEIs had rejected SharePoint for reasons such as policy, problems with functionality and technical aspects, bugs, and cost (for licensing, people and development).
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1. OVERVIEW

Many HEIs have successfully implemented SharePoint and achieved their service/deployment aims. For some, this has been possible by using SharePoint out-of-the-box, often under existing site licences, probably related to the purpose they are using SharePoint for and the local context. For others successful implementation of SharePoint has required much time, effort and expense. SharePoint can require complex preparatory work developing infrastructure, configurations and customisation. This can require the purchase of additional Microsoft licences and third party add-ons. Some third party add-ons are poorly designed and poorly supported. SharePoint specific knowledge and skills are required. These are often lacking in-house and have to be purchased from external sources. HEIs often use consultants; they found that consultants have to be carefully managed to ensure that they pursue the organisation’s implementation/deployment goals rather than their own. Some HEIs have looked to the temporary employment of developers rather than using consultants. The pool of such external expertise is not large, and often developers are not interested in employment at the comparatively low salaries offered in the HE sector. Use of outside expertise runs the risk that if a programme of training to develop in-house skills is not run in parallel, this outside help will be needed again in the future when SharePoint is updated or if the organisation wants to use it in other ways.

SharePoint is a very complex product with a huge scope, some would argue overly so. Despite this only just over 60% of the current SharePoint users interviewed had or were developing a strategy for using SharePoint. User demand and evangelism and organic growth have positive aspects of encouraging use of a new tool or service. However, if this is allowed to continue unchecked, or outside the defined parameters, use of SharePoint can very quickly become a sprawl. SharePoint can work well in specific areas in an organisation and as a point solution. It is much more challenging to use it enterprise wide. In light of the lessons learned by the HEIs in this survey and the things they said they would do differently, one conclusion that can be drawn is that it would be wise for an organisation planning to use SharePoint to set up a clear strategy noting what they want to achieve and what aspects of SharePoint they want to deploy. This strategy needs to be supported by a set of controls and governance procedures to ensure that it is adhered to and to prevent ‘mission creep’.

SharePoint fits well into a Microsoft framework. It can be easy to use for the end user, benefitting from a familiar user interface. However, there is a risk of proprietary lock in. SharePoint 2007 only runs on the Microsoft 'stack'; organisations need Windows as their operating system and MS SQL Server as their content database in order to run SharePoint. SharePoint 2007 works best with MS Office 2007, and some functionality is lost if organisations are using previous versions of Office, or equivalent applications from other providers.

The 78% of respondents using SharePoint matches with information from Microsoft of a usage figure of ~75-80% - “the licensing agreement with MS includes a SharePoint licence. So most HEIs have SharePoint [by default]”, “there is an element of SharePoint that is part of the operating system and can be used for ‘free’.” “but because HEIs have free access to SharePoint doesn’t necessarily mean they are users”, “if HEIs have bought the SharePoint server product then they ‘must’ be using it”; “approximately 33% have brought the server product.” (Personal communication with Dominic Watts, UK HE Business Manager, Microsoft. 11 September 2009).

However, there is no consistent pattern across the HEIs using SharePoint in terms of the scale of its use (e.g. across the whole institution, within a small part of the institution), the stage of implementation (e.g. planned, live), or the purpose of the use (e.g. for collaboration, as an intranet). In the HEI context, it is interesting to note that there are 13 uses in the Teaching & Learning area, but only 2 uses for a VLE (Virtual Learning Environment), suggesting most universities have a VLE and are using SharePoint for pockets of other activity. The wide range of
drivers demonstrates the flexibility of SharePoint and its potential to provide a solution to a wide range of requirements.

**Benefits - Some Views**

“We are able to deliver an intranet and collaboration system for staff and students, accessible anytime, anyplace, anywhere.”

“We depend on funding from industry so the ability to collaborate in team sites is a bonus for us and our partners.”

“IT have enjoyed the advantages but this is because they are more team focussed than other areas and more technically capable”

My Sites - “People like the idea of being able to search for colleague’s skills but lots of people aren't prepared to put in the time to update their own skills.”

**Barriers/Weaknesses - Some Views**

“single sign on, despite MS claims, was only achieved after lot of development work by us and consultant”

“We had quite a few problems with technical implementation of SharePoint. There were some inconsistencies. We suspect errors in the way things were set up initially.”

“It was hard to come up with the Information architecture for the site. You are trying to appeal to two different mindsets: the corporate mindset of administrative staff, and the mindset of scientists.”

“Recruiting a lead portal developer was difficult. Finding someone with requisite SharePoint skills prepared to work for an HE salary was difficult”

“information architecture and governance needs tight control”

“there's so much that can be done, the resourcing requirement is high”
### Lessons Learned - Some Views

“weren’t aware of the amount of customisation required but it gets easier as the design/roll out progresses”

“It is important to use external consultants in the right way. We chose the company that convinced us that they would work alongside us, so that our staff learned skills from them and understood what they did. We only call them in when we don’t know how to do something.”

“User education is very important, sometimes users don’t know which aspect of SharePoint functionality to use. There is often more than one way to do things in SharePoint.”

### Do differently - Some Views

“sandbox and organic growth may prove to be a handicap in the future, may be an issue with sprawl”

“strategy definition must happen before moving forward beyond existing pilots”

### Non users - Some Views

“only really stupid people go for SharePoint - look at open source systems and if you have in-house skills then you can ‘really rev’ the products”

“happy to be behind and benefit from others’ experience”

“not a ‘finished product’; not sure how close it is to being one - more like a framework that needs skills to implement”
2. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this part of the project was to conduct a survey of 70-80 HEIs to determine the scale, scope and nature of use of SharePoint within HEIs. The method comprised telephone interviews, concentrating on IT Directors/Managers. Questions included functional applications of SharePoint, drivers for use, the procurement process used, the reception of SharePoint by administrative staff, students and academic staff, the key benefits brought to them by SharePoint, the weaknesses of their implementation and one key thing they would do differently, their future plans for SharePoint. For non-users, questions included reasons for non-use. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

We used a purposive sampling approach with the aim of:

- obtaining a representative sample of the range of HEIs with respect to type and geographical location
- including HEIs that we know from the literature have used / are using SharePoint to increase our chances of getting data
- including HEIs where we have contacts to increase our chances of getting agreement to participate

The names and contact details of HEIs in the UK were obtained from the website of Universities UK [http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/)

The universities were characterised by

**type:**
- old (19th century and earlier)
- red brick (late 19th century / early 20th century)
- sixty (new plate glass universities or existing organisations made universities in the 1960s)
- new (polytechnics and HE colleges etc. made universities in the 1990s/2000s)
- assoc (organisations that are part of a larger body, e.g. schools of London University, or are validated by another organisation, e.g. Leeds Trinity & All Saints College and Leeds University)

**geographical location:**
- Wales
- Northern Ireland
- Scotland
- England:
  - East Midlands
  - West Midlands
  - East England
  - London
  - NE England
  - NW England
  - SE England
  - SW England
  - York and Humberside

There are 159 HEIs listed in the master list, and we had an initial target of 70-80 i.e. ~50%. For our sample we noted how many of each type/location we needed based on the relative proportions in the master list. We then set up a grid and populated this grid: by adding in the HEIs known to have
used SharePoint; then adding in HEIs selected from the master list by choosing every other name in the list for the criteria we required; then by replacing an HEI by another, of the same criteria, where we had contacts.

When contacting HEIs in the sample some were not interested in participating. Therefore we replaced them with another target HEI from the master list with the same/similar criteria.

Within the time period available for this stage of the project, the final number of interviews achieved = 38, ~25% of the population, plus 2 interviews with other relevant organisations in the HE field.

Figures 1, 2 and 3 show the breakdown of UK HEIs by type and location, respectively. They show that the types and location of HEIs interviewed are a reasonable match to the population of UK HEIs. The main differences are that more old HEIs and HEIs from the North East, North West and Scotland were interviewed; less HEIs from the South East were interviewed than in the total population. (See Appendix B for the numeric data).

![Figure 1. Breakdown of HEI Type](image1.png)

![Figure 2. Breakdown of location of UK HEIs](image2.png)
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3. USE / NON USE OF SHAREPOINT AND SCALE OF USE

3.1 SharePoint Version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Users</th>
<th>2007 Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users (no / %)</td>
<td>2007 Version (no / %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone survey (40)</td>
<td>31 (~78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 9 HEIs not using SharePoint, 5 were considering its use and 4 had rejected it on the grounds of functionality, bugs, configuration issues/difficulty, training overhead, governance overhead or policy.

3.2 Strategy for SharePoint

18 (58%) of current users had a strategy for SharePoint, 1 user was developing a strategy and a further current non-user had a strategy (viz. preparing a business case) for using SharePoint.

3.3 Scale of use - SharePoint users

Number of uses across the whole of an HEI = 30
- involving students = 11
Number of specific areas of an HEI where SharePoint is used = 65
- involving students = 9
Number at specific stage:
- consider = 4
- planned = 17
- pilot = 16
- roll out = 7
- live = 44
- not specified = 7

Multiple uses both across the whole of the HEI and in specific areas (14 HEIs)
Multiple uses across the whole of the HEI only (2 HEIs)
Multiple uses in specific areas only (10 HEIs)
Single use across the whole of the HEI (1 HEI)
Single use in a specific area only (4 HEIs)

Figure 4 shows the number of HEIs with single uses or multiple uses in either specific areas only, across the whole organisation only or a combination of both. Figure 5 shows at what stage(s) these uses are – from under consideration to live.
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3.4 Scale of considered use - SharePoint non-users

Number of uses considered across the whole of an HEI = 10
Number of uses considered in specific areas of an HEI = 9
Number at specific stage:
- consider = 15
- planned = 1
- pilot = 3

Multiple uses considered both across the whole of the HEI and in specific areas (3 HEIs)
Multiple uses considered in specific areas only (1 HEIs)
Single use considered across the whole of the HEI (2 HEIs)
Single use considered in a specific area only (2 HEIs)
No uses considered (1 HEI)
4. NATURE OF USE OF SHAREPOINT

4.1 Where and how SharePoint has been used

Note: One HEI can use SharePoint in a number of different areas and for a number of different purposes and therefore % do not apply

Figure 6: Use in areas of HEI

Figure 7: Purpose of use
Table 1: Where and how SharePoint has been used - detailed breakdown
(numbers refer to individual uses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Corp site</th>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Portal</th>
<th>Web services</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>VLE</th>
<th>Collabor</th>
<th>Intell</th>
<th>KM</th>
<th>BPM</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Across whole HEI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical resources (Estates/ IT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Admin &amp; Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial &amp; Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific areas (other)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key (here and elsewhere in this section):
Corp site = Corporate website; DM = Document management; RM = Records management; VLE = Virtual Learning environment; Collabor = Collaboration; Intell = Business intelligence; KM = Knowledge management; BPM = Business process management

Note: The numbers here (and elsewhere in this section) are larger than in the Section 3 ‘scale of use’ (above), as use of SharePoint across the whole of the HEI or within a specific area of an HEI could be for more than one purpose, e.g. 1 use of SharePoint for the purposes of DM, RM and BPM.
Table 2: Where and how SharePoint has been considered for use by non users
(numbers refer to HEIs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corp site</th>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Portal</th>
<th>Web services</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>VLE</th>
<th>Collabor&quot;</th>
<th>Intell</th>
<th>KM</th>
<th>BPM</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2 Drivers for using SharePoint in specific functional areas

**Table 3: Drivers for use across the HEI as a whole or in specific areas (other than the functional areas covered later in this section)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Stage of Use</th>
<th>Corporate Website</th>
<th>Intranet (See also intranets specific to functional areas in the HEI)</th>
<th>Document Management</th>
<th>Records Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 HEIs, 1 with SharePoint search function only (3 live, 2 planned). Non users - 1 HEI business case, 1 HEI procurement phase</td>
<td>21 HEIs, 7 all staff and students, 4 for all staff, 2 for all students, 7 in specific areas, 1 extranet (1 consider, 4 planned, 1 pilot, 5 roll out, 9 live). Non users - 1 HEI business case, 1 HEI unsuccessful</td>
<td>4 HEIs, 2 in specific areas, 1 for all staff, 1 for all staff and students (1 planned, 2 pilots, 1 live). Non users - 2 HEIs pilots, 1 HEI rejected</td>
<td>3 HEIs, 2 in specific areas (1 consider, 1 planned, 1 live). Non users - 1 HEI pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drivers**

- current open source CMS (typo3) doesn't meet requirements
- SharePoint is a better technical solution than existing one
- stable, long term product
- rapid integration to existing architecture
- connectivity intranet to website
- prevention of fragmentation of different portal solutions
- corporate marketing
- controlled branding
- basic public information provision
- faculty specific
- devolve content management to departments - SharePoint tool of choice

- dissatisfaction with previous system (2 HEIs)
- replace static intranet
- information provision (improved) to students (2 HEIs)
- student ownership of their learning
- improve communication
- improve efficiency across functional boundaries
- improve processes
- change practice
- collaboration
- research and collaborative groups with external stakeholders
- integration with other collaborative systems
- bring applications together in one place
- Web-based system
- communication with DMS
- portal plus documents
- personalisation (2 HEIs)
- authentication
- single sign on
- organic growth

- enterprise EDRM
- easier administration
- improve website content
- replace shared drivers, public folders (2 HEIs)
- document repository
- reduction storage costs
- savings academic staff time
- enhanced user experience
- self management
- evaluation to find out if SharePoint was fit for purpose
- ongoing business case to expand pilot

- enterprise EDRM
- document repository
## Purpose and Stage of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Business intelligence</th>
<th>Knowledge management</th>
<th>Business process mgt</th>
<th>Other (Office plug-ins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 HEIs, 3 including students, 3 in specific areas (1 considered, 1 planned, 1 pilot, 1 roll out, 4 live). Non users - 3 HEIs considering, 1 HEI rejected</td>
<td>2 HEIs (1 roll out, 1 live)</td>
<td>2 HEIs (2 live)</td>
<td>2 HEIs, 1 across whole university both students and staff (1 planned, 1 live). Non users - 1 HEI pilot</td>
<td>1 HEI, across HEI (live)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drivers
- collaboration
- web based solution
- improved content management
- efficiency
- increased access
- wanted to try SharePoint
- replacement of SP2003 portal
- improved collaborative functionality
- if many other HEIs are using SharePoint then it would be easier to collaborate if we had SharePoint
- non use - happy to be behind and benefit from others' experience

- collaboration
- collaborative control
- efficiency
- replace shared drives
- improved auditing
- improved DMS
- increased access
- paperless forms (2 HEIs)
- savings physical storage space
- evaluation to find out if SharePoint was fit for purpose
- ongoing business case to expand pilot

- cost effective
- fits MS infrastructure
- unified communications
Table 4: Drivers for Use in the Governance & Management Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Stage of use</th>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Document Management</th>
<th>Records Management</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HEI (pilot)</td>
<td>4 HEIs, selected aspects (1 planned, 1 pilot, 2 live)</td>
<td>1 HEI, selected aspects, current records only (live)</td>
<td>7 HEIs, 3 selected aspects (1 planned, 1 pilot, 2 live)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drivers
- better governance
- dissatisfaction with previous system
- better functionality
- efficiency
- improved search
- replace network drives
- user adoption
- short term approach
- collaboration (2 HEIs)
- embedding committees into the IT infrastructure
- reduction email traffic
- savings storage costs
- version control

Table 5: Drivers for Use in the Financial Resources Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Stage of Use</th>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Document Management</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Business Intelligence</th>
<th>Business Process Mgt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HEI (plan)</td>
<td>1 HEI (live)</td>
<td>1 HEI (roll out)</td>
<td>1 HEI (live)</td>
<td>1 HEI (live)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drivers
- better governance
- dissatisfaction with previous system
- automation
- business need
- efficiency
- time (rapid development)
- user adoption
- centralise repository
- improve collaboration across split sites
- previous experience of SharePoint
- increase effectiveness
- improve management
- devolving some of the management/decision making to management staff across the HEI
- sharing/accessing corporate information more efficiently across the HEI
- point solution
- automation
- business need
- efficiency
- time (rapid development)
- user adoption

Table 6: Drivers for use in the Physical Resources Area (estates & IT services)

Authors: Sue Childs, Julie McLeod, Gavin Siggers, James Lappin, CEIS, Northumbria University. © Eduserv
### Purpose and Stage of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Document Management</th>
<th>Records Management</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Business Process Mgt</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HEI in selected part (live)</td>
<td>4 HEIs, in selected parts (2 pilots, 2 live)</td>
<td>1 HEI (pilot)</td>
<td>5 HEIs (2 pilots, 1 rollout, 1 live)</td>
<td>1 HEI, in selected part (live)</td>
<td>1 HEI, in selected part (live)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Drivers

- collaboration
- web-based
- centralised service
- collaboration (3 HEIs)
- improved archive management
- improved resilience
- increased access
- point solution
- single storage space
- web-based
- to share documents using something other than shared drives
- centralised service
- collaboration
- improved archive management
- improved resilience
- single storage space
- collaboration (2 HEIs)
- contact external partners
- simplify process
- collaboration
- web-based
- testbed

### Table 7: Drivers for use in the Human Resources Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Stage of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 HEI (live)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Drivers

- automation
- efficiency
### Table 8: Drivers for Use in the Student Administration & Services Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Stage of Use</th>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Document Management</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Business Process Mgt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 HEIs, 1 involving students (1 plan, 1 live)</td>
<td>2 HEIs (1 pilot, 1 live)</td>
<td>4 HEIs (1 planned, 1 pilot, 1 roll out)</td>
<td>2 HEIs (1 pilot, 1 live)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong></td>
<td>• better governance</td>
<td>• automation</td>
<td>• business need</td>
<td>• automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dissatisfaction with previous system</td>
<td>• compliance (FoI, DP)</td>
<td>• collaboration (particularly across split sites) (2 HEIs)</td>
<td>• efficiency (2 HEIs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• extranet</td>
<td>• efficiency</td>
<td>• consistency</td>
<td>• improved management information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• improve student community</td>
<td>• standardisation forms</td>
<td>• functionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• centralise repository</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• previous experience of SharePoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9: Drivers for Use in the Teaching & Learning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Stage of Use</th>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Document Management</th>
<th>VLE</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Business Process Mgt</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 HEIs, in specific schools, 1 for students in one school (1 pilot, 1 live)</td>
<td>3 HEIs, 2 in specific schools (1 pilot, 2 live)</td>
<td>2 HEIs, 1 all staff and students, 1 in specific schools (1 live, 1 against the rules). Non users - 3 HEIs considering/potentially considering, 1 HEI rejected</td>
<td>4 HEIs, 1 involving all staff and students, 1 a small specific use involving staff and students, 1 in specific school (1 pilot, 3 live)</td>
<td>1 HEI (live)</td>
<td>1 HEI, personal development planning (consider)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong></td>
<td>• collaboration</td>
<td>• automation</td>
<td>• user driven, against the rules</td>
<td>• collaboration (2 HEIs)</td>
<td>• automation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Web-based</td>
<td>• collaboration</td>
<td>• to reduce training overhead</td>
<td>• efficiency</td>
<td>• in house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• efficiency</td>
<td>• Blackboard expensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>• forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: Drivers for Use in the Research Area
### Purpose and Stage of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Document Management</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Business Process Mgt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 HEIs, 1 involving students (1 plan, 1 live)</td>
<td>1 HEI, involving students as well as staff (live)</td>
<td>8 HEIs, 1 involving students as well as staff (2 planned, 1 pilot, 5 live). Non users - 1 HEI potentially considering</td>
<td>1 HEI (1 planned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drivers**

- better governance
- collaboration
- dissatisfaction with previous system

- collaboration

- new RM strategy/policy
- collaboration (4 HEIs)
- collaboration with other research organisations
- tracking research activity
- replace shared drives

**Table 11: Drivers for use in the Commercial & Development Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose and Stage of Use</th>
<th>Intranet</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 HEI (pilot)</td>
<td>1 HEI (live)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drivers**

- improved communication
- collaboration
5. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

SharePoint is available in the HEIs existing MS bundle / campus agreements (32 HEIs), though some additional licence top ups might have been required.

Very few HEIs undertook any formal process before using SharePoint. Of the ones that did, this comprised:

- committee recommendation (1 HEI)
- consultant recommendation (2 HEIs)
- analysis of requirements against different products (4 HEIs)
- some form of competitive tendering process (3 HEIs) (Note: vendors’ response to requirements document, (1HEI), for associated systems or consultancy (2 HEIs))
- test / pilots (11 HEIs Note: this will be an underestimate as current live uses may have been piloted)
6. SHAREPOINT USE - SUCCESSES AND BARRIERS

6.1 Successes

Achieved / improved required activity/service (23 HEIs)
e.g. branding / identity / look and feel, central repository, central platform, collaboration (across the HEI, with external parties), content management (the solution of choice for one HEI), document management (the solution of choice for one HEI), document sharing, improved website, intranet (particularly consistency of approach), information provision, improved student communication, remote submission of student’s work, workflow, automation of forms, improved access to back end systems, dealt with backlog, accessibility (anytime, anyplace, anywhere)

SharePoint functionality & technical features (14 HEIs)
e.g. stable environment, 2007 version an improvement over earlier version, integration with other systems (e.g. VLE, email, voicemail), underlying generic functionality, bringing applications together, quick to deploy, works out of the box, easy to set up, high return of functionality for limited effort, replicates process well, dynamic portal, search functionality, wizards, document versioning, personalisation, single sign on

Organisational factors (9 HEIs)
e.g. controlled roll out required to prevent uncontrolled growth and sprawl, free re licences, perception of business need to develop appropriate point solution, use of a single integrated technology, high level of publicity + word of mouth + organic change program, reduction in paper use, less duplication, low training overhead, beginning to allow us to improve our processes, better collaboration with external funding partners, success and demand creates risk that difficult to support level of system use
Additional activities required (2 HEIs) 8
e.g. business process improvement / re-engineering / simplification prior to use, customisation resulting in better ways of working, development of architecture/infrastructure, encouraged/supported business process improvements, good design rather than the product per se, in house tools, user requirement analysis in pilot and live system and implementation of requirements

People factors (17 HEIs)
e.g. organic growth, popular, user demand user evangelism, buy in (acceptance, spread of use), heavy usage, user familiarity, easy to use, intuitive feel, user friendly, lack of need for technical skills by users, development of expertise, use of in house trainers, targeted, flexible training, good support network, financial savings for students, devolving responsibility to users

Too early to say (2 HEIs)

6. 2 Barriers

![Figure 9: Barriers to SharePoint use](image)

SharePoint functionality & technical features (16 HEIs)
e.g. not mature product, complex product (hard to define what it is), complex architect, complex licensing, not usable out of the box, configuration issues, databases issues, external access, functional delivery when not out of the box, HTML generated within CMS needs checking and editing, emphasis on IE, incompatibility with other browsers (both older IE versions and non-IE), navigation difficult, real time updates, stability issues, Mac users, permissions, single sign on, security

Organisational factors (13 HEIs)
e.g. difficult to balance demand v control, need to mitigate uncontrolled growth, formal projects to ensure control, need for structured approach reduces quick win approach, lack of centralised approach, need for plan / strategy, university RM governance, lack of policies and procedures, lack of process documentation, not free to deploy, investment in resourcing, investment in testing, investment in training, lack of expertise in SharePoint development in market place at a price that HEIs can afford, mixed platform users may steer clear of SharePoint, different Office versions
across organisation, one solution covers too much (need to concentrate on what you need), RAD (rapid application development).

**People factors** (13 HEIs)
e.g. lack of recordkeeping by users, need for experts, need to employ consultants, staff (IT) skills and motivation (low paid in HEIs), technical limitations of teams, need for user community acceptance, MS training (standard) not sufficient, need for in-house training, non use by some / opt outs, not geared to normal users, MS products not universally popular, not user friendly, resistance to centralisation of portal service by IT staff

**Too early to say** (2 HEIs)
7. SHAREPOINT FEATURES - BENEFITS AND WEAKNESSES

7.1 Summary comparison of benefits and weaknesses

Figure 10: SharePoint features - benefits and weaknesses

7.2 Detailed comparison

Collaboration

Benefits (17 HEIs)
e.g. ease of use, user friendly and flexible, familiar GUI, integration with Office, My site, out of box (gives quick wins), team sites (particularly – quick to set up, users controlling their team sites, internal access, external access), gives many facilities (instant messaging, Web conferencing, telephony), document libraries, promotes business excellence, real time collaboration (possibly), sharing expertise, sharing information

Weaknesses (5 HEIs)
e.g. preventing SharePoint sprawl, some requirements need customisation, difficulties setting up security groups, difficulties setting up access rights, because of ad hoc nature it is too difficult to control where sites are set up, giving flexibility causes permissioning issues, difficulty rolling over site collection boundaries, difficult to do collaborative working on documents, limitation on the size of SharePoint lists
Portal

**Benefits** (3 HEIs)
e.g. student portal (with single sign on)

**Enterprise search**

**Benefits** (5 HEIs)
e.g. crawling is easy, easy configuration, dedicated consultancy available, very powerful (almost too powerful)

**Weaknesses** (2 HEIs)
e.g. definite limitations with the search

**Websites / Content Management**

**Benefits** (6 HEIs)
e.g. rich functionality allows move away from point solution approach to single platform with low cost & simplified integration, ease of use, familiar GUI, out of box (gives quick wins)

**Weaknesses** (5 HEIs)
e.g. not a very good CMS, too complex, too much flexibility, complexity of branding (a non-trivial exercise), meeting accessibility standards is difficult, meeting web standards is difficult, web pages not accessible, not easy to use, steep learning curve for anyone wanting to develop a custom web part, switch between active and inactive content functionality missing, permissioning is not great

**Business Forms & Integration**

**Benefits** (3 HEIs)
e.g. better business processes as a result of careful analysis, better management information reports, ease of use, familiar GUI, main area of use

**Weaknesses** (1 HEI)
e.g. technically difficult, unnecessarily complex

**Business Intelligence**

**Benefits** (1 HEI)

**Workflow**

**Benefits** (6 HEIs)
e.g. developed as part of training, ease of use, familiar GUI, monthly reporting including versioning, if it had worked would have been a real benefit, organic growth supported by staff development in other areas, with process reengineering to improve wows

**Weaknesses** (3 HEIs)
e.g. SharePoint 2003 doesn't have proper workflow, complicated, configuration challenging
Interoperability

**Benefits** (2 HEIs)

**Weaknesses** (3 HEIs)
e.g. integration with other systems, needs workarounds, poor for Mac users, poor for non IE browsers, poor for other databases, real time updates

Web Services

No comments

Records management

**Benefits**

No comments

**Weaknesses** (2 HEI)
e.g. deficient in RM, document governance, may need 3rd party plug in (e.g. controlpoint), reporting on who/how many have used the document

Document management

**Benefits** (6 HEIs)
e.g. out of box (gives quick wins), good point solution, seen as a cheap way of pushing DM, document libraries, document sharing, editing documents etc were useful features

**Weaknesses** (1 HEI)
e.g. is it suitable enterprise wide?

Generic functionality and technical factors

**Benefits** (16 HEIs)
e.g. scope of functionality, migration to office 2007 provides better integration to SharePoint 07, integration with Groupwise, integration with MS environment, integration with Office, familiar environment, intuitive, out of box, good administrative tools available from 3rd party vendors, promoting the architecture using diagnostic tools that fit with SharePoint, simplification, security seems fine, availability seems fine, back-end of this implementation was a SQL database so integration and building the back-end was simple, server integration deploys easily, single sign on, SharePoint lists, use of VLE etc through single portal, active directory, good compression ratio gives savings on data storage space, good fit, allows better sharing, allows easily demonstrable BPI and automation,

**Weaknesses** (28 HEIs)
e.g. locked into proprietary MS, browser reliance on IE, ‘it’s MS’, requires deployment internally or hosted, upgrading from 2003 to 2007, poor integration to non MS platforms/systems, challenge of xplatform compatibility, not truly browser agnostic, accessibility compliance with DDA, relationship of SharePoint to other systems (each of these systems has a specific role to play -it’s dangerous when they start to replicate what each other do), Microsoft has taken the product too far (tried to make it a jack-of-all-trades), product scope is so vast that delivery is difficult to focus and requires complex development/configuration to reduce this scope, requirement for governance generated by large functional scope was too big an overhead for the university to cover, architecture complicated (including for web CMS), complicated (particularly for configuring), complex DB architecture, not operate as a relational db, not plug and play, site collection options out of the box,
out of box functionality only meets 70% of requirement so overhead is high to make it usable, unable to configure it to meet requirements, too many constraints (you need to know about them in advance), functionality is infuriatingly inconsistent, development toolkit needed, need a huge amount of 3rd party plugins to make it better but this increases the cost, plug ins from 3rd party vendors are not good and poorly supported, managing delivery of RM, probably not best choice for VLE, bad interface, bad layout, limited customisable template for look and feel, difficult to use, not intuitive (particularly in the deep areas), complex for access control, access rights/control not sufficiently sophisticated (had to handle outside SharePoint), slow and cumbersome, moving items between collections, navigation, for wikis / blogs it's missing ActiveX so lose rich text functions, poor help, problems are difficult to resolve, service packs did not do what they said they would do, users confused about Groove (part of Office7) and SharePoint

Organisational factors

**Benefits** (7 HEIs)

e.g. gives a lot of functionality for limited cost, risk is outweighed by need to put in point solutions for collaboration and DM, could implement tactically (i.e. didn't have to deploy institution-wide), system administration overhead reduced by the amount of different op systems being rationalised to the one MS platform, governance of web parts and structure has allowed controlled roll out and deployment, clear guidelines on what is a standard roll out and what constitutes a customised project solution, devolved management of access and site management, allows quick deployment by trained users, low user training requirement

**Weaknesses** (14 HEIs)

e.g. an institution-wide SharePoint implementation is a very big undertaking and would cause more problems than it would solve, difficult to identify how to use it in the broader context of an HEI, dilemma is people will look at what SharePoint says it can do and then think that they ought to try and use all of those functions, expensive (e.g. licensing), licence cost for student population is too high, resource intensive to get up and running well, need for planning, information architecture and governance needs tight control, governance at university level needs to be addressed, developing the architecture to address the different needs/views of different stakeholders, politics, change management challenges, how IT departments evolve, large training overhead for developers and users, back up and continuity needs careful management, if project is successful then there is a risk that overlap with other technologies may mean people want to move off existing technologies which could be complex,

**Implementation activities** (6 HEIs)

e.g. need for top level support, roadmapping is the key to success, timing coincided with improved delivery of process improvement, did too much customisation (makes service packs time consuming to implement and blocking upgrade), piloting and tight control best approach to controlling rollout balanced against demand, pilots with customised functionality to progress standardised offering, familiarity of intranet skinning to allow acceptance of SharePoint ahead of actual roll out, reduced training overhead by limiting the number of access profiles and what is available in the portfolio of what can be had, templates and style sheets designed by the school of arts and media, small group training as required
People factors

**Benefits** (11 HEIs)
e.g. allowing people to work much more efficiently, improved communication across the university by using alerts and blogs, large external SharePoint community helps to support development, experienced SharePoint users acting as champions, organic growth by word of mouth, ease of use (for experienced users), easy to use, familiarity, intuitive, lot of MS expertise, mop up training sessions available, training others is easy

**Weaknesses** (7 HEIs)
e.g. complex system (we have very few people understand it), recruiting a lead portal developer was difficult (finding someone with requisite SharePoint skills prepared to work for an HE salary), server management needs to be run by experts, demand for experts exceeds supply of experts, need consultancy, difficult to get consultants to focus on the HEI’s aim, we used a third party to develop SharePoint and do the customisations - when it came to making changes we didn't have the skills to do it and we became very dependent on our developer, resistance to /dislike of MS, stakeholder buy in needs to be addressed, need supporting culture shift, need in house training, people aren't prepared to put in the time to update their own skills, support community is still developing, average users do not want the responsibility but would rather that this was a centralised service, customised to allow anti MS dissenters to drop in content on website and prove it works, kids in a sweet shop, some people don’t use their My Site at all, some people have created team collaboration sites underneath their My Sites, we have a problem getting content authors to add custom keywords to pages and sites, look and feel, people find it hard to understand the concept of SharePoint lists
8. STAKEHOLDER VIEWS

Managers

- it’s a part of general life rather than as a specific tool, they just use it (1 HEI)
- enthusiasm (2 HEIs)
- not come across any dissatisfaction (1 HEI)

IT staff

- development teams were resistant and not keen on working on ms environment (1 HEI)
- some people don't like Microsoft products (1 HEI)
- some high-end web designers don't like SharePoint, they find it restrictive. They can no longer use their web skills (1 HEI)
- WCMS/web team resisted use of SharePoint in the first place (1 HEI)
- have enjoyed the advantages but this is because they are more team focussed than other areas and more technically capable (1 HEI)
- too early to say (2 HEIs)

Admin/clerical staff

- finance think it's very good fit to requirements (1 HEI)
- finance – enthusiasm (1 HEI)
- finance not expressed any dissatisfaction (1 HEI)
- marketing - think it's very good (2 HEIs)
- HR disillusioned (1 HEI)
- some people coming out as good content authors are people in PA or admin positions. They are organised thinkers and SharePoint appeals to them (1 HEI)
- in service departments there was quite rapid adoption. SharePoint enabled them to do lots of administrative tasks better (1 HEI)
- the interface seems familiar to people. Everyone knows how to use Word and Excel, and how to use web pages. People don't like to learn something new. Most groups perceive it as an extension to the Office environment, rather than something new. (1 HEI)

Academic staff

- dislike / resistance - it's MS (4 HEIs)
- if SharePoint gets perceived as a ‘corporate’ system people on the academic side may view it with suspicion (1 HEI)
- not really aware of what they're using through website, meetings etc. (1 HEI)
- initial resistance. Now have a few people in senior positions that like this stuff. Our biggest section wants to be part of this (1 HEI)
- a lot academic & research staff asking for it because people they're working with use it (1 HEI)
- generally positive (1 HEI)
Students

- early adopters last year found environment comfortable (1 HEI)
- we did some user testing of the portal. Students were quick to catch onto the advantages (1 HEI)
- not many students use SharePoint. All of them have a log on and the ability to create a My Site if they want to. But we haven’t publicised it. Around 2,000 students have set up a My Site (1 HEI)
- don’t seem to be as aware of it as they should. We need to put a lot more effort into communication with students as to what this is about (1 HEI)

General views

- not universally popular (1 HEI)
- some adverse comments about some functionality (1 HEI)
- most people think SharePoint will solve their DM problems; just ’dumped’ all documents into SharePoint (team site) and found it didn’t help! (1 HEI)
- bit clunky - out of box web parts (1 HEI)
- not very easy to use (1 HEI)
- dissenters don’t like the solution because of the content rather than the technology itself (1 HEI)
- ask for something to enable them to share documents &/or collaborate; not bothered what it is (1 HEI)
- we did some user testing of the portal. Staff couldn't think beyond what they knew (1 HEI)
- long way from having it accepted by whole organisation (1 HEI)
- three phases - like it, don't like it, like it (1 HEI)
- positive (3 HEIs)
- group of advocates (1 HEI)
- some people have embraced SharePoint, others are less enthusiastic (1 HEI)
- there is a lot of interest in the programme (1 HEI)
- large user group volunteered - based on success and promoting the service (1 HEI)
- between 50% and 75% of staff members are using SharePoint. Most staff members have joined one or two team sites. A good proportion of staff use My Sites (1 HEI)
- departments now know more about the system than IT do (1 HEI)
- met requirements - does what it says it will do for the areas tested (1 HEI)
- impressed by real improvements to ways of working (1 HEI)
- collaboration has reduced cost of document change management & risks (1 HEI)
- video conferencing integration has been a real benefit for remote meetings and time saving/efficiency (1 HEI)
- too early to say (1 HEI)
- to be announced. Surveying staff to see if SharePoint suitable for document management (1 HEI)
9. KEY LESSONS LEARNT

**Technical / Functionality Factors (11 HEIs)**

- need for better design particularly of infrastructure
- 2007 is more mature (gaps in the technology have been addressed)
- use out of the box is the way forward (except for remote web access)
- the need for and amount of customisation required (2 HEIs)
- 3rd party software required to get full potential out of SharePoint
- concepts and features seemed like a good fit but just couldn't make it work
- there is often more than one way to do things in SharePoint
- integration with external systems e.g. groupwise
- SharePoint is not browser agnostic
- didn't realise that SharePoint was not designed for easy web publishing
- difficulty of achieving single sign on
- amount of storage space need to provision
- we made the navigation structure too detailed and too closely tied to the organization structure
- we imported information from active directory and buy default any site is only viewable by people within that part of the organization, though site owners can invite others in. This has proved a barrier to sharing
- use of SharePoint prompts overall review of other systems

**Organisational factors (19 HEIs)**

- SharePoint is not something that you can just jump into
- strategic direction is key to success
- need to have clear information requirements & a strategy for managing information; IT services can then provide the service using the right tool(s)
- high level buy in
- need to be specific about what we would like to do with SharePoint and what we don't want to do to avoid mission creep
- functionality must be restricted (will be hard to convince this is a need)
archive strategy required
need for training strategy
governance and control needs to be tight
site ownership needs control or central management
resourcing was an issue (5 HEIs)
investment of time and effort is high
it costs a lot (particularly for the infrastructure and staff resources)
need more resources (e.g. money, time) (2 HEIs)
added cost of required 3rd party software
senior level endorsement for resource allocation
non user - looked like it wouldn't be cost effective either internally or using external resource
technical staff required to deal with complex environment and produce functionality (2 HEIs)
proved that it was not as simple as management hoped for
you don't need a complicated solution to a complicated problem
very happy with the decision to move to SharePoint and intend to build on the programme
we have used SharePoint in two, relatively small areas. Both areas have found it useful, but they have expressed concerns about whether their approach to implementing SharePoint could scale across the organisation
if we spread it out to other areas we would no longer be able to let each area decide on its own policies and governance, we would have to think about consistency across the whole system
may prompt changes as SharePoint is success

Implementation factors (11 HEIs)

set up right to start with to avoid the mess
get the governance right
getting initial framework right first time
understand what the customer wants to achieve
define information architecture in order to provide RM and better IM
make sure everything is properly specified before doing things
don’t introduce too much functionality in one go
hand back prioritisation to customers
content leads the technology and demonstrate that the technology supports content driven requirements
amount of effort in pilot and project and elapsed time to move and improve from 2003 to 2007
has been a long haul project run in the background - not a strategic business system
start small and grow (2 HEIs)
problem of feature creep
transparency, openness and visibility
learn to offer solutions to problems, not bits of functionality
get the right access permissions for the right people at the right time to the right places on SharePoint server
act as a consultancy, offer support
training (2 HEIs)
manage expectations of customers
get feedback

People factors (9 HEIs)
• ensure customers understand the process of configuring the tool
• consultants are still learning
• use external consultants in the right way (2 HEIs)
• architects were excellent - no one in the Institution had any skills in relation to SharePoint
• increased knowledge in university has improved the situation
• skill set
• sometimes users don't know which aspect of SharePoint functionality to use - there is often more than one way to do things
• typical people issues

Other factors (1 HEI)

• Too early to say
10. THINGS TO DO DIFFERENTLY

Figure 12: Things to do differently

Technical / Functionality Factors (6 HEIs)

- we would do it differently if we were starting again
- don’t underestimate complexity of deployment requirements
- conduct a centralised data review ahead of deployment
- design the infrastructure up front
- flatter structure
- less customisation
- other associated systems need development work too
- release onto platform

Organisational factors (11 HEIs)

- wouldn’t do things differently (2 HEIs)
- make sure that priorities are agreed by management and are based on a good business justification
- have a clear scope/requirements up front
- reduce what you’re doing due to complexity
- better organisation and planning (3 HEIs)
- plan with expertise involvement
- put effort into how you deploy
- invest the time
- invest the resources including money (3 HEIs)
- use a dedicated team for development
- only give teams a team site if there is a specific problem they wish to address
Implementation factors (4 HEIs)

- sandbox and organic growth approach has risks
- need strategy definition before moving forward beyond pilots
- don't take on too much, even though SharePoint can do so much
- find a user sponsor rather than sponsoring in IT department
- talk to stakeholders and establish what are the top priorities and do them before anything else

People factors (9 HEIs)

- involve consultants at an early stage in programme
- don't use consultants
- employ SharePoint developers on short-term contracts instead of consultants
- need for developers (with required skills and motivation)
- need to start from the drawing board with a technical project team that could do more internally
- train technical staff (not just SharePoint skills)
- need understanding from IT infrastructure people
- provide more training for people at the beginning of the project
- set up a user community group to benchmark against
- deliver focussed communication to users
- training of users specifically tailored to implementation

Other factors (2 HEIs)

- too early to say (2 HEIs)
11. REASONS FOR NON USE

Considering / potentially considering (5 HEIs)

- not yet considered (2 HEIs)
- considering possible use (2 HEIs)
- procurement is not closed
- ongoing business case to expand pilot
- not rejected but lack funding
- happy to be behind and benefits from others' experience

Rejected SharePoint (4 HEIs)

- policy driven
- not deeply embedded with Microsoft
- lock in fear
- SharePoint is not a finished product - more like a framework that needs skills to implement functionality issues (particularly DM and RM) (2 HEIs)
- 'only really stupid people go for SharePoint' - look at open source systems and if you have in-house skills then you can really exploit these
- only or best works over Internet Explorer
- need lot of expertise if want to extend
- configuration issues/difficulty
- bugs
- licensing costs
- governance overhead
- SharePoint developer costs
- development costs
- people cost
- training overhead
APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HEI (PREPOPULATED INFORMATION)
(Note names of HEI and other personal / sensitive information is deleted after categorisation)

Name of HEI
Interviewed by
Date
HEI location
HEI type
Number of staff
Number of students
Split sites
Overseas campus

INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

1a Respondent job title
1b Scope of role

2a Use SharePoint (if no go to 2c)
2b Which version
2c Strategy for SharePoint (if 2a and 2c=no go to 14)
2d Strategy brief description

USE OF SHAREPOINT

3 Where, why and how do you use SharePoint in your organisation?

For each use:
- Area of Institute
  - (select from: Governance & Management; Financial Resources; Physical Resources; Human Resources; Student Administration & Services; Teaching & Learning; Research; Commercial & Development; Other)
- Use for
  - (select from: Corporate website, Intranet, Document Management, Records Management, Virtual Learning, Collaboration, Business Intelligence, Knowledge Management, Other)
- Strategy for
- %staff users; %student users
- Drivers
- Project Phase
  - (select from: Planned, Pilot/Model Office, Rollout/ongoing, Production/Live, Dropped)

4 Did you undergo a procurement exercise? Competitive tender? Licences already available (MS bundle)?

5 Please highlight your Successes / Achievements
Use Case/Business Area - Successes & Achievements summary

6 Please highlight your Barriers & Issues
Use Case/Business Area - Barriers & Issues summary
7 Functional Analysis of SharePoint - Benefits
(feature, select from: Collaboration, Portal, Enterprise search, Content Management, Business Forms & Integration, Business Intelligence, Workflow, Interoperability, Web Services)

8 Functional Analysis of SharePoint - Weaknesses
(feature, select from: Collaboration, Portal, Enterprise search, Content Management, Business Forms & Integration, Business Intelligence, Workflow, Interoperability, Web Services)

9 Non-Functional Analysis of SharePoint - Benefits
(Aspects such as: Technical/Architecture; People/Change Management)

10 Non-Functional Analysis of SharePoint - Weaknesses
(Aspects such as: Technical/Architecture; People/Change Management)

11 Please share the Views of the community
(specify stakeholder group, select from: Managers, Academics, IT staff, Admin/clerical, Students)

12 What have been the Lessons Learnt

13 Is there one thing you would do differently?
End of survey for SharePoint users

14 Have you ever considered using SharePoint?

For each considered use:
- Area of Institute
  - (select from: Governance & Management; Financial Resources; Physical Resources; Human Resources; Student Administration & Services; Teaching & Learning; Research; Commercial & Development; Other)
- Use for
  - (select from: Corporate website, Intranet, Document Management, Records Management, Virtual Learning, Collaboration, Business Intelligence, Knowledge Management, Other)
- Strategy for
- %staff users; %student users
- Drivers
- Rejected at Project Phase
  - (select from: Pre procurement, Procurement, Testing/evaluation, Planned, Pilot/Model Office, Rollout/ongoing, Production/Live)
- Reasons for rejection

15 If you don't use SharePoint do you use something in its place?
Feature/reason, Alternative, why use the alternative?
**APPENDIX B. BREAKDOWN OF HEI TYPE AND LOCATION IN SURVEY SAMPLE VS TOTAL UK HEI POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI characteristic</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of HEI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbrick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humberside</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>