Staff Intranet and Document Repository Solutions Committee
Working Draft – Final Report

Part I: Background and Scope

Beginning in December 2013, Eli Brooke, Alina Dunbar, Vincent McCoy, Carly Mulliken, Katie Melody, Gianna Mosser, and Suzette Radford began meeting biweekly as the newly formed Staff Intranet and Document Repository Solutions Committee with the following objectives:

- assess the various tools and locations for storing and sharing data currently being used at the University Library and Press
- investigate SharePoint for potential inclusion in the Northwestern Collaboration Service Initiative
- and make recommendations for document management strategies based on committee findings

The following information technology solutions will be described in detail in this report:

1. Depot
2. the L and N drives
3. Google Docs
4. Staff Web

Part II: Methodology

The committee began by informally polling their respective departments about technologies used, current file sharing strategies, and storage practices. After reviewing the results, the committee decided to administer separate surveys regarding usage of 1) Depot and 2) all other document storage technologies. A third, entirely separate survey, was administered to NU Press staff regarding their document storage patterns. The NUP survey can be found in its entirety in Appendix C.

On February 27, 2014, the committee hosted an open forum and invited all Library and NU Press staff to attend. The forum was designed to provide staff with an additional opportunity to discuss concerns regarding document storage technologies, as well as to gain clarification about the surveys if needed. The comments collected during the forum are consistent with the survey and can be read in full in Appendix B. In addition, a complete audio recording of the session is available upon request.

Most of the committee members were not familiar with SharePoint, so the decision was made to utilize the software for all committee activities, including sharing documents, keeping minutes, storing survey results, etc. We requested a SharePoint demo session with Kevin Ossler and Gene Bugler from NUIT Collaboration Services in order to further educate ourselves about the capacities and robustness of the platform. We asked Ossler and Bugler specific questions based on the data we collected from the survey, the forum, and our own committee investigations.

Part III: Data
Depot
The first survey was distributed via email to Library staff with Depot accounts; 38 staff members responded. Of those surveyed, 18 reported that they are still actively using their Depot accounts. The remaining 20 survey respondents no longer utilized their Depot accounts, and 17 of those 20 were fine with having NUIT delete their accounts immediately.

Survey Monkey and Staff Forum
A comprehensive survey was developed and distributed via Survey Monkey to the entire Library staff. A total of 108 Library and NU Press staff, representing 26 departments, took the survey. This provided us with robust and representative data about document storage patterns and needs throughout the Library. Please note that NU Press staff was asked to fill out a contextualized survey separately (they did not use the Survey Monkey link) and, unless specified, the data below is pulled from the 103 NUL staff responses. Please also note that the comments collected during the open staff forum corroborated the survey data.

Of the 103 Library staff who completed the survey,
- 82.5% were Windows users (85 of 103)
- 17.48% were Mac users (18 of 103)

The response to the question about L Drive usage was definitive and overwhelming:

Over 60% of those surveyed reported that they used the L Drive on a daily basis. An additional 18.5% used it weekly. Compared to all the other tools considered in the survey, the L Drive was clearly the most highly and frequently used tool.
When asked whether there was any departmental work or workflows that were dependent upon using the L Drive to store or share files, over 80% responded in the affirmative. Just 14 Library staff answered “no” or “not really,” while an overwhelming number of survey participants left substantial details about why continued access to the L Drive was crucial for their department. Among those who commented:

- One respondent remarked that “All daily operations depend on using the L drive. Department policies, documents, spreadsheets, signage, etc. need to be in a shared space.”
- Another pointed out that “Our department uses the L drive in order to access numerous documents without having to e-mail them to each other. On the L drive, everyone has access.”
- And finally, one responded reported that “We have a lot of documents that need to be accessed by multiple people from different computers. A network drive is an efficient and logical way for that to happen because there is no discrepancy about which version of a finding aid or department document is up to date.”

Reports of L COLLABORATION usage were more mixed. Based on this chart, and the free responses, it seems that Library staff use the COLLABORATION folder on an “as needed” basis, as opposed to considering it crucial for their everyday work. One staff member commented that their use of the COLLABORATION...
folder “depends on the committee,” while four separate staff members remarked that they only used it “occasionally.”

Responses to the effectiveness of StaffWeb were less positive.

A significant percentage of respondents indicated that they frequently used StaffWeb to view and access other departments’ documents (44%), or to share their own departmental forms, updates, and policy information (22%). However, the negative tone of the responses to the following question, “Do you have any issues with using StaffWeb for document storage and sharing?” suggest that a large portion of StaffWeb users are dissatisfied with its interface (67%), but in the absence of a better staff intranet solution, have no choice but to use the tool at hand.
Nearly two-thirds of survey respondents used Google Drive/Docs to fulfill as yet unmet document storage and sharing needs, while emphasizing that the software is convenient and easy to use. Additionally, the high percentage of survey respondents utilizing the “My Documents” folder (69%) echoes the Library staff’s requests for an established set of guidelines regarding document storage and sharing tools. Please note that for the purposes of our report, we are considering usage of Dropbox, Depot, and Box.com in a separate section of the document.

Finally, when asked to reflect on what features should be incorporated into a new staff intranet solution, survey respondents highlighted features that would solve many, if not all, of the issues they had raised regarding the L Drive, L COLLABORATION, and StaffWeb.

These were the top five features that respondents requested be included in a new staff intranet solution:

1. Better navigation, including intuitive headings, improved document organization/archive, and more appealing interface (37 respondents)
2. Simultaneous editing of documents, in addition to support for all file types, cloud storage to simplify document retrieval, and fluid upload/download capabilities (14 respondents)
3. Flexible access controls that can be managed by departments themselves (8 respondents)
4. Improved search feature (5 respondents)
5. Formatting consistency across all department pages, as well as optional—and flexible—departmental customization (4 respondents)

Other suggestions included:
A staff “discussion board” or centralized feature where messages can be posted; a system that had no automatic logouts; a library-wide calendar; the ability to integrate widgets/code; mobile access; the ability to retrieve previously visited pages or viewing history; RSS/email notification of new content; the ability to customize a personal dashboard; a service that is equally accessible on and off campus access; and the ability to share beyond the Library.

Part IV: Findings

The most frequent criticism of the current document repository solutions is the lack of guidelines regarding where and how documents should be stored. We identified two broad categories for document storage: 1) archival storage and 2) file sharing to support departmental workflows. As you will see below, different technologies fulfill different aspects of these needs.

DEPOT
The primary use of Depot is for sharing large documents and files, frequently with external vendors and users without University NetIDs. For several departments (University Archives, Special Collections, NU Press), Depot is an essential workflow aspect and a replacement for it must be secured before Depot is deactivated by NUIT this summer.

Sharepoint cannot currently accommodate external sharing.

NETWORK DRIVES—L and N
The L and N drives are the most commonly used tools for document storage.
In response to the question “Do you have any issues with using the L Drive for document storage and sharing?” over two-thirds of those who responded either had no issues with the L Drive or left a positive comment about its functionality. The remaining 28 negative responses focused on the following issues:
- Access issues within NUL/Difficult to share with staff and collaborators outside NUL/Ofsite and Mac access both difficult (12 respondents)
- Hierarchy/organization of folders is confusing/chaotic (10 respondents)
- Changing sharing settings requires submission of help desk ticket/difficult for student assistants to get access (5 respondents)
- No capacity to edit files simultaneously (4 respondents)

L COLLABORATION
According to the survey data, Library staff use the L COLLABORATION folder on an “as needed” basis, as opposed to considering it crucial for their everyday work.

Sharepoint could offer some of the file sharing capabilities currently accomplished via the L and N drives, and particularly L COLLABORATION, but there are individual file size and aggregate file size restrictions.

GOOGLE DOCS
Many staff made persuasive arguments to support their usage of Google Docs as a collaboration tool with people both inside and outside of the University. Reasons for utilizing Google Drive/Docs were as follows:

- For committee or collaborative work, especially for simultaneous editing of documents and version control (18 respondents)
- Ease of sharing files with patrons, student workers, collaborators outside of NUL who lack NetIDs, or even interdepartmentally within the Library (16 respondents)

Sharepoint does allow for the multi-user editing function also available in Google Docs.

STAFF INTRANET (StaffWeb)
The majority of the staff surveyed expressed issues with the current iteration of StaffWeb. The two most commonly used words to describe StaffWeb were “clunky” and “cumbersome.” More specifically, survey respondents highlighted the following issues:

- Directory is confusing, misleading, and not intuitive; there is a lack of consistency across departments, and no established format (23 respondents)
- Interface is too cumbersome to make StaffWeb an effective work tool (17 respondents)
- Sharing settings very crude; hard to specify or change access permissions (8 respondents)
- Issues with editing/uploading documents, no capacity to edit files simultaneously (8 respondents)
- Poor search feature (7 respondents)
- Not suitable as a permanent archive; L Drive is superior for departmental needs (4 respondents)
- Automatic log-outs disrupt workflow (3 respondents)

The insufficiencies of StaffWeb and the L Drive should be considered in tandem with the justifications Library staff offered for turning to additional document sharing and storage tools—most notably GoogleDocs.

When asked to reflect on what features should be incorporated into a new staff intranet solution, survey respondents highlighted features that would solve many, if not all, of the issues they had raised regarding the L Drive, L COLLABORATION, and StaffWeb.

These were the top five features that respondents requested to be included in a new staff intranet solution:

1. Better navigation, including intuitive headings, improved document organization/archive, and more appealing interface (37 respondents)
2. Simultaneous editing of documents, in addition to support for all file types, cloud storage to simplify document retrieval, and fluid upload/download capabilities (14 respondents)

3. Flexible permissions controls that can be managed by departments themselves (8 respondents)

4. Improved search feature (5 respondents)

5. Formatting consistency across all department pages, as well as optional—and flexible—departmental customization (4 respondents)

SharePoint does operate very much like an intranet website, so some of the scope of StaffWeb is immediately possible. Specifically, SharePoint could supplant the public features of the StaffWeb directory, but can also accommodate more restricted file access. Of the features in the list above, we believe that—if designed properly—a new staff Internet built using SharePoint can improve upon StaffWeb in all requested areas.

Part V: Recommendations and Next Steps

OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
We recommend the creation of a permanent Staff Intranet and Document Repository Oversight Committee. The main charge of this committee will be to develop and maintain best practice guidelines for all document storage and sharing patterns across the Library and NU Press. These best practice guidelines should ensure consistency for the sharing and storage of digital documents intended for more “public” external audiences, while allowing flexibility for internal workflows. When necessary, the Oversight Committee will adjudicate any disputes regarding document sharing and storage, and make final rulings on complaints or requests for new service.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR L AND N DRIVES, DEPOT, AND GOOGLEDOCS

L AND N DRIVES
We recommend that the L and N drives be retained for both archival and workflow procedures. As demonstrated by our findings, dependence on both network drives is significant, widespread, and crucial for everyday work. The Oversight Committee should develop clear guidelines, based on staff input and recognizing the need for flexibility, for the appropriate use, structure, and organization of folders and files on the network drives.

DEPOT
We are confident that Box.com, with which the University has a pending contract, will be a satisfactory replacement for Depot, as well as Dropbox. Both Depot and Dropbox were primarily used by Library and NU Press staff to share files—sometimes extremely large files—on a one-time basis with external customers or collaborators. The Oversight Committee should establish best practices for this product based on input from the staff who use it.

GOOGLEDOCS
We recognize the need of our staff to collaborate with scholars and librarians at other institutions who do not possess NetIDs or have access to University document systems. GoogleDocs is also frequently used internally by Library and NU Press staff because of its collaborative advantages, including simultaneous file editing and granular sharing settings. While a new staff intranet built using SharePoint software could address most of these internal needs, it may not be a viable replacement for GoogleDocs in every situation. The Oversight Committee should develop best practices regarding usage of GoogleDocs, keeping in mind the security implications.

**RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING STAFF INTRANET**
We recommend that the Oversight Committee consider appointing a working group to design and build a new staff intranet using SharePoint, which would replace the current Drupal-based StaffWeb. If planned and executed well, a SharePoint-based intranet could solve many internal collaboration issues for staff, including the five main points of concern about StaffWeb raised by respondents to our survey and forum. SharePoint’s cloud-based storage and simultaneous editing capabilities would make it much easier for us to share our documents with our partners at Galter, Pritzker, United Library, and the Qatar Library who don't routinely login to our Library AD domain, since anyone with a NetID could access a SharePoint site if given the appropriate permission.

Sharepoint has a high capacity for customization, and it seemed from the demo and discussion we held with Kevin Ossler and Gene Bugler from NUIT Collaboration Services to be more flexible than the current Drupal-based StaffWeb site, but it we feel it is important to stress that any new staff intranet should be planned out carefully in advance. The working group would work in consultation with library staff to establish a hierarchy of sites and subsites to be created by NUIT, as well as develop and implement a template for their customized appearance which reflects standards for consistent and coherent structure and organization. Usability testing with staff would be essential at all phases in the design process, as well as consultation with NUIT and existing SharePoint users on campus. The staff intranet working group would work with the Oversight Committee to develop best practices regarding what kinds of documents should be made available in the new staff intranet, as well as how they should be organized. The working group would be disbanded after the new site has gone live, and each Library department’s designated site owners should be given thorough SharePoint training, after which they may be given control over the content and sharing permissions on their own sites.

The Oversight Committee would be considered the product owner of the new staff intranet.
# Appendix A: Summary of Document Repository User at NU Library and NU Press

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>How being used</th>
<th>Workflow concerns</th>
<th>Who manages</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L and N network drives</td>
<td>Individual and departmental document storage. Workflow repository for in progress publications (NUP). Departmental forms, templates, stats (CS). Collaborative Space for committees</td>
<td>Some Dept work flows are dependent upon the shared drive being available. It is especially convenient for Windows users. Mac users can with a bit more trouble attach the drive to their desktop.</td>
<td>Library Technology Support Dept.</td>
<td>Very easy for Windows users because drives are automatically mapped at login.</td>
<td>More difficult for Mac users to manually map drives. Our Partners who don’t normally login to the library domain must use an 3rd party solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot</td>
<td>Primarily used for drop off and pickup of files too large to send as email attachments. Can be used for non-NU customers who don’t have netids.</td>
<td>Needed for file sharing with non-NU customers or vendors. Some depts such as NUP, Univ Archives and Special Collections are completely dependent and must have a replacement if Depot is deactivated.</td>
<td>NUIT.</td>
<td>Cloud based storage makes it easy for all staff to access regardless of their hardware platform. Users outside of Northwestern can be given “tickets” that allow them to pick-up or deposit files. No NU netid is required.</td>
<td>Depot is being phased out by NUIT sometime during 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Drive</td>
<td>Used as Collaborative space for Committee work and for collaborating with people outside of</td>
<td>Used because there is a need to be able to share and edit documents with staff outside of NU in real-time.</td>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Easy to use for collaboration with people outside of Northwestern. Documents can be edited in</td>
<td>Storage is not owned or under the control of Northwestern. Might be some security concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository</td>
<td>How being used</td>
<td>Workflow concerns</td>
<td>Who manages</td>
<td>Pros</td>
<td>Cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffweb</td>
<td>Used to store and share Departmental documents and documents from committees</td>
<td>Cumbersome interface difficult to use. Poorly organized with too little security on files and folders. Index is poor and it is difficult to find documents. Frequent timeouts and the need to login again is annoying. Editing and uploading documents is clunky.</td>
<td>Library Technology Support Dept</td>
<td>Completely open access to all Library staff. Departments have complete control of their sites content and appearance.</td>
<td>There are no standards being enforced for content or for how the departments sites are organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>Some NU business is being conducted such as shared spreadsheets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>real time and simultaneously by different people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Document Repository Discussion Session, 2/27/2014

25 Staff Members in attendance, not including Committee members

What do you LIKE about Staffweb?

- Navigation. If/when it is updated/curated
- Fairly easy to use
- Accessible off-site
- Easy to edit
- Searchable
- Easy to use
- Tries to be a central place for staff information
- Nice that we can look there first for rosters and minutes – all depts. and cttes should be required to post those things
- Nothing
- It is organized logically
- New hires! Great way to learn more about them!
- Easy to upload docs for staff use
- Central place for committee docs
- It aggregates info
- It’s searchable
- Uses netID and password so I don’t have another login password
- All procedures in one place
- I like that I can access staffweb w/username and password
- Easy to log into and to navigate through

What do you DISLIKE about StaffWeb?

- The auto time-out in StaffWeb is annoying
- I dislike StaffWeb—it times out and I have to re-enter my password everytime I use it.
- Not flexible structure
- Many staff don’t use it so it limits my use of it
- Not intuitive how to construct a page. Too steep a learning curve.
- Cutting and pasting issues for new pages – formatting gets messed up
- Searching: too many levels; many orphan/unlinked docs; incomplete/absent indices
- (dvb)
- Is it here, on the L drive, or was it an email attachment?
- Poor search interface
- Hard for staff outside library to share on L
- Clunky
- Difficult to find things
- Doesn’t make using tables easy. Have to use attachment method.
- Document storage isn’t the best
- It is another thing I have to log into.
- Clunky, old fashioned, avoid at all costs
- Organization of StaffWeb is not totally logical
- Many staffweb pages are out of date (or even empty!); some not touched since created.
- Too hard to find website
- Logging in each time (whine, whine)
- Having to scroll up and down to save changes
- Procedures not necessarily up to date (issue of documents, not the interface)
- Not enough categories at top tabs – for example everything has to be grouped under “committees” even if it is really a group or a project
- Difficult to find
- Cumbersome to use
- Confusing in structure
- Broken links (not a problem w/staffweb per se)
- Browse by department
- No coherent or consistent organization – each dept. has built its area differently
- It doesn’t seem to be updated regularly. Outdated information
- Old, outdated version of documents lurk there and sometimes pop up
- Hard to locate specific items w/ search
- Difficult to navigate: overly complicated hierarchical structure
- Drupal is too complicated and not flexible enough (formatting, etc.)

Notes from Carly:
- not sure if current, ex: new hire pictures from months ago
- search feature is not effective, just end up asking someone that will probably know, documents are not linked properly
- uneven use, some departments and committees use, but some don't, some of them use the L Drive and some don't
- there isn't any coherent organization or consistent look, usage, documents, links, etc
- posting document is a nuisance
- there should be a "Best Practices" or guidelines for when to use what (not just StaffWeb, but also google docs, LibGuides, L Drive, etc)
- iterations of drafts not usable through StaffWeb and it's all out in the open too
- no outside users

Notes from Eli:
- no ability to narrow searches

**What features do you want to see in a new staff intranet?**
- Updated staff directory – maybe w/ pictures (opt-in) (someone added “Yes!” in pencil, different hand)
- Most of our documentation should be public
- A forum/discussion space that actually gets used (dvb)
- “social” forum aspect (never took off in StaffWeb)
- Forum content pushed to email
- Active tables updating
- Usability testing
- Give us some options and we’ll tell you what works for us
- Blogs for writerly types. Possibly a public side for this.
- Library blog (new members, news, etc.) but actually maintained
- More shortcuts
- Easy way to update the dept. website
Need to have auto feeds – how to know when there is new article/photo in LibStaff News?
Better document storage and sharing
One central place for all staff information
More obvious organization
Easier way to post documents. Drupal is not a forgiving interface!
More ease/flexibility for edits, uploads
Staff directory without incorrect and inconsistent department names
The ability for 2 or more users to simultaneously edit a file would be nice, like Google Docs
Would like to have wiki and blog platforms for staff communication
Have a clickable organization chart as an alternate means of access to division/dept/unit information
I would like the ability to share a document or file with specific individuals and only them

Notes from Carly:
- staff directory with pictures
- clickable org chart (take to dept's page)
- limit on search, similar to advanced search feature
- update/modify notifications sent
- forum section that people actually use
- depository of interest to form committees, help, etc
- back-end usability that mean docs, etc are linked properly
- editing tool
- proper access for info/docs
- blog section
- staff announcements similar to Facebook
- document retention and update policy

Do you have any issues with using the L Drive for document storage and sharing?
- No one person to oversee categories and hierarchies – everybody just adds willy-nilly
- Can’t share docs w/staff outside NUL
- Permissions are cumbersome
- My students often use Google Docs b/c it’s easier to access mobiley than the L drive (dvb)
- How secure is it? Enough for docs with sensitive info?
- I have a default preference to seeking info on the web over drives
- L Drive? What’s an L Drive?
- Delete old files
- Again – no consistent organization – even in Collaboration and Staff, some areas are hyper-organized, some just one big folder
- Folder list is a mess; not clear which folders you have “permission” and which not – and some have almost the same names
- Only one person can work on document at a time
- Lots of old stuff – too easy to never clean out
As far as I can tell there isn’t any cleanup w/in L Drive. Once there, there forever.
The L drive has worked well for me for storing stuff. I find it less useful for sharing
because the users need to know exact location.
The L Drive is fine for storage, but collaboration is hard.
L Drive is fine for storage of most documents unless there are privacy or sensitivity
concerns.
Like – convenient and seamless access

Notes from Carly:
• L drive is hard to access for some people (Mac users and users not in Main library)
• suggestion: need a "webmaster" that will set up a good way to manage/organize and also
oversee content (labeled properly, permissions, etc)

Other document storage and sharing areas of concern
• I don’t remember the specific program, but have used wikis effectively in the past
• Google Docs isn’t a useful solution because it requires a separate sign on, not netID
• Sharepoint was awful the first time around, what will make the 2\textsuperscript{nd} time worthwhile?
• Perhaps guidelines on when to put docs on L vs. staffweb vs. google docs
• Use dropbox: google drive for work but need admin privileges to install program (non-
web based)
• Concerns about security on Dropbox, Google Docs
• We currently have no state document retention policies. As a result, some of us keep
nothing, while others have files back to the other (sic) 1990s.
• Will need growing storage space
• Use Google Docs for collaborative work. Negative – it is clunky to use, e.g. Excel is not
fully functional
• When non-StaffWeb pages become the “go-to” place for info, there should be links
from StaffWeb to those pages.
• Google Docs – permissions, archival docs – will docs be lost as people leave?
• Whatever winds up being “StaffWeb” or its replacement should be \textit{mandated} as the place
where information is stored, or where one can find a pointer to where information is
stored.

Notes from Carly:
• google docs-easy to collaborate together, convenient, "swarm" on a doc all at once so
it's more efficient, share outside of NU
• google docs-security problem, which despite security concerns is necessary in certain
situations and use came out of necessity
• google docs- need guidelines for what's shared, what it's used for, etc

Notes from Eli:
• some university business shared with outsiders isn't sensitive; there should be
guidelines and levels for what needs protection and what doesn't
• Policy and technology should facilitate efficient collaborative work, not get in the
way of it
• need for something that allows simultaneous editing, which favors something cloud-based (Sharepoint seems to be allowing Alina and me to be doing that right now on this doc!!)

Overarching Themes from Discussion (from Carly):
• style/best practice
• access (secure, outside, etc)
• collaboration
• usability testing before goes live

From Eli:
• much discussion about a need for less confusing/free-for-all structure and best practice guidelines in both StaffWeb and L Drive; SP even suggested having some sort of "webmaster" to look at what to put where in terms of an overall policy
Appendix C: Northwestern University Press Document Repository and Sharing Survey

Respondent #1: I use PCs for the most part, though often hop onto a Mac for design and typesetting work.
Respondent #2: MAC user
Respondent #3: Mac User
Respondent #4: I use a Macintosh with operating system version 10.9.1
Respondent #5: I am a PC user.

1. We would like to better understand how you are using the N-drive (also known as the server). How often do you use the drive? All the time? Sometimes?

Respondent #1: Ongoing—I deposit and retrieve files every few minutes.
Respondent #2: All the time.
Respondent #3: I use it daily to access different files.
Respondent #4: All of the time. I work with large files and projects (InDesign, Quark, Photoshop image processing, etc.). I tend to copy the working files to my desktop, work on them and back up locally. Once the project is finished, I package the files and place back on the server. Smaller files I work directly on the server.
Respondent #5: I use the server constantly.

2. Are there any workflows or procedures in your department that depend upon the server? Please elaborate.

Respondent #1: All our procedures depend on the N-drive. We store our book files, our art, our MS files; I store my budgets, the production schedule, the forms I use. It is our working server, our light archive, and our dark archive (though not our only one).

Respondent #2: As designer and typesetter, I check out readers’ reports, upload approved covers, assess cover and interior photographs, place marketing materials, download final documents for production from the server.

Respondent #3: I have my own procedure for keeping track of award submissions—I keep these files stored in a folder in a server. I don’t think our department has any other specific procedures that we rely on the server for; we use it mainly to store files.

Respondent #4: Yes, from project starts to finish, various departments add their projects to the server, other departments retrieve the files (uses them on the server or off the server as described above), edit files, place revised files, and archive files on the server. A Project could last up to several years.

Respondent #5: The main workflows I use that depend on the server are CIP data applications (which is where I find files for type to submit to the Library of Congress), permissions applications (template letters and previously sent letters are stored here), and, to a lesser extent, copyright applications (I pull various information for this from the server). Mainly I store it for
using files, like cleared ebook rights or bestseller lists, that might be of interest to other departments or individuals.

3. What specific folders on the N-drive are you using to store your files? Please make a list of the folders, e.g., N: Public\Editorial Share. (We would like staff to look at the N drive and claim their active folders and in the process of doing so we hope they will delete any folders they no longer need.)

Respondent #1: N:\Production; N:\Public; N:\Lain Adkins; N:\Electronic Books; N:\Editorial - N: Public\Editorial Share; -N: nupress\Acquisition; -N: nupress\Production; -N: Public\Sales-Marketing Share

Respondent #2: N: Marketing/Catalog Production; N: Sales/Staff-Greta; N: Subsidiary Rights 2/Sales/Templates/First serial; N: Marketing/Advertising; N: Marketing/Vanity Fliers; N: Marketing/Publicity/Press Materials

Respondent #3: Every folder within the “Production” folder is vital. Final archived projects are stored in the “2-Projects” folder holding 100’s of finished book files used for reprints. As a department, we purge our folder on a regular basis eliminating unnecessary files.

Respondent #4: N:Liz Admin Asst Files is where I store almost everything I save to the server. I also use the CIP Applied/Received folders within the Editorial folder to save information about CIP data.

Respondent #5: I sometimes look up information in the Acquisitions/Project Files folder and the Electronic Books folder for various projects, as well as the various Share folders in the Public folder, but they aren’t places I store things, just reference.

4. Do you prefer to use a web interface for your work whenever you can? Please elaborate. For example, do you prefer to use OWA to read your email and calendar instead of Outlook 2010.

Respondent #1: I prefer non-internet software whenever possible. It seems to be less slow. I also can’t remember all the passwords that go with internet applications.

Respondent #2: I use OWA when not in the office.

Respondent #3: I prefer to use the desktop version of Outlook whenever possible. I only use OWA remotely or when I’m having issues with my Outlook. My Outlook has all my preferences and folders stored the way I want them, which is why I prefer it.

Respondent #4: I prefer to use desktop programs while in office. Off campus, web interface is fine. Being tied to a web interface leaves us vulnerable if (and when) service web is disrupted.

Respondent #5: For NUP-related work, mostly I don’t---I prefer Outlook to OWA. I might use things like OWA more if it had a significantly better interface than Outlook, but that’s not the
case. Since most NUP files are saved on the server, I default to that. For my own, non-NU projects, I prefer web-based interfaces like Google Drive, since I can work from anywhere. I might use web-based services for work more often if they a) existed and b) were convenient to use.

5. Would you like to see a portion of the functionality now provided by the N-drive moved to a web interface? You would be able to view files and folders using a web browser.

Respondent #1: No thank you, I like it the way it is.

Respondent #2: Yes.

Respondent #3: Sure; I would be open to this as long as all of the files and folders were kept intact and it allowed for easier functionality.

Respondent #4: With the size of files I work with, NO. Try editing and transferring 300 images off of a web interface…

Respondent #5: I would be okay with that, but it wouldn’t bother me if it didn’t happen.

6. Do you or your department use Depot for NUP business? In what capacities?

Respondent #1: I use it weekly, to transmit design files, art files, and text files to print and typesetting vendors; and to receive files from the same.

Respondent #2: Yes, I often need to receive or send art/production files that are too large to email.

Respondent #3: I’ve used it occasionally to send oversized files to vendors, such as poster orders for exhibits and conferences.

Respondent #4: From time to time. Though it seems that my account has been capped, leaving it useless for my use. Not having direct access to the Depot folder, and only through a web interface, it is quite cumbersome to use, just to find out that the file I am trying to share exceeds file size limits.

Respondent #5: I do not.

7. Do you use any computer systems outside of the University, like Google Docs, to store University business? If yes, what systems do you use? How much space are you using on those systems?

Respondent #1: No.

Respondent #2: I use Dropbox. Currently I’m using 3.3 GB of 6.38 GB available to me.
Respondent #3: No.

Respondent #4: No, dislike Google Docs. Again, too dependent on web access an another account/login info to remember and monitor….
Respondent #5: I only occasionally use Google Drive for University business, usually if I am going to be working on something from multiple locations or if I want to use my laptop at work. I would say I have used barely any space for this, maybe 5-10 Word and Excel documents in the three years I’ve been here, and I delete the files from Google when I’m done.

8. Do you use any other University system to store or share documents, like a FTP site?

Respondent #1: No. I use Depot for everything external, and the N-drive for everything internal.

Respondent #2: No.

Respondent #3: No, not currently.

Respondent #4: Yes, Cyberduck for FTP file transfer. 99% used to send and retrieve electronic files to printers, typesetters and related vendors. Essential to our workflow. Some of our vendors have a web based FTP interface, but most use programs similar to Cyberduck.

Respondent #5: Not that I can think of, no.

9. Do you need to share any documents or files with customers or business partners outside of the University who do not have net IDs? If yes, please explain.

Respondent #1: I transmit design files, art files, and text files to print and typesetting vendors using Depot.

Respondent #2: Yes, I often work with authors, their contacts and freelancers, transferring large Photoshop or InDesign files.

Respondent #3: No.

Respondent #4: Yes, with authors, printers and typesetters. Large manuscripts, book interior PDFs or sending/receiving image files and final print files.

Respondent #5: No

10. What committees or tasks require you to share the most documentation with members of NUP staff?

Respondent #1: Editorial work, design work, typesetting work—all part of my day at NU Press.

Respondent #2: Front panel covers for Sales and Marketing, final print files for interiors and covers to Production.
Respondent #3: I am not currently involved in any committees within NUP, but the one major project I work on twice a year is the seasonal catalog, which involves a workflow that relies on several staff members. The advertisements and flyers I work on also involve other staff members, as I need their feedback for approval before submitting the final versions.

Respondent #4: Between Acquisitions, Editorial, Design and Marketing (guess that is all of them…) in various stages of the project.

Respondent #5: Mainly applying for CIP data. The digital initiatives committee uses the server to a limited extent, but I think both it and the TM working group could use the server more to improve the process of how we share our work.
## Appendix D: Campus Technology Leaders Use of Sharepoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept/School</th>
<th>Using Sharepoint?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NU-Q</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NU-Q deployed a SharePoint 2007 installation in 2009 and upgraded to Sharepoint 2010 in 2011. Our initial rollout model was to provide sites to each distinct business and academic unit at NU-Q. We identified champions in many of those units to identify and work with their unit to develop content for the NU-Q employee audience. Over time specific project or business process sites have been established to address cross-departmental needs. We have units owning the task of authoring/editing/publishing internal business process and other documentation. A variety of modest workflow tasks have been successful. Site calendars have been effectively rolled up into an NU-Q planning calendar.</td>
<td>It could be said that not every unit needs a SharePoint. Our units without champions have not sought to develop content within the service. Additionally complex list based workflows have proven beyond the capabilities of most NU-Q power users. Until there's content its difficult to drive community members to the platform. In my experience the more good content or reasons team members have to visit the site, the more likely they are to contribute to other areas of the site. This content growth cycle growth is an important phase of adoption. At NU-Q, we went through a year of slowly developing content before a critical mass of community members began recognizing the value. The challenge we face now is in making the content more accessible and in some cases better digestible. Crowd sourced content is invaluable, but as site collections for broad audiences mature an eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/School</td>
<td>Using SharePoint?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We have migrated over 40 sites and the process went very smoothly with the assistance of Gene, Kevin and the consultant Roberto. These sites have varying degrees of usage from advanced to novice with different levels of experience with our users. We have had SharePoint sites since 2003. The end user documentation has been excellent and the Global knowledge class was much appreciated. What we need is more training of a shorter nature (perhaps 1/2 days) for our SharePoint site owners. The users are also requesting that work flows are turned on and supported.</td>
<td>) I agree with Chris's statements on the support level needed to make SharePoint successful. We look forward to working with Box because it has been our experience that there are very different needs and some requests will be better suited with Box versus SharePoint vs. other services. We currently access the needs before a site is created for the law school and guide the user toward a certain technical service based on their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bienen</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>While I have pitched the potential of SharePoint to my Deans’ Suite, we have no current production rollout and no concrete plans to establish any specific sites in the near future (FY14-15). While this is partially due to a lack of development resources that I can allocate to sandbox-style experiments, it is also a function of design philosophy. We presently have a deeply-entrenched file-level collaboration workflow within our administrative culture. I see SharePoint as being a tool which builds tools, not simply a new As far as centrally-provided resources go, I think the availability of Lynda.com tutorials and (mandatory) training courses certainly cover a wide middle-range of the University population and I’ve looked at them cursorily. Our needs, however, will probably lie at the two ends of the spectrum. In terms of developing focused tools, we will probably utilize more technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept/School</th>
<th>Using SharePoint?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>platform to exchange our current practices for. Based on my own experiences, as a framework Sharepoint has too much overhead to really be efficient for low-bandwidth, high-turnover purposes. So, currently, it only factors into the end-phases of initiatives I'm pushing in the School in regards to the codification and modernization of Business Procedures and Practices, many of which are presently being handled less efficiently than they could be.</td>
<td>resources than the standard list-libraries-wikis-sites walkthroughs; in terms of actual utilization, our end-users would receive specific instruction that minimizes their exposure to SharePoint as a generic entity. The &lt;share.northwestern.edu&gt; demo site was great as an example of basic SharePoint functionality, but - at the same time - it is an illustration of the sort of easily-orphaned SharePoint resource that I don't think we would find significant value in supporting, at least presently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research</td>
<td>Pilot sites only</td>
<td>OR has taken a conservative approach to SharePoint too. We have a couple of sites that are pilots that we're using as a learning tool to get our feet wet. We do plan to use SharePoint to a greater extent as a collaboration platform for OR units. I think at this point some of our users see SharePoint as a potential document authoring tool and have asked for document workflow features as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medill</td>
<td>Pilot. One site</td>
<td>To date Medill has one small site up in Graduate Admissions and Financial Aid. The goal is to use the site as a replacement for the old Graduate Admissions network share and to enable collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/School</td>
<td>Using Sharepoint?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and document versioning. We haven't used the site enough yet to have any strong opinions about how well it works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Student Affairs has rolled out one instance of SP at Health Services replacing a fairly comprehensive local SP 2003 site. That rollout went smoothly, but the site owner had SP experience and was a motivated user. I worry about the abilities/competence of site owners as sites proliferate in our division.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSS - NUIT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>we have transitioned the NUIT Intranet to SHAREPOINT, and are doing some testing with moving the DSS internal support wiki to the system. After sending staff to the onsite training session we coordinated with many of you, it has made it easier to understand the system capabilities and begin to move things forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SESP maintains a small SharePoint 2013 installation with the additional Analysis Server and PowerPivot tools installed. SharePoint is only used to host PowerView reports and BI connected Excel documents. Works incredibly well for this specific use. Would migrate to central farm if the additional SQL tools were available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SCS has not used the new SharePoint/Box option yet nor have SCS looked at the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/School</td>
<td>Using SharePoint?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit and Advisory Services -NUIT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AandAS has not used Sharepoint. We have looked into the use of it for two different activities, but have not made it through the training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Weinberg has taken a conservative approach to SharePoint so far. We have a handful of sites that we consider pilots as we figure out our long-term structures. We do plan to use SharePoint much more extensively in future months as a collaboration platform for departments. It will be a considerable challenge to encourage adoption among our faculty and staff, and we are now starting to plan our time/effort allocation accordingly. I appreciate NUIT¹s efforts working with Weinberg IT to figure out the appropriate site templates and tools for a College-wide rollout.</td>
<td>As I have mentioned in other venues, I am concerned about the support model and rollout approach. Recognizing that SharePoint adoption is not quite analogous to Exchange, I think making sure IT@NU is well prepared to support such a multi-faceted tool as SharePoint requires a community-based, collaborative approach to communications, training (both IT and end-user), and ongoing support. One of the strengths of the approach we took with Exchange is that once the community (i.e. the Deployment working group) determined the overall approach, it was much easier for local IT to go back into the units and both prepare the IT personnel and educate the end-user population on what was happening and why. I think this is a key topic for our shared consideration so we can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/School</td>
<td>Using SharePoint?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Our most significant problem is that our current site is on SharePoint 2007 and we are having difficulty upgrading it to 2010 and then again to 2013. If we cannot get the service pack applied and the upgrades completed we will have to recreate our administrative (Finance/Budget and IT) sites which will be a real problem. Gene has been very helpful but we have not yet been able to successfully move this forward.</td>
<td>We have not yet had resources to devote to new groups and projects on our site. I'm told that the resources and documentation are excellent. It may be that we do not have a sufficiently experienced person working on this or it may be that we just have not put enough emphasis on SharePoint. In any case, the Feinberg Site has not gotten off the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Info and Sys Sec -- NUIT</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>We've (ISS/C) had limited deployment of Sharepoint and I'm a casual user of Box. Comparing the usability of Sharepoint to Box, I'm in favor of Box. I find it easier to use, access and share documents; navigation of the Box &quot;site&quot; is remarkably easy, less so in Sharepoint. I've been frustrated in attempts to find a document within Sharepoint, so much so that it has become a &quot;best practice&quot; to include the full URL of a document's location in order for one to access a document (rather than search for it). Further, Mozilla's Firefox is my browser of choice; often I'm unable to access Sharepoint resources (authentication is successful followed by a blank screen). Rather than modify Firefox settings, I invoke IE to view Sharepoint resources - workable,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/School</td>
<td>Using Sharepoint?</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but aggravating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>