Experiences from the first round of benchmarking

By Yiannis Salmatzidis & Angeliki Agorogianni
Who we are?

AUTh background

• 41 departments organized in 11 faculties
• A public university predominantly funded by the national government
• 6 campuses, 21 locations

IT Center in numbers

• Established in its consolidated form in 2012
• 4 ICT centers merged into one
• Serves 43,820 FTE students and 3,494 FTE staff
Why did we decide to participate?

• Searching a wide accepted tool/methodology to justify and document our costs internally
• Engagement with a team having experience and know-how in benchmarking
• Compare ourselves to similar-sized institutions and find best practices
• Gain for ourselves the historical perspective
• Establish cooperation with foreign partners
Was it easy?

- Very good records of costs and volumes at the IT Center’s organizational level (centralized)
- More difficult to gather costs and volumes at the distributed organizational level (departments, Central Library, Research Committee, etc.)
- For the first time cost classification per ICT service
Key findings?
#1 We are a large university, spending too little on ICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUTh</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed degrees in total</td>
<td>8.462</td>
<td>3 / 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (FTE)</td>
<td>43.820</td>
<td>1 / 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (FTE)</td>
<td>3.494</td>
<td>14 / 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>HEI-Group</th>
<th>AUTh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT share of institution budget</td>
<td>6.0 %</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
<td>2.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT share of institution personnel</td>
<td>4.0 %</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
<td>2.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution staff / IT personnel (FTE)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students / IT personnel (FTE)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User accounts / IT Personnel (FTE)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#1 We are a large university, spending too little on ICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT Costs/Completed degree</td>
<td>414€</td>
<td>414€</td>
<td>18.310€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Costs/Completed credit (ECTS)</td>
<td>2€</td>
<td>2€</td>
<td>73€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Costs/Student (FTE)</td>
<td>80€</td>
<td>80€</td>
<td>3.237€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Costs/Staff (FTE)</td>
<td>1.003€</td>
<td>1.003€</td>
<td>12.627€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Costs/Active user account</td>
<td>53€</td>
<td>53€</td>
<td>1200€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#2 IT costs/service

Cost by Service

- Unspecified
- Audiovisual services
- IT management, administration
- Business applications
- Voice services
- Data networks: LAN & WAN
- IT Service Desk / Helpdesk (in)
- Workstations, client and perip
- Infrastructure
#3 we are missing something

![Graph showing IT costs ratio](image-url)

- **Unspecified**
- **IT costs in academic units**
- **IT costs in other central units**
- **Centralized IT costs**
#4 What about our Staff

Ratio: IT / Institution (FTE)

1. Overloaded
2. Much lower salaries (~2.000€/month aggr. vs. ~5.200€/month)
Which part of the analysis was more useful?

1. Apparently **CIO Summary**

2. **CIOchoose5** adds only a little more insight
   
   *(similar sized institutions but all from countries with different economical situation)*
Where did we use them?

- Internal report to the supervising IT committee
- Key findings included in the University’s annual self-evaluation report

Help decision makers to:
- create a first full picture of AUTh’s total IT costs
- understand better our comparative IT spending position
What actions did we take in 2015?

• Voice services costs reduction – renegotiating telecom contracts & transition to VoIP
• Priority to expand eduroam campus coverage
Questions we have? ¹

In order to provide more accurate data next year:

• What approach do you use for data collection at the different organizational levels?
• How do you divide the staff cost in the service level dimension?
• Do you include only email tickets in helpdesk volumes?
Questions we have? ²

• What is your Workstations procurement/administration policy? (central/distributed)

• How do you perceive “Income from IT services to other organizations”? (are national and EC funding research/infrastructure programs included?)
Goals for next year round

@ Bencheit task force level

- More universities from rest of Europe – bigger and representative sample

@ AUTh level

- Establishment of a permanent mechanism of data collection at all organizational levels
- Communication of key findings to end users
- Dissemination of BencHEIT initiative among Greek Universities
Looking into the future

• A web site – not an excel file- with the appropriate functionalities
• Disclosure of some executive public part for HEIs that give their consent (public reference for justification of decisions)
• External funding for sustainability?
Why not organize a benchmarking workshop at EUNIS 2016?

Promote EUNIS 2016 to your networks!
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