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**PROJECT DETAILS**

**Location of Projection:** Portobello, Sheffield  
**Goal:** To assist graduates to hone and develop enterprise skills during their times at University. Thereby, enhancing their potential impact as social entrepreneurs, enterprising employees and business owners.

**Purpose of Project:**

1. Create 480 square metres of facility space originally to be housed within the old Jessop Hospital building. However, it is currently located in the old Da Vinci Café area.

2. Provide and excellent learning experience for students by impacting upon at least 200 students, but with a White Rose Consortium target of 500 students in total.

3. Provide excellent teaching in the curriculum supported by high quality facilities such as the IT rich seminar room.

4. Develop extra curricular activities including a micro-incubator to enable students to test their ideas.

5. Promote shared learning experience amongst students and visiting experts via provision of clubs and events.

**Client Department(s):** Sheffield branch of White Rose Centre of Excellence in the Teaching and Learning of Enterprise (Professor John Yates)

**Project Management Functionaries**

- **Internal Project Manager** – David S. Briggs
- **Contractors** – Hillside Construction

**Project Finances**

- **Initial Budget:** £ 916,660¹
- **Revised Budgeted Cost:** £ 999,908²
- **Actual Cost:** £ 931,372³

**Procurement:** Selected Tenders (Framework Agreement)

---

¹ Business Cases prepared on 24/09/04 (£800,000 for Building, £116,660 for Equipment)  
² Financial Summary Statement and uBase records  
³ Financial Summary Statement and uBase records (Building spend £851,853 and £79,519 for Equipment under spend of £68,536 being retained for equipment purchase to be made)
Source of Funds
- HEFCE: £ 916,660
- University: £ 14,712

Project Scheduling
- Planned Start Date: 18/09/06
- Actual Start Date: 18/09/06
- Planned Completion Date: 05/02/07
- Actual Completion Date: 10/04/07
- Planned Duration of Construction: 20 weeks
- Actual Duration of Construction: 29 weeks

Approvals
- SMG Approval: 27/09/04
- Finance Committee Approval: 06/10/04
- University Council: 25/10/04
- HEFCE Approval: 17/12/05 (For Building Capital)
  12/10/05 (For Equipment Capital)

---

4 University contribution may increase to £83,248 provided that the anticipated expenditure on equipment is made.
Project Overview

PCR Methodology

This Post Construction Review (PCR) was developed to investigate how development, procurement, delivery and commissioning processes might be improved in the future as well as identifying processes and techniques that are worth incorporating into future projects because of the benefits or outcomes gained.

This review is solely based on inputs from the Project Manager. Unfortunately it was not possible to gain inputs from the client’s perspective, despite attempts made to gain the project client’s input.

Highlights

**Budget Development**

There was an increase of £83,248 in the budget. This increase was an additional £51,853 for building and £31,395 for equipment. The increased budget for the building was as a result of two matters. First the initial budget for the project was approved before the establishment of Stage D costs. This was done in order to submit the proposal to HEFCE in time for approval of the Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) funding. Secondly, there was an increase in the estimated building costs owing to the discovery of a significant water ingress problem during the construction.

The increased budget for the equipment was as a result of HEFCE providing extra CETL funding. It was decided that the extra funds would be used to better equip the WRECTLE centre on Portobello road and various CETL satellites on the campus.

**Cost Management,**

From the review the mechanism to control the costs for the project were all in place. A review of the minutes of the PEG reveals that most of the times the Project Manager gave updates on the status of the costs on the projects. Also there was regular reporting of the costs to the Capital Steering Group.

Most of the financial assurance procedures, which were inline with good practices, appeared to be effectively performed by the Project Manager and the accounting officer. However, a review of the PEG meeting minutes, agendas and reports reveal that the PEG was not presented nor considered a risk register or risk log for the project.
**Project Implementation**

From the interview with the Project Manager it was indicated that there were members of staff of the Department of Estates who were aware of the water ingress problem with the building. However, he was not made aware of the existence of the problem until after construction had begun.

**Performance to Schedule**

The project was 9 weeks over schedule primarily as a result of the occurrence of the water ingress problem.

**Project Governance Issues**

The Project Executive Group (PEG) appeared to have regular meeting prior to and during the early stages of construction. However, meetings were held less regularly during the construction. Also, there was no closeout meeting at the end of construction.

**Conclusions/ Recommendations**

This water ingress problem could have been planned for before the project began, had the Project Manager been informed prior to construction. However, as a result of communication problems that existed between the relevant sections of the Department of Estates, the Project Manager was not made aware of the issue before construction. It must be noted that the management of the Department of Estates is aware of the impaired communications between the respective sections of the Department. There have been efforts to enhance the level of informal and formal communications between the relevant sections.

Moreover, the management of the Department of Estates has also instituted a policy of ensuring the backlog maintenance issues are highlighted to the relevant project managers for those buildings earmarked for refurbishment.

From this, and previous reviews, there appear to be a custom of not developing risk registers for smaller projects at the University. Generally, the use of risk registers, as a part of the management of project contingencies, is inconsistently applied across different projects. It is increasingly becoming apparent that the University need to advise project managers and PEGs about the need for consistent approach to the use of risk registers and contingency management.