EDUCAUSE

CORE DATA SERVICE

2003 Summary Report

Brian L. Hawkins, Julia A. Rudy, and Joshua W. Madsen

EDUCAUSE

EDUCAUSE

www.educause.edu • 303-449-4430

EDUCAUSE is a nonprofit association whose mission is to advance higher education by promoting the intelligent use of information technology. Membership is open to institutions of higher education, corporations serving the higher education information technology market, and other related associations and organizations. Resources include professional development activities; print and electronic publications, including books, monographs, and the magazines *EDUCAUSE Quarterly* and *EDUCAUSE Review*; strategic policy advocacy; teaching and learning initiatives; applied research; special interest collaborative communities; awards for leadership and exemplary practices; and extensive online information services. The current membership comprises more than 1,900 colleges, universities, and educational organizations, including 200 corporations, with 14,000 active members. EDUCAUSE has offices in Boulder, Colorado, and Washington, D.C.; www.educause.edu, e-mail info@educause.edu.

Art direction by Joseph Daigle, Studio Productions

IT Organization, Staffing, and Planning

The first section of the core data survey included questions that can be clustered into three areas: campus information technology (IT) leadership and organization, IT staffing, and IT strategic planning.

IT Leadership and Organization

Survey responses for the title of the highest ranking technology administrator beg the question, "What's in a name?" The title for this highest ranking IT administrator continues to be anything but consistent or predictable! Of the 822 institutions whose data were included in our "snapshot" for this 2003 summary report, 294 unique titles were reported compared with 275 last year. However, there were more than 200 additional survey respondents this year, so perhaps we are approaching the maximum number of combinations and permutations of every level (vice president, assistant/associate vice president, dean, director, and others) and area descriptor (information systems/services/technology, and others). These various combinations and permutations often included an addendum such as "and CIO" or "and CTO." The most common unique title was in fact CIO (chief information officer), which was mentioned in 29.2% of ALL responses, up from 27.6% last year. CIO was followed by director of information technology and vice president for information technology as the most common titles.

Table 1-1 shows percentages of the various titles[1] by Carnegie classification,[2] to allow for easy comparison across segments of the higher education community. As shown in the table, the vice president title is most common in research universities (DR), while director is the dominant title in liberal arts colleges (BA), comprehensive universities (MA), and associate's colleges (AA). The title of CIO is found in all of the groups, but especially in doctoral and MA universities.

These highest ranking IT administrators not only have a variety of titles, they also have a variety of reporting relationships within their respective organizational structures. Table 1-2 shows the percentage of top IT leaders reporting to various officials on their campuses, once again broken out by Carnegie class. The differences in reporting relationships indicate substantially different patterns among Carnegie groups. However, the percentage of IT leaders reporting directly to the president is relatively similar for all groups, although notably higher for associate's colleges. In fact, this group shows a substantial increase in the percentage of top IT administrators reporting to the president, from 33.7% last year to 43.1% this year.

Although nearly 37% of the top IT administrators at doctoral institutions carry the title vice president, vice chancellor, or something equivalent, only about 24% report to the president or chancellor. It is likely that their title reflects a level of significance and seniority within the executive leadership team, and not necessarily a structural reporting relationship

Table 1-1
Title of Highest Ranking IT Administrator

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
VP, Deputy VP, Vice Chancellor, Vice Rector	20.1%	36.8%	17.2%	13.0%	15.9%	17.9%
CIO	21.5%	33.7%	26.0%	11.8%	14.5%	18.7%
CTO	3.3%	2.5%	3.5%	4.1%	4.1%	1.6%
Vice Provost, Ass't/ Assoc Vice Provost, Ass't/Assoc Vice Chancellor/VP	11.1%	12.9%	16.3%	9.5%	9.0%	4.1%
Director, Dean, Executive Director	40.0%	12.9%	35.7%	56.2%	50.3%	49.6%
Ass't/Assoc Director, Ass't/Assoc Dean	1.3%	0.0%	0.9%	2.4%	2.8%	0.8%
Head, Manager, Other	2.7%	1.2%	0.4%	3.0%	3.4%	7.3%

or an indication of who conducts this person's performance appraisal.

Last year, an unusually high percentage of respondents marked the "other" functional reporting area, especially those from doctoral institutions. In a few cases, this reflected the top IT administrator reporting in a somewhat unique manner, such as to a vice president for student affairs. However, the vast majority of these "other" responses reflected dual-reporting relationships, most commonly to the top academic *and* the top administrative officers, although some report to both the president and one of these other top VP positions. These joint-reporting relationships were presented as options to check on the 2003 survey, allowing for break-out analysis this year. Such dual-reporting relationships were reported by about 4% of ALL institutions, but by more than 7% of doctoral institutions.

While reporting relationships are potentially interesting, who actually does the IT leader's performance evaluation is less important than whether or not the IT leader is a member of the executive cabinet. The ability to sit on the president's cabinet, executive committee, or whatever the top policy forum is called is far more important, in that this seat allows the top IT leader to actively engage in campus-

level discussions about strategic directions and policy and to work with other senior officers in understanding the role that IT can play in the various functional areas on campus. As shown in Table 1-3, the percentage of top IT leaders sitting on a top policy council is substantially greater than the percentage of those who actually report to the president

With regard to the various functional areas that report to the top IT administrator, there are as many variations as with titles. Because of the increasing complexity of information technology, there are many subgroupings and focal areas into which IT staff resources fall. Once again the core data survey attempted to identify what functions lie within the line operations of the top IT administrator as the head of the central IT organization.

There is a rather remarkable consistency in the responses to this question, with the same areas ranked in the top 13 of the 18 functional areas, regardless of Carnegie group. These areas, in descending order, are network infrastructure and services, desktop support/user support services/training, administration of the IT organization, IT security, IT policy, administrative information systems, operations/data center, Web support services, telephony, academic computing/research computing, instructional technol-

Table 1-2
Percentage of Top IT Administrators Reporting
to Various Campus Officers

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
President/ chancellor/CEO	30.4%	23.9%	28.0%	28.1%	43.1%	31.7%
Highest ranking academic officer (Provost, Academic VP, Dean)	28.3%	41.1%	32.4%	33.5%	15.3%	12.2%
Highest ranking administrative officer (Administrative VP, Executive VP)	22.6%	19.0%	20.0%	19.2%	25.7%	33.3%
Highest ranking business officer (Business Officer, CFO)	10.7%	4.3%	12.0%	12.6%	11.1%	13.8%
Second-level academic officer (Assistant/Associate Provost or Assistant/ Associate VP)	1.0%	2.5%	1.3%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Second-level administrative officer (Assistant/ Associate Administrative VP)	0.6%	0.6%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Jointly to president/ chancellor/CEO and chief academic officer	1.9%	1.2%	0.9%	3.0%	2.1%	3.3%
Jointly to chief academic officer and chief administrative or financial officer	2.1%	6.1%	1.8%	1.2%	0.0%	0.8%
Other	2.3%	1.2%	2.2%	1.8%	2.8%	4.1%

Table 1-3
Percentage of Top IT Administrators Who Are Members of the
President's or Chancellor's Cabinet

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	44.0%	48.5%	39.1%	34.7%	56.9%	44.7%
No	56.0%	51.5%	60.9%	65.3%	43.1%	55.3%

ogy, multimedia services, and technology R&D/ advanced technology. While not all Carnegie groups had precisely this order, the differences were insignificant, as shown in Table 1-4.

The remaining five functional areas showed no uniform patterns, but some data points are worth noting. Distance education reports to the top IT administrator far more

Table 1-4
Functions Reporting to the Top IT Administrator

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Academic/Research Computing	74.2%	83.4%	79.1%	77.8%	63.9%	60.2%
Administration of IT Organization	95.6%	97.5%	97.8%	95.8%	91.7%	93.5%
Administrative Information Systems	92.8%	91.4%	97.3%	92.8%	88.2%	91.9%
Computer Store	14.5%	26.4%	12.9%	16.2%	2.8%	13.0%
Desktop Support/ User Support Services/Training	96.7%	94.5%	98.2%	97.0%	97.9%	95.1%
Distance Education	27.4%	22.7%	38.7%	19.8%	29.9%	20.3%
Instructional Technology	67.6%	72.4%	74.2%	68.3%	60.4%	56.9%
IT Policy	93.3%	93.9%	95.6%	92.8%	89.6%	93.5%
IT Security	94.5%	94.5%	96.0%	94.0%	90.3%	97.6%
Library	15.3%	11.0%	16.9%	16.2%	15.3%	17.1%
Mailroom	3.9%	1.2%	3.1%	6.0%	4.2%	5.7%
Multimedia Services	51.7%	51.5%	59.6%	50.9%	45.8%	45.5%
Network Infrastructure and Services	96.8%	97.5%	97.3%	97.0%	95.8%	95.9%
Operations/Data Center	90.1%	96.9%	90.2%	86.8%	86.8%	89.4%
Print/Copier Services	27.7%	22.7%	22.2%	34.7%	26.4%	36.6%
Technology R&D/Advanced Technology	56.8%	62.6%	60.9%	59.3%	49.3%	47.2%
Telephony	74.2%	86.5%	78.7%	56.9%	70.8%	77.2%
Web Support Services	82.7%	89.0%	88.0%	77.2%	76.4%	79.7%
Other Function	11.3%	12.9%	14.2%	6.0%	11.1%	11.4%

frequently among MA institutions than among any of the other groups. The computer store reports more often within the IT structure of doctoral institutions, probably due to the need to encourage the standardization of hardware in these schools, as well as the ability of these larger organizations to manage such an operation.

IT Staffing

The core data survey requested data related to staffing levels, which we have used to suggest several staffing ratios. Data related to staffing practices are also reported.

Staffing Levels

While it is fine to state that a given set of functions reports to the CIO, perhaps the more interesting question is how each of these functions is staffed on a comparative basis. The survey requested data not only for regular full-time equivalent (FTE) IT staff but also for student FTE employees because most IT organizations could not meet the needs of their campus constituencies without the skills and talents of the students who serve in a variety of capacities in IT support.

The deployment of staff and student employees in these areas needs to be under-

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Academic/Research Computing	3.2	9.2	1.4	0.9	1.8	3.1
Administration of IT Organization	4.7	12.3	3.0	1.7	1.8	5.0
Administrative Information Systems	12.0	34.8	6.9	3.3	3.4	12.9
Desktop Computing Support, User Services, Training, Computer Store	8.4	19.0	5.4	3.2	3.9	12.2
Help Desk	3.4	7.8	2.3	1.2	1.7	4.4
IT Policy	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.9
IT Security	1.0	2.6	0.6	0.3	0.4	1.6
Instructional Technology, Student Computing	5.7	14.2	4.0	1.9	2.9	5.8
Network Infrastructure and Services	6.1	16.6	3.7	2.0	2.2	6.7
Operations, Data Center	5.7	18.2	2.6	0.8	1.7	5.9
Telephony	4.7	15.2	2.4	0.8	0.9	4.5
Web Support Services	2.5	5.6	1.7	1.0	1.1	3.3
Other Function	2.2	5.6	1.1	0.3	0.4	4.3

stood in both absolute and relative terms. The tables in this section reflect those differences, with Tables 1-5 and 1-6 showing the average number of FTE staff and student employees, respectively, devoted to these various functions. Tables 1-7 and 1-8 show the percent of the total number of central FTE IT staff and student employees, respectively, devoted to each function, thus controlling to some extent for size differences across Carnegie classes.

The core data survey respondents were allowed to assign decimal numbers of individuals to the various functions, which is especially important to smaller schools with fewer staff who must cover more than one functional area. Thus, if a given individual spent 50% of her time doing network architecture, 30% of her time doing database work in administrative computing, and the remainder in security, assignment of time of .5, .3, and .2, respectively, would be appropriate.

In comparing last year's and this year's data, the average number of FTE student employees appeared to decrease notably. However, this result may well be a function of more accurate reporting by respondents this year. To discourage the reporting of student worker headcount, which appeared to have occurred in the inaugural survey, this year's survey provided a built-in audit that included a formula for calculating FTE, with the result being fewer student employees reported.

Finally, in looking at these tables, part of the difference seen may be due to the available funding or the complexity of the institution. But we also recognize that there might be a critical mass for staffing a given area, and thus the comparable percentages may be skewed somewhat due to this factor.

The aggregation of data for like Carnegie groups works well for purposes of simplicity, and in almost all cases no significant meaning is lost. However, the total IT staff number (summing the IT staff numbers in all of the

Table 1-6
Average Number of FTE Student Employees
in the Central IT Organization in Each Functional Area

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Academic/Research Computing	1.3	3.2	1.2	0.4	0.9	1.0
Administration of IT Organization	0.3	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Administrative Information Systems	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1
Desktop Computing Support, User Services, Training, Computer Store	2.7	7.1	2.6	1.3	0.9	1.1
Help Desk	2.3	5.3	2.3	1.7	0.6	1.3
IT Policy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
IT Security	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Instructional Technology, Student Computing	3.8	10.8	3.8	1.4	1.2	0.7
Network Infrastructure and Services	0.5	1.5	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.2
Operations, Data Center	0.4	1.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0
Telephony	0.4	1.3	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.0
Web Support Services	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.1
Other Function	0.5	1.3	0.6	0.1	0.0	0.2

functional areas previously described) is more meaningful when like Carnegie classes are not grouped. The rather dramatic differences between the Doctoral Extensive and Doctoral Intensive schools (shown in Table 1-9) are of particular interest.

Table 1-10 shows the average number of central IT staff for each of the groupings in the first column, the total of central and distributed/departmental IT staff in the second column, and the percentage of the total IT staff that the central IT staff represent in the third column. Clearly the number of distributed/departmental IT staff increases at a significant rate as the complexity of the institution increases, just as it did last year. Note that the percentage of distributed staff is greatest at Doctoral Extensive campuses.

Highly complex, large, research-oriented institutions have a greater need for specialized, often disciplinarily trained IT staff in the departments and colleges to support faculty.

These staff may focus far more on the academic applications in a particular field, while the central staff concern themselves more with infrastructure, system-wide applications, general support, and so forth. In looking at the data submitted by the 490 institutions that completed both the 2002 and 2003 surveys, there appears to be movement toward decentralized support models in all groupings, thus lowering the percentage of centralized IT support on campus. The numerator in the ratio (number of centralized IT personnel) described in Table 1-10 has stayed remarkably constant from last year to this year, but the total number of campus IT support staff has increased, in the form of distributed support personnel. Curiously this is happening not just in research institutions, as was highlighted last year, but in community colleges, small colleges, and other groups. That this distributed support is increasing even in a tough financial climate for higher education is especially note-

Table 1-7
Percentage of FTE Staff in
the Central IT Organization in Each Functional Area

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Academic/Research Computing	5.2%	5.8%	4.7%	4.6%	6.8%	4.5%
Administration of IT Organization	9.0%	7.6%	9.0%	10.5%	8.9%	9.1%
Administrative Information Systems	18.3%	20.6%	19.3%	19.0%	13.3%	18.1%
Desktop Computing Support, User Services, Training, Computer Store	16.3%	12.3%	16.0%	17.8%	18.2%	17.8%
Help Desk	7.2%	5.3%	7.4%	7.5%	9.3%	6.6%
IT Policy	1.3%	0.6%	1.1%	1.5%	1.8%	1.9%
IT Security	2.1%	1.6%	2.0%	1.9%	2.7%	2.8%
Instructional Technology, Student Computing	9.5%	8.9%	10.1%	9.5%	11.2%	7.4%
Network Infrastructure and Services	10.8%	10.9%	10.3%	11.9%	10.8%	10.2%
Operations, Data Center	6.9%	10.9%	6.3%	4.2%	5.9%	7.3%
Telephony	5.8%	9.1%	6.2%	4.5%	3.7%	5.0%
Web Support Services	5.2%	3.6%	5.2%	5.9%	5.9%	5.6%
Other Function	2.3%	3.0%	2.4%	1.2%	1.6%	3.8%

worthy. This is a ratio that should be carefully monitored over the upcoming years, in all types of institutions, now that we have data rather than the anecdotal information that in the past indicated this trend only in doctoral institutions.

Staffing Ratios

While it is not clear whether stable ratios regarding staffing are possible, part of the Core Data Service effort is to provide benchmarks for comparison, not just descriptive statistics. Ratio analysis has long been a standard in examining business performance, and it is hoped that a variety of key ratios will emerge via the CDS that allow for effective comparison of IT data. In terms of staffing, we calculated a ratio for the number of students supported per central IT staff member, derived by dividing the number of FTE students (data reported by campuses to IPEDS[3]) by the number of FTE central IT staff (derived from the total of all the numbers entered into the survey question about functional area support). These ratios, shown in Table 1-11, do not differ appreciably from last year's.

Staffing Practices

The CDS also provides insight into a number of staffing practices. In terms of meeting market pressures related to hiring and keeping qualified staff, campuses turn to a variety of techniques. Overall, 31.9% of campuses reported having separate salary scales for IT professionals, but as Table 1-12 indicates, this is highly uneven across Carnegie groups. Alternatively, participants were asked if their campuses use either separate IT job titles *or* a broadband IT classification and compensation system. Table 1-13 indicates that nearly 63% of ALL respondents use one of these approaches, with a notably higher percentage of "yes" responses by doctoral universities (more than 76%).

Finally, ongoing professional development

Table 1-8
Percentage of FTE Student Employees
in the Central IT Organization in Each Functional Area

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Academic/Research Computing	9.2%	7.5%	9.7%	7.0%	12.9%	10.3%
Administration of IT Organization	2.0%	2.7%	1.5%	1.1%	3.3%	1.8%
Administrative Information Systems	1.5%	2.2%	1.6%	0.9%	1.2%	1.4%
Desktop Computing Support, User Services, Training, Computer Store	23.7%	21.3%	20.4%	26.8%	29.3%	23.5%
Help Desk	25.5%	18.1%	24.8%	31.9%	21.7%	35.8%
IT Policy	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
IT Security	0.4%	1.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	.8%
Instructional Technology, Student Computing	23.5%	30.6%	25.4%	19.8%	20.9%	14.7%
Network Infrastructure and Services	3.7%	4.9%	4.2%	2.5%	3.1%	3.4%
Operations, Data Center	2.0%	3.1%	1.9%	2.1%	1.5%	0.6%
Telephony	2.4%	3.6%	3.7%	1.0%	1.1%	1.3%
Web Support Services	3.2%	2.8%	4.2%	3.5%	2.5%	1.5%
Other Function	2.8%	2.1%	2.4%	3.2%	2.5%	5.0%

Table 1-9
Summary Statistics of Total Central FTE IT Staff

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
ALL	59.9	29.8	.5	657.0
DR EXT	205.1	176.4	39.0	657.0
DR INT	82.1	74.4	17.5	276.8
MA I	39.2	32.0	4.0	163.0
MA II	16.1	13.2	4.0	51.0
BA LA	21.8	21.0	3.2	55.3
BA GEN	12.3	10.1	2.0	56.0
AA	22.5	16.0	1.0	96.0
OTHER	70.5	51.0	.5	507.0

is critical to recruiting, retaining, and retraining a qualified IT staff. Respondents were asked how many dollars are set aside in the annual budget and provided for professional development or training per FTE IT staff member. Table 1-14 shows a relative consistency in the statistical measures across all Carnegie classes, with baccalaureate schools investing heaviest in the development of their staffs. However, on average, across all institutions included in both the 2002 and 2003 data sets, the amount of money that the central IT organization budgets annually per IT staff member for training *decreased*. This is a data

Table 1-10
Central FTE IT Staff as a Percentage of
Total Campus FTE IT Staff

	Mean Central FTE IT Staff	Mean Total Campus FTE IT Staff*	% Central FTE IT Staff
ALL	59.9	87.8	68.2%
DR EXT	205.1	390.4	52.5%
DR INT	82.1	125.3	65.5%
MA I	39.2	47.8	82.0%
MA II	16.1	18.4	87.5%
BA LA	21.8	24.4	89.3%
BA GEN	12.3	13.6	90.4%
AA	22.5	26.1	86.2%
OTHER	70.5	97.1	72.6%
*Central plus estimated distributed/departmental IT staff			

Table 1-11
Students Supported per Central FTE IT Staff Member

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Mean	153.1	122.8	156.8	126.4	227.9	133.9
Median	136.3	117.4	147.2	114.3	187.2	117.3
Minimum	0.1	24.2	43.7	40.2	54.3	0.1
Maximum	1320.4	439.1	387.0	437.1	1320.4	938.0

Table 1-12
Separate Salary Scales for IT Professionals

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	31.9%	42.9%	39.1%	17.4%	25.7%	30.9%
No	68.1%	57.1%	60.9%	82.6%	74.3%	69.1%

point that will bear watching, given the importance of keeping staff up to date in skills and providing professional development opportunities for growth and job satisfaction.

IT Planning and Advisory Groups

In reference to IT planning, the core data survey asked whether the campus strategic plan includes strategies and directions for IT and whether or not the campus has a stand-alone IT strategic plan. As seen in Table 1-15, more than three-fourths of ALL respondents indicated that their institutional plans do address IT directions and strategies, and nearly that number also have a stand-alone IT strategic plan, as shown in Table 1-16.

The last two questions in the first section of the survey requested data on the various groups that provide feedback about IT strategies in general and then specifically about IT security and policy. Results for the former are reported in Table 1-17, while results for the latter are reported in Table 4-20 in Section Four as part of the discussion about security. Respondents could mark as many responses as were applicable in each case, so the percentages do not total 100% but rather reflect the frequency of usage of each type of advisory group.

This year three additional groups were added to the survey as possible responses for providing advice on IT strategy: a president's cabinet/council, student committee, and a

Table 1-13
Separate IT Job Titles or a Broadband IT Classification
and Compensation System

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	62.8%	76.1%	64.0%	49.1%	63.9%	60.2%
No	37.2%	23.9%	36.0%	50.9%	36.1%	39.8%

Table 1-14
Dollar Amount in Budget per FTE IT Staff Member
for Professional Development/Training

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Mean	$1,123	$1,098	$974	$1,313	$1,001	$1,315
Median	$1,000	$1,000	$911	$1,292	$800	$1,000
Minimum	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Maximum	$13,500	$3,500	$4,000	$3,500	$4,000	$13,500

Table 1-15
Campus Strategic Plan Includes Strategies and Directions for IT

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	78.2%	72.4%	80.0%	73.7%	85.4%	80.5%
No	21.8%	27.6%	20.0%	26.3%	14.6%	19.5%

Table 1-16
Campus Has a Stand-Alone IT Strategic Plan

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	72.4%	76.1%	76.4%	58.1%	82.6%	67.5%
No	27.6%	23.9%	23.6%	41.9%	17.4%	32.5%

state agency or system/district office. These three new options were reported by 45.1%, 20%, and 10.7% of ALL campuses, respectively, with student committees being far more prevalent at larger and more complex institutions and advice from system or district offices far more characteristic of community college respondents. One trend to watch in the future is the percentage of campuses that have and use a Board of Trustees committee; although this number increased in absolute value, it is not statistically significant in this first year of trend data.

Notes

1. Title data were normalized for analysis into the groupings shown in Table 1-1.

2. Carnegie classifications include more distinct breakouts than shown for most tables. For our analyses, we combined Doctoral/Research Universities-Extensive and Doctoral/Research Universities-Intensive into DR; Master's Colleges and Universities I and Master's Colleges and Universities II into MA; Baccalaureate Colleges-Liberal Arts, Baccalaureate Colleges-General, and Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges into BA. Our AA group includes institutions with the classification of Associate's Colleges. Our OTHER category includes Tribal Colleges and schools in the Specialized Institutions category as well as those institutions without a Carnegie class (primarily international institutions).

3. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) is a single, comprehensive data collection program designed to capture data for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for all institutions and

Table 1-17
Groups Providing Advice on IT Strategy

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Trustee Committee	15.3%	23.3%	14.2%	18.6%	6.3%	13.0%
President's Cabinet/Council	45.1%	38.0%	53.3%	41.9%	54.9%	32.5%
Administrative Committee	55.0%	66.9%	60.4%	41.3%	52.8%	50.4%
Academic/Faculty Committee	62.5%	73.6%	71.1%	52.1%	56.3%	53.7%
Technology Advisory Committee	73.1%	74.8%	76.0%	66.5%	77.1%	69.9%
Student Committee	20.0%	28.2%	28.0%	10.2%	16.0%	12.2%
State Agency or System/District Office	10.7%	9.2%	12.4%	3.0%	22.9%	5.7%
Other	14.0%	22.1%	11.6%	11.4%	4.9%	22.0%
No IT Advisory Groups	3.4%	2.5%	3.6%	3.6%	2.8%	4.9%

educational organizations whose primary purpose is to provide postsecondary education. IPEDS collects institution-level data in such areas as enrollments, program completions, faculty, staff, and finances.