



Fiscal Year 2004 Summary Report

Brian L. Hawkins, Julia A. Rudy, and Robert Nicolich

September 2005





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.

© Copyright 2005 EDUCAUSE

All rights reserved. No part of this monograph may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from EDUCAUSE.

Art direction by Joseph Daigle, Studio Productions

Information Systems

Since colleges and universities began to prepare for Y2K, administrative systems have become a major focus of campus information technology units, in many cases after years of neglect. The need to provide better campus decision support systems with an integrated view of data has also become important. Systems that support enterprise resource planning (commonly called ERPs) have taken on a significant role in campus IT strategies.

In this section, we examine ERP systems and the sources of costs associated with them, along with methods of implementing information systems. In particular, seven of the most commonly used campus information systems are explored from the perspective of their age, most common vendors, replacement plans, and so forth.

ERP Systems

ERP systems are a major focus, as well as a concern, on many campuses; the challenges associated with such systems have been in the top two issues in the EDUCAUSE Current Issues

Survey in each of the past five years.¹ These systems are becoming a standard, but the cost and complexity of their implementation continue to be issues.

As seen in Table 5-1, nearly 70% of ALL institutions reported having implemented or being in the process or RFP stage of implementing an ERP, with only 20% reporting no plans to do so. That level of implementation is similar for doctoral, MA, and BA institutions, but is significantly lower for AA colleges and institutions in the OTHER category. The highest percentage (nearly half) of institutions with an ERP project already completed was found among BA colleges. Overall, the percentage of institutions that have completed an ERP project implementation increased significantly from 2003 to 2004, from 38.6% to 43.9%.

Table 5-2 shows the percentage of overall ERP costs spent or projected to be spent on various elements of the project by schools that reported such a project completed, in process, or in the RFP stage. Doctoral institutions reported spending the least proportionally on

Table 5-1
ERP Project Status

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Implementation completed	43.9%	44.8%	45.6%	49.7%	37.4%	40.7%
Implementation in process	23.0%	29.3%	26.1%	20.1%	22.3%	14.3%
RFP stage	2.1%	1.1%	1.2%	3.6%	1.2%	4.3%
Considering	10.8%	10.3%	10.4%	8.9%	10.8%	14.3%
No plans	20.1%	14.4%	16.6%	17.8%	28.3%	26.4%

Table 5-2
Average Proportion of the Total Cost of the ERP by Area of Expenditure
for Respondents with ERP Projects

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Software and licenses	24.9%	17.6%	25.6%	32.0%	25.6%	23.0%
Software maintenance	11.4%	7.6%	12.6%	14.3%	11.1%	11.2%
Training	7.8%	6.1%	8.3%	9.7%	7.9%	6.8%
In-house staff costs	19.6%	23.0%	18.9%	17.8%	18.2%	20.4%
Consulting fees	18.6%	25.9%	19.3%	11.2%	13.1%	23.5%
Hardware	11.8%	11.9%	10.3%	11.8%	14.2%	12.1%
Other	5.8%	7.8%	5.1%	3.1%	9.8%	3.0%
*N = 615						

software and software maintenance, but this may well be an artifact of their much larger spending on consulting fees. Doctoral institutions also reported spending a notable proportion on in-house staff costs, which in combination with their higher percentage of consulting costs reflects the substantial personnel commitment required to implement such systems at large, complex institutions. However, doctoral institutions reported spending a significantly lower percentage than BA and MA institutions on training. The percentage spent on hardware was comparable across institutional types.

System Implementation Strategies

The survey requested information about methods of developing and implementing information systems in general, including the types of system modifications campuses make when purchasing systems. There have long been vigorous discussions about the appropriateness of building versus buying administrative systems. A 2002 ECAR study found that modification of the basic vendor code was the single most important factor related to budget overruns, and yet these modifications might be necessary to achieve the goals of a given campus.²

Table 5-3 presents commonly used methods of implementing systems. The respondents to the survey were allowed to check more than one method, so these do not sum to 100%. Some findings with regard to implementation strategies include the following:

- Purchasing a system and customizing it is the most common acquisition strategy, with about 71% of ALL institutions indicating this method.
- The strategy of buying a package and implementing it without modification is the second most common strategy overall, with this approach being used more by DR, MA, and BA institutions than AA and OTHER colleges. In fact, MA and BA schools reported using this strategy more often than purchasing and customizing a software package.
- Developing systems in partnership with a vendor is the least common of the acquisition strategies, one that is used significantly more at doctoral and OTHER institutions and least at BA colleges.
- Developing systems in-house with existing IT staff is most common among doctoral institutions. This is undoubtedly due to the differences in size of the IT staff (as illustrated in Section One of this report), with large staffs in doctoral institutions and relatively smaller staffs at other types of institutions.
- The strategy of buying a package of integrated systems is used at 57% of ALL institutions, most used by doctoral institutions and least used by AA and OTHER schools. About 44% of ALL respondents reported buying best-of-breed applications, with much more

**Table 5-3
Strategies for Acquiring Information Systems**

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Develop systems in-house	53.6%	69.5%	44.8%	47.9%	44.6%	66.4%
Develop systems in partnership with a vendor	35.1%	42.0%	34.4%	24.9%	33.7%	41.4%
Purchase a commercial product without customization	65.2%	73.6%	69.3%	68.6%	56.0%	54.3%
Purchase a commercial product and customize	71.3%	83.9%	68.0%	63.3%	66.3%	77.1%
Buy best-of-breed applications	44.2%	60.9%	40.2%	37.9%	31.9%	52.1%
Buy a package of integrated systems	57.0%	66.7%	61.4%	59.8%	45.8%	47.1%
Enhance legacy systems and provide Web interfaces	43.3%	61.5%	35.3%	40.2%	39.8%	42.1%
Outsource administrative systems	8.3%	9.2%	6.2%	8.9%	10.8%	7.1%
Other	2.4%	2.3%	3.7%	1.2%	1.8%	2.1%

**Table 5-4
Buy and Modify Commercial Software Packages**

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	68.2%	87.9%	67.2%	57.4%	55.4%	73.6%
No	31.8%	12.1%	32.8%	42.6%	44.6%	26.41%

variation among Carnegie groups for using this method.

- The strategy of enhancing legacy systems is used significantly more at doctoral institutions (nearly 62%). This finding is congruent with a finding reported below that doctoral institutions overall have older systems, which might lead them to enhance these systems with more friendly Web-based front ends to keep them going rather than replace them.
- Finally, the practice of outsourcing administrative systems is not particularly common in any of the Carnegie groups, although slightly more prevalent at BA, AA, and DR institutions.

Modifying commercial software packages is a more commonly used strategy at all types of campuses than expected. The question related to this strategy was reworded on the 2004 survey, so trend analysis is not possible, but the data in Table 5-4 indicate that about 68% of ALL respondents buy and modify commercial software packages, with this practice reported most by doctoral institutions. It is important, therefore, to understand if there are any differences in the kind of modifications made. Table 5-5 shows that the most common method of modification among ALL institutions that buy and modify software is modification of the system configuration, followed closely by modification of external modules.

Table 5-5
Extent of Modification of Commercial Packages

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Modify underlying code	37.6%	49.7%	32.7%	24.7%	42.4%	35.0%
Modify configuration	82.7%	89.5%	75.3%	85.6%	78.3%	85.4%
Modify external modules	72.8%	77.8%	72.8%	66.0%	63.0%	80.6%
Other	3.1%	4.6%	3.1%	2.1%	4.3%	1.0%
*N = 607						

Table 5-6
Percentage of Institutions Having Various Major Information Systems

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student information system	99.3%	100.0%	100.0%	98.8%	98.8%	98.6%
Financial information system	99.0%	100.0%	99.2%	100.0%	97.0%	98.6%
Human resources system	95.4%	98.3%	97.5%	92.3%	95.8%	91.4%
Development system	76.6%	89.1%	88.4%	93.5%	45.2%	57.9%
Library information system	90.0%	89.1%	92.5%	89.3%	85.5%	92.9%
Course management system	95.7%	100.0%	98.3%	93.5%	91.6%	93.6%
Grants management system	41.2%	83.3%	33.2%	24.3%	22.9%	45.0%

Seven Types of Information Systems

Respondents were asked to provide data about seven types of information systems commonly found on college campuses. Data are presented below for these systems with respect to whether they are present on the campus, when they were implemented, plans for implementing a new system, whether they are provided at the system or district level when schools are part of a multicampus system, and the vendors reported for purchased systems.

Table 5-6 presents the average percentage of institutions that reported having each type of system. As is evident from the table,

- Virtually all campuses have student information systems and financial information systems in place, and there are no significant differences among groups for these two types of systems.
- Human resources systems are common across all groups, but fewer BA colleges

than other types of schools reported having these.

- Development systems are the second least reported type of system (after grant management systems with 41%), with just three-fourths of ALL institutions having such systems. Associate's and OTHER colleges employ development systems significantly less than other types of institutions, and BA colleges reported the highest deployment of such systems (93.5%).
- Library systems are nearly ubiquitous, with 90% of ALL institutions having such systems in place, with no significant differences found among groups.
- Course management systems are also extremely common, with these systems found at the highest levels in schools in the DR (100%) and MA (98.3%) groups.
- The use of grants management systems directly correlates with the research mission of the institution, and the data

Table 5-7
Year of Implementation for Various Information Systems

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student Information System						
Mean	1994.4	1992.9	1994.2	1995.4	1999.3	1996.4
Median	1996	1995	1996	1997	1995	1999
Financial Information System						
Mean	1995	1994	1995.2	1995.5	1994.4	1996.2
Median	1997	1996	1997	1997	1997	1998
HR System						
Mean	1996.1	1995.3	1996.5	1996.8	1994.7	1997.5
Median	1998	1999	1999	1997	1997	1999
Development System						
Mean	1996.6	1996.8	1996	1995.8	1998.4	1997.7
Median	1998	1997	1997	1999	1998	1998
Library System						
Mean	1996.7	1995.8	1996.8	1996.8	1996.6	1997.5
Median	1998	1997.5	1998	1998	1998	1999
Course Management System						
Mean	2000.2	1999.6	2000.2	2000.4	2000.4	2000.4
Median	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Grants Management System						
Mean	1997.8	1997.3	1998.2	1998.8	1994.4	1999.4
Median	2000	2000	2000	2001	2000	2001

reflect that pattern, with more than 83% of doctoral institutions and fewer than 25% of BA colleges reporting use of these systems.

In looking at the data about the age of the systems, there is a relatively large difference between the mean and the median when examining the year of implementation of the various systems. The mean, which is a statistical average, is almost inevitably lower than the median, which is the year for which there are an equal number of responses greater and lower than that value. The mean being lower than the median is the result of a significantly greater number of respondents reporting earlier years when systems were implemented, thereby reducing this value. This is likely because of legacy systems that may date back to the late 1970s or early 1980s.

Table 5-7 shows that the oldest systems reported by any group are the student systems reported by doctoral institutions. On average

these systems are about 12 years old. Financial information systems are the second oldest and, again, the oldest of these are found in doctoral institutions. Course management systems are the newest of all the systems examined, which shouldn't be surprising because such systems are relatively new to the marketplace compared to other types of systems that have been available for decades. Although the numbers are not significantly different, it is worth noting that doctoral institutions were the first to implement course management systems. In terms of trends from 2003 to 2004, there was a significant increase in the replacement of all systems except for development systems, that is, the mean year of implementation increased (became more recent), thus reflecting replacement.

Table 5-8 shows the percentage of campuses expecting to implement a new system in the next three years. Note a mostly consistent correlation between the age of the system and plans to implement a new system. For exam-

Table 5-8
Percentage of Campuses Expecting to Implement a New System in the Next Three Years

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student information system	26.4%	31.0%	28.2%	18.3%	32.5%	20.0%
Financial information system	21.6%	28.2%	23.2%	16.0%	25.3%	12.9%
Human resources system	21.2%	25.9%	21.6%	14.8%	25.9%	17.1%
Development system	14.4%	16.1%	18.3%	16.6%	10.2%	7.9%
Library system	9.7%	8.6%	9.1%	7.1%	15.7%	7.9%
Course management system	12.9%	13.8%	12.0%	14.8%	9.6%	15.0%
Grants management system	14.6%	31.6%	12.0%	6.5%	9.0%	14.3%

Table 5-9
Percentage of Various Systems Provided at the System/District Level

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student information system	19.3%	14.4%	14.1%	11.8%	44.6%	13.6%
Financial information system	24.3%	21.3%	24.5%	13.0%	44.0%	17.9%
Human resources system	24.4%	21.3%	25.7%	12.4%	44.0%	17.1%
Development system	7.3%	8.6%	7.5%	7.1%	8.4%	4.3%
Library system	21.5%	14.4%	20.7%	13.6%	39.2%	20.0%
Course management system	15.6%	8.6%	16.2%	7.7%	33.1%	12.1%
Grants management system	6.3%	12.6%	4.1%	3.6%	4.8%	7.1%

ple, 31% of doctoral institutions, which have the oldest implementations of such systems, plan to implement new student information systems in the next three years. Such a correlation is also notable with respect to propensity of a group not to have a type of system and that group's implementation plans for that system—for example, while fewer AA and OTHER institutions have development systems, it is also the case that much lower percentages of these schools plan to implement such systems.

The most dramatic change in the data for this question from 2003 to 2004 is that for ALL institutions the percentage of schools planning to implement a new library system

dropped from about 13% to under 10%. This pattern held for all Carnegie groups, but was significant and most intense in BA and AA institutions.

Table 5-9 presents the percentage of various information systems provided at the system/district level. Overall, the data show that the percentage of AA schools reporting systems provided at the system/district level is much greater than other Carnegie groups. Most of the types of systems are provided two to three times more often by the system/district for these schools, except for development and grants management systems, which Table 5-6 shows are already much less prevalent at AA

Table 5-10
Student Information System Vendors Reported by 5% or More
of Institutions Reporting Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
SunGard SCT	34.5%
Homegrown	17.3%
Datatel	13.7%
PeopleSoft	13.2%
Jenzabar	11.7%
TOTAL	90.4%
DR Institutions	
SunGard SCT	45.4%
Homegrown	27.0%
PeopleSoft	20.1%
TOTAL	92.5%
MA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	41.1%
Datatel	18.7%
Jenzabar	12.9%
PeopleSoft	12.9%
Homegrown	10.0%
TOTAL	95.6%

BA Institutions	
Jenzabar	30.1%
SunGard SCT	25.9%
Datatel	18.7%
Homegrown	6.6%
PeopleSoft	6.6%
TOTAL	87.9%
AA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	33.1%
Homegrown	21.5%
Datatel	16.6%
PeopleSoft	11.0%
Jenzabar	8.6%
TOTAL	90.8%
OTHER Institutions	
Homegrown	26.1%
SunGard SCT	20.9%
PeopleSoft	15.7%
Datatel	7.5%
Jenzabar	6.0%
TOTAL	77.2%

Table 5-11
Financial System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions Reporting Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
SunGard SCT	27.7%
PeopleSoft	16.6%
Datatel	13.4%
Jenzabar	10.5%
Homegrown	10.2%
TOTAL	78.4%
DR Institutions	
SunGard SCT	36.4%
PeopleSoft	23.1%
Homegrown	14.5%
Oracle	6.9%
TOTAL	80.9%
MA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	30.1%
PeopleSoft	19.2%
Datatel	17.6%
Jenzabar	11.3%
Homegrown	7.9%
TOTAL	86.1%

BA Institutions	
Jenzabar	28.6%
SunGard SCT	25.0%
Datatel	18.5%
PeopleSoft	7.1%
TOTAL	79.2%
AA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	29.2%
Homegrown	16.8%
Datatel	16.8%
PeopleSoft	13.7%
Jenzabar	7.5%
TOTAL	85.0%
OTHER Institutions	
PeopleSoft	18.5%
SunGard SCT	14.1%
Oracle	11.9%
Homegrown	9.6%
Datatel	8.1%
SAP	5.2%
TOTAL	67.4%

Table 5-12
Human Resources System Vendors Reported by 5% or More
of Institutions Reporting Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
SunGard SCT	23.8%
PeopleSoft	20.4%
Homegrown	12.2%
Datatel	12.1%
Jenzabar	6.9%
TOTAL	75.4%
DR Institutions	
PeopleSoft	31.5%
SunGard SCT	29.8%
Homegrown	16.1%
Oracle	5.4%
TOTAL	82.8%
MA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	26.0%
PeopleSoft	19.9%
Datatel	16.9%
Homegrown	11.7%
Jenzabar	6.5%
TOTAL	81.0%

BA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	23.2%
Jenzabar	21.9%
Datatel	17.9%
PeopleSoft	9.3%
ADP	8.6%
TOTAL	80.9%
AA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	25.3%
PeopleSoft	18.8%
Homegrown	17.5%
Datatel	15.6%
Jenzabar	5.8%
TOTAL	83.0%
OTHER Institutions	
PeopleSoft	21.6%
Concept	12.0%
Homegrown	11.2%
SunGard SCT	10.4%
Datatel	5.6%
SAP	5.6%
TOTAL	76.4%

colleges. This finding is not surprising, given that the majority of these schools are public community colleges, many of them part of a broader community college district.

Finally, quite different patterns of vendors of the various types of information systems are associated with each of the Carnegie groups, as reflected in Tables 5-10 to 5-16. A word of explanation concerning the data captured about specific system vendors is warranted. Each table lists the vendors, in descending order, who were named by 5% or more of respondents who indicated having that system. Note that these vendors are categorized by corporate name, not by individual product. Thus there may be several products that have been combined for a single vendor, or in the case of acquisitions, several companies may be incorporated under the company that acquired these firms. Note also that if a campus reported developing its own system, this is shown in the category of "homegrown," giv-

ing a sense of what types of institutions are opting for this strategy. Like purchased systems, homegrown solutions are included in the analyses if this approach was reported by at least 5% of institutions responding that that type of system is in use.

In the actual data available through the online database service to those who completed the core data survey, both these aggregate listings, as well as the specific product names, are available. For purposes of simplicity this report shows only the aggregate (normalized) data. Also, since only vendors reported by 5% or more of survey respondents are listed, the totals in the tables do not equal 100%.

The percentage for the vendors reported in our survey is shown to help the reader understand the relative presence of these vendors within a given segment of the higher education community. Note that EDUCAUSE does not present these data as evidence of market share or vendor dominance.

Table 5-13
Development System Vendors Reported by 5% or More
of Institutions Reporting Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Blackbaud	22.4%
SunGard SCT	18.6%
Datatel	12.2%
SunGard BSR	10.4%
Jenzabar	9.2%
Homegrown	7.2%
TOTAL	80.0%
DR Institutions	
SunGard BSR	29.0%
SunGard SCT	20.6%
Homegrown	10.3%
JSI/Best	8.4%
Datatel	7.7%
Blackbaud	6.5%
PeopleSoft	5.2%
TOTAL	87.7%
MA Institutions	
Blackbaud	26.4%
SunGard SCT	21.2%
Datatel	16.0%
Jenzabar	9.0%
SunGard BSR	6.6%
JSI/Best	5.7%
TOTAL	84.9%

BA Institutions	
SunGard SCT	22.1%
Jenzabar	20.1%
Blackbaud	18.2%
Datatel	16.9%
TOTAL	77.3%
AA Institutions	
Blackbaud	43.8%
Jenzabar	9.6%
SunGard SCT	8.2%
Homegrown	8.2%
TOTAL	69.8%
OTHER Institutions	
Blackbaud	31.2%
Homegrown	15.6%
SunGard SCT	10.4%
Datatel	9.1%
Jenzabar	6.5%
SunGard BSR	5.2%
TOTAL	88.0%

Web Portals

While not exactly a traditional information system, a Web portal offers access to a variety of campus resources, including major administrative systems. Table 5-17 shows the various stages of portal deployment that characterize each of the Carnegie groups. Nearly 90% of ALL responding institutions have implemented a Web portal or have such an implementation in process or planned. A significantly higher percentage of doctoral institutions have already deployed Web portals compared to all other groups. Associate's colleges reported the fewest portals deployed, and fewer of these schools have portal implementations in process. However, nearly 40% of these schools say they are planning a Web portal implementation. More BA and AA institutions than schools in other categories reported no plans to imple-

ment a Web portal. The percentage of schools that had implemented a portal increased from about 31% in 2003 to nearly 39% in 2004, with this trend occurring in all Carnegie groups.

Looking at data from the institutions that reported a Web portal implemented, in process, or planned, there are fairly distinct differences among Carnegie groups with regard to procurement strategies and characteristics of the portal. As evident in Table 5-18, all groups reported a myriad of strategies, but the strategy of deploying a purchased product was reported most often overall. Customizability of implemented or planned portals differs significantly across Carnegie classes, as shown in Tables 5-19 and 5-20. Portals at doctoral institutions were more often reported to be customizable by the individual.

Table 5-14
Library System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions Reporting Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	25.0%
Endeavor	20.8%
Sirsi	17.1%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	7.8%
Ex Libris	6.5%
TOTAL	77.2%
DR Institutions	
Endeavor	28.6%
Innovative Interfaces	27.9%
Sirsi	16.2%
Ex Libris	9.1%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	5.8%
TOTAL	87.6%
MA Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	26.9%
Endeavor	24.7%
Sirsi	15.2%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	7.2%
Ex Libris	5.8%
TOTAL	79.8%

BA Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	34.0%
Sirsi	20.0%
Endeavor	16.7%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	6.0%
TOTAL	76.7%
AA Institutions	
Sirsi	19.9%
Endeavor	12.8%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	12.8%
PALS	9.2%
Innovative Interfaces	8.5%
Homegrown	6.4%
Ex Libris	5.7%
TOTAL	75.3%
OTHER Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	26.0%
Endeavor	18.1%
Sirsi	15.0%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	7.9%
Ex Libris	7.9%
Homegrown	6.3%
TOTAL	81.2%

Table 5-15
Course Management System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions Reporting Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Blackboard	41.3%
WebCT	34.7%
Homegrown	5.0%
TOTAL	81.0%
DR Institutions	
WebCT	42.0%
Blackboard	36.8%
More than one	6.9%
Homegrown	5.7%
TOTAL	91.4%
MA Institutions	
Blackboard	52.7%
WebCT	28.7%
TOTAL	81.4%

BA Institutions	
Blackboard	48.0%
WebCT	24.3%
Jenzabar	6.1%
TOTAL	78.4%
AA Institutions	
WebCT	40.7%
Blackboard	32.0%
Desire2Learn	11.3%
TOTAL	84.0%
OTHER Institutions	
WebCT	41.0%
Blackboard	29.0%
Homegrown	12.1%
TOTAL	85.1%

Table 5-16
Grants Management System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of
Institutions Reporting Such Systems

ALL Institutions		BA Institutions	
Homegrown	33.2%	SunGard SCT	38.2%
SunGard SCT	19.0%	Homegrown	17.6%
PeopleSoft	9.2%	Jenzabar	11.8%
Blackbaud	5.4%	Blackbaud	11.8%
TOTAL	66.8%	Datatel	5.9%
		TOTAL	85.3%
DR Institutions		AA Institutions	
Homegrown	43.5%	SunGard SCT	25.9%
SunGard SCT	15.3%	Blackbaud	18.5%
PeopleSoft	11.5%	Homegrown	14.8%
MIT COEUS	9.9%	Datatel	7.4%
Oracle	6.9%	Jenzabar	7.4%
infoEd	5.3%	TOTAL	74.2%
TOTAL	92.4%	OTHER Institutions	
		Homegrown	42.6%
MA Institutions		Research Master	14.8%
SunGard SCT	24.3%	PeopleSoft	11.1%
Homegrown	21.4%	Blackbaud	5.6%
PeopleSoft	10.0%	SunGard SCT	5.6%
Datatel	8.6%	TOTAL	79.7%
Blackbaud	7.1%		
Jenzabar	5.7%		
TOTAL	77.1%		

Table 5-17
Status of Web Portal Deployment

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Implemented	38.5%	53.4%	38.6%	33.7%	24.1%	42.9%
In process	20.8%	19.5%	16.2%	23.1%	21.7%	26.4%
Planning	29.2%	19.0%	34.4%	28.4%	39.8%	21.4%
No plans	11.5%	8.0%	10.8%	14.8%	14.5%	9.3%

Table 5-18
Development and Procurement Strategies for Web Portals

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Developed in-house	21.3%	13.8%	11.2%	22.9%	15.5%	21.3%
Purchased product	62.2%	66.9%	68.4%	61.8%	71.8%	62.2%
Based on open source	12.6%	13.8%	14.0%	12.5%	8.5%	12.6%
Other	3.9%	5.6%	6.5%	2.8%	4.2%	3.9%
*N = 788						

Among the institutions that have implemented, are in the process of implementing, or are planning to implement a Web portal, the

percentage of schools that have as a target audience prospective students and alumni differed significantly by Carnegie class.

Table 5-19
Percentage of Web Portals Customizable by the Individual

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	83.4%	92.5%	83.7%	78.5%	84.5%	75.6%
No	16.6%	7.5%	16.3%	21.5%	15.5%	24.4%
*N = 788						

Table 5-20
Percentage of Web Portals Customizable to the Individual

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	85.4%	91.9%	86.0%	82.6%	80.3%	85.0%
No	14.6%	8.1%	14.0%	17.4%	19.7%	15.0%
*N = 788						

Table 5-21
Percentages of Web Portal Customization for Specific Constituencies

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Current students	98.0%	97.5%	99.5%	98.6%	97.2%	96.1%
Prospective students	68.4%	73.8%	74.0%	70.8%	54.9%	64.6%
Faculty	96.2%	96.3%	97.7%	96.5%	96.5%	92.9%
Staff	93.4%	95.6%	96.7%	86.8%	90.8%	95.3%
External community	34.8%	38.1%	37.2%	31.9%	30.3%	34.6%
Alumni	55.3%	55.0%	63.3%	56.3%	45.1%	52.8%
Other	2.9%	1.3%	2.3%	4.9%	2.8%	3.9%
*N = 788						

Table 5-22
Web Portal Integration with Campus Administrative Systems

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	96.3%	98.8%	98.1%	95.8%	95.1%	93.7%
No	3.4%	1.2%	1.9%	4.2%	4.9%	6.3%
*N = 788						

Approximately 74% of doctoral and MA institutions and 71% of BA schools have designed or will design their Web portals for prospective students, whereas only about 64% and 55% of OTHER and AA schools, respectively, have done or will do so (Table 5-21). A similar pattern was observed for alumni audiences: doctoral, MA, and BA institutions more frequently design, or plan to design, their Web portals for alumni than do AA and OTHER schools. Designing Web portals for current students, faculty, and staff is a nearly universal practice,

as 90% or more of the institutions within each Carnegie group reported targeting these audiences. The external community was a relatively uncommon target, with only about 35% of ALL institutions intending their Web portal for this population.

One of the main reasons for having a portal is to serve students better by providing easier access to the information they need to register for classes, conduct business with the campus, and so forth. Table 5-22 shows the extent to which campus portals are connected or will be

connected to their administrative systems as reported by the institutions that have implemented, have in process, or plan portals. About 96% of ALL institutions reported that they have integrated or plan to integrate their Web portals. This high level of integration of administrative systems and Web portals is consistent across all Carnegie groups.

Notes

1. Summaries of the annual Current Issues Survey are available at <<http://www.educause.edu/CurrentIssues/875>>.
2. Robert B. Kvavik et al., *The Promise and Performance of*

Enterprise Planning Systems for Higher Education (Boulder, Colo.: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research, 2002). This publication is available at no charge through the EDUCAUSE Web site at <<http://www.educause.edu/LibraryDetailPage/666?ID=ERS0204>>. See also two summaries of this major research study: Robert B. Kvavik and John Voloudakis, *The Promise and Performance of Enterprise Systems for Higher Education: Summary of Findings*, 2002, <<http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EDU0220.pdf>>, and Paula King, *Respondent Summary: The Promise and Performance of Enterprise Planning Systems for Higher Education*, 2002, <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ecar_so/ers/ERS0204/ekf0204.pdf>.