



2003 Summary Report

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





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 2004 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

Understanding the Core Data Service

Higher education continues to experience unprecedented pressure for accountability from both internal and external constituencies, from trustees to campus administration to prospective students and their parents to governmental agencies. In recent years, these accountability demands “have been especially targeted at information technology, putting strong pressures on IT leaders to explain and justify the costs and benefits of the expenses associated with their areas.”¹ Fundamental to such efforts is having reliable data about information technology practices, structures, and expenditures at comparable institutions for benchmarking purposes.

Finding such useful and relevant comparative data for IT units in higher education has long been a challenge, and a number of data collection activities arose through the years to meet this need. (See Appendix A for the historical context from which the current EDUCAUSE Core Data Service arose.) Three years ago EDUCAUSE determined the need for a somewhat different approach from existing data collection efforts and thus developed and launched a program called the EDUCAUSE Core Data Service (CDS), which consists of

- an annual core data survey that collects data about information technology environments and practices on (primarily) member campuses;
- a Web-based, interactive database service available to all who complete the survey through which they can access data contributed by their peers to help benchmark, plan, and make decisions about IT on their campus; and
- an annual, publicly available summary report about campus IT environments based on data contributed through the survey.

This *EDUCAUSE Core Data Service 2003*

Summary Report is the second report published as part of the CDS program.² Before delving into the five major sections that follow this introductory section (each of which parallels and summarizes data from a section of the core data survey), we encourage you to read this introduction to fully understand the CDS program, especially its underlying principles, appropriate use policies, methodology (including use of Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, or IPEDS,³ data), how data are analyzed and presented in this summary report, and what is new this year.

Underlying CDS Principles

A defining characteristic of the EDUCAUSE CDS is its collection and presentation of data *identifiable by institution* in the interactive database component of the service. The level of participation in the program is evidence that the value of being able to select a specific comparison group of similar, peer institutions outweighs any reluctance participants might have to disclose identifiable data. (See Appendix B for a list of 2003 survey participants.) The willingness of the community to share what until last year had been largely unavailable financial data has allowed this service to approach the status of a breakthrough application.

A second fundamental principle of the program is that only those campuses that complete and submit the survey each year are eligible to log into the interactive database site. Nonparticipating campuses do not have access, nor do corporations, researchers, agencies, associations, the media, or the general public. However, EDUCAUSE feels an obligation to provide some overall data analysis to member campuses that do not participate, as well as to the vendor community who support the association, and thus we publish this annual summary report for distribution on a complimentary basis to the entire EDUCAUSE membership and general public.

A third important element of the CDS is its appropriate use policy and the efforts expend-

ed to ensure that all survey participants are well informed about the conditions and terms of use of the data captured through the CDS survey. Access to the database service is not only restricted to participating campuses but further restricted to individuals on those campuses who have been authorized by their campus to use the database. Such authorized access is provided through an EDUCAUSE username and password issued to authenticated individuals recognized by the CDS system. The CDS has a strong copyright and appropriate use policy (see <http://www.educause.edu/coredata/use_policy.asp>) expressly to protect the information of participating institutions. Anyone authorized to access the database must “click through” and agree to all of the terms and conditions of use before gaining that access. Any campus found in violation of the terms and conditions of use will be penalized by loss of participation privileges in the CDS, and EDUCAUSE may take legal action against any party who accesses or uses database content or data without authorization.

Finally, a note about the trust relationships and partnership we enjoy with our corporate members. While use of the CDS database is restricted to campuses that complete the survey, thus de facto precluding vendor participation, some of the campus individuals who complete the survey are in fact employees or contractors with corporations that have facilities management contracts with their campuses. We contacted the companies known to offer such services (Blackwell Consulting Services, CampusWorks, Collegis, and SunGard SCT), and they graciously agreed in writing not to seek access to the service or survey data, realizing that it is strictly for campus consumption for planning and institutional analysis. Further, they agreed that if any data did come into their hands, they would not use it. It is this level of true partnership that we in higher education are fortunate to enjoy with our corporate community.

Methodology

All EDUCAUSE member campuses that have an IPEDS unit ID number as well as interna-

tional member institutions (which do not have such numbers) are invited to complete the core data survey through an e-mail message sent annually in January to the primary representative at each member campus. We also invite schools that are not members of EDUCAUSE to participate in the CDS if they are members of affinity groups such as the Consortium of Liberal Arts Colleges (CLAC), the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), the League for Innovation in the Community College, and the National Institute for Technology and Liberal Education (NITLE). In January 2004, more than 2,400 campuses were invited to participate in the 2003 survey.

In the case of an institution with a Carnegie classification of “system,” individual member campuses within the system are invited to complete the survey, provided they have an IPEDS unit ID number. A multicampus system with a single unit ID is invited to complete the survey as a single institution. System or district offices (except those that have a single unit ID) are not eligible to complete the survey; however, if 40% of the campuses within the system or district complete the survey, the system/district office becomes eligible to access the interactive database service.

Access to the survey is provided through an authorization system that gives such access initially to the individual designated as the primary or key representative in the EDUCAUSE records database at the time the invitation to participate is extended. That individual is invited to manage the completion of the survey on his or her campus or to designate another individual or individuals to do so.

All data captured by the core data survey are submitted electronically through an easy-to-use Web-based interface that enables respondents to answer the approximately 50 questions over time; that is, they can enter data, save them, and return to the site at another time to enter more data or change data already entered. Participants are given about two months to submit the survey, which can take anywhere from several hours to several days to complete, depending on the ready availability of the campus data requested. (See Appendix C for a copy

of the 2003 survey.) Note that all financial data sought through the core data survey are for the previous fiscal year, so actual rather than projected budgets are captured. For example, the survey launched in January 2004 sought financial data for fiscal year 2002–2003 and thus is referred to as the 2003 core data survey. Once a campus submits its survey, data cannot be changed except by special request, for example, in the case of incorrect data having been submitted.

Embedded throughout the survey are a variety of pop-up and linked help notices, electronic navigation to a glossary of terms and definitions, and other aids to clarify questions and to obtain consistent responses. (A copy of the glossary appears in Appendix D of this summary report.) New to the 2003 survey is an audit system that provides red-flag messages to respondents if inconsistent data are entered, giving the respondent an opportunity to correct data after receiving an explanation of why the data appear to be problematic.

Use of IPEDS Data

EDUCAUSE information systems enable automatically matching respondents with their corresponding IPEDS data, so these elements do not have to be entered by the respondent. Based on data reported by U.S. colleges and universities through IPEDS for 2001 (the most up-to-date IPEDS data available), the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty, number of FTE students, gross general institutional expenditures, and type of institutional control (public or private) are matched in the database, as is the Carnegie classification for each institution.

Despite the best of intentions, IPEDS data have proved to be inconsistent and inappropriate for much of what we intended to accomplish. In the summer of 2003, we conducted extensive analyses of our survey data and selected IPEDS data (faculty FTE, student FTE, and total institutional expenditures), both to ensure data integrity and to prepare the 2002 CDS summary report issued in October 2003. Through those analyses, we determined that some of the campus IPEDS total expenditures data were inconsistent, and thus ratios

using that data element, as well as approximations of the former educational and general (E&G) budget of an institution, could not be used due to their unreliability.

Various faculty and student ratios based on IPEDS data were included in the 2002 summary report, but subsequent analyses in the fall of 2003 (after the printing of the report) showed some serious problems with the IPEDS faculty data. Thus we advise that the two ratios presented in the 2002 summary report that were based on IPEDS faculty data should be considered questionable. These ratios are not included in this 2003 summary report or in the ratio section of the online database component of this year's CDS. However, the actual IPEDS data are available through the demographic feature of the database for those who wish to include them in their analyses.

In researching the way financial and faculty data are reported to IPEDS, we collaborated with several commercial enterprises, the Department of Education, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), and other groups that are actively using comparable data. We learned that these problems are endemic with IPEDS and that there are no easy workarounds. Please see <<http://www.educause.edu/coredata/news>> for details of the issues with IPEDS data on total institutional expenditures and faculty FTE numbers, as well as for suggestions for using IPEDS data, with caution, in your campus analyses.

How Data Are Presented in This Summary Report

Data for this summary report are reported by Carnegie classification, but we have combined like Carnegie categories for ease of reporting and for manageable data presentation in the tables. In doing this, we ensure that by combining groups we do not lose important distinctions. Appropriate statistical tests are conducted with a large number of variables in the data to determine if consistent and meaningful differences exist between like categories. Within the Carnegie categories, tests are run to determine if such categories can be combined. In all these sets of analyses, for the second consecu-

tive year, no significant patterns were identified when the size differences in the schools were controlled for. This was also the case when controlling for public versus private control.⁴

Thus, throughout this report—with a very few exceptions—the data displays focus on the following combined categories: BA, which combines Baccalaureate Colleges-Liberal Arts, Baccalaureate Colleges-General, and Baccalaureate-Associate's Colleges; MA, which combines Master's Colleges and Universities I and Master's Colleges and Universities II; DR, which combines Doctoral/Research Universities-Extensive and Doctoral/Research Universities-Intensive; and AA, which includes all schools with a classification of Associate's Colleges (community colleges, technical colleges, junior colleges, and other colleges that grant associate's degrees). Definitions of these official Carnegie classifications are included in Appendix E. Our category of OTHER includes Tribal Colleges and schools in the Specialized Institutions Carnegie class (such as law schools, health-related institutions, art schools, and so forth), as well as participating international institutions, which do not have Carnegie classes assigned because that is a uniquely U.S. schema.

The purpose of this report is to provide aggregate data in simple form for those who do not have access to the interactive database service. In our analyses we have not tried to provide every possible cut on the data, but rather some summary data that we believe will be useful to the public. Keep in mind that the database service component of the CDS allows for viewing data much more discretely. The service offers filters, sorting tools, graphing tools, and other features to make the interactive database service as useful and valuable as possible to participants. New this year are the ability to see trend data comparing 2002 and 2003 data (see details about trend analyses below) and a sixth section that provides automatically generated ratios in seven areas.

We urge readers who have access to the database service to use the service rather than this report for benchmarking purposes for a more refined and accurate picture than the

tables in this report can provide. If your campus has not submitted the 2003 survey, you may still do so until December 1, 2004, in order to gain access to the service for the remainder of 2004 and into the spring of 2005 (up until the deadline for submitting next year's survey).

2003 Core Data Participation

A total of 822 institutions had submitted the 2003 survey when we froze the data set in May 2004 in order to do the analyses for this summary report. Submissions continued to come in throughout the summer and likely will continue for the rest of the calendar year. As of September 15, 2004, 832 campuses had submitted the 2003 survey. Note that last year there were 622 schools in the frozen data set. The 822 schools in this year's frozen data set represent a 32% increase in participation. Of the schools that completed the 2002 survey, 137 did not complete the 2003 survey, so in actuality there are more than 330 new participants in this year's service.

This year there are increases in the number of schools participating in all Carnegie groups, ranging from a 12.8% increase in doctoral institutions (where we had the highest percentage of potential participants in this category last year as a base) to a high of an increase of 61.8% in community college participation. Increases were across the board, but particularly important was the increase in MA institutions, which are largely public colleges and universities.

The level of participation among statewide and multicampus systems and districts also increased this year. The Texas Department of Information Resources required institutions in the statewide public higher education system to complete the EDUCAUSE CDS survey, as it became the de facto standard for institutional data collection about information technology in Texas. Several other state higher education boards (including Georgia and Mississippi) required participation, and many state university systems encouraged the fullest participation of their member campuses. This year 23 systems or districts

achieved at least a 40% participation rate (with several reaching or approaching 100%), as compared to 16 last year.

Trend Analyses

Since the EDUCAUSE CDS is now into its second full year of operation, it is possible to examine trends within the overall data and within specific Carnegie groups. An electronic set of tools was created for the online database users so that they can see trends within specifically defined peer groups or other categories of analysis. Using this tool, users can determine if they want to compare the results of all survey participants or if they want to compare data of just those institutions that completed the survey both years. In the latter case, actual change is more confidently ascertained, whereas in the analyses that would compare all participants from each year, some of the change is likely to result from a different sample, possibly leading to false conclusions. In this summary report, the narrative attempts to highlight key trends when they are seen to be important, but only using the matched-pair method, that is, comparing data only from the 490 schools that completed the survey both years.

When comparing data for all 490 schools in this subset, finding statistical significance is likely to occur quite frequently because of the large sample sizes. However, many of the most interesting changes do not occur across the board, but are patterns specific to community colleges, research institutions, or other Carnegie groups. When examining those subgroups within the subset of schools that participated both years, sample sizes become fairly small, and statistical significance is harder to find. In some of those cases, the narrative in this summary report will note these changes (which may or may not be due to chance), even though statistical significance was not found, simply to hypothesize a possible trend of special interest.

The Fallacy of Relying Only on Input Measures

We began this introductory section by proposing that the collection of IT-related data is

important to help campuses plan more effectively by virtue of having access to information about IT infrastructure, funding, and management practices of schools similar to themselves. But the problem with IT benchmarks of any kind—and the CDS is no exception—is that these input comparisons are too often used to convince decision makers to keep pace with their peers and that more is better where technology is concerned.

This effort to “keep up with the Joneses” is ultimately an inflationary pressure that can be dysfunctional, acting as a negative driver. Such pressure and focus on input measures is a fallacy that higher education is finally beginning to recognize. Rather than engaging in an “arms race,” we need to focus on effectiveness—trying to determine which institutions seem to be doing the best job with the fewest resources, with an eye toward understanding the environment and practices that make this possible. Hawkins and Barone made the case for a new kind of assessment model that not only uses input measures but recognizes the even greater importance of evaluating outcomes in higher education:

Although ... efforts [using input measures] may have leveraged additional funds (appropriately or not), they do not include measures that offer insight into how technology is enabling new and better research, whether or how technology is enhancing teaching and learning, or whether administrative functions are easier for students to access or less expensive to operate. The problem is that in order to effectively measure the success and/or value of an IT investment, we must come to grips with evaluating these functional outcomes of the college or university. However, we have thus far successfully avoided grappling with these difficult challenges of assessing learning outcomes, administrative efficiency, effectiveness, and so on. Without working in tandem with others on campus to identify and evaluate these outcomes and then to understand and describe the

enabling role of IT in facilitating these accomplishments (or the failure thereof), we will never be able to reasonably and meaningfully assess the return on IT investment.⁵

Some might suggest that the EDUCAUSE CDS may contribute to the fallacy of overvaluing input measures, but we would counter such an allegation on several fronts:

- First, this kind of application is in very high demand by our members for a host of reasons, among them being able to understand where the market really is and what other campuses are actually doing, in order potentially to *reduce* the pressures on growth and expansion.
- Second, even if legitimate outcome measures *were* available, we would still require input measures to understand the effectiveness equation. Efforts such as the CDS are necessary but not sufficient to achieve the ultimate goal of defining standards of optimal achievement of goals.
- Third, the CDS database service has the potential to dispel the myths surrounding IT funding and investment by providing detailed data that present a more accurate and reliable picture of campus IT environments.
- Fourth, the interactive service is providing a useful network to help participants find and communicate with colleagues like themselves, who have similar systems and characteristics and who are facing similar challenges, and to learn from them.
- Fifth, the CDS has the potential to promote more congruity in campus IT funding models, provide models for IT organization and support, identify exemplary processes for allocating and expending resources (both human and financial),

and promote more effective IT management overall through prompting more widespread tracking of IT expenditures (whether these occur internally or externally to the central IT unit) at higher education institutions.

We believe that the CDS also has the potential to create a different sociometry for the IT community, replacing the casual inquiry to a listserv for information with a more informed method of obtaining comparative data. All too frequently a concerned member will post a query on the CIO listserv asking, for example, “Who out there has or is considering having the library report to the CIO?” A few folks respond, but the results are serendipitous and incomplete, based on who happens to be reading the listserv at the time, whether or not the respondents are from similar types of institutions, and so forth. That is but one question the CDS can answer, filtering responses based on criteria such as Carnegie class, FTE enrollment, public versus private control, and even institutional budget, until a short list of the most appropriate schools for comparison appears. Clicking on any school on the list will link to the EDUCAUSE member directory, where all of the representatives to EDUCAUSE for that campus are listed, including contact information. This facilitation of communication between and among members of the community, based on information about areas of common interest or challenges, has from the beginning been a key objective of the EDUCAUSE CDS.

As illustrated by the excerpt from Hawkins and Barone, there is a clear and pressing need for higher education to focus on outcome goals, and EDUCAUSE has both been advocating in this arena and partnering with other higher education organizations to advance this agenda. We fully recognize that our core data program is not the endgame, but it is an important part of the total picture. It is our hope that eventually our service will be part of the analysis in determining the most efficient methods and effective practices for achieving important output objectives and goals.

Notes

1. B. L. Hawkins and C. A. Barone, "Assessing Information Technology: Changing the Conceptual Framework," in *Organizing and Managing Information Resources on Your Campus*, P. A. McClure, ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003), pp. 129–145.
2. Both the 2002 and 2003 Core Data Service summary reports are available for free download in PDF form on the EDUCAUSE Web site at <<http://www.educause.edu/coredata/reports/2002/>> and <<http://www.educause.edu/coredata/reports/2003/>>. Print copies are available for \$10 each.
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 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. IPEDS data reporting requires the extensive effort of a variety of offices on any campus, and this is the "official" information the college or university stands behind, used by the federal government.
4. The first two authors of this report would like especially to acknowledge the invaluable statistical analyses that were conducted by our coauthor, Joshua Madsen. These analyses added rigor and understanding to the interpretation of these data.
5. Hawkins and Barone, *op. cit.*, p. 133.