EDUCAUSE

CORE DATA SERVICE

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.

Art direction by Joseph Daigle, Studio Productions

FIVE

Information Systems

Since colleges and universities began to prepare for Y2K toward the end of the last decade, 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 them. 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 four 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, more than 60% of ALL institutions reported having implemented or being in the process of implementing an ERP, with fewer than 25% reporting no plans to do so. This level of implementation is essentially the same for doctoral, MA, and BA institutions (about 63–66%), but is notably lower for AA colleges and institutions in the OTHER category. The highest percentage (46.1%) of institutions with an ERP project completed was found among BA colleges. Of ALL institutions that responded to both last year's and this year's surveys, the percentage that indicated they have completed an ERP implementation increased significantly from 2002 to 2003, from 36.5% to 39.8%.

Table 5-2 shows the percentage of overall ERP costs spent on various elements of the project for institutions that have completed an ERP implementation, have an implementa-

Table 5-1
ERP Project Status

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Implementation completed	38.6%	37.4%	35.6%	46.1%	36.1%	38.2%
Implementation in process	21.5%	28.2%	27.1%	19.8%	17.4%	9.8%
RFP stage	4.1%	5.5%	4.4%	3.0%	4.9%	2.4%
Considering	12.4%	12.3%	10.2%	10.8%	14.6%	16.3%
No plans	23.4%	16.6%	22.7%	20.4%	27.1%	33.3%

Table 5-2
Average Percentage of the Total Cost of the ERP by Area of Expenditure

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Software and licenses	24.3%	18.8%	25.5%	30.0%	24.3%	20.9%
Software maintenance	10.9%	7.4%	11.4%	15.0%	10.0%	9.8%
Training	7.7%	6.1%	8.5%	9.1%	7.3%	6.6%
In-house staff costs	20.3%	22.5%	18.8%	18.7%	21.3%	21.6%
Consulting fees	19.4%	29.1%	18.6%	11.1%	12.6%	27.6%
Hardware	12.0%	11.4%	10.9%	12.1%	13.9%	12.9%
Other	5.5%	4.8%	6.3%	4.0%	10.5%	0.6%
* N = 528						

tion in process, or are in the request for proposal (RFP) stages. Doctoral institutions spent the least proportionally on software and software maintenance, but this may well be an artifact of their much larger spending on consulting fees. Doctoral institutions also spent 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. Through the years, there have 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 70% of ALL institutions indicating this method.

- The strategy of buying a package and implementing it without modification is the second most common strategy, and no appreciable differences were found across the Carnegie groups for this method. However, it is interesting to note that the use of this approach increased significantly from 2002 to 2003 among schools responding to both surveys, from 60% to about 66%. This is congruent with the finding of the ECAR research study on ERPs that modification is what leads to cost overruns and delayed implementations.

- 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 at doctoral institutions and relatively smaller staffs at other types of institutions.

- The strategy of buying a package of integrated systems is used at nearly 55% of ALL institutions, most used by doctoral institu-

Table 5-3
Strategies for Acquiring Information Systems

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Develop systems in-house	53.3%	66.9%	44.9%	44.9%	50.0%	65.9%
Develop systems in partnership with a vendor	32.8%	41.1%	29.3%	22.2%	34.0%	41.5%
Purchase a commercial product without customization	64.4%	69.9%	65.3%	65.3%	57.6%	61.8%
Purchase a commercial product and customize	70.2%	81.0%	66.7%	65.9%	65.3%	74.0%
Buy best-of-breed applications	39.9%	57.7%	36.4%	29.9%	31.9%	45.5%
Buy a package of integrated systems	54.5%	60.7%	59.1%	59.3%	42.4%	45.5%
Enhance legacy systems and provide Web interfaces	43.3%	63.8%	34.2%	35.9%	41.0%	45.5%
Outsource administrative systems	7.7%	6.7%	5.3%	9.6%	8.3%	9.8%
Other	2.3%	3.1%	3.1%	1.8%	0.7%	2.4%

Table 5-4
Method and Extent of Modification of Commercial Packages

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Modify underlying code	29.4%	41.1%	25.3%	29.3%	28.5%	22.8%
Modify configuration	65.0%	76.7%	62.7%	56.9%	61.8%	68.3%
Modify external modules	62.7%	84.7%	60.9%	47.9%	52.1%	69.1%
Other	2.4%	2.5%	4.4%	1.2%	2.1%	0.8%
Do not buy and modify	19.5%	8.0%	21.3%	25.7%	26.4%	14.6%

tions and least used by AA and OTHER schools. About 40% of ALL respondents reported buying best-of-breed applications, with much more variation among Carnegie groups for using this method.

- The strategy of enhancing legacy systems is used considerably more at doctoral institutions (nearly 64%). 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 OTHER institutions.

Modifying systems is a more commonly used strategy at all types of campuses than might be expected. It is important, therefore, to understand if there are any differences in the kind of modifications made. Table 5-4 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 modifica-

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

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student Information System	99.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.2%	98.6%	97.6%
Financial Information System	99.1%	100.0%	99.1%	99.4%	98.6%	98.4%
Human Resources System	95.1%	98.8%	96.9%	89.2%	95.8%	94.3%
Development System	75.3%	86.5%	85.3%	96.4%	39.6%	55.3%
Library Information System	89.4%	87.7%	91.6%	90.4%	88.9%	87.0%
Course Management System	93.7%	98.8%	96.4%	89.2%	92.4%	89.4%
Grant Management System	40.0%	81.6%	32.9%	22.8%	23.6%	40.7%

tion of external modules. More doctoral institutions than all of the other groups modify the underlying code of administrative systems, but overall fewer than 30% of responding institutions reported this strategy. About 20% of ALL respondents indicated that they do not buy and modify commercial packages, with only 8% of doctoral institutions indicating this.

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 regarding 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 5-5 presents the 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 reported these than the other groups.

- Development systems are the second least reported type of system (after grant management systems). Associate's and OTHER colleges employ development systems considerably less than other types of institutions, while BA colleges reported the highest deployment of such systems (96.4%).

- Library systems are nearly ubiquitous, with nearly 90% of ALL institutions having such systems in place, with no significant differences found among groups.

- Course management systems are also extremely common, but BA and OTHER institutions have a notably lower percentage of such systems than do doctoral and MA institutions.

- The use of grant management systems directly correlates with the research mission of the institution. The data reflect that pattern, with more than 81% of doctoral institutions and fewer than 23% 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 reason for this is the reporting by some institutions of much earlier years of implementation for "legacy" systems that date back to the late 1970s or early 1980s, which effectively lowered the average.

Table 5-6 shows that the oldest systems

Table 5-6
Year of Implementation for Various Information Systems

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student System						
Mean	1993.9	1992.2	1993.5	1994.3	1993.7	1996.3
Median	1996.0	1994.0	1995.0	1996.0	1995.0	1998.0
Financial System						
Mean	1994.5	1992.9	1994.4	1994.6	1995.0	1995.9
Median	1997.0	1996.0	1996.0	1996.0	1997.0	1998.0
HR System						
Mean	1996.0	1994.8	1995.7	1996.6	1996.1	1996.9
Median	1998.0	1998.0	1999.0	1999.0	1998.0	1999.0
Development System						
Mean	1995.9	1995.9	1995.6	1995.0	1997.9	1997.2
Median	1997.0	1997.0	1997.0	1996.0	1999.0	1998.0
Library System						
Mean	1996.5	1995.6	1996.5	1996.5	1996.5	1997.7
Median	1998.0	1998.0	1998.0	1997.0	1997.0	1998.0
Course Management						
Mean	1999.8	1998.8	2000.1	2000.1	2000.0	2000.0
Median	2000.0	2000.0	2000.0	2000.0	2000.0	2000.0
Grant Management						
Mean	1997.5	1996.5	1997.1	1998.4	1998.3	1999.8
Median	2000.0	1999.0	2000.0	2001.0	2000.0	2001.0

Table 5-7
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%	33.1%	30.2%	18.6%	26.4%	21.1%
Financial Information System	21.3%	27.6%	24.9%	18.0%	19.4%	13.0%
Human Resources System	20.0%	24.5%	24.9%	13.2%	18.1%	16.3%
Development System	13.3%	16.6%	17.8%	14.4%	5.6%	8.1%
Library System	13.6%	11.0%	11.6%	12.6%	23.6%	10.6%
Course Management System	12.3%	11.0%	12.0%	11.4%	15.3%	12.2%
Grant Management System	12.3%	30.7%	9.3%	4.8%	6.9%	9.8%

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 of the systems, 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.

Table 5-7 shows the percentage of campuses

Table 5-8
Percentage of Various Systems Provided at the System/District Level

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student Information System	19.6%	15.3%	14.7%	12.6%	47.2%	11.4%
Financial Information System	25.4%	20.9%	25.3%	13.8%	52.8%	15.4%
Human Resources System	25.4%	20.2%	26.2%	13.2%	51.4%	17.1%
Development System	7.4%	11.0%	7.1%	7.8%	6.3%	4.1%
Library System	20.8%	15.3%	18.7%	14.4%	44.4%	13.0%
Course Management System	13.1%	8.0%	10.2%	7.8%	34.0%	8.1%
Grant Management System	6.2%	9.8%	6.2%	4.2%	5.6%	4.9%

Table 5-9
Student Information System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions with Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	34.4%
Homegrown	19.2%
Datatel	13.2%
PeopleSoft	12.4%
Jenzabar	12.0%
TOTAL	91.2%
Doctoral Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	43.0%
Homegrown	28.8%
PeopleSoft	18.4%
TOTAL	90.2%
MA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	41.0%
Datatel	16.5%
Jenzabar	13.4%
Homegrown	12.9%
PeopleSoft	10.7%
TOTAL	94.5%

BA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Jenzabar	29.4%
SunGard SCT	25.8%
Datatel	23.3%
Homegrown	8.0%
PeopleSoft	7.4%
TOTAL	93.9%
AA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	31.7%
Homegrown	26.1%
Datatel	14.8%
PeopleSoft	12.7%
Jenzabar	8.5%
TOTAL	93.8%
OTHER Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Homegrown	24.8%
SunGard SCT	24.8%
PeopleSoft	13.7%
Jenzabar	6.0%
TOTAL	69.3%

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 example, more than 33% of doctoral institutions, which have the oldest implementations of such systems, plan to implement new student information systems in the next three years. Similarly, course management systems overall are the "youngest" systems and, congruently, the least projected to be implemented in the next three years. Such a correlation is also notable with respect to the propensity of a group *not* to have a type of system and that group's new implementation plans for that system—for example, while fewer AA and

Table 5-10
Financial System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions with Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	25.6%
PeopleSoft	16.2%
Datatel	13.2%
Homegrown	12.1%
Jenzabar	10.6%
TOTAL	77.7%
Doctoral Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	34.8%
PeopleSoft	22.4%
Homegrown	16.8%
Oracle	7.5%
TOTAL	81.5%
MA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	27.8%
PeopleSoft	17.0%
Datatel	16.1%
Jenzabar	11.7%
Homegrown	10.3%
TOTAL	82.9%

BA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Jenzabar	27.9%
SunGard SCT	23.0%
Datatel	22.4%
PeopleSoft	8.5%
TOTAL	81.8%
AA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	22.5%
Homegrown	19.0%
PeopleSoft	16.2%
Datatel	16.2%
Jenzabar	7.0%
TOTAL	80.9%
OTHER Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
PeopleSoft	16.9%
SunGard SCT	16.1%
Oracle	11.9%
Homegrown	11.0%
Datatel	5.1%
SAP	5.1%
TOTAL	66.1%

OTHER institutions have development systems, much lower percentages of these schools plan to implement such systems.

When looking for such correlations, a perhaps unexpected data point is the much higher percentage (about 24%) of AA schools that plan to implement a new library system in the next three years, even though the mean and median years of implementation for these systems among AA schools did not differ notably from other groups, nor did AA schools differ notably from other Carnegie classes with regard to the level of installation of library systems. A similarly interesting finding is that even though among doctoral institutions the median year of implementation of grant management systems is 1999, more than 30% of institutions in this group plan to implement a new system in the next three years.

Table 5-8 presents the percentage of systems provided at the system/district level. Overall, the data show that the percentage of AA schools providing systems at the system/district level was much greater than other Carnegie groups. Most of the systems are found two to three times more often at the system/district level for AA schools than other groups, except for development and grant management systems, which Table 5-5 shows are already much less prevalent at AA 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 5-9 to 5-15. A word of explanation concerning the data captured

Table 5-11
Human Resources System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions with Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	21.9%
PeopleSoft	20.4%
Homegrown	14.4%
Datatel	12.0%
Jenzabar	6.2%
TOTAL	74.9%
Doctoral Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
PeopleSoft	31.0%
SunGard SCT	27.2%
Homegrown	16.5%
Oracle	5.7%
TOTAL	80.4%
MA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	24.8%
PeopleSoft	19.5%
Homegrown	15.7%
Datatel	14.8%
Jenzabar	7.6%
TOTAL	82.4%

BA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Datatel	21.4%
SunGard SCT	20.0%
Jenzabar	17.2%
PeopleSoft	11.0%
ADP	8.3%
Homegrown	6.9%
TOTAL	84.8%
AA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
PeopleSoft	22.0%
SunGard SCT	20.5%
Homegrown	18.9%
Datatel	15.9%
TOTAL	77.3%
OTHER Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
PeopleSoft	17.7%
Concept	14.2%
Homegrown	13.3%
SunGard SCT	13.3%
ADP	5.3%
SAP	5.3%
TOTAL	69.1%

about specific system vendors is warranted. Each table lists the vendors, in descending order, who were named by 5% or more of respondents who reported 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," giving the reader 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 that reported having that system.

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 5-12
Development System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions with Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackbaud	20.5%
SunGard SCT	17.1%
Datatel	13.6%
BSR	10.3%
Jenzabar	8.9%
Homegrown	7.2%
JSI/Best	5.4%
TOTAL	83.0%
Doctoral Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
BSR	29.1%
SunGard SCT	18.4%
Homegrown	10.6%
Datatel	7.8%
Blackbaud	6.4%
JSI/Best	5.7%
PeopleSoft	5.7%
TOTAL	83.7%
MA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackbaud	23.8%
SunGard SCT	21.2%
Datatel	15.9%
Jenzabar	10.1%
JSI/Best	7.4%
BSR	5.3%
TOTAL	83.7%

BA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Datatel	22.0%
Blackbaud	18.2%
Jenzabar	17.6%
SunGard SCT	17.0%
JSI/Best	5.7%
Homegrown	5.0%
TOTAL	85.5%
AA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackbaud	36.8%
SunGard SCT	8.8%
Homegrown	7.0%
Jenzabar	7.0%
Datatel	5.3%
TOTAL	64.9%
OTHER Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackbaud	33.3%
Homegrown	14.3%
SunGard SCT	9.5%
BSR	7.9%
Datatel	6.3%
TOTAL	71.3%

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 5-16 shows the various stages of portal deployment that characterize each of the Carnegie groups. Nearly 84% of ALL responding institutions have implemented a Web portal or have such an implementation in process or planned. While a notably higher percentage of doctoral institutions have already deployed Web portals compared to all other groups, a significantly lower percentage of AA institutions than all other groups reported having already implemented a Web portal. However, more than 45% of AA schools said they are planning a Web portal implementation. A higher percentage of BA and AA institutions than schools in other categories reported no plans to implement a Web portal. Overall, the percentage of schools that had implemented a portal increased from about 27% in 2002 to about 31% in 2003.

Looking at data from the 690 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 charac-

Table 5-13
Library System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions with Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Innovative Interfaces	25.2%
Endeavor	18.9%
Sirsi	16.6%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	8.2%
Ex Libris	5.9%
Homegrown	5.5%
TOTAL	80.3%
Doctoral Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Endeavor	26.8%
Innovative Interfaces	26.1%
Sirsi	14.8%
Ex Libris	8.5%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	7.7%
TOTAL	83.9%
MA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Innovative Interfaces	27.9%
Endeavor	22.1%
Sirsi	15.7%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	7.4%
Ex Libris	6.4%
TOTAL	79.5%

BA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Innovative Interfaces	35.6%
Sirsi	18.8%
Endeavor	14.1%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	6.0%
TOTAL	74.5%
AA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Sirsi	18.1%
Endeavor	13.4%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	11.0%
PALS	11.0%
Homegrown	9.4%
Innovative Interfaces	9.4%
Ex Libris	5.5%
TOTAL	77.8%
OTHER Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Innovative Interfaces	23.4%
Endeavor	15.9%
Sirsi	15.9%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	10.3%
Homegrown	6.5%
TOTAL	72.0%

teristics of the portal. A higher percentage of doctoral and OTHER institutions reported using or planning to use only open-source solutions, and notably more BA colleges than other groups reported in-house development. As is evident in Table 5-17, all groups reported a myriad of strategies, but overall the strategy of deploying a purchased product was reported most often.

Customizability of implemented or planned portals differed significantly across Carnegie classes, as shown in Tables 5-18 and 5-19. Portals at doctoral institutions were more often reported to be customizable by the individual. Of ALL institutions that reported having a Web portal in place, in process, or planned, the percentage reporting customizability by the individual increased from about 59% to 81% from 2002 to 2003, with significant increases in each of the Carnegie groups for this portal characteristic. With regard to customizability to the individual, the percentage of MA institutions reporting this characteristic was slightly higher than doctoral institutions. Comparing last year's survey results with this year's for this portal characteristic, there was an increase from about 47% to 83% for ALL institutions having a Web portal in place, in process, or planned, again with significant increases for each Carnegie group.

Among the 690 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

Table 5-14
Course Management System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Institutions with Such Systems

ALL Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackboard	42.1%
WebCT	36.4%
TOTAL	78.5%
Doctoral Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
WebCT	42.9%
Blackboard	39.1%
More than one	7.5%
TOTAL	89.5%
MA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackboard	49.3%
WebCT	31.2%
TOTAL	80.5%

BA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackboard	51.8%
WebCT	26.2%
Homegrown	5.0%
TOTAL	83.0%
AA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
WebCT	43.9%
Blackboard	34.8%
TOTAL	78.7%
OTHER Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
WebCT	41.1%
Blackboard	28.0%
Homegrown	13.1%
TOTAL	82.2%

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

ALL Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Homegrown	33.0%
SunGard SCT	17.5%
PeopleSoft	9.3%
Blackbaud	5.5%
TOTAL	65.3%
Doctoral Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Homegrown	43.0%
SunGard SCT	14.9%
PeopleSoft	11.6%
MIT COEUS	8.3%
Oracle	7.4%
infoEd	5.0%
TOTAL	90.2%
MA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Homegrown	26.9%
SunGard SCT	20.9%
Blackbaud	7.5%
Datatel	7.5%
Jenzabar	7.5%
PeopleSoft	7.5%
TOTAL	77.8%

BA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
SunGard SCT	36.4%
Homegrown	15.2%
Jenzabar	15.2%
Datatel	9.1%
Blackbaud	6.1%
PeopleSoft	6.1%
TOTAL	88.1%
AA Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Blackbaud	24.0%
Homegrown	24.0%
SunGard SCT	20.0%
Datatel	8.0%
Jenzabar	8.0%
TOTAL	84.0%
OTHER Institutions	
Vendor	**Percentage**
Homegrown	33.3%
Research Master	22.2%
PeopleSoft	13.3%
Blackbaud	6.7%
TOTAL	75.5%

Table 5-16
Status of Web Portal Deployment

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Implemented	31.3%	46.6%	30.2%	30.5%	13.2%	35.0%
In process	19.5%	20.2%	19.6%	18.0%	17.4%	22.8%
Planning	33.2%	24.5%	35.1%	29.9%	45.1%	31.7%
No plans	16.1%	8.6%	15.1%	21.6%	24.3%	10.6%

Table 5-17
Development and Procurement Strategies for Web Portals

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Developed in-house	21.9%	21.5%	14.1%	31.3%	19.3%	27.3%
Purchased product	61.7%	60.4%	69.6%	56.5%	69.7%	48.2%
Based on open source	11.7%	14.8%	10.5%	10.7%	6.4%	16.4%
Other	4.6%	3.4%	5.8%	1.5%	4.6%	8.2%
*N = 690						

Table 5-18
Percentage of Web Portals Customizable by the Individual

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	81.0%	88.6%	82.7%	72.5%	81.7%	77.3%
No	19.0%	11.4%	17.3%	27.5%	18.3%	22.7%
*N = 690						

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

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	82.6%	85.9%	86.4%	79.4%	81.7%	76.4%
No	17.4%	14.1%	13.6%	20.6%	18.3%	23.6%
*N = 690						

Table 5-20
Percentages of Web Portal Customization for Specific Constituencies

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Current Students	98.1%	98.0%	99.0%	97.7%	99.1%	96.4%
Prospective Students	65.4%	71.8%	70.2%	66.4%	57.8%	54.5%
Faculty	94.8%	96.0%	95.3%	96.9%	93.6%	90.9%
Staff	92.2%	96.0%	92.7%	90.1%	89.9%	90.9%
External Community	34.8%	37.6%	37.2%	33.6%	29.4%	33.6%
Alumni	54.2%	55.7%	61.8%	57.3%	42.2%	47.3%
Other	1.7%	1.3%	1.0%	2.3%	1.8%	2.7%
*N = 690						

Table 5-21
Web Portal Integration with Campus Administrative Systems

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	95.7%	98.0%	97.4%	93.9%	92.7%	94.5%
No	4.3%	2.0%	2.6%	6.1%	7.3%	5.5%
*N = 690						

class. Approximately 70% of doctoral and MA institutions and 66% of BA schools have designed or will design their Web portals for prospective students, whereas only about 55% and 58% of OTHER and AA schools, respectively, have done or will do so (see Table 5-20). 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 were nearly universal practices, as approximately 90% or more of the institutions within each Carnegie group reported these strategies. The external community was a relatively uncommon target, with about one-third 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 5-21 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. The level of integration implemented, in process, or planned ranges from 93% to 98% across the various Carnegie groups (nearly 96% overall for institutions in this data subset), showing a fairly consistent and high rate of integration of administrative systems and Web portals. Overall, the percentage of integration for ALL institutions with Web portals implemented, in process, or planned jumped significantly from 2002 to 2003, from 80% to nearly 96%, and the pattern of increase held for each of the Carnegie groups.

Notes

1. Summaries of the annual EDUCAUSE Current Issues Survey are available at <http://www.educause.edu/issues>.
2. R. B. Kvavik et al., *The Promise and Performance of Enterprise Systems for Higher Education* (Boulder, Colo.: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research, Research Study, Vol. 4, 2002), <http://www.educause.edu/asp/doclib/abstract.asp?ID=ERS0204>. See also two summaries of this major research study: R. B. Kvavik and J. Voloudakis, "The Promise and Performance of Enterprise Systems for Higher Education: Summary of Findings," <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EDU0220.pdf>; and P. King, "Respondent Summary: The Promise and Performance of Enterprise Planning in Higher Education," <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ecar_so/ers/ERS0204/ekf0204.pdf>http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ecar_so/ers/ERS0204/ekf0204.pdf.