FIVE

Information Systems

The need to provide better campus decision support systems with an integrated view of data is critically important to campuses in order to manage the complexities of our institutions in a turbulent market environment. 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 five 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 continues to be an issue.

As seen in Table 5-1, 73% of ALL institutions reported having implemented or being in the process or RFP stage of implementing an ERP, with only about 18% reporting no plans to do so. That level of implementation is similar for the various Carnegie groups analyzed. Overall, the percentage of institutions that have completed an ERP project implementation increased significantly from the 2004 to the 2005 survey, from 43.9% to 48.8%.

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 software and licenses 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,

Table 5-1
ERP Project Status

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Implementation completed	48.8%	46.2%	53.4%	59.2%	39.9%	40.1%
Implementation in process	22.5%	33.0%	23.3%	13.0%	25.2%	16.9%
RFP stage	1.7%	2.2%	0.8%	2.2%	2.5%	1.4%
Considering	8.9%	8.2%	8.0%	6.5%	11.0%	12.0%
No plans	18.1%	10.4%	14.5%	19.0%	21.5%	29.6%

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

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Software and licenses	23.3%	16.6%	24.6%	29.4%	24.2%	20.8%
Software maintenance	11.3%	8.5%	12.8%	13.7%	11.0%	9.2%
Training	8.2%	6.1%	8.0%	9.9%	10.0%	6.9%
In-house staff costs	20.8%	24.6%	18.8%	20.3%	18.2%	23.5%
Consulting fees	19.0%	26.4%	18.9%	12.0%	13.5%	25.1%
Hardware	11.4%	11.9%	10.8%	10.2%	13.1%	11.8%
Other	6.0%	5.9%	6.1%	4.6%	10.0%	2.7%

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 AA, 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 75% of ALL institutions indicating this method.
- The strategy of buying a package and implementing it without customization is the second most common strategy overall, with this approach being used more by DR and BA institutions than MA, AA, and OTHER colleges. In fact, BA schools reported using this strategy more often than purchasing and customizing a software package.
- A new strategy was added to this year's survey, that is, use of an open-source product, with or without modification. About 32% of ALL respondents checked this strategy, with this being most common at DR institutions and least common at AA institutions.
- Developing systems in partnership with a vendor is the second least common of the acquisition strategies (less than 38%), one that is used most at doctoral institutions and least at BA colleges.
- Developing systems in-house is more common among doctoral and OTHER than MA, BA, and AA 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 institution.
- The strategy of buying a package of integrated systems is used at about 61% of ALL respondents, most used by doctoral institutions and least used by AA and OTHER schools. About 48% of ALL respondents reported buying best-of-breed applications, with much more variation among Carnegie groups for this strategy.

Table 5-3
Strategies for Acquiring Information Systems

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Develop systems in-house	55.6%	67.6%	48.1%	53.8%	44.8%	69.0%
Develop systems in partnership with a vendor	37.6%	46.2%	37.8%	28.3%	35.6%	40.8%
Purchase a commercial product without customization	70.1%	79.1%	69.8%	72.8%	65.6%	60.6%
Purchase a commercial product and customize	75.2%	83.5%	73.7%	68.5%	72.4%	79.6%
Use an open source product, with or without modification	31.8%	37.9%	31.3%	33.7%	19.0%	37.3%
Buy best-of-breed applications	48.1%	62.6%	44.7%	41.8%	36.2%	57.7%
Buy a package of integrated systems	61.2%	69.8%	64.9%	60.9%	56.4%	49.3%
Enhance legacy systems and provide Web interfaces	44.8%	57.7%	38.2%	42.4%	39.9%	49.3%
Outsource administrative systems	9.0%	7.7%	9.9%	9.2%	8.0%	9.9%
Other	2.4%	2.2%	2.3%	1.1%	1.8%	4.9%

Table 5–4
Percent of Institutions that Modify Commercial Packages

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	75.3%	91.2%	76.0%	68.5%	60.1%	80.3%
No	24.7%	8.8%	24.0%	31.5%	39.9%	19.7%

- The strategy of enhancing legacy systems is used significantly more at doctoral institutions (nearly 58%). 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 common in any of the Carnegie groups.

Modifying commercial software packages is a more commonly used strategy at all types of campuses than expected. The data in Table 5-4 indicate that about 75% 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 by modification of external modules, with far less modification of underlying code.

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

Table 5–5
Method and Extent of Modification of Commercial Packages

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Modify underlying code	44.7%	53.6%	41.7%	35.7%	46.9%	44.7%
Modify configuration	85.9%	90.4%	79.9%	88.9%	83.7%	88.6%
Modify external modules	73.8%	78.9%	72.4%	70.6%	61.2%	83.3%
Other	3.8%	6.6%	4.5%	1.6%	2.0%	2.6%
*N = 703						

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

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student information system	98.9%	100.0%	99.6%	97.8%	99.4%	97.2%
Financial information system	98.8%	100.0%	98.9%	97.8%	98.2%	99.3%
Human resources system	95.5%	99.5%	96.6%	90.8%	96.9%	93.0%
Development system	78.1%	90.1%	87.0%	92.4%	50.3%	59.9%
Library information system	90.2%	90.1%	92.4%	90.8%	86.5%	90.1%
Course management system	96.7%	99.5%	98.5%	93.5%	96.9%	93.7%
Grants management system	42.4%	84.1%	33.6%	23.4%	22.7%	52.8%

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 commercial 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 grants management systems at 42%), with about 78% of ALL institutions having such systems. Associate's and OTHER colleges employ development systems significantly less than other types of institution, and BA colleges have the highest deployment of such systems (92.4%).
- Library systems are nearly ubiquitous, with more than 90% of ALL institutions having such systems in place, with no significant differences found among groups.
- Course management systems are also extremely common, with about 99% of DR and MA institutions reporting having these systems. It should be noted, however, that there was a significant increase in the use of course management systems for AA institutions since last year.
- The use of grants management systems directly correlates with the research mission of the institution, with more than 84% of doctoral institutions and fewer than 24% of BA and AA colleges reporting use of these systems.

Table 5-7
Year of Implementation for Various Information Systems

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student System						
Mean	1995.3	1993.5	1995.5	1996	1994.8	1996.7
Median	1997	1996	1997	1997	1996	1999
Financial Information System						
Mean	1996.2	1995.7	1996.8	1996.2	1996	1996.2
Median	1998	1998	1999	1998	1998	1998
HR System						
Mean	1996.9	1996	1997.6	1997.1	1996.1	1997.6
Median	1999	1999	1999	2000	1998	1999
Development System						
Mean	1997.5	1997.4	1997.4	1996.8	1999.3	1998
Median	1999	1998	1998	1998	2000	1999
Library System						
Mean	1997.9	1997.3	1998.3	1997.6	1999.1	1997.4
Median	1999	1998	1999	1998	2000	1998
Course Management System						
Mean	2000.6	1999.8	2000.5	2001.3	2000.7	2000.8
Median	2000	2000	2000	2001	2001	2001
Grants Management Systems						
Mean	1999.1	1998.6	1998.8	1999	1999.8	2000.4
Median	2001	2000	2000	2002	2002	2002

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. 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, as was the case last year. On average, for ALL respondents, these systems are about 10 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 most recently implemented 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 the 2004 to the 2005 survey, there was a significant increase in the replacement of student, financial, and HR systems, that is, the mean year of implementation increased significantly (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 example, about 31% of doctoral institutions, which have the oldest 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

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	24.9%	30.8%	24.4%	13.6%	33.1%	23.2%
Financial information system	18.3%	20.9%	16.8%	8.7%	28.8%	18.3%
Human resources system	19.6%	20.9%	18.3%	10.9%	29.4%	20.4%
Development system	13.1%	18.7%	13.0%	10.3%	13.5%	9.2%
Library system	7.5%	7.1%	6.5%	5.4%	11.0%	8.5%
Course management system	14.6%	14.8%	12.2%	16.3%	15.3%	15.5%
Grants management system	14.8%	29.7%	12.6%	5.4%	9.8%	17.6%

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

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Student information system	19.6%	15.9%	16.0%	10.3%	44.8%	14.1%
Financial information system	24.7%	20.3%	27.5%	12.5%	44.8%	17.6%
Human resources system	24.4%	19.8%	27.1%	12.0%	46.0%	16.9%
Development system	6.9%	9.3%	5.3%	6.0%	10.4%	3.5%
Library system	22.7%	14.3%	23.7%	14.7%	44.2%	17.6%
Course management system	16.9%	9.9%	18.3%	6.5%	37.4%	13.4%
Grants management system	6.6%	12.6%	4.2%	4.3%	4.9%	8.5%

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 notable change in the data for this question from the 2004 to the 2005 survey is that for DR and MA institutions there was a net decrease in the schools planning to implement a new financial system; this was also the case for ALL respondents. For AA schools, there was a net increase since last year in the percentage that indicated they were planning to implement a course management system in the next three years.

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 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.

Table 5-10
Student Information System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Respondents

ALL Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	35.7%
Homegrown	15.9%
Datatel	14.3%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	13.6%
Jenzabar	10.0%
Doctoral Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	45.6%
Homegrown	25.3%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	19.2%
MA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	40.4%
Datatel	18.8%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	13.8%
Jenzabar	10.8%
Homegrown	10.4%

BA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	31.8%
Jenzabar	24.0%
Datatel	20.1%
Homegrown	6.7%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	6.7%
AA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	31.3%
Homegrown	17.5%
Datatel	16.3%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	14.4%
Jenzabar	8.1%
OTHER Institutions	
Homegrown	24.4%
SunGard Higher Education	23.7%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	14.1%
Datatel	8.9%
Jenzabar	5.9%

Table 5-11
Financial System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Respondents

ALL Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	27.9%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	17.4%
Datatel	13.6%
Jenzabar	8.9%
Homegrown	8.7%
Oracle/Oracle	5.1%
Doctoral Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	39.0%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	25.3%
Homegrown	11.0%
Oracle/Oracle	8.8%
MA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	27.4%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	19.7%
Datatel	17.0%
Jenzabar	8.9%
Homegrown	8.1%
SAP	5.0%

BA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	28.9%
Jenzabar	22.8%
Datatel	20.0%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	7.2%
AA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	25.2%
Datatel	17.0%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	17.0%
Homegrown	13.2%
Jenzabar	7.5%
OTHER Institutions	
Oracle/PeopleSoft	16.4%
SunGard Higher Education	16.4%
Oracle/Oracle	13.6%
Datatel	8.6%
Homegrown	7.1%
SAP	5.0%

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 under a single vendor, or in the case of acquisitions or mergers, several companies may now be included under the company that acquired or incorporated them.[3]

Table 5-12
Human Resources System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Respondents

ALL Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	24.3%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	19.7%
Datatel	12.6%
Homegrown	12.4%
Jenzabar	6.2%
Doctoral Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	30.9%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	29.8%
Homegrown	14.9%
Oracle/Oracle	6.6%
MA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	24.6%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	19.4%
Datatel	16.1%
Homegrown	12.5%
SAP	6.5%
Jenzabar	6.0%

BA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	28.0%
Datatel	19.5%
Jenzabar	17.1%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	9.1%
ADP	7.3%
Homegrown	6.1%
AA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	21.9%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	21.3%
Homegrown	16.8%
Datatel	16.1%
Jenzabar	5.8%
OTHER Institutions	
Oracle/PeopleSoft	18.0%
SunGard Higher Education	12.5%
Homegrown	11.7%
Concept	6.3%
Datatel	6.3%
SAP	5.5%

Table 5-13
Development System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Respondents

ALL Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	30.3%
Blackbaud	23.8%
Datatel	11.5%
Jenzabar	6.9%
Homegrown	6.3%
Doctoral Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	51.5%
Homegrown	9.2%
Blackbaud	8.0%
JSI/Best	7.4%
Datatel	6.1%
MA Institutions	
Blackbaud	29.2%
SunGard Higher Education	28.8%
Datatel	15.5%
Jenzabar	6.2%
JSI/Best	5.3%

BA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	29.8%
Blackbaud	19.0%
Datatel	17.9%
Jenzabar	14.3%
AA Institutions	
Blackbaud	37.2%
SunGard Higher Education	11.5%
Homegrown	7.7%
Jenzabar	7.7%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	5.1%
OTHER Institutions	
Blackbaud	37.5%
Homegrown	12.5%
SunGard Higher Education	11.3%
Jenzabar	6.3%
Datatel	5.0%

Note also that if a campus reported developing its own system, this is shown in the category of "homegrown," giving a sense of what types of institution are opting for this strategy. New this year, respondents were asked to indicate if the system is an open-source product. So, like purchased systems, homegrown and open-source solutions are included in the

Table 5-14
Library System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Respondents

ALL Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	27.3%
Endeavor	21.3%
Sirsi	14.9%
Ex Libris	10.3%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	5.8%
Doctoral Institutions	
Endeavor	29.3%
Innovative Interfaces	28.7%
Sirsi	14.0%
Ex Libris	12.2%
MA Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	28.5%
Endeavor	27.3%
Sirsi	12.4%
Ex Libris	8.3%

BA Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	37.1%
Sirsi	17.4%
Endeavor	15.0%
Ex Libris	7.2%
AA Institutions	
Sirsi	17.1%
Ex Libris	16.4%
Epixtech (Dynix, Horizon, NOTIS)	12.1%
Endeavor	11.4%
Innovative Interfaces	11.4%
OTHER Institutions	
Innovative Interfaces	27.8%
Endeavor	19.0%
Sirsi	15.1%
Ex Libris	8.7%

Table 5-15
Course Management System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Respondents

ALL Institutions	
Blackboard/Blackboard	41.2%
Blackboard/WebCT	32.4%
Doctoral Institutions	
Blackboard/Blackboard	39.8%
Blackboard/WebCT	39.2%
More than one	5.5%
MA Institutions	
Blackboard/Blackboard	53.1%
Blackboard/WebCT	24.0%
Desire2Learn	6.6%

BA Institutions	
Blackboard/Blackboard	44.9%
Blackboard/WebCT	19.8%
Open Source	14.4%
Jenzabar	5.4%
AA Institutions	
Blackboard/WebCT	44.9%
Blackboard/Blackboard	30.8%
Desire2Learn	8.3%
OTHER Institutions	
Blackboard/WebCT	41.1%
Blackboard/Blackboard	27.1%
Homegrown	7.8%

tables if these approaches were reported by at least 5% of institutions responding that a 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.

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.

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

Table 5-16
Grants Management System Vendors Reported by 5% or More of Respondents

ALL Institutions	
Homegrown	31.5%
SunGard Higher Education	19.2%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	11.1%
Blackbaud	5.2%
COEUS/MIT	5.0%
Doctoral Institutions	
Homegrown	38.4%
SunGard Higher Education	16.7%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	13.8%
COEUS/MIT	10.9%
InfoEd	6.5%
Oracle/Oracle	6.5%
MA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	26.3%
Homegrown	21.1%
Datatel	7.9%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	7.9%
Blackbaud	6.6%
SAP	6.6%

BA Institutions	
SunGard Higher Education	42.9%
Homegrown	20.0%
Blackbaud	8.6%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	8.6%
Jenzabar	5.7%
AA Institutions	
Blackbaud	22.2%
Homegrown	22.2%
SunGard Higher Education	18.5%
Datatel	7.4%
OTHER Institutions	
Homegrown	38.8%
Research Master	14.9%
Oracle/PeopleSoft	13.4%
Blackbaud	6.0%

Table 5-17
Status of Web Portal Deployment

	ALL	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Implemented	43.4%	62.6%	42.4%	34.2%	29.4%	48.6%
In process	18.0%	14.8%	20.6%	18.5%	15.3%	19.7%
Planning	27.7%	15.4%	28.6%	28.8%	39.9%	26.1%
No plans	10.9%	7.1%	8.4%	18.5%	15.3%	5.6%

stages of portal deployment that characterize each of the Carnegie groups. About 89% 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 implement a Web portal. The percentage of schools that had implemented a portal increased from the 2004 to the 2005 survey from 38.5% to 43.4%, 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 overall the strategy of deploying a purchased product was reported most often. 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 and to the individual.

Among the institutions that have imple-

Table 5-18
Development and Procurement Strategies for Web Portals

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Developed in-house	14.7%	14.8%	10.8%	20.0%	9.4%	20.9%
Purchased product	67.9%	65.7%	70.4%	67.3%	76.1%	58.2%
Based on open source	12.5%	14.8%	12.9%	10.7%	9.4%	14.2%
Other	4.9%	4.7%	5.8%	2.0%	5.1%	6.7%
* *N* = 831						

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

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	84.5%	92.3%	84.2%	78.7%	84.1%	82.1%
No	15.5%	7.7%	15.8%	21.3%	15.9%	17.9%
* *N* = 831						

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

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	85.2%	91.7%	85.8%	84.7%	78.3%	83.6%
No	14.8%	8.3%	14.2%	15.3%	21.7%	16.4%
* *N* = 831						

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

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Current students	98.4%	98.2%	99.2%	98.7%	97.8%	97.8%
Prospective students	70.2%	71.6%	75.8%	74.0%	58.0%	66.4%
Faculty	95.5%	97.0%	96.7%	96.7%	96.4%	89.6%
Staff	94.2%	94.7%	95.4%	93.3%	94.2%	92.5%
External community	33.2%	33.7%	34.2%	28.7%	31.2%	38.1%
Alumni	55.0%	52.7%	58.8%	60.7%	42.8%	57.5%
Other	2.3%	1.8%	1.7%	4.0%	1.4%	3.0%
* *N* = 831						

mented, are in the process of implementing, or are planning to implement a Web portal, the percentages of schools that have as a target audience prospective students and alumni were fairly consistent across the various Carnegie classes except for the AA group, which had significantly lower percentages of colleges reporting Web portals that serve or will serve these constituencies. (See Table 5-21.)

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 95% of ALL institutions reported that they have integrated or plan to inte-

Table 5-22
Web Portal Integration with Campus Administrative Systems

	ALL*	DR	MA	BA	AA	OTHER
Yes	95.3%	97.6%	95.4%	96.0%	94.9%	91.8%
No	4.7%	2.4%	4.6%	4.0%	5.1%	8.2%
* *N* = 831						

grate 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 EDUCAUSE Current Issues Survey are available at <http://www.educause.edu/issues/>.
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>.
3. An exception to this methodology was made for Oracle and Blackboard, which have merged with PeopleSoft and WebCT, respectively, because of the two major product lines involved in each case. These are shown with the corporate name followed by a slash and the product line.