**IT Service Delivery**

The data tables in this file are provided as a summary of the data collected from the ECAR IT Service Delivery survey conducted in 2014. Question text has been abbreviated in this document, but full question text can be found in the survey instrument (<http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/SI/esi1501.pdf>). The data are disaggregated by Carnegie Classification (2010) in some tables. Responses to open-ended questions are not included to preserve respondent anonymity. Note that the number of respondents (n) varies from question to question and that percentages for multiple-choice questions may not sum to 100% due to independent rounding.

For more information about this study, including the associated research report(s), slide deck(s), and infographic(s), visit the research hub at <http://www.educause.edu/library/resources/it-service-delivery-research>.
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|  |
| --- |
| **Respondents by Carnegie Class** |
| **Carnegie Classification** |
|  | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. | n |
| Carnegie Classification | 16% | 26% | 28% | 20% | 9% | 99% | 1% | 230 |
| n | 37 | 59 | 65 | 45 | 21 | 227 | 3 |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section A. The Future of IT Service Delivery** |
| **A1. In terms of current focus, where does your IT organization fall on the following scale? (slider scale)** |
|  |
|  | A1. Current focus |
| Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 39 | 40 | 18 | 33 |
| BA | 38 | 34 | 17 | 58 |
| MA | 40 | 40 | 19 | 61 |
| DR | 38 | 34 | 19 | 40 |
| Other U.S. | 37 | 38 | 13 | 20 |
| All U.S. | 39 | 35 | 18 | 212 |
| Non-U.S. | 58 | 58 | 25 | 2 |
|  |
|  |
| **A2. Where do you think the focus of your IT organization will be 5 YEARS from now? (slider scale)** |
|  |
|  | A2. Focus in 5 years |
| Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 57 | 60 | 16 | 33 |
| BA | 57 | 50 | 18 | 58 |
| MA | 61 | 61 | 18 | 62 |
| DR | 59 | 65 | 17 | 40 |
| Other U.S. | 60 | 65 | 15 | 20 |
| All U.S. | 59 | 60 | 17 | 213 |
| Non-U.S. | 83 | 83 | 4 | 2 |
|  |
|  |
| **A3. Where do you think the focus of your IT organization will be 10 YEARS from now? (slider scale)** |
|  |
|  | A3. Focus in 10 years |
| Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 69 | 75 | 18 | 33 |
| BA | 71 | 75 | 20 | 58 |
| MA | 71 | 75 | 19 | 61 |
| DR | 70 | 78 | 23 | 40 |
| Other U.S. | 75 | 80 | 15 | 20 |
| All U.S. | 71 | 75 | 20 | 212 |
| Non-U.S. | 90 | 90 | 0 | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **A4. Currently, the lead IT responsibility at your institution is:** |
|  |
|  | Carnegie Classification |
| AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Consolidated in one role |  | 94% | 91% | 90% | 82% | 100% | 91% | 100% |
| Shared by two or more partnering roles |  | 6% | 9% | 10% | 18% | 0% | 9% | 0% |
| n |  | 34 | 58 | 62 | 39 | 20 | 213 | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **A4a. With which role(s) is the lead IT responsibility currently shared at your institution?** |
|  |
|  | Unchecked | Checked | n |
| Lead of learning strategy | 40% | 60% | 20 |
| Lead of analytics/institutional effectiveness | 45% | 55% | 20 |
| Lead of information/institutional security | 80% | 20% | 20 |
| Lead of IT risk management | 80% | 20% | 20 |
| Lead of e-science | 85% | 15% | 20 |
| IT lead(s) of academic or administrative departments (e.g., medical school, business school, HR department) | 55% | 45% | 20 |
| Other | 75% | 25% | 20 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **A5. In 10 years, the lead IT responsibility at your institution will be:** |
|  |
|  | Carnegie Classification |
| AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Consolidated in one role |  | 82% | 86% | 87% | 80% | 90% | 85% | 100% |
| Shared by two or more partnering roles |  | 18% | 14% | 13% | 20% | 10% | 15% | 0% |
| n |  | 34 | 58 | 62 | 40 | 20 | 214 | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **A5a. With which role(s) do you predict the lead IT responsibility at your institution will be shared?** |
|  |
|  | Unchecked | Checked | n |
| Lead of learning strategy | 47% | 53% | 32 |
| Lead of analytics/institutional effectiveness | 53% | 47% | 32 |
| Lead of information/institutional security | 69% | 31% | 32 |
| Lead of IT risk management | 78% | 22% | 32 |
| Lead of e-science | 88% | 13% | 32 |
| IT lead(s) of academic or administrative departments (e.g., medical school, business school, HR department) | 75% | 25% | 32 |
| Other please specify | 81% | 19% | 32 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **A6. In general, 10 years from now, to what extent will the span of responsibility of the lead IT person(s) cover each of these areas? (slider scales)** |
|  |
|  | All Respondents |
|  |
| Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | n |
| E-learning | 52 | 50 | 22 | 198 |
| Learning analytics | 52 | 50 | 22 | 204 |
| Administrative analytics | 64 | 68 | 22 | 210 |
| Institutional data management and governance | 67 | 75 | 21 | 204 |
| Information security | 86 | 90 | 15 | 212 |
| IT risk management | 83 | 85 | 15 | 211 |
| IT compliance | 83 | 89 | 16 | 211 |
| IT service management | 87 | 90 | 15 | 210 |
| IT resource management | 84 | 90 | 15 | 212 |
| IT vendor and contract management | 84 | 90 | 14 | 212 |
| E-science | 42 | 40 | 21 | 193 |
| Enterprise architecture | 87 | 90 | 16 | 211 |
| Digital business strategy | 65 | 70 | 21 | 208 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section B. Current Methods of Delivering IT Services** |
| **B1. Is your institution part of one or more purchasing consortiums?** |
|  |
|  | Carnegie Classification |
| AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No |  | 16% | 17% | 16% | 23% | 33% | 19% | 67% |
| Yes |  | 84% | 83% | 84% | 77% | 67% | 81% | 33% |
| n |  | 37 | 58 | 62 | 43 | 21 | 221 | 3 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B1b. Identify the benefits of the consortium(s) in which you participate (compared to purchasing without a consortium).** |
|  |
|  | Unchecked | Checked | n |
| Low price | 37% | 63% | 179 |
| Fair price | 43% | 57% | 179 |
| Transparent pricing | 62% | 38% | 179 |
| Pre-arranged terms and conditions | 26% | 74% | 179 |
| Better terms and conditions | 48% | 52% | 179 |
| Better quality of services offered | 82% | 18% | 179 |
| Streamlining of purchasing requirements (e.g., RFPs, sole source justification) | 31% | 69% | 179 |
| Increased ability to standardize on software | 66% | 34% | 179 |
| Greater range of software/services available | 86% | 14% | 179 |
| Other | 96% | 4% | 179 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2. For each area, identify the extent to which business processes have been standardized at your institution.** |
|  |
|  | Not really standardized across units (1) | Standardized across some units (2) | Standardized across many units (3) | Standardized across nearly all units (4) | n |
| Payroll | 2% | 2% | 3% | 92% | 211 |
| Time and attendance tracking | 6% | 11% | 13% | 69% | 210 |
| Faculty/staff hiring | 6% | 14% | 29% | 50% | 208 |
| Faculty/staff onboarding, transfers, and exiting | 14% | 23% | 27% | 36% | 209 |
| Student recruitment | 8% | 14% | 27% | 51% | 206 |
| Undergraduate admissions | 3% | 7% | 11% | 79% | 204 |
| Graduate admissions | 9% | 15% | 19% | 56% | 149 |
| Professional admissions | 8% | 19% | 21% | 52% | 130 |
| Degree audit | 7% | 10% | 17% | 67% | 198 |
| Accounts payable | 2% | 4% | 8% | 86% | 212 |
| Budgeting and financial management | 5% | 8% | 19% | 67% | 212 |
| Procurement | 6% | 15% | 20% | 59% | 213 |
| Expense management (travel reimbursement, etc.) | 5% | 5% | 20% | 70% | 213 |
| Student registration | 2% | 3% | 9% | 86% | 211 |
| Course enrollment | 1% | 3% | 11% | 84% | 212 |
| Course catalog and scheduling management | 3% | 8% | 13% | 77% | 210 |
| Classroom and event scheduling | 7% | 19% | 28% | 46% | 211 |
| Financial aid management | 3% | 3% | 9% | 85% | 208 |
| Grants administration (preaward) | 10% | 14% | 22% | 54% | 192 |
| Grants administration (postaward) | 11% | 13% | 23% | 53% | 190 |
| IT access and accounts management | 2% | 4% | 17% | 77% | 213 |
| Internal service provider billing | 13% | 13% | 26% | 48% | 151 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Payroll** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 13% | 31 | 55% | 31 | 81% | 31 | 71% | 31 |
| BA | 21% | 52 | 42% | 52 | 56% | 52 | 52% | 52 |
| MA | 6% | 53 | 38% | 53 | 72% | 53 | 57% | 53 |
| DR | 8% | 38 | 42% | 38 | 58% | 38 | 61% | 38 |
| Other U.S. | 21% | 19 | 47% | 19 | 63% | 19 | 63% | 19 |
| All U.S. | 13% | 193 | 44% | 193 | 65% | 193 | 59% | 193 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 100% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Time and attendance tracking** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 19% | 27 | 48% | 27 | 74% | 27 | 59% | 27 |
| BA | 23% | 44 | 34% | 44 | 55% | 44 | 34% | 44 |
| MA | 11% | 47 | 36% | 47 | 72% | 47 | 55% | 47 |
| DR | 23% | 31 | 29% | 31 | 61% | 31 | 45% | 31 |
| Other U.S. | 6% | 16 | 56% | 16 | 75% | 16 | 63% | 16 |
| All U.S. | 17% | 165 | 38% | 165 | 66% | 165 | 49% | 165 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 0% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Faculty/staff hiring** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 23% | 26 | 31% | 26 | 62% | 26 | 50% | 26 |
| BA | 23% | 40 | 30% | 40 | 40% | 40 | 38% | 40 |
| MA | 26% | 46 | 30% | 46 | 59% | 46 | 59% | 46 |
| DR | 16% | 32 | 25% | 32 | 53% | 32 | 44% | 32 |
| Other U.S. | 23% | 13 | 46% | 13 | 62% | 13 | 69% | 13 |
| All U.S. | 22% | 157 | 31% | 157 | 54% | 157 | 50% | 157 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Faculty/staff onboarding, transfers, and exiting** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 39% | 23 | 26% | 23 | 70% | 23 | 43% | 23 |
| BA | 30% | 33 | 21% | 33 | 39% | 33 | 33% | 33 |
| MA | 38% | 34 | 24% | 34 | 62% | 34 | 53% | 34 |
| DR | 21% | 24 | 25% | 24 | 54% | 24 | 46% | 24 |
| Other U.S. | 18% | 11 | 45% | 11 | 82% | 11 | 55% | 11 |
| All U.S. | 31% | 125 | 26% | 125 | 58% | 125 | 45% | 125 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Student recruitment** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 33% | 24 | 42% | 24 | 67% | 24 | 38% | 24 |
| BA | 29% | 45 | 31% | 45 | 53% | 45 | 24% | 45 |
| MA | 23% | 43 | 42% | 43 | 72% | 43 | 47% | 43 |
| DR | 21% | 28 | 46% | 28 | 64% | 28 | 32% | 28 |
| Other U.S. | 54% | 13 | 38% | 13 | 69% | 13 | 31% | 13 |
| All U.S. | 29% | 153 | 39% | 153 | 64% | 153 | 35% | 153 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Undergraduate admissions** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 17% | 30 | 30% | 30 | 77% | 30 | 40% | 30 |
| BA | 28% | 50 | 26% | 50 | 60% | 50 | 20% | 50 |
| MA | 22% | 49 | 39% | 49 | 67% | 49 | 41% | 49 |
| DR | 23% | 35 | 49% | 35 | 71% | 35 | 43% | 35 |
| Other U.S. | 40% | 10 | 60% | 10 | 80% | 10 | 50% | 10 |
| All U.S. | 24% | 174 | 37% | 174 | 68% | 174 | 36% | 174 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Graduate admissions** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 0% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
| BA | 22% | 23 | 17% | 23 | 43% | 23 | 17% | 23 |
| MA | 28% | 47 | 36% | 47 | 66% | 47 | 36% | 47 |
| DR | 33% | 21 | 52% | 21 | 62% | 21 | 38% | 21 |
| Other U.S. | 8% | 12 | 33% | 12 | 58% | 12 | 33% | 12 |
| All U.S. | 25% | 105 | 34% | 105 | 59% | 105 | 32% | 105 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Professional admissions** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 9% | 11 | 18% | 11 | 55% | 11 | 36% | 11 |
| BA | 19% | 21 | 24% | 21 | 38% | 21 | 10% | 21 |
| MA | 12% | 33 | 30% | 33 | 58% | 33 | 39% | 33 |
| DR | 14% | 14 | 36% | 14 | 57% | 14 | 21% | 14 |
| Other U.S. | 22% | 9 | 22% | 9 | 56% | 9 | 22% | 9 |
| All U.S. | 15% | 88 | 27% | 88 | 52% | 88 | 27% | 88 |
| Non-U.S. | 100% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% | 1 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Audit degree completion** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 46% | 28 | 29% | 28 | 68% | 28 | 46% | 28 |
| BA | 18% | 40 | 25% | 40 | 65% | 40 | 53% | 40 |
| MA | 24% | 46 | 28% | 46 | 70% | 46 | 59% | 46 |
| DR | 19% | 31 | 39% | 31 | 61% | 31 | 58% | 31 |
| Other U.S. | 23% | 13 | 54% | 13 | 46% | 13 | 54% | 13 |
| All U.S. | 25% | 158 | 32% | 158 | 65% | 158 | 54% | 158 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Accounts payable** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 6% | 32 | 44% | 32 | 72% | 32 | 66% | 32 |
| BA | 8% | 50 | 38% | 50 | 52% | 50 | 44% | 50 |
| MA | 8% | 51 | 43% | 51 | 57% | 51 | 61% | 51 |
| DR | 10% | 39 | 41% | 39 | 67% | 39 | 62% | 39 |
| Other U.S. | 15% | 20 | 35% | 20 | 60% | 20 | 55% | 20 |
| All U.S. | 9% | 192 | 41% | 192 | 60% | 192 | 57% | 192 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Budgeting and financial management** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 16% | 31 | 42% | 31 | 74% | 31 | 55% | 31 |
| BA | 23% | 48 | 33% | 48 | 56% | 48 | 33% | 48 |
| MA | 4% | 48 | 33% | 48 | 58% | 48 | 48% | 48 |
| DR | 13% | 31 | 45% | 31 | 65% | 31 | 48% | 31 |
| Other U.S. | 6% | 18 | 28% | 18 | 61% | 18 | 44% | 18 |
| All U.S. | 13% | 176 | 36% | 176 | 62% | 176 | 45% | 176 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Procurement** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 7% | 29 | 62% | 29 | 72% | 29 | 66% | 29 |
| BA | 9% | 33 | 48% | 33 | 58% | 33 | 55% | 33 |
| MA | 8% | 49 | 47% | 49 | 61% | 49 | 59% | 49 |
| DR | 17% | 35 | 40% | 35 | 54% | 35 | 49% | 35 |
| Other U.S. | 0% | 13 | 46% | 13 | 46% | 13 | 38% | 13 |
| All U.S. | 9% | 159 | 48% | 159 | 60% | 159 | 55% | 159 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Expense management** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 3% | 32 | 47% | 32 | 47% | 32 | 47% | 32 |
| BA | 13% | 46 | 35% | 46 | 46% | 46 | 37% | 46 |
| MA | 13% | 54 | 41% | 54 | 63% | 54 | 59% | 54 |
| DR | 26% | 34 | 38% | 34 | 50% | 34 | 50% | 34 |
| Other U.S. | 6% | 17 | 29% | 17 | 41% | 17 | 53% | 17 |
| All U.S. | 13% | 183 | 39% | 183 | 51% | 183 | 49% | 183 |
| Non-U.S. | 100% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Student registration** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 28% | 32 | 41% | 32 | 75% | 32 | 41% | 32 |
| BA | 18% | 51 | 33% | 51 | 69% | 51 | 29% | 51 |
| MA | 13% | 53 | 43% | 53 | 77% | 53 | 47% | 53 |
| DR | 5% | 38 | 37% | 38 | 76% | 38 | 45% | 38 |
| Other U.S. | 22% | 18 | 28% | 18 | 78% | 18 | 22% | 18 |
| All U.S. | 16% | 192 | 38% | 192 | 74% | 192 | 39% | 192 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Course enrollment** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 19% | 32 | 31% | 32 | 69% | 32 | 41% | 32 |
| BA | 16% | 51 | 33% | 51 | 63% | 51 | 29% | 51 |
| MA | 10% | 52 | 42% | 52 | 75% | 52 | 44% | 52 |
| DR | 8% | 39 | 36% | 39 | 64% | 39 | 38% | 39 |
| Other U.S. | 16% | 19 | 21% | 19 | 63% | 19 | 16% | 19 |
| All U.S. | 13% | 193 | 35% | 193 | 67% | 193 | 36% | 193 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Course catalog and scheduling management** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 10% | 29 | 41% | 29 | 59% | 29 | 38% | 29 |
| BA | 20% | 45 | 31% | 45 | 64% | 45 | 13% | 45 |
| MA | 12% | 51 | 29% | 51 | 69% | 51 | 43% | 51 |
| DR | 21% | 38 | 39% | 38 | 66% | 38 | 47% | 38 |
| Other U.S. | 19% | 16 | 25% | 16 | 50% | 16 | 19% | 16 |
| All U.S. | 16% | 179 | 34% | 179 | 64% | 179 | 34% | 179 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Classroom and event scheduling** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 23% | 22 | 45% | 22 | 77% | 22 | 45% | 22 |
| BA | 16% | 37 | 30% | 37 | 62% | 37 | 30% | 37 |
| MA | 17% | 47 | 38% | 47 | 64% | 47 | 36% | 47 |
| DR | 21% | 29 | 48% | 29 | 72% | 29 | 31% | 29 |
| Other U.S. | 36% | 14 | 29% | 14 | 57% | 14 | 29% | 14 |
| All U.S. | 20% | 149 | 38% | 149 | 66% | 149 | 34% | 149 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% | 1 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Financial aid management** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 28% | 32 | 47% | 32 | 78% | 32 | 69% | 32 |
| BA | 18% | 49 | 27% | 49 | 51% | 49 | 47% | 49 |
| MA | 17% | 52 | 42% | 52 | 69% | 52 | 56% | 52 |
| DR | 8% | 38 | 39% | 38 | 63% | 38 | 53% | 38 |
| Other U.S. | 44% | 16 | 25% | 16 | 63% | 16 | 50% | 16 |
| All U.S. | 20% | 187 | 37% | 187 | 64% | 187 | 55% | 187 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 1 | 100% | 1 | 100% | 1 | 100% | 1 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Grants administration (preaward)** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 4% | 25 | 36% | 25 | 60% | 25 | 48% | 25 |
| BA | 10% | 31 | 16% | 31 | 39% | 31 | 26% | 31 |
| MA | 10% | 41 | 24% | 41 | 46% | 41 | 41% | 41 |
| DR | 18% | 33 | 36% | 33 | 52% | 33 | 55% | 33 |
| Other U.S. | 10% | 10 | 30% | 10 | 50% | 10 | 20% | 10 |
| All U.S. | 11% | 140 | 28% | 140 | 49% | 140 | 41% | 140 |
| Non-U.S. |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Grants administration (postaward)** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 8% | 24 | 46% | 24 | 71% | 24 | 54% | 24 |
| BA | 16% | 31 | 16% | 31 | 35% | 31 | 19% | 31 |
| MA | 10% | 41 | 24% | 41 | 49% | 41 | 39% | 41 |
| DR | 16% | 32 | 41% | 32 | 50% | 32 | 56% | 32 |
| Other U.S. | 10% | 10 | 30% | 10 | 50% | 10 | 20% | 10 |
| All U.S. | 12% | 138 | 30% | 138 | 50% | 138 | 40% | 138 |
| Non-U.S. |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. IT access and accounts management** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 16% | 31 | 32% | 31 | 81% | 31 | 58% | 31 |
| BA | 16% | 51 | 37% | 51 | 61% | 51 | 65% | 51 |
| MA | 23% | 53 | 40% | 53 | 60% | 53 | 72% | 53 |
| DR | 19% | 36 | 44% | 36 | 61% | 36 | 75% | 36 |
| Other U.S. | 21% | 19 | 26% | 19 | 47% | 19 | 68% | 19 |
| All U.S. | 19% | 190 | 37% | 190 | 63% | 190 | 68% | 190 |
| Non-U.S. | 100% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 100% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2a. Internal service provider billing** |
|  |
|  | B2a. Redesigned in the past year. | B2a. Standardization has resulted in reduced or avoided costs. | B2a. Standardization has improved efficiency in terms of time. | B2a. Standardization has reduced risks in this area. |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 0% | 18 | 28% | 18 | 50% | 18 | 33% | 18 |
| BA | 0% | 26 | 12% | 26 | 27% | 26 | 12% | 26 |
| MA | 9% | 34 | 29% | 34 | 38% | 34 | 47% | 34 |
| DR | 5% | 22 | 41% | 22 | 64% | 22 | 41% | 22 |
| Other U.S. | 0% | 7 | 29% | 7 | 14% | 7 | 14% | 7 |
| All U.S. | 4% | 107 | 27% | 107 | 41% | 107 | 33% | 107 |
| Non-U.S. | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% | 1 | 100% | 1 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B2b. For the business processes you identified as being standardized across many or nearly all units, rate how much easier or difficult it is for staff to get their jobs done?** |
|  |
|  | Standardization has made getting jobs done much more difficult. (1) | Standardization has made getting jobs done somewhat more difficult. (2) | Standardization has not made a difference in the ability to get jobs done. (3) | Standardization has made getting jobs done somewhat easier. (4) | Standardization has made getting jobs done much easier. (5) | n |
| Payroll | 2% | 6% | 10% | 45% | 38% | 166 |
| Time and attendance tracking | 3% | 7% | 14% | 31% | 44% | 147 |
| Faculty/staff hiring | 1% | 7% | 23% | 51% | 18% | 136 |
| Faculty/staff onboarding, transfers, and exiting | 1% | 7% | 18% | 52% | 23% | 106 |
| Student recruitment | 0% | 2% | 12% | 45% | 41% | 125 |
| Undergraduate admissions | 0% | 2% | 10% | 38% | 50% | 141 |
| Graduate admissions | 1% | 0% | 15% | 44% | 40% | 81 |
| Professional admissions | 1% | 0% | 19% | 44% | 35% | 68 |
| Audit degree completion | 2% | 2% | 14% | 36% | 47% | 133 |
| Accounts payable | 1% | 4% | 19% | 43% | 33% | 161 |
| Budgeting and financial management | 2% | 5% | 22% | 43% | 28% | 150 |
| Procurement | 5% | 7% | 16% | 42% | 29% | 137 |
| Expense management (travel reimbursement, etc.) | 3% | 8% | 26% | 38% | 26% | 157 |
| Student registration | 0% | 1% | 7% | 44% | 48% | 167 |
| Course enrollment | 0% | 3% | 8% | 45% | 43% | 166 |
| Course catalog and scheduling management | 1% | 3% | 16% | 43% | 37% | 155 |
| Classroom and event scheduling | 2% | 4% | 15% | 45% | 34% | 131 |
| Financial aid management | 1% | 1% | 19% | 45% | 34% | 154 |
| Grants administration (preaward) | 2% | 3% | 26% | 40% | 30% | 101 |
| Grants administration (postaward) | 2% | 5% | 26% | 36% | 30% | 99 |
| IT access and accounts management | 0% | 2% | 15% | 37% | 45% | 172 |
| Internal service provider billing | 0% | 0% | 26% | 44% | 30% | 81 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B3. In analytics, BI, and data management, what has happened at your institution in the past year with:** |
|  |
|  | We do not have any positions/roles in this area. | Positions/roles exist but are shrinking. | Positions/roles exist and have remained stable. | Positions/roles exist and have been growing. | n |
| Data analysts | 24% | 5% | 44% | 27% | 197 |
| Database administrators | 10% | 8% | 65% | 18% | 198 |
| Data governance managers | 54% | 4% | 31% | 11% | 193 |
| Institutional research professionals | 7% | 4% | 58% | 30% | 191 |
| Data architects | 55% | 4% | 29% | 12% | 195 |
| Enterprise data warehouse managers | 45% | 6% | 35% | 14% | 194 |
| System administrators | 3% | 9% | 72% | 16% | 198 |
| Data visualization specialists | 68% | 2% | 18% | 12% | 190 |
| Data integration specialists | 39% | 5% | 34% | 23% | 194 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B4. In business process management, what has happened at your institution in the past year with:** |
|  |
|  | We do not have any positions/roles in this area. | Positions/roles exist but are shrinking. | Positions/roles exist and have remained stable. | Positions/roles exist and have been growing. | n |
| Process analysts | 41% | 3% | 36% | 21% | 190 |
| Change leaders | 47% | 3% | 29% | 21% | 185 |
| Professionals knowledgeable in LEAN | 76% | 0% | 12% | 12% | 163 |
| Enterprise architects | 48% | 4% | 38% | 11% | 192 |
| Systems administrators | 4% | 9% | 73% | 13% | 194 |
| Application developers | 15% | 10% | 60% | 16% | 193 |
| Service managers | 24% | 4% | 56% | 16% | 190 |
| Functional area experts | 12% | 6% | 62% | 19% | 193 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B5. Has your institution moved any services to the cloud?** |
|  |
|  | Carnegie Classification |
| AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No |  | 21% | 16% | 13% | 11% | 15% | 15% | 0% |
| Yes |  | 79% | 84% | 87% | 89% | 85% | 85% | 100% |
| n |  | 34 | 51 | 54 | 36 | 20 | 195 | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B5a. Which services has your institution moved to the cloud?** |
|  |
|  | Infrastructure, such as servers, storage, data center (also known as IaaS) | Platforms for software development, such as a computing platform and solution stack (also known as PaaS) | Entire services or applications, such as HR, student information (also known as SaaS) | Other |
| Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent | n |
| Carnegie Classification |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AA | 30% | 27 | 19% | 27 | 67% | 27 | 11% | 27 |
| BA | 28% | 43 | 5% | 43 | 81% | 43 | 19% | 43 |
| MA | 53% | 47 | 28% | 47 | 66% | 47 | 30% | 47 |
| DR | 41% | 32 | 16% | 32 | 81% | 32 | 19% | 32 |
| Other U.S. | 24% | 17 | 12% | 17 | 94% | 17 | 6% | 17 |
| All U.S. | 37% | 166 | 16% | 166 | 76% | 166 | 19% | 166 |
| Non-U.S. | 50% | 2 | 0% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 50% | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B5b. As a result of moving services to the cloud, what has happened at your institution with:** |
|  |
|  | We do not have any positions/roles in this area. | Positions/roles exist but are shrinking. | Positions/roles exist and have remained stable. | Positions/roles exist and have been growing. | n |
| Vendor managers | 37% | 2% | 48% | 13% | 165 |
| Contract negotiators | 37% | 1% | 49% | 13% | 166 |
| Legal specialists | 45% | 2% | 41% | 12% | 164 |
| Security and privacy specialists | 21% | 1% | 58% | 20% | 166 |
| Application managers | 18% | 5% | 71% | 5% | 167 |
| System administrators | 3% | 13% | 75% | 8% | 166 |
| Data integration specialists | 34% | 0% | 49% | 17% | 166 |
| Data architects | 51% | 2% | 41% | 7% | 167 |
| Enterprise architects | 43% | 3% | 46% | 8% | 166 |
| Application developers | 16% | 10% | 68% | 7% | 167 |
| User support professionals | 4% | 6% | 80% | 10% | 166 |
| Service managers | 24% | 2% | 65% | 8% | 167 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B5c. Rate the following in terms of their importance to making decisions about moving IT services to the cloud. (slider scales)** |
|  |
|  | All Respondents |
|  |
| Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | n |
| Total cost of ownership | 80 | 80 | 15 | 163 |
| Availability of consortium options | 46 | 50 | 27 | 158 |
| Return on investment | 73 | 75 | 20 | 160 |
| Vendor reputation | 76 | 76 | 16 | 164 |
| Market reputation/popularity | 62 | 63 | 22 | 162 |
| Contract length | 56 | 52 | 22 | 153 |
| Scalability | 74 | 76 | 18 | 164 |
| Adaptability (ability to integrate with existing services infrastructure) | 80 | 82 | 17 | 166 |
| Fit with existing staffing resources | 68 | 71 | 21 | 162 |
| Reliability | 88 | 90 | 12 | 166 |
| Speed of deployment | 69 | 71 | 17 | 162 |
| Ease of use | 80 | 81 | 16 | 165 |
| Ease of upgrades | 77 | 79 | 15 | 161 |
| Effect on workforce (whether positions/roles may need to be added, eliminated, or shifted) | 59 | 60 | 24 | 161 |
| Quality of user service and support | 82 | 86 | 15 | 164 |
| Alignment with institutional mission and goals | 78 | 84 | 21 | 162 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B6. Does your institution outsource any services?** |
|  |
|  | Carnegie Classification |
| AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No |  | 53% | 64% | 56% | 53% | 50% | 56% | 50% |
| Yes |  | 47% | 36% | 44% | 47% | 50% | 44% | 50% |
| n |  | 34 | 50 | 54 | 36 | 20 | 194 | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B6a. As a result of outsourcing services, what has happened at your institution with:** |
|  |
|  | We do not have any positions/roles in this area. | Positions/roles exist but are shrinking. | Positions/roles exist and have remained stable. | Positions/roles exist and have been growing. | n |
| Vendor managers | 37% | 1% | 54% | 9% | 82 |
| Contract negotiators | 37% | 2% | 49% | 11% | 81 |
| Legal specialists | 44% | 1% | 44% | 10% | 81 |
| Security and privacy specialists | 31% | 1% | 52% | 16% | 83 |
| Application managers | 24% | 10% | 65% | 1% | 82 |
| System administrators | 8% | 13% | 75% | 4% | 83 |
| Data integration specialists | 32% | 0% | 56% | 12% | 82 |
| Data architects | 52% | 0% | 39% | 9% | 82 |
| Enterprise architects | 42% | 2% | 51% | 5% | 81 |
| Application developers | 21% | 12% | 62% | 5% | 81 |
| User support professionals | 10% | 11% | 72% | 7% | 82 |
| Service managers | 23% | 1% | 67% | 9% | 81 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B6b. Rate the following in terms of their importance in making decisions about outsourcing IT services in your unit. (slider scales)** |
|  |
|  | All Respondents |
|  |
| Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | n |
| Total cost of ownership | 81 | 82 | 17 | 82 |
| Availability of consortium options | 46 | 50 | 24 | 79 |
| Return on investment | 75 | 78 | 19 | 82 |
| Vendor reputation | 74 | 76 | 17 | 83 |
| Market reputation/popularity | 62 | 62 | 20 | 82 |
| Contract length | 57 | 55 | 22 | 81 |
| Scalability | 70 | 71 | 19 | 81 |
| Adaptability (ability to integrate with existing services infrastructure) | 79 | 80 | 18 | 83 |
| Fit with existing staffing resources | 72 | 73 | 19 | 82 |
| Reliability | 86 | 90 | 15 | 83 |
| Speed of deployment | 69 | 70 | 17 | 82 |
| Ease of use | 78 | 76 | 15 | 83 |
| Ease of upgrades | 71 | 73 | 18 | 81 |
| Effect on workforce (whether positions/roles may need to be added, eliminated, or shifted) | 63 | 60 | 22 | 81 |
| Quality of user service and support | 85 | 90 | 15 | 83 |
| Alignment with institutional mission and goals | 78 | 84 | 20 | 82 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B7. Does your institution share any services?** |
|  |
|  | Carnegie Classification |
| AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No |  | 62% | 80% | 63% | 51% | 70% | 66% | 50% |
| Yes |  | 38% | 20% | 37% | 49% | 30% | 34% | 50% |
| n |  | 34 | 49 | 54 | 35 | 20 | 192 | 2 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B7a. How many of your major IT services are delivered as shared services?** |
|  |
|  | Carnegie Classification |
| AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| One |  | 17% | 20% | 15% | 12% | 17% | 15% | 0% |
| A few |  | 67% | 80% | 60% | 71% | 67% | 68% | 100% |
| Many |  | 17% | 0% | 25% | 18% | 17% | 17% | 0% |
| Nearly all |  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| n |  | 12 | 10 | 20 | 17 | 6 | 65 | 1 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B7b. As a result of instituting shared services, what has happened at your institution with:** |
|  |
|  | We do not have any positions/roles in this area. | Positions/roles exist but are shrinking. | Positions/roles exist and have remained stable. | Positions/roles exist and have been growing. | n |
| Vendor managers | 38% | 9% | 46% | 6% | 65 |
| Contract negotiators | 37% | 6% | 52% | 5% | 65 |
| Legal specialists | 38% | 6% | 54% | 2% | 63 |
| Security and privacy specialists | 20% | 6% | 56% | 18% | 66 |
| Application managers | 18% | 9% | 71% | 2% | 66 |
| System administrators | 3% | 15% | 77% | 5% | 66 |
| Data integration specialists | 32% | 2% | 54% | 12% | 65 |
| Data architects | 42% | 8% | 46% | 5% | 65 |
| Enterprise architects | 42% | 8% | 48% | 3% | 65 |
| Application developers | 6% | 14% | 74% | 6% | 66 |
| User support professionals | 9% | 5% | 73% | 14% | 66 |
| Service managers | 22% | 8% | 61% | 9% | 64 |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B7c. Rate the following in terms of their importance in making decisions about sharing IT services in your unit. (slider scales):** |
|  |
|  | All Respondents |
|  |
| Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | n |
| Total cost of ownership | 80 | 87 | 19 | 63 |
| Availability of consortium options | 61 | 61 | 26 | 64 |
| Return on investment | 74 | 81 | 23 | 64 |
| Vendor reputation | 62 | 66 | 25 | 64 |
| Market reputation/popularity | 55 | 54 | 24 | 62 |
| Contract length | 49 | 50 | 22 | 59 |
| Scalability | 74 | 75 | 19 | 62 |
| Adaptability (ability to integrate with existing services infrastructure) | 76 | 79 | 19 | 65 |
| Fit with existing staffing resources | 67 | 68 | 24 | 59 |
| Reliability | 84 | 90 | 20 | 64 |
| Speed of deployment | 61 | 60 | 19 | 64 |
| Ease of use | 72 | 76 | 19 | 64 |
| Ease of upgrades | 68 | 74 | 23 | 62 |
| Effect on workforce (whether positions/roles may need to be added, eliminated, or shifted) | 59 | 60 | 20 | 63 |
| Quality of user service and support | 79 | 86 | 23 | 65 |
| Alignment with institutional mission and goals | 81 | 86 | 20 | 64 |
|  |
|  |