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The data tables in this file are provided as a summary of the data collected from the ECAR Analytics in Higher Education survey conducted in 2015. Question text has been abbreviated in this document, but full question text can be found in the survey instrument (<https://library.educause.edu/~/media/files/library/2015/5/esi1504.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 <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2015/5/analytics-in-higher-education-2015>.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondents by institution type (Carnegie class and country)** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Percentage of sample | |  | 100% | 12% | 20% | 23% | 24% | 10% | 89% | 11% |
| *n* | |  | 245 | 29 | 49 | 56 | 59 | 24 | 217 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section B. The State of Analytics at Your Institution** | | | | | | | |
| **B1. Choose the option that best describes the role that each of the following positions plays in LEARNING ANALYTICS at your institution.** | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Don’t have this position/area | Not currently involved in analytics in any major way | Support/ contributor role | Leadership/ sponsor role | *n* |
| President/chancellor | | 1% | 34% | 28% | 37% | 221 |
| Chief academic officer (CAO) or provost | | 3% | 16% | 26% | 55% | 233 |
| Chief learning officer (CLO) or equivalent | | 76% | 4% | 9% | 11% | 233 |
| Student success leader | | 31% | 10% | 38% | 21% | 226 |
| Chief information officer (CIO) or equivalent | | 4% | 7% | 42% | 48% | 240 |
| Chief data officer (CDO) or equivalent | | 79% | 3% | 11% | 7% | 237 |
| Director of institutional research | | 7% | 10% | 50% | 33% | 233 |
| Chief analytics officer or equivalent | | 82% | 2% | 8% | 8% | 232 |
| Chief financial officer or chief business officer (CFO/CBO) | | 3% | 41% | 36% | 19% | 230 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B1a. Does your institution have a dedicated LEARNING ANALYTICS leader?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No | |  | 81% | 83% | 80% | 80% | 81% | 92% | 82% | 75% |
| Yes | |  | 19% | 17% | 20% | 20% | 19% | 8% | 18% | 25% |
| *n* | |  | 245 | 29 | 49 | 56 | 59 | 24 | 217 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B2. Choose the option that best describes the role that each of the following positions plays in INSTITUTIONAL ANALYTICS at your institution.** | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Don’t have this position/area | Not currently involved in analytics in any major way | Support/ contributor role | Leadership/ sponsor role | *n* |
| President/chancellor | | 0% | 19% | 30% | 51% | 229 |
| Chief academic officer (CAO) or provost | | 3% | 15% | 38% | 45% | 237 |
| Chief learning officer (CLO) or equivalent | | 76% | 5% | 13% | 6% | 227 |
| Student success leader | | 32% | 14% | 43% | 11% | 227 |
| Chief information officer (CIO) or equivalent | | 3% | 4% | 40% | 53% | 239 |
| Chief data officer (CDO) or equivalent | | 79% | 0% | 11% | 9% | 234 |
| Director of institutional research | | 7% | 4% | 41% | 49% | 237 |
| Chief analytics officer or equivalent | | 81% | 0% | 9% | 10% | 233 |
| Chief financial officer or chief business officer (CFO/CBO) | | 2% | 20% | 44% | 34% | 235 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B2a. Does your institution have a dedicated INSTITUTIONAL ANALYTICS leader?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No | |  | 63% | 57% | 60% | 71% | 55% | 78% | 63% | 61% |
| Yes | |  | 37% | 43% | 40% | 29% | 45% | 22% | 37% | 39% |
| *n* | |  | 241 | 28 | 48 | 56 | 58 | 23 | 213 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B3. How are analytics services and activities delivered at your institution?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Program run by institutional research (IR) | |  | 27% | 36% | 36% | 25% | 23% | 27% | 28% | 12% |
| Program run by information technology (IT) | |  | 17% | 14% | 9% | 15% | 23% | 27% | 17% | 12% |
| Program jointly run by IR and IT | |  | 43% | 50% | 53% | 43% | 36% | 41% | 44% | 35% |
| Program run by a dedicated analytics center separate from IR and IT | |  | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 15% |
| Program run by a dedicated analytics center that includes IR and/or IT | |  | 7% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 13% | 0% | 6% | 8% |
| Other departments or programs | |  | 5% | 0% | 2% | 4% | 5% | 5% | 3% | 19% |
| Outsource most or all of our analytics activities | |  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| *n* | |  | 230 | 28 | 45 | 53 | 56 | 22 | 204 | 26 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: “No method” and “Not sure” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B4. Identify which staff functions are needed or need to be augmented to optimally provide analytics services and support at your institution.** | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Not in place; not needed | Not in place; needed | Already in place; no more needed | Already in place; more needed | *n* |
| Data architecture | | 5% | 36% | 21% | 39% | 239 |
| Data cleaning | | 3% | 34% | 16% | 46% | 233 |
| Data management | | 2% | 23% | 22% | 53% | 237 |
| Data governance | | 3% | 39% | 22% | 37% | 241 |
| Data organization | | 2% | 33% | 20% | 44% | 230 |
| Data analysis | | 0% | 15% | 13% | 72% | 238 |
| Visual data communication | | 3% | 41% | 9% | 47% | 233 |
| Verbal data communication (e.g., reporting or telling stories with data) | | 6% | 36% | 14% | 44% | 227 |
| Statistical analysis | | 0% | 18% | 23% | 59% | 239 |
| Creation of predictive models and outputs | | 1% | 54% | 6% | 38% | 235 |
| Analytics tool training | | 2% | 44% | 9% | 45% | 238 |
| Development of user experiences and interfaces | | 4% | 43% | 8% | 45% | 228 |
| Technical management of analytics applications and infrastructure | | 2% | 23% | 31% | 45% | 242 |
| Translation of priorities and decision-making needs into analytics models | | 2% | 43% | 13% | 42% | 231 |
| Leadership for analytics initiatives | | 0% | 30% | 29% | 40% | 238 |
| Analytics initiatives management | | 3% | 37% | 27% | 33% | 231 |
| Analytics vendor liaison | | 22% | 28% | 34% | 16% | 222 |
| Analytics liaison for faculty, staff, and administrators | | 7% | 45% | 17% | 30% | 231 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B5. How many current staff (FTE) are dedicated to providing analytics services and support at your institution?** | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Median | *n* |
| Institution type | |  |  |
| All | | 4.0 | 238 |
| AA | | 3.4 | 28 |
| BA | | 3.0 | 48 |
| MA | | 3.8 | 56 |
| DR | | 8.0 | 55 |
| Other U.S. | | 2.5 | 23 |
| All U.S. | | 3.9 | 210 |
| Non-U.S. | | 5.3 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B5a. Of the FTE reported in question 5, how many analytics staff (FTE) are in:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Central IT | | Distributed IT | | IR | | Library | | Finance unit | | Administrative unit | | Academic unit | |
| Median | *n* | Median | *n* | Median | *n* | Median | *n* | Median | *n* | Median | *n* | Median | *n* |
| Institution type | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | | 1.5 | 203 | 0.0 | 76 | 2.0 | 198 | 0.0 | 60 | 0.5 | 83 | 1.0 | 96 | 0.8 | 103 |
| AA | | 1.0 | 24 | 0.0 | 4 | 2.0 | 27 | 0.0 | 5 | 0.1 | 6 | 1.0 | 7 | 0.5 | 10 |
| BA | | 1.3 | 41 | 0.0 | 19 | 1.0 | 43 | 0.0 | 15 | 0.3 | 18 | 0.5 | 20 | 0.0 | 16 |
| MA | | 2.0 | 43 | 0.0 | 14 | 1.5 | 45 | 0.0 | 11 | 0.5 | 17 | 1.0 | 20 | 0.5 | 24 |
| DR | | 3.0 | 50 | 0.0 | 21 | 3.0 | 49 | 0.0 | 14 | 1.0 | 23 | 1.5 | 23 | 1.0 | 27 |
| Other U.S. | | 1.0 | 21 | 0.0 | 7 | 1.8 | 16 | 0.0 | 5 | 0.3 | 7 | 0.5 | 9 | 0.3 | 8 |
| All U.S. | | 1.5 | 179 | 0.0 | 65 | 2.0 | 180 | 0.0 | 50 | 0.5 | 71 | 1.0 | 79 | 0.5 | 85 |
| Non-U.S. | | 1.8 | 24 | 0.0 | 11 | 2.0 | 18 | 0.5 | 10 | 1.0 | 12 | 2.0 | 17 | 1.0 | 18 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B5b. Does your institution employ analytics staff in other departments/units not listed above?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No | |  | 85% | 93% | 91% | 87% | 79% | 68% | 85% | 85% |
| Yes | |  | 15% | 7% | 9% | 13% | 21% | 32% | 15% | 15% |
| *n* | |  | 228 | 28 | 44 | 54 | 53 | 22 | 201 | 27 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B5c. How many analytics staff (FTE) are in these other departments/units?** | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Median | *n* |
| Institution type | |  |  |
| All | | 1.5 | 35 |
| AA | | 1.5 | 2 |
| BA | | 1.5 | 4 |
| MA | | 1.0 | 7 |
| DR | | 3.0 | 11 |
| Other U.S. | | 2.0 | 7 |
| All U.S. | | 1.5 | 31 |
| Non-U.S. | | 2.0 | 4 |
|  |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **B6. How many more staff (FTE) would your institution need in order to optimally provide analytics services and support?** | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Median | *n* |
| Institution type | |  |  |
| All | | 3.0 | 213 |
| AA | | 2.0 | 27 |
| BA | | 2.0 | 41 |
| MA | | 3.0 | 53 |
| DR | | 5.0 | 47 |
| Other U.S. | | 2.0 | 19 |
| All U.S. | | 3.0 | 187 |
| Non-U.S. | | 3.0 | 26 |
|  |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section C. The Use of Data at Your Institution** | | | | | | | |
| **C1. Check which option on the scale below best describes how your institution collects, stores, and/or uses the types of data listed below.** | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | We do not collect usable data. | Data are collected but not connected. | Data are systematically collected and connected. | Data are systematically connected and used. | *n* |
| Admissions system | | 0% | 24% | 27% | 49% | 241 |
| Advancement/fundraising system | | 7% | 47% | 19% | 27% | 230 |
| Customer relationship management system (admissions or recruiting focus) | | 11% | 37% | 25% | 28% | 232 |
| Customer relationship management system (alumni or donor focus) | | 15% | 48% | 20% | 17% | 222 |
| Customer relationship management system (other focus) | | 41% | 35% | 12% | 11% | 186 |
| Facilities management system | | 23% | 59% | 11% | 7% | 222 |
| Financial aid system | | 4% | 23% | 34% | 39% | 236 |
| Financial management system | | 2% | 31% | 28% | 39% | 232 |
| Human resources system | | 7% | 42% | 24% | 27% | 234 |
| IT service desk management system | | 6% | 50% | 18% | 27% | 240 |
| Learning management system | | 5% | 47% | 28% | 19% | 239 |
| Library system | | 10% | 59% | 19% | 11% | 222 |
| Procurement system | | 16% | 52% | 19% | 14% | 220 |
| Room scheduling system | | 19% | 40% | 26% | 15% | 233 |
| Housing system | | 22% | 41% | 25% | 12% | 207 |
| Student information system | | 1% | 16% | 30% | 54% | 237 |
| Integrated planning and advising services system | | 27% | 31% | 20% | 22% | 208 |
| National institutional surveys (e.g., BCSSE, CCSSE/NSSE, CIRP/YFCY) | | 14% | 40% | 21% | 25% | 195 |
| Students' behavioral data (e.g., website visits, card swipes) | | 38% | 43% | 12% | 7% | 226 |
| Students' geospatial data | | 70% | 20% | 6% | 4% | 210 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C2. Provide your best estimate of how data are being used in various functional areas of your institution.** | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | We do not collect usable data | Data are collected but are never or rarely used | We create and use analyses or reports to monitor operations or programs | We create and use analyses or reports to make projections for programs or groups | We create and use predictive analyses or reports that may trigger proactive responses | *n* |
| Student learning (real-time or on-demand assessment and feedback) | | 22% | 31% | 34% | 13% | 7% | 241 |
| Student learning (learning outcomes, course completion) | | 7% | 20% | 50% | 24% | 7% | 242 |
| Student degree planning | | 13% | 16% | 50% | 27% | 7% | 240 |
| Undergraduate student progress (retention, graduation, etc.) | | 3% | 10% | 48% | 40% | 18% | 241 |
| Graduate student progress (retention, graduation, etc.) | | 16% | 18% | 41% | 28% | 9% | 237 |
| Enrollment management, admissions, and recruiting | | 1% | 8% | 45% | 45% | 23% | 239 |
| Cost to complete a degree | | 19% | 24% | 37% | 21% | 4% | 235 |
| Time to complete a degree | | 6% | 16% | 54% | 29% | 8% | 240 |
| Instructional management (which courses need to be offered, number of sections, staffing needs) | | 11% | 21% | 47% | 26% | 8% | 239 |
| Other student objectives | | 37% | 24% | 31% | 7% | 3% | 228 |
| Progress of institutional strategic plan | | 21% | 23% | 43% | 17% | 5% | 238 |
| Alumni/development/institutional advancement | | 13% | 20% | 49% | 22% | 7% | 233 |
| Central IT | | 10% | 18% | 51% | 26% | 6% | 241 |
| Facilities | | 14% | 31% | 46% | 14% | 3% | 235 |
| Finance and budgeting | | 3% | 12% | 49% | 41% | 10% | 237 |
| Procurement | | 12% | 30% | 46% | 14% | 1% | 234 |
| Human resources | | 7% | 26% | 53% | 18% | 1% | 234 |
| Library | | 9% | 27% | 51% | 17% | 3% | 235 |
| Faculty research performance | | 29% | 22% | 39% | 12% | 2% | 231 |
| Faculty teaching performance | | 9% | 23% | 55% | 15% | 3% | 235 |
| Faculty promotion and tenure | | 9% | 22% | 55% | 15% | 3% | 234 |
| State/federal/accreditation reporting | | 6% | 7% | 60% | 31% | 7% | 238 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **C3. Are there any other areas not specified in the previous question in which your institution is using large data sets to respond to strategic initiatives or broad questions?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No | |  | 94% | 85% | 96% | 100% | 93% | 91% | 94% | 96% |
| Yes | |  | 6% | 15% | 4% | 0% | 7% | 9% | 6% | 4% |
| *n* | |  | 225 | 26 | 46 | 50 | 54 | 23 | 199 | 26 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section D. Priority of, Concerns About, and Future Plans for Analytics** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **D1. What priority does your institution place on LEARNING ANALYTICS?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Major institutional priority | |  | 23% | 21% | 19% | 25% | 25% | 17% | 22% | 32% |
| Major priority for some departments, units, or programs but not for the entire institution | |  | 26% | 41% | 8% | 28% | 25% | 17% | 23% | 43% |
| An interest of the institution but not a priority | |  | 42% | 28% | 65% | 38% | 39% | 58% | 45% | 21% |
| Intentionally not a priority or interest | |  | 3% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 5% | 4% | 3% | 0% |
| Little awareness, and therefore not a priority or interest | |  | 6% | 10% | 6% | 8% | 5% | 4% | 7% | 4% |
| *n* | |  | 238 | 29 | 48 | 53 | 56 | 24 | 210 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D2. What priority does your institution place on INSTITUTIONAL ANALYTICS?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Major institutional priority | |  | 47% | 59% | 44% | 44% | 55% | 25% | 47% | 50% |
| Major priority for some departments, units, or programs but not for the entire institution | |  | 30% | 21% | 40% | 28% | 24% | 33% | 29% | 36% |
| An interest of the institution but not a priority | |  | 20% | 17% | 17% | 26% | 16% | 42% | 22% | 11% |
| Intentionally not a priority or interest | |  | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
| Little awareness, and therefore not a priority or interest | |  | 2% | 3% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 4% |
| *n* | |  | 241 | 29 | 48 | 54 | 58 | 24 | 213 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D3. Indicate which response best describes the use of analytics in each of the following areas at your institution.** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | No discussion to date | Considered, not pursued | Experimenting/ considering | In planning | Used sparsely | Used broadly | *n* |
| Student learning (real-time or on-demand assessment and feedback) | | 15% | 16% | 25% | 14% | 20% | 11% | 238 |
| Student learning (learning outcomes, course completion) | | 4% | 11% | 22% | 13% | 23% | 27% | 234 |
| Student degree planning | | 5% | 8% | 16% | 17% | 27% | 28% | 236 |
| Undergraduate student progress (retention, graduation, etc.) | | 3% | 5% | 14% | 9% | 21% | 48% | 236 |
| Graduate student progress (retention, graduation, etc.) | | 22% | 7% | 11% | 11% | 22% | 27% | 232 |
| Enrollment management, admissions, and recruiting | | 2% | 4% | 11% | 10% | 16% | 57% | 236 |
| Cost to complete a degree | | 21% | 13% | 16% | 11% | 24% | 15% | 226 |
| Time to complete a degree | | 9% | 9% | 15% | 13% | 25% | 30% | 230 |
| Instructional management (which courses need to be offered, number of sections, staffing needs) | | 6% | 12% | 20% | 14% | 25% | 22% | 228 |
| Other student objectives | | 36% | 14% | 18% | 13% | 13% | 6% | 213 |
| Progress of institutional strategic plan | | 14% | 8% | 15% | 19% | 23% | 21% | 229 |
| Alumni/development/institutional advancement | | 10% | 11% | 15% | 19% | 23% | 22% | 228 |
| Central IT | | 11% | 9% | 15% | 15% | 28% | 22% | 237 |
| Facilities | | 19% | 13% | 16% | 17% | 23% | 12% | 223 |
| Finance and budgeting | | 5% | 3% | 12% | 16% | 25% | 39% | 231 |
| Procurement | | 22% | 9% | 16% | 15% | 27% | 12% | 222 |
| Human resources | | 12% | 7% | 18% | 18% | 29% | 16% | 229 |
| Library | | 17% | 9% | 17% | 16% | 25% | 16% | 225 |
| Faculty research performance | | 35% | 7% | 15% | 15% | 21% | 8% | 218 |
| Faculty teaching performance | | 12% | 8% | 17% | 14% | 27% | 22% | 225 |
| Faculty promotion and tenure | | 18% | 8% | 18% | 15% | 23% | 19% | 220 |
| State/federal/accreditation reporting | | 6% | 5% | 11% | 13% | 25% | 41% | 228 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D4. What level of investment has your institution made in LEARNING ANALYTICS?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Major investment | |  | 18% | 29% | 16% | 13% | 25% | 13% | 19% | 14% |
| Minor investment | |  | 41% | 36% | 24% | 50% | 45% | 29% | 39% | 54% |
| Little or no investment | |  | 41% | 36% | 60% | 37% | 30% | 58% | 43% | 32% |
| *n* | |  | 232 | 28 | 45 | 54 | 53 | 24 | 204 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D4a. Rank the top 3 factors that motivated your institution to invest in LEARNING ANALYTICS.** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Attempt to reengineer business processes | |  | 11% | 17% | 6% | 12% | 9% | 0% | 10% | 17% |
| Attempt to optimize resources | |  | 22% | 17% | 24% | 18% | 24% | 30% | 21% | 28% |
| Attempt to improve the quality of administrative services | |  | 11% | 11% | 6% | 12% | 9% | 20% | 11% | 11% |
| Attempt to contain or reduce costs | |  | 8% | 11% | 12% | 9% | 6% | 10% | 9% | 0% |
| Attempt to generate revenue | |  | 8% | 6% | 12% | 3% | 12% | 0% | 7% | 11% |
| Attempt to demonstrate higher education's effectiveness/efficiency to external audiences (parents and students, government, media, etc.) | |  | 35% | 17% | 47% | 36% | 32% | 60% | 36% | 33% |
| Attempt to create greater transparency, sharing/federation of data | |  | 8% | 0% | 6% | 12% | 12% | 10% | 9% | 6% |
| Attempt to reduce students' time to degree | |  | 35% | 39% | 12% | 42% | 41% | 50% | 38% | 22% |
| Attempt to attract more students | |  | 17% | 17% | 24% | 15% | 12% | 20% | 16% | 22% |
| Attempt to reach a different or broader segment of students | |  | 10% | 17% | 24% | 0% | 9% | 0% | 9% | 17% |
| Attempt to understand the demographics and behaviors of a changing student population | |  | 29% | 50% | 47% | 15% | 29% | 20% | 30% | 22% |
| Attempt to decrease student dropout rate or improve retention | |  | 64% | 72% | 71% | 70% | 65% | 50% | 67% | 44% |
| Attempt to improve student course-level performance | |  | 36% | 28% | 12% | 52% | 35% | 20% | 34% | 50% |
| Attempt to improve faculty productivity | |  | 4% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 3% | 10% | 3% | 11% |
| *n* | |  | 130 | 18 | 17 | 33 | 34 | 10 | 112 | 18 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: Percentage of respondents ranking item in top 3 | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D5. What level of investment has your institution made in INSTITUTIONAL ANALYTICS?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Major investment | |  | 37% | 45% | 31% | 38% | 50% | 25% | 39% | 18% |
| Minor investment | |  | 43% | 31% | 42% | 48% | 36% | 42% | 40% | 61% |
| Little or no investment | |  | 21% | 24% | 27% | 13% | 14% | 33% | 20% | 21% |
| *n* | |  | 234 | 29 | 45 | 52 | 56 | 24 | 206 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D5a. Rank the top 3 factors that motivated your institution to invest in INSTITUTIONAL ANALYTICS.** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Attempt to reengineer business processes | |  | 23% | 23% | 12% | 27% | 26% | 25% | 23% | 20% |
| Attempt to optimize resources | |  | 43% | 23% | 55% | 45% | 43% | 31% | 42% | 45% |
| Attempt to improve the quality of administrative services | |  | 25% | 14% | 24% | 27% | 28% | 44% | 27% | 10% |
| Attempt to contain or reduce costs | |  | 29% | 23% | 33% | 20% | 30% | 38% | 28% | 40% |
| Attempt to generate revenue | |  | 11% | 5% | 18% | 9% | 7% | 0% | 9% | 30% |
| Attempt to demonstrate higher education's effectiveness/efficiency to external audiences (parents and students, government, media, etc.) | |  | 36% | 23% | 30% | 36% | 41% | 31% | 34% | 50% |
| Attempt to create greater transparency, sharing/federation of data | |  | 28% | 27% | 24% | 25% | 26% | 44% | 27% | 30% |
| Attempt to reduce students' time to degree | |  | 13% | 23% | 3% | 9% | 24% | 0% | 13% | 10% |
| Attempt to attract more students | |  | 19% | 18% | 30% | 18% | 13% | 19% | 19% | 15% |
| Attempt to reach a different or broader segment of students | |  | 4% | 5% | 6% | 7% | 0% | 6% | 4% | 0% |
| Attempt to understand the demographics and behaviors of a changing student population | |  | 25% | 41% | 21% | 30% | 17% | 25% | 25% | 20% |
| Attempt to decrease student dropout rate or improve retention | |  | 34% | 59% | 30% | 39% | 35% | 19% | 37% | 10% |
| Attempt to improve student course-level performance | |  | 6% | 18% | 3% | 5% | 4% | 6% | 6% | 0% |
| Attempt to improve faculty productivity | |  | 3% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 15% |
| *n* | |  | 181 | 22 | 33 | 44 | 46 | 16 | 161 | 20 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: Percentage of respondents ranking item in top 3 | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D6. Would any strategic priorities at your institution benefit from the use of data, regardless of whether data are actually being collected or used for analytics now?** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| No | |  | 10% | 14% | 6% | 5% | 10% | 17% | 9% | 14% |
| Yes | |  | 90% | 86% | 94% | 95% | 90% | 83% | 91% | 86% |
| *n* | |  | 243 | 28 | 48 | 56 | 59 | 24 | 215 | 28 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D7. To what extent do you see the following as concerns about the use of data or analytics in higher education?** | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Not a concern | Minor concern | Moderate concern | Major concern | *n* |
| The data used for analytics aren't always accurate. | | 5% | 29% | 43% | 23% | 241 |
| The data will be misused wrong conclusions will be drawn. | | 6% | 22% | 43% | 30% | 242 |
| Student privacy rights will be breached. | | 17% | 40% | 30% | 13% | 243 |
| Faculty privacy rights will be breached. | | 22% | 42% | 25% | 12% | 243 |
| Staff privacy rights will be breached. | | 25% | 46% | 21% | 9% | 243 |
| Analytics solution providers (vendors) will have access to data. | | 23% | 40% | 25% | 12% | 240 |
| Analytics solution providers (vendors) will claim to own and will profit from analytics models/algorithms/solutions based on our data. | | 28% | 30% | 25% | 18% | 237 |
| We must have an exit strategy/contingency plan when changing vendors becomes necessary. | | 12% | 26% | 30% | 32% | 236 |
| Institutions will be reliant on blackbox algorithms to inform decisions about students, faculty, or strategic priorities. | | 16% | 38% | 31% | 16% | 237 |
| Institutions will be dependent on the quality of vendor algorithms that they don't fully understand. | | 15% | 31% | 31% | 22% | 239 |
| Government regulations will be imposed, requiring more reporting on performance metrics. | | 6% | 26% | 36% | 32% | 239 |
| Government regulations will be imposed, requiring reporting on questionable/flawed performance metrics. | | 7% | 22% | 35% | 36% | 238 |
| Institutions won't be able to afford to implement analytics effectively. | | 2% | 15% | 35% | 48% | 238 |
| Institutions that don't invest in analytics will be at a significant strategic disadvantage. | | 7% | 14% | 39% | 40% | 236 |
| There will not be a sufficient return on investment; the money would be better spent elsewhere. | | 21% | 33% | 31% | 16% | 238 |
| What we do in higher education can't be measured. | | 51% | 29% | 17% | 3% | 235 |
| The higher education community doesn't know how to use data to make decisions. | | 20% | 28% | 35% | 16% | 237 |
| This is another means of running higher education like a business, and that's the wrong model for higher education. | | 49% | 30% | 17% | 4% | 237 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Note: “Don’t know” responses omitted from table | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D8. Please rank order the analytics benchmarking comparisons that would be of most value to your institution.** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | | Institution type | | | | | | | |
| All | AA | BA | MA | DR | Other U.S. | All U.S. | Non-U.S. |
| Comparison of my institution over time | |  | 79% | 81% | 79% | 72% | 82% | 88% | 79% | 78% |
| Comparison of my institution to an ideal | |  | 39% | 41% | 45% | 46% | 28% | 25% | 38% | 48% |
| Comparison of my institution to our peer institutions | |  | 84% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 84% | 88% | 85% | 78% |
| Comparison of my institution to our aspirational peer institutions | |  | 78% | 63% | 79% | 76% | 93% | 75% | 79% | 63% |
| Comparison of my institution to industry | |  | 17% | 15% | 13% | 19% | 9% | 25% | 15% | 33% |
| *n* | |  | 236 | 27 | 47 | 54 | 57 | 24 | 209 | 27 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: Percentage of respondents ranking item in top 3 | | | | | | | | | | | |