CHEITA Benchmarking Case Study Results

Interactive data collection and reporting portals at EDUCAUSE

Leah Lang, Director of Analytics Services, EDUCAUSE

December 13, 2017
CHEITA IT Benchmarking Group Members

- **Paul Sherlock**, CIO, University of South Australia
- **Anne Kealley**, CEO, CAUDIT
- **Lori MacMullen**, Executive Director, Canadian University Council of Chief Information Officers (CUCCIO)
- **Leah Lang**, Director of Analytic Services, EDUCAUSE
- **Johan Bergström**, Project Leader, Umeå University, Sweden
- **Peter Tinson**, Executive Director, UCISA, UK
CHEITA Benchmarking Project Goals

• Provide a method or process to identify international peer institutions
  • Explore the CAUDIT Complexity Index as a possible approach to comparing institutions internationally
  • Develop a version of the Complexity Index to facilitate benchmarking
• Develop a small set of metrics which can be used to benchmark internationally (to be confirmed).
National and Regional Benchmarking Models
The CHEITA Global Complexity Index (GCI)

- Modeled after the CAUDIT Complexity Index
- Based on three key factors:
  - Student FTE
  - Staff FTE
  - Research Income
- Uses Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) to compare financial data across international boundaries
- Has a “predictive” quality
- More details at http://www.cheita.org/publicationsresources/benchmarking/
Global Complexity Index - Peer Group

- University of South Australia
- Carleton University
- University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
- University of Texas at San Antonio

- Staff component of CI
- Student component of CI
- Research component of CI
Total institutional income

University of South Australia: $419,815,107
Carleton University: $460,679,815
University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee: $532,329,299
University of Texas at San Antonio: $502,587,476
Age

- University of South Australia: 25
- Carleton University: 75
- University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee: 61
- University of Texas at San Antonio: 48
2016 Times Higher Education Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of South Australia</th>
<th>Carleton University</th>
<th>University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee</th>
<th>University of Texas at San Antonio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarities

- Upwardly mobile
- Strong outreach component
- Online learning ambitions
- Money is a scarce
- IT quality measures already adopted
Total IT Expenditure (USD)

University of South Australia
Carleton University
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
University of Texas at San Antonio
Degree of centralization of spending

- University of South Australia: Centralized IT spending
- Carleton University: Centralized IT spending
- University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee: Centralized IT spending
- University of Texas at San Antonio: Centralized IT spending
Total IT Staff (FTE)
Degree of centralization of staff

- University of South Australia: 150.00 (Centralized IT Staff (FTE)) + 50.00 (Decentralized IT Staff (FTE)) = 200.00
- Carleton University: 100.00 (Centralized IT Staff (FTE)) + 50.00 (Decentralized IT Staff (FTE)) = 150.00
- University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee: 100.00 (Centralized IT Staff (FTE)) + 50.00 (Decentralized IT Staff (FTE)) = 150.00
- University of Texas at San Antonio: 200.00 (Centralized IT Staff (FTE)) + 100.00 (Decentralized IT Staff (FTE)) = 300.00
Next Steps

1. Finalize paper and publish
2. Continue the conversation with peer institutions
3. Add CGCI to tools like EDUCAUSE Core Data Service and Transnational Benchmarking
4. Develop CGCI look-up tool on CHEITA website
Tools for Better Decision Making

Campus leaders use EDUCAUSE assessment and benchmarking services to plan for and manage IT service delivery, financials, security and risk, technology-supported learning, and digital initiatives.

EDUCAUSE SERVICES

ASSESSMENT

Learning Space Rating System
Measure how classroom design supports and enables active learning

Information Security Program Assessment Tool
Evaluate the maturity of your information security program

IT Risk Register
Identify common risks to support your strategic IT risk-management program

BENCHMARKING

Technology Research in the Academic Community
Track student and faculty technology needs and experiences

Core Data Service
Compare peer and aspirant data for IT financials, staffing, and services

Benchmarking Service
Measure technical and cultural capability for digital initiatives like student success
Assess and benchmark your institution's digital capabilities.

Core Data Service

*Compare peer and aspirant data for IT financials, staffing, and services*

www.educause.edu/coredata

FREE to all!

Due October 13!
Take the survey

Welcome, Leah Lang | EDUCAUSE

Core Data Services > Add Data

SURVEY ACTIONS

Resources

FAQ    Glossary    IT domain definitions    Survey question overview

Refresh page

Data entered in a module is saved when you click next, back, or close the window. Module progress on this page is updated every 15 minutes. However, you may need to refresh this page to see the most recent update. This page has been refreshed as of 10 minutes ago.

IT ORGANIZATION, STAFFING, AND FINANCING

Questions about central IT organization, staffing, and financing. This module is offered annually and is required for all participants.

View Responses

Continue Module

My institution plans to complete this module.  

Author

Leah Lang
Director of Analytics Services
EDUCAUSE

Status: In Progress

The module progress indicator on the Add Data page and CDS Dashboard is unavailable at this time. We are working on restoring this functionality and apologize for any inconvenience.

Resources:

- CDS 2017 module
- FTE Calculator
- Survey Guide
- Question Assignment Spreadsheet
Get the data
Total central IT spending per institutional FTE (students, faculty, and staff) vs. total central IT spending as a percentage of institutional expenses

Median total central IT spending per institutional FTE (students, faculty, and staff)
(all nonspecialized U.S. median = $993)
Analytics Maturity

5: Optimized
4: Established
3: Developing
2: Initial
1: Absent

IR involvement: 3.7
Technical Infrastructure: 3.3
Policies: 3.4
Investment/resources: 2.8
Data efficacy: 3.4
Decision-making culture: 3.4

Composite: 3.3
Enterprise Application Market

- Customer relationship management
- Business intelligence reporting
- IT service desk management
- Web content management
- Data warehouse
- Human resources information
- E-mail: faculty/staff
- Room scheduling
- Admissions: undergraduate
- Facilities management
- Grants management: preaward
- E-mail: student
- Learning management
- Procurement
- Grants management: postaward
- Advancement/fundraising
- Library
- Financial management
- Student information
- Financial aid

System area rate of change:

- Mean year of implementation

Systems customized: 0% - 100%
Systems outsourced: 0% - 100%