

UCISA HEITS Statistical Return 2002 - 2003

August 2004

(Updated May 2005)

The results of the seventh year of UCISA's Higher Education Information Technology Statistics exercise are available here.

A more detailed analysis of Trends in HEITS over the last four years has been commissioned from LISU. Access to this file is restricted to UCISA members only.

A number of significant trends has been observed, including:

- IS/IT Directors are increasingly also managing MIS, telecommunications and AV services. The largest increase is in the management of MIS, which has increased by 28% - over 90% of Directors now also manage this area. The proportion of services operated independently of library services has fallen, to 48% of the total.
- Central IT/IS spending on staff per FTE student has increased by 5.6% over the last year, and by 53% over six years, compared to increases of 0.4% and 19% respectively in Central IT/IS staff numbers. This compares to an increase of 22.3% in the Index of Average Earnings over the period of 1998-2003.
- Central provision of workstations for students has risen by 21% over the last six years, with little change in the central provision for staff. There is now an average of 8.6 FTE students per student workstation, and 1.1 staff per staff workstation.
- The average life of workstations is generally considered to be between 3 and 5 years, and the mean across institutions has fallen slightly over the last six years, to 3.8 years. The average age of workstations in use has changed little over the period, and is currently 2.5 years.
- Student ownership of PCs is estimated to have doubled since 1997-98, with over 70% of students now thought to own their own PC. In line with this increase, the percentage of rooms in halls of residence with network connections has also doubled, to 55% in 2002-03. Half of all institutions have at least 70% of their student residences connected to the network, but 23% still have none.
- The average number of pages printed per FTE student has increased by 50% over the last six years. The average price charged per page has fallen slightly, to 4.7p, mainly due to reductions in the highest charging institutions.
- Training provision varies between institutions, particularly in the amount of provision for students. There have been slight falls in the training hours per staff member over the last six years, most notably since 2000-01. The picture for student training is more variable, with those few institutions making extensive (often credit-bearing) provision increasing, while the rest have cut back.

The trends analysis was carried out by Claire Creaser and Sonya White of the Library and Information Statistics Unit (LISU) at Loughborough University.



Commentary on HEITS 2002/2003 (for the year ending 31 July 2003)

UNIVERSITY & COLLEGES INFORMATION SYSTEMS ASSOCIATION

STATISTICS WORKING PARTY

Commentary on the Higher Education Information Technology Statistics collected for 2002/2003.

1. Following an initial pilot study in 1996/97, this is the sixth full year in which UCISA has attempted to obtain comparative statistics for Information Technology service providers in Higher Education.
2. UCISA's Statistics Working Party has liaised closely with SCONUL's Advisory Committee on Performance Improvement (ACPI) on common definitions and categories etc. UCISA has also employed the services of LISU at Loughborough University in the interpretation of these statistics.
3. The exercise aimed to gather statistics on Information Technology across whole institutions. However, it is accepted that many respondents had accurate information only for the centrally provided element of information technology services and that departmental information could only be provided on the basis of best endeavour. The problems of collecting this type of information across the whole institution are acknowledged.
4. The exercise was voluntary and the response rate this year is slightly higher than last year with 70% of institutions submitting a reply. 99 institutional returns are included in the published statistics. We are very grateful to all those who contributed to this year's exercise.
5. ***All the figures should be interpreted with caution. Institutions vary widely in the way in which Information Services are organised and simplistic comparisons can be very misleading. Again this year there is a separate section containing the explanatory notes and background information provided by the institutions when submitting the form. It is advisable to consult these notes before attempting to make any appropriate comparisons.***
6. The information gathered has allowed certain ratios to be calculated which largely follow those recommended in the Funding Councils' Value for Money Study on Information Systems and Technology Management. These derived ratios are the same as those obtained last year, allowing possible comparisons to be made.
7. HESA have allowed us access to their data submitted by institutions for the 2002/2003 round of data collection and some relevant HESA figures, for academic staff and student FTE numbers, are included here. The return sought details of non-academic staff.
8. Not all institutions submitted a complete return and so blanks in the derived ratios indicate that one or more of the relevant data elements are missing.

9. Overall means in the derived ratios are weighted. This means they are not the column total divided by the number of items. They are calculated as shown in the example taking care to exclude cases where data are not available for all of the relevant variables. Those means included in the Trends section are also weighted.

Example: IT expenditure as a percentage of total expenditure was calculated as:

$$\frac{\text{Total institutional IT/IS expenditure in 2002/03}}{\text{Total institutional recurrent expenditure in 2002/03}} \times 100$$

Including data from only those institutions which supplied both figures.

10. Summary statistics have been included for the fourth year. These statistics consist of the minimum value, lower quartile, median, upper quartile and the maximum value as well as the mean. This is a useful way for institutions to see where they are placed compared to others. However, it is advisable to consult the explanatory notes before attempting to make any comparisons.
- 11 In those instances when a query arises with an institution's return, the respondent is contacted in an attempt to ensure that the statistics presented are as accurate as possible. In some cases, it has not been possible to resolve the query without causing undue delay to the publication of the statistics; affected figures are given in italics in the main data spreadsheet and are omitted from the summary figures and the trend analysis.

Management Statistics included:

- (a) Total IT/IS spend as percentage of total institutional recurrent expenditure
- (b) IT/IS spend per FTE student
- (c) IT/IS spend per FTE staff (all staff)
- (d) IT/IS spend per workstation
- (e) Staff per staff workstation
- (f) Academic staff per academic staff workstation
- (g) Support staff per support staff workstation
- (h) Students per student workstation
- (i) Workstation hours per year per 100 students
- (j) IT training hours per student
- (k) IT training hours per member of staff

Further information is available from:

Martin Price-UCISA Executive Secretary (execsec@ucisa.ac.uk)

Simon Marsden-Chair of UCISA Statistics Working Party (simon.marsden@ed.ac.uk)



2002/2003 Higher Education Information Technology Statistics (HEITS) Summary

	Total	Number of responses	Maximum	Upper Quartile	Median	Lower Quartile	Minimum	Mean
IT Spend:								
% total spend		72	11.8	6.9	5.3	4.2	1.7	5.3
per FTE student (£)		74	2,785	625	448	272	89	474
per FTE staff (£)		54	12,444	3,362	2,858	2,228	587	2,812
per workstation (£)		61	6,770	1,792	1,475	1,168	310	1,525
Users per workstation:								
total staff		53	1.7	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.5	0.9
academic staff		54	1.8	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.8
support staff		41	9.2	1.2	0.9	0.8	0.5	1.0
students		79	21.4	9.5	7.4	6.4	2.5	7.7
Workstation hours per year per student*		63	4,807	595	395	230	35	451
Total institutional recurrent expenditure (£'000)	11,512,328	97	467,175	133,345	99,170	65,893	7,853	118,684
FTE students	1,230,904	98	30,686	17,512	12,172	7,524	659	12,560
FTE staff:								
Total	135,495	65	7,545	2,570	1,902	938	200	2,085
Academic	96,210	98	4,688	1,183	810	468	74	982
Support	62,241	69	3,289	1,161	823	422	80	902
Total institutional IT/IS expenditure (£'000)	445,722	74	20,000	7,576	5,055	3,105	135	6,023
Expenditure on central IT staff (£'000)	144,275	67	5,640	2,723	2,018	1,297	205	2,153
Institutional workstations:								
for students	124,825	79	5,000	2,108	1,500	900	122	1,580
for academic staff	57,948	54	8,000	1,245	841	374	93	1,073
for support staff	45,962	52	2,878	1,125	827	308	20	884
for all staff	153,104	71	12,000	2,832	1,920	965	167	2,156
total (staff + students)	259,433	72	14,750	4,563	3,483	1,801	289	3,603
Student computer lab availability (million hours)	350	63	47.0	6.1	4.0	2.5	0.1	5.6
% students owning/having use of own computer		65	99	84	71	50	10	68
Hours of central IT training:								
staff	286,001	76	38,400	3,751	1,580	1,000	0	3,763
students credit-bearing	123,102	67	34,930	89	0	0	0	1,837
students non-credit bearing	149,257	71	23,400	2,326	650	0	0	2,102
IT training hours:								
per 100 students		72	848.4	35.2	10.6	1.3	0.0	29.5
per staff		55	5.6	2.1	1.3	0.7	0.0	1.4

* workstation hours per year per student is calculated as the institutional workstation availability in student computer rooms per student