



## STATISTICS WORKING PARTY

### Commentary on the Higher Education Information Technology Statistics collected for 2004/2005

1. Following an initial pilot study in 1996/97, this is the eighth 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 55% of institutions submitting a reply. 83 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 2004/2005 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:

$$\frac{\text{Total institutional IT/IS expenditure in 2004/05}}{\text{Total institutional recurrent expenditure in 2004/05}} \times 100$$

Including data from only those institutions which supplied both figures.


10. Summary statistics have been included for the sixth 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. Other data shown in italics in the tables do not comply with the standard definition of that element, and are excluded from the summary calculations.

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:

Peter Tinson-UCISA Executive Secretary (execsec@ucisa.ac.uk)

	2004/2005 Higher Education Information Technology Statistics (HEITS) Summary							
	Total	Number of responses	Maximum	Upper Quartile	Median	Lower Quartile	Minimum	Mean
IT Spend:								
% total spend		63	10.8	6.9	5.8	4.6	1.4	5.6
per FTE student (£)		63	3,764	735	507	381	149	632
per FTE staff (£)		55	11,118	4,081	3,496	2,860	834	3,576
per workstation (£)		53	4,646	1,938	1,531	1,245	420	1,651
Users per workstation:								
total staff		53	1.6	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.9
academic staff		39	10.8	1.1	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.0
support staff		34	2.2	1.2	0.9	0.7	0.4	1.0
students		67	13.9	9.3	7.4	6.1	2.3	7.7
Workstation hours per year per student*		54	2,153	617	416	302	40	529
Total institutional recurrent expenditure (£'000)	11,993,572	83	692,916	153,847	116,768	75,570	10,300	144,501
FTE students	1,048,903	83	28,655	16,449	12,213	8,274	576	12,637
FTE staff:								
Total	142,188	61	6,180	2,900	2,070	1,496	118	2,331
Academic	88,577	83	3,886	1,258	854	580	0	1,067
Support	57,436	57	2,634	1,260	916	592	85	1,008
Total institutional IT/IS expenditure (£'000)	468,515	63	24,000	9,352	6,500	4,226	434	7,437
Expenditure on central IT staff (£'000)	167,088	57	14,400	3,565	2,605	1,955	260	2,931
Institutional workstations:								
for students	114,663	67	4,600	2,137	1,500	1,083	141	1,711
for academic staff	48,174	41	3,800	1,603	1,200	521	0	1,175
for support staff	29,157	34	3,000	1,151	773	359	30	858
for all staff	165,931	66	8,748	3,165	2,157	1,293	250	2,514
total (staff + students)	258,944	63	10,996	5,437	3,895	2,353	391	4,110
Student computer lab availability (million hours)	309	54	25.0	6.2	4.6	3.1	0.5	5.7
% students owning/having use of own computer		59	99	87	80	70	15	76
Hours of central IT training:								
staff	181,248	66	21,000	4,154	1,662	861	0	2,746
students credit-bearing	48,392	42	9,328	473	0	0	0	1,152
students non-credit bearing	141,197	52	20,360	4,334	1,555	60	0	2,769
IT training hours:								
per 100 students		48	537.9	37.1	13.8	1.5	0.0	45.2
per staff		55	4.2	1.5	1.1	0.5	0.0	1.2

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