



STATISTICS WORKING PARTY

Commentary on the Higher Education Information Technology Statistics collected for 2005/2006

1. Following an initial pilot study in 1996/97, this is the ninth 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 88 institutional returns included in the published statistics. These 88 institutions accounted for 67% of UK FTE students. We are very grateful to all those who contributed to this year's exercise.

	2005/06 respondents	UCISA UK HE members	Total UK HE
Number of institutions	88	139	168
Total FTE students	1,153,778	1,665,306	1,710,877
Total FTE academic staff	95,193	131,692	134,745
Total institutional expenditure (£m)	13,688	18,859	19,312

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 2005/2006 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:

$$\frac{\text{Total institutional IT/IS expenditure in 2005/06}}{\text{Total institutional recurrent expenditure in 2005/06}} \times 100$$

Including data from only those institutions which supplied both figures.

10. Summary statistics have been included for the seventh 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.
12. 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)