



## Student Information Systems, Collection of Grades, Application for Degree, and Degree Audit Functions

We thank the Office of the Registrar at Georgia Tech and the Georgia Tech Athletic Association for their permission to publish this report. The survey was done at their request by AACRAO Consulting in summer 2007.

One of two reports from the survey, this report summarizes results for all 509 institutions for which we received responses. (The other report summarizes results of the special section exclusively for those respondents from institutions that belong to the NCAA; that is also posted on the AACRAO Web site.)

### **STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS USED**

When asked what student information system they currently use, respondents indicated the following, in descending order of frequency:

- Sungard SCT (159 or 35.3%),
- Jenzabar (87 or 19.3%),
- Datatel (76 or 16.9%),
- In-house/Homegrown (52 or 11.6%)
- Oracle/PeopleSoft (43 or 9.6%).
- CAMS (15 or 3.3%) (Note that these were written in by respondents who marked “other.”)
- Scholastic Online Information System (SONIS) or SONIS Web (10 or 2.2%). (Note that these were written in by respondents who marked “other.”)
- CampusVue (8 or 1.8%) (Note that these were written in by respondents who marked “other.” (89 or 18% of respondents marked “other.”)
- SAP (1)

#### *Student Information Systems Used, by Institution Size*

	Sungard SCT	Jenzabar	Datatel	In-House/ Home-grown	Oracle/ People Soft	CAMS	SONIS/ SONIS Web	Campus Vue
Under 1,000	15 (17%)	30 (34.1%)	3 (3.4%)	10 (11.4%)	4 (4.5%)	10 (11.4%)	10 (11.4%)	6 (6.8%)
1,000-4,999	65 (31.4%)	50 (24.2%)	60 (29%)	11 (5.3%)	14 (6.8%)	5 (2.4%)		2 (1%)
5,000-9,999	37 (57.8%)	5 (7.8%)	9 (14%)	8 (12.5%)	5 (7.8%)			
10,000-19,999	24 (48%)	2 (4%)	3 (6%)	11 (22%)	10 (20%)			
20,000+	18 (43.9%)		1 (2.4%)	12 (29.3%)	10 (24.4%)			

*Student Information Systems Used, by Institution Type*

	Sungard SCT	Jenzabar	Datatel	In-House/ Home- grown	Oracle/ People Soft	CAMS	SONIS/ SONIS Web	Campus Vue
Private, FP, 2-yr				2 (50%)				2 (50%)
Private, FP, 4-yr	1 (5.9%)	3 (17.6%)	1 (5.9%)		7 (41.2%)		2 (11.8%)	3 (17.6%)
Private, NFP, 2- yr	1 (16.7%)			1 (16.7%)		3 (50%)	1 (16.7%)	
Private, NFP, 4- yr	70 (28.6%)	76 (31%)	56 (22.9%)	17 (6.9%)	5 (2%)	12 (4.9%)	6 (2.4%)	3 (1.2%)
Public 2- yr	20 (40.8%)	4 (8.2%)	10 (20.4%)	7 (14.3%)	7 (14.3%)		1 (2%)	
Public 4- yr	67 (51.9%)	4 (3.1%)	9 (7%)	25 (19.4%)	24 (18.6%)			

Eighty-nine respondents indicated that they use a system not mentioned in the given choices. Some of these appear above, if they were mentioned frequently. Others are listed as follows:

Blackbaud (4)	Computing Options (1)
Empower (4)	Comspec/Empower (1)
Scan (4)	PowerCampus (1, converting to it)
TOLEMAC (4)	ECAMS (1)
Campus Management (2)	EDC-Univers (1)
CARS (2)	Education Edge (1)
Champlain (2)	Empower by Comspect International (1)
FX Scholar (2)	GradPro by RobinSoft Inc (1)
Grad Pro (2)	IA (1)
ISRS (2)	Informix (1)
POISE (2)	local system (1)
SIS Plus (2)	Modified Information Associate (1)
Ala Quest (1)	Pre-SIS Plus IDMS Database (1)
APECS (1) but is moving to SCT	SMS (1)
CMDS (1)	state-sponsored system (1)
COCO (1)	Thoroughbred Alaquest (1)
	Universe (1)

## USE OF AN ELECTRONIC PROCESS TO COLLECT GRADES

When asked if they use an electronic process to collect grade changes, 93 institutions (18%) answered yes. The majority (415 institutions, or 82% of respondents) do not use an electronic process for grade changes.

Of those 82 institutions that answered “yes”:

- 44 institutions (54%) indicated that the module was written by their SIS vendor;
- 31 institutions (38%) indicated that their module was written on campus; and
- 6 institutions (7%) indicated that their module was a consultant’s custom solution.

### *Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Grades, By Type of Institution*

Type of Institution	Yes	No
Private, for-profit, 2-yr (5)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
Private, for-profit, 4-yr+ (21)	5 (23.8%)	16 (76.2%)
Private, not-for-profit, 2-yr (7)	0	7 (100%)
Private, not-for-profit, 4-yr+ (281)	47 (16.7%)	234 (83.3%)
Public 2-yr (59)	9 (15.3%)	50 (84.7%)
Public 4-yr+ (135)	30 (22.2%)	105 (77.8%)

### *Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Grades, By Size of Institution*

Size of Institution	Yes	No
Under 1,000 (120)	16 (13.3%)	104 (86.7%)
1,000-4,999 (220)	37 (16.8%)	183 (83.2%)
5,000-9,999 (71)	9 (12.7%)	62 (87.3%)
10,000-19,999 (52)	18 (34.6%)	34 (65.4%)
20,000+ (45)	13 (28.9%)	32 (71.1%)

## USE OF AN ELECTRONIC PROCESS TO COLLEGE MAJOR AND/OR MINOR CHANGES

When asked if they use an electronic process to collect major and/or minor changes, the majority of institutions (424, or 83%) said no, and 83 institutions (16%) said yes.

Of those that use an electronic process to collect major and/or minor changes:

- 47 institutions (57%) had their module written on campus;
- 32 institutions (39%) had their module written by their SIS vendor; and
- 4 institutions (4.8%) indicated their module was a consultant's custom solution.

*Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Major and/or Minor Changes, by Type of Institution*

Type of Institution	Yes	No
Private, for-profit, 2-yr (5)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
Private, for-profit, 4-yr+ (21)	6 (28.6%)	15 (71.4%)
Private, not-for-profit, 2-yr (7)	0	7 (100%)
Private, not-for-profit, 4-yr+ (280)	34 (12.1%)	246 (87.9%)
Public 2-yr (59)	10 (16.9%)	49 (83.1%)
Public 4-yr (135)	31 (23%)	104 (77%)

*Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Major and/or Minor Changes, by Size of Institution*

Size of Institution	Yes	No
Under 1,000 (119)	15 (12.6%)	104 (87.4%)
1,000-4,999 (220)	25 (11.4%)	195 (88.6%)
5,000-9,999 (71)	9 (12.7%)	62 (87.3%)
10,000-19,999 (52)	14 (26.9%)	38 (73.1%)
20,000+ (45)	20 (44.4%)	25 (55.6%)

## USE OF AN ELECTRONIC PROCESS TO COLLECT APPLICATIONS FOR A DEGREE

When asked if they use an electronic process to collect applications for degree, the majority (386 institutions, or 76%) said no, and 117 institutions (23%) answered yes.

Of those institutions that do use an electronic process to collect applications for degree:

- 66 (56%) had their module written on campus;
- 41 (35%) had their module written by their SIS vendor; and
- 7 institutions (6%) indicated their module was a consultant's custom solution.

### *Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Applications for a Degree, by Type of Institution*

Type of Institution	Yes	No
Private, for-profit, 2-yr (5)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
Private, for-profit, 4-yr+ (21)	5 (23.8%)	16 (76.2%)
Private, not-for-profit, 2-yr (7)	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)
Private, not-for-profit, 4-yr+ (277)	54 (19.5%)	223 (80.5%)
Public 2-yr (59)	10 (16.9%)	49 (83.1%)
Public 4-yr (134)	43 (32.1%)	91 (67.9%)

### *Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Applications for a Degree, by Size of Institution*

Size of Institution	Yes	No
Under 1,000 (118)	17 (14.4%)	101 (85.6%)
1,000-4,999 (219)	44 (20%)	175 (80%)
5,000-9,999 (71)	20 (28.2%)	51 (71.8%)
10,000-19,999 (50)	16 (32%)	34 (68%)
20,000+ (45)	20 (44.4%)	25 (55.6%)

## USE OF AN ELECTRONIC PROCESS TO COLLECT COURSE GRADES

The majority of institutions (388, or 76%) use an electronic process to collect course grades; 119 institutions (23%) do not.

For the schools that do use an electronic process to collect course grades:

- 301 (78%) had their module written by their SIS vendor;
- 56 institutions (11%) had their module written on campus; and
- 7 institutions (1.4%) indicated that their module was a consultant's custom solution.

### *Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Course Grades, by Type of Institution*

Type of Institution	Yes	No
Private, for-profit, 2-yr (5)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)
Private, for-profit, 4-yr+ (21)	18 (85.7%)	3 (14.3%)
Private, not-for-profit, 2-yr (7)	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)
Private, not-for-profit, 4-yr+ (280)	200 (71.4%)	80 (28.6%)
Public 2-yr (59)	51 (86.4%)	8 (13.6%)
Public 4-yr (135)	115 (85.2%)	20 (14.8%)

### Use of an Electronic Process to Collect Course Grades, by Size of Institution

Size of Institution	Yes	No
Under 1,000 (119)	60 (50.4%)	59 (49.6%)
1,000-4,999 (220)	181 (82.3%)	39 (17.7%)
5,000-9,999 (71)	63 (88.7%)	8 (11.3%)
10,000-19,999 (52)	47 (90.4%)	5 (9.6%)
20,000+ (45)	37 (82.2%)	8 (17.8%)

# Degree Audit

## USE OF AN ELECTRONIC DEGREE AUDIT SYSTEM

When asked if they are live with an electronic degree audit system, most schools (304, or 60%) answered yes, while 202 schools (40%) answered no.

### *Use of an Electronic Degree Audit System, by Type of Institution*

Type of Institution	Yes	No
Private, for-profit, 2-yr (5)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)
Private, for-profit, 4-yr+ (21)	11 (52.4%)	10 (47.6%)
Private, not-for-profit, 2-yr (7)	1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)
Private, not-for-profit, 4-yr+ (279)	149 (53.4%)	130 (46.6%)
Public 2-yr (59)	36 (61%)	23 (39%)
Public 4-yr (135)	104 (77%)	31 (23%)

### *Use of an Electronic Degree Audit System, by Size of Institution*

Size of Institution	Yes	No
Under 1,000 (119)	43 (36.1%)	76 (63.9%)
1,000-4,999 (220)	128 (58.2%)	92 (41.8%)
5,000-9,999 (71)	50 (70.4%)	21 (29.6%)
10,000-19,999 (52)	43 (82.7%)	9 (17.3%)
20,000+ (44)	40 (90.9%)	4 (9.1%)

Of the 304 schools that are live with an electronic degree audit system:

- 63 institutions (21%) use CAPP
- 50 institutions (16%) use Datatel (These were marked as “Other” and written in the following forms: Datatel, Datatel’s Degree Audit, Degree Audit, Datatel Colleague, DA module within Datatel, Datatel Program Eval, Datatel’s Product, Degree Audit Module in Colleague, Datatel vendor)
- 35 institutions (12%) use DARS;
- 32 institutions (11%) use Jenzabar (These were marked as “Other” and written in the following forms: Jenzabar. Jenzabar CX, Jenzabar Advising Module, Jenzabar POISE Degree Audit, Jenzabar PX, Jenzabar’s Built-In System, Jenzabar CX Degree Audit, Jenzabar Degree Audit, Jenzabar Software that includes Degree Audit in its Advising module)
- 31 institutions (10%) use an In-house/Homegrown system;

- 16 institutions (5%) use PeopleSoft/Oracle (These were marked as “Other” and written in the following forms: PeopleSoft/Oracle, PeopleSoft, PeopleSoft Academic Advisement, Oracle)
- 10 institutions (3%) use a consultant’s custom solution;
- 7 institutions (2%) use CAMS/Three Rivers (These were marked as “Other” and written in the following forms: CAMS, CAMS Enterprise, Three Rivers, Three Rivers/CAMS Windows)
- 6 institutions (2%) use Sungard/SCT (These were marked as “Other” and written in the following forms: OnCourse (Sungard Plus system – not Banner yet), Sungard SCT, Sungard SCT Power CAMPUS, SungardHE PowerCampus, a program within SCT PowerCampus.)
- 5 institutions (2%) use DegreeWorks;
- 1 institution (0.3%) uses Pace; and
- In addition to the 110 institutions who marked “Other” and that we have included in the list above, 44 additional institutions (14%) marked “Other.”

*Systems Used by the 304 Schools That are Live With an Electronic Degree Audit System,  
by Size of Institution*

	Under 1,000	1,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000+
CAPP		22 (17.6%)	20 (39.2%)	10 (23.3%)	11 (27.5%)
Datatel	3 (7.3%)	40 (32%)	5 (9.8%)	1 (2.3%)	1 (2.5%)
DARS		4 (3.2%)	8 (15.7%)	10 (23.3%)	13 (32.5%)
Jenzabar	10 (24.4%)	19 (15.2%)	2 (3.9%)	1 (2.3%)	
In-House/ Homegrown	6 (14.6%)	12 (9.6%)	2 (3.9%)	6 (14%)	5 (12.5%)
PeopleSoft/ Oracle	1 (2.4%)	4 (3.2%)	2 (3.9%)	6 (14%)	3 (7.5%)
Consultant’s custom solution	1 (2.4%)	3 (2.4%)	4 (7.8%)	2 (4.7%)	
CAMS/ Three Rivers	5 (12.2%)	2 (1.6%)			
Sungard/SCT	3 (7.3%)	2 (1.6%)		1 (2.3%)	
DegreeWorks		1 (0.8%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	
Pace				1 (2.3%)	
Other	12 (29.3%)	16 (12.8%)	7 (13.7%)	2 (4.7%)	7 (17.5%)



*Systems Used by the 304 Schools That are Live With an Electronic Degree Audit System,  
by Type of Institution*

	Private, FP, 2-yr	Private, FP, 4-yr	Private, NFP, 2-yr	Private, NFP, 4-yr	Public 2-yr	Public 4-yr
CAPP				23 (15.6%)	7 (20%)	33 (31.7%)
Datatel		1		35 (23.8%)	7 (20%)	7 (6.7%)
DARS		2		2 (1.4%)	5 (14.3%)	26 (25%)
Jenzabar				29 (19.7%)	1 (2.9%)	2 (1.9%)
In-House/ Homegrown	1	2		16 (11%)	2 (5.7%)	10 (9.6%)
PeopleSoft/ Oracle		1		3 (2%)	1 (2.9%)	11 (10.6%)
Consultant's custom solution				6 (4.1%)	2 (5.7%)	2 (1.9%)
CAMS/ Three Rivers				7 (4.8%)		
Sungard/SCT				5 (3.4%)		1 (1%)
DegreeWorks				2 (1.4%)	2 (5.7%)	1 (1%)
Pace						1 (1%)
Other	2	4	1	19 (12.9%)	8 (22.9%)	10 (9.6%)

*YEAR INSTITUTIONS WENT LIVE WITH ELECTRONIC DEGREE AUDIT*

When asked when their degree audit went live, institutions answered as follows:

Year	Number of responding institutions that went live with degree audit
2007	22 (4.3%)
2006	45 (8.8%)
2005	34 (6.7%)
2004	22 (4.3%)
2003	30 (5.9%)
2002	19 (3.7%)
2001	19 (3.7%)
2000	23 (4.5%)
1999	13 (2.6%)
1998	11 (2.2%)
1997	8 (1.6%)
1996	12 (2.4%)
1995	6 (1.2%)

The remaining 38 institutions that responded went live between 1985 and 1993.

**USE OF A “WHAT IF” FUNCTION FOR STUDENTS TO REVIEW THEIR COURSES IN RELATION TO POSSIBLE PROGRAMS**

When asked if they were using a ‘what if’ function for students to review their courses in relation to possible programs, 261 (51%) answered no, and 209 (41%) answered yes.

Of the schools that are using the ‘what if’ function:

- 177 (85%) are using a module written by the vendor;
- 28 (5.5%) are using a module written on campus; and
- 5 (1%) are using a consultant’s custom solution.

## STAFF FTE FOR SUPPORTING THE DEGREE AUDIT ON CAMPUS

When asked for the number of full-time-equivalent staff FTE their campus had for supporting the degree audit, responses ranged from “1” to “10.” The averages by size of institution are listed below.

### *Average FTE Staff Who Support Degree Audit, by Size of Institution*

Size of Institution	Average FTE
Under 1,000 (60)	1.9
1,000-4,999 (147)	1.8
5,000-9,999 (51)	1.7
10,000-19,999 (42)	2
20,000+ (36)	2.9