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Overview of the session

What is the CHEITA IT Benchmarking Project?

What is the CHEITA Global Complexity Index (GCI)?

Using the GCI to identify the “Deep Dive” peer group

Introduction to the Universities in the peer group

The results (so far) from the “Deep Dive”

How you can use the CHEITA GCI to find your peers
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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.
There are 237 institutions in the global benchmark database coming from 6 different benchmarking projects.
The CHEITA Global Complexity Index (GCI)

- Modelled after the CAUDIT Complexity Index
- Uses Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) to compare financial data across international boundaries
- Has a “predictive” quality

http://www.cheita.org/publicationsresources/benchmarking/
Deep Dive
Deep Dive: Selecting the international peer group

- **Determine Complexity Range**: Selected a range of complexity
- **Identify Possible Participants**: Identified a set of universities within that range
- **Invite Participants**: Invited each university to participate in a deep dive on their institutional strategy and IT practices
- **Case Study Interviews**: Conducted case study interviews with each university
Peer group members

CI-Range of 3.3 and 3.5
8 institutions
4 part of this presentation
University of South Australia

Largest in the peer group with 32,000 students
Most distributed with 4 large campuses and two smaller campuses.
Youngest institution and lowest institutional income in the group
65 programs of study
More than 2,000 professors and staff members
28,000 students
Oldest University in the peer group.
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Smallest student base in the group
Highest institutional income.
Second oldest in the group.
University of Texas at San Antonio

29,000 students
1400+ faculty.
largest university in the San Antonio metropolitan region
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total Institutional Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>$419,815,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>$460,679,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee</td>
<td>$532,329,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>$502,587,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of university revenue from government

- University of South Australia: 64%
- Carleton University: 38%
- University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee: 34%
- University of Texas at San Antonio: 43%
Number of campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Number of Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>Carleton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IT quality measures already adopted
Strong outreach component
Online learning ambitions
Funding is scarce
Upwardly mobile
Degree of centralization of spending

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

Centralized IT spending
Decentralized IT spending
Degree of centralization of staff

- University of South Australia
- Carleton University
- University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
- University of Texas at San Antonio
What has the CHEITA Benchmarking project achieved?

1. Conducted a systematic review of a number of national approaches to IT benchmarking.

2. Adopted and adapted the CAUDIT Complexity Index as a basis for international comparison.

3. Tested and proven the methodology by using the GCI to identify a “deep dive” peer group.

4. Spawned other research activity incl. investigating relationships between GCI and other qualitative measures.
Finding your peers

Let the CHEITA Benchmarking group identify a number of institutions of the same or similar complexity.

Use the GCI calculator to identify your Complexity. It is available at www.cheita.org.

Compare and collaborate. By yourself or in a facilitated setting.
Workshop with the “deep dive” institutions to gain better insight into the results so far

Complete the deep dive analysis & publish the results

Incorporate data from other countries currently outside of the CHEITA project – everyone is welcome

Consider refinements to the calculation of the GCI

Encourage and support the use of the GCI to undertake comparison in other areas of University activity

What happens next?

CHEITA website: www.cheita.org
Benchmarking IT: A Global approach http://tinyurl.com/nrz42b