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# Introduction

The Corporate Information Systems Group (CISG) has carried out an annual survey of all ucisa member institutions in each year since 2007. This analysis was commissioned to present trends and comparisons over the ten-year period 2009 to 2019, with tables given to show the overall number of respondents selecting each system in each year that data are available. Tables are ordered by popularity in 2019 – with the system selected by the most respondents listed first, and the system with the fewest number of respondents given last. The number of respondents selecting ‘various’, ‘other’, ‘none’ and ‘not known’ will be presented at the bottom of the tables where applicable. Charts are also presented illustrating the top four systems for each area in 2019 and highlighting any changes in the proportion of respondents indicating that these systems were in use at their institution in each available year since 2009. Where the option ‘other’ is one of the four most popular choices in 2019, the trend line has been omitted from the corresponding chart, with the next most popular individual system included as an alternative. Please note that the tables indicate the number of respondents selecting each system in each available year since 2009, with the charts illustrating the proportion of respondents selecting the four most popular options in each available year since 2009.

It is important to note that a different number of institutions have responded in each year of the survey, and so the data are based on a varying sample of institutions in each year, therefore, any apparent trends should be treated with caution. As a result of the different institutions responding each year, the numbers presented in the tables may appear to show an increase/decrease in a particular system between years but the same may not also be true when considering the proportion of respondents that selected the system. It is also important to note that not all respondents answered each question of the survey, and so the totals included in the tables represent the overall number of respondents to each question.

There have been various changes over the years in both the names of the systems and the companies themselves, often as a result of mergers and takeovers. Wherever possible, we have attempted to note these changes and have combined systems where necessary to allow the ten-year trends to be presented. In addition to this, and particularly in the earlier surveys where drop-down boxes were not used for the questions, there have also been several different ways of spelling/listing a system. Appendix A (p. 37) illustrates where different systems have been included within other systems in the tables and charts, as well as highlighting the various spellings/listing of systems in the survey responses.

Appendix B (p. 41) includes a list of those systems included as ‘other’ in each of the areas in the CIS survey. Where a system has been selected by no more than one institution in each year over the ten-year period and is not included in the 2019 options in the CIS survey, this has generally been included in the count of ‘other’ for that question. Where an institution has indicated an ‘other’ system was in use but the detail they provided suggested that it was one of the options for the relevant question, the respondent has been included within the correct category rather than in the count for ‘other’. Where an institution has recorded more than one system in use at their institution, this has been included within the ‘various’ count wherever possible. Further to this, where an institution indicated that the system was ‘out to tender’, for example, or ‘currently being implemented’ with no system listed, these have generally not been included in any of the categories.

Please note that the figures presented here may differ from those in the annual survey tables, or from those presented in previous year-on-year analyses, as a result of the grouping of some categories as well as company mergers and takeovers, or may include a category that is not represented in each year of the survey.

# Finance

Table 1 Finance Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Unit4/Agresso | 73 | 73 | 61 | 52 | 56 | 47 | 56 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 54 |
| Advanced Business Solutions | 12 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 10 | 12 | 11 |
| Oracle - Financials | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| Technology One | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| SAP | 10 | 11 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 5 |
| Symmetry | 11 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 3 |
| Access Dimensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Civica Resource Financials | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| SUN Account | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| B-plan Aptos | 9 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Capita APTOS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Ellucian Banner Finance | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Deltek -Maconomy | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Microsoft Dynamics NAV | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Oracle | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Topaz Financials | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 7 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| *Total respondents* | *135* | *137* | *112* | *100* | *103* | *75* | *101* | *117* | *125* | *117* | *98* |

Figure 1 illustrates that Unit4/Agresso continues to be the most popular finance system and has been the system of choice in at least half of responding ucisa member institutions in each year since 2009. It is important to note that the Unit4/Agresso category covers several different systems (Appendix A, p37), and in 2019, 52 respondents overall (53%) indicated that Unit4 Business World was the finance system at their institution.

Advanced Business Solutions has been the second most popular finance system at responding institutions throughout the ten-year period, except for 2014 when Oracle – Financials was in use at one more institution. However, it is worth noting that the three other systems represented in Figure 1 are some way behind Unit4/Agresso which was used at 54 responding institutions (55%) in 2019, compared to eleven respondents (11.2%) reporting they used Advanced Business Solutions, seven respondents (7.1%) reporting they used Oracle-Financials and six respondents (6.1%) reporting they used Technology One.

Figure 1 Trends in the 4 most popular Finance Systems of 2019

# HR

Table 2 HR Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Midland HR/iTrent | 23 | 23 | 20 | 19 | 23 | 18 | 26 | 30 | 35 | 36 | 32 |
| NorthgateArinso | 38 | 38 | 31 | 28 | 31 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 26 | 21 | 19 |
| Core HR | 5 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 14 |
| Agresso/Unit4 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 14 | 14 | 13 |
| SAP | 13 | 14 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| Oracle | 11 | 11 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 |
| Ciphr - Compel | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Bond HR | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Frontier - Chris 21 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Accero Cyborg | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alta HR | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Ceredian Source | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deltek Maconomy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| HRPro | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jane HR and Payroll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Oracle - Peoplesoft | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Pyramid | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rebus | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sage Snowdrop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Select HR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Other | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total respondents* | *134* | *136* | *112* | *100* | *102* | *75* | *103* | *117* | *125* | *117* | *99* |

NorthgateArinso was the most popular HR system at ucisa member institutions over the period 2009 to 2014; however, since 2013 it has fallen in popularity overall and was in use at 19 responding institutions (19%) in 2019 (Table 2) – compared to 31 responding institutions (30%) in 2013. In contrast to this, the proportion of institutions indicating that Midland HR/iTrent was the HR system at their institution has increased in each year since 2010 (Figure 2) so that it has been the most popular HR system at responding institutions in the three most recent years, and was in use at 32 responding institutions (32%) in 2019. When we consider the 70 institutions responding in both 2015 and 2019 the trend over recent years is confirmed, with NorthgateArinso being the system of choice at fifteen institutions (21%) in 2019 compared to 20 institutions (29%) in 2018, with Midland HR/iTrent in use at 23 institutions (33%) in the most recent year, compared to 19 responding institutions (27%) in 2015.

Core HR has also increased in popularity overall since 2009, although there have been some fluctuations, so that it has been the third or fourth most popular HR system at responding institutions in each year since 2012. Agresso/Unit4 has followed a similar trend and has been ranked in the top four HR systems at responding institutions in each year since 2016. However, despite the overall increase over the ten-year period, both Core HR and Agresso/Unit4 remain some way behind MidlandHR/iTrent, with Core HR in use at fourteen responding institutions (14.1%) in 2019, compared to thirteen responding institutions (13.1%) reporting that they used Agresso/Unit4.

Figure 2 Trends in the 4 most popular HR Systems of 2019

# Payroll

Table 3 Payroll Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Midland HR/iTrent | 24 | 24 | 21 | 19 | 24 | 17 | 27 | 29 | 34 | 35 | 29 |
| NorthgateArinso | 32 | 32 | 27 | 27 | 29 | 21 | 25 | 28 | 27 | 23 | 19 |
| Core Payroll | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 14 |
| Agresso/Unit 4 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| SAP | 13 | 14 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 7 |
| Oracle | 7 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| Bureau Service | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Ceredian/Centrefile | 9 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Frontier - Chris 21 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Accero Cyborg | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Access Select Payroll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Action file | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alta HR | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Bond HR | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Civica Resource Financials | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Earnie IQ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ICS Equinity - Perito | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Jane HR and Payroll | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Maxima | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outsourced | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Payrite | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pyramid | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Topaz EMS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4 |
| *Total respondents* | ***133*** | ***135*** | ***112*** | ***99*** | ***102*** | ***74*** | ***103*** | ***117*** | ***125*** | ***117*** | ***97*** |

A similar trend emerges when we consider the core payroll systems at ucisa member institutions over the ten-year period (Table 3). NorthgateArinso was the most popular payroll system from 2009 to 2014 - when it was the core payroll system at 21 responding institutions (28%); however, since then, the proportion of institutions indicating they used NorthgateArinso has fallen overall, with 19 responding institutions (20%) indicating it was the system of choice in the most recent year. In contrast to this, MidlandHR/iTrent has increased in popularity overall since 2009 – with 29 respondents (30%) indicating it was the core payroll system at their institution in 2019 compared to 24 responding institutions (18%) in 2009 (Figure 3). As a result, MidlandHR/iTrent has been the most popular payroll system at responding institutions in each year since 2015. When we consider the 54 institutions responding in both 2014 and 2019 the trend over recent years is confirmed, with fourteen respondents (26%) using NorthgateArinso as their payroll system in 2014 compared to thirteen respondents (24%) in the most recent year, and thirteen responding institutions (24%) indicating they used Midland HR/iTrent in 2014 compared to 17 responding institutions (31%) in 2019.

As with HR, Core Payroll followed by Agresso/Unit4 were the next most popular payroll systems at responding institutions in 2019 and both have increased in popularity overall since 2009. In 2019 fourteen respondents (14.4%) indicated that Core HR was the payroll system at their institution, with twelve respondents indicating they used Agresso/Unit4 (12.4%) – compared to five respondents (3.8%) indicating they used Core Payroll and seven respondents (5.3%) reporting that Agresso/Unit4 was their payroll system in 2009.

Figure 3 Trends in the 4 most popular Payroll Systems of 2019

# Student Records

Table 4 Student Records Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Tribal - SITS | 66 | 68 | 53 | 52 | 48 | 36 | 56 | 57 | 60 | 61 | 49 |
| Ellucian Banner | 16 | 16 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 15 |
| Bespoke/in-house | 18 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 11 | 9 |
| Agresso/Unit4 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 7 |
| CampusIT - Quercus | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| Capita | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Oracle-Peoplesoft | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| ITS (Integrated Tertiary Software) | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Tribal-ebs | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Ellucian PowerCampus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Oracle | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SAP | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| *Total respondents* | *135* | *137* | *112* | *100* | *102* | *75* | *103* | *116* | *124* | *116* | *99* |

Tribal-SITS has been the most popular student records system at responding institutions throughout the ten-year period and has been the student records system at around half of responding institutions in each year since 2009, with 49 respondents (49%) reporting it was the system at their institution in 2019. In the most recent year this is followed by Ellucian Banner (15 respondents, 15%), a bespoke/in-house system (9 respondents, 9.1%) and Agresso/Unit4 (7 respondents, 7.1%). Together these four systems have been the top four student records systems at responding institutions throughout the ten-year period – although the systems ranked second, third and fourth have fluctuated since 2009 and they remain some way behind the popularity of Tribal-SITS.

Figure 4 Trends in the 4 most popular Student Records Systems of 2019

# Estates

Table 5 Estates Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Planon | 14 | 17 | 14 | 19 | 21 | 18 | 24 | 29 | 32 | 28 | 32 |
| Archibus | 21 | 19 | 20 | 16 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 8 |
| CAFM | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| FSI Concept | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| Quantarc | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| QuEMIS | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 5 |
| QFM Estates Manager | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| TOPdesk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Trend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Honeywell BMS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Micad | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Badger | 6 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 17 | 14 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| IBM Maximo | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Manhattan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Planet FM | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Service Now | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| SysAid - Estates Helpdesk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Tribal - K2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Tririga | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| GVA | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mass | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pirana | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Pythagoras | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Q5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| SAP | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Serco | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SiteHelpdesk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Various | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Other | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| None | 6 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 5 |
| Not known | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| *Total respondents* | *107* | *107* | *111* | *96* | *102* | *74* | *103* | *117* | *124* | *115* | *97* |

Table 5 highlights the wide range of estates systems that have been available to ucisa member institutions throughout the ten-year period. In 2009, Archibus was the most popular estates system (21 respondents, 20%), followed by a bespoke/in-house system (17 respondents, 16%), Planon (14 respondents, 13.1%) and Quantarc and Badger which were both in use at six responding institutions (5.6%). However, since then, Planon has increased in popularity overall (Figure 5), with an increase in the most recent year, so that it has been the most popular estates system at responding institutions since 2012 and was in use at 32 responding institutions (33%) in 2019. When we consider the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019 we see that the increase in the proportion of respondents indicating that Planon was their estates system in 2019 is less pronounced, with 25 respondents (30%) indicating that they used Planon in 2018 compared to 27 respondents (32%) in the most recent year.

In contrast, Archibus has decreased in popularity overall since 2009, despite fluctuations, and it was the core estates system at eight responding institutions (8.2%) in the most recent year – compared to at 21 responding institutions (20%) in 2009. In 2019, Archibus is closely followed by CAFM (6 respondents, 6.2%) and FSI Concept, Quantarc and QuEMIS which were each the core estates system at five responding institutions (5.2%).

Please note that Figure 5 includes the six most popular estates systems in 2019 due to FSI Concept, Quantarc and QuEMIS all being selected by five responding institutions. In addition, five respondents also selected ‘none’ in 2019 and this has been omitted from Figure 5 for clarity.

Figure 5 Trends in the 6 most popular Estates Systems of 2019

# Library

Table 6 Library Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Ex Libris Alma | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 24 | 30 | 30 | 29 |
| Capita Alto | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 11 |
| Sierra | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 11 |
| SirsiDynix | 20 | 22 | 20 | 17 | 16 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 |
| Ex Libris Aleph | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 17 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 13 | 7 | 6 |
| Millenium | 24 | 26 | 22 | 21 | 25 | 11 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 8 | 6 |
| Heritage | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 5 |
| Ex Libris | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| Talis | 42 | 43 | 29 | 23 | 19 | 15 | 23 | 16 | 12 | 11 | 4 |
| Koha | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| SirsiDynix - Unicorn | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Horizon | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Kuali | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Vubis Smart | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Ex Libris Voyager | 16 | 16 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Various | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| *Total respondents* | *133* | *135* | *110* | *100* | *102* | *75* | *102* | *117* | *125* | *117* | *99* |

It is worth noting that in previous years all Ex Libris packages (Ex Libris, Aleph, Alma and Voyager) and SirsiDynix packages (SirsiDynix and SirsiDynix – Unicorn) were combined in to two categories; however, for the second time this year they are included individually as they are presented in the CIS survey. Ex Libris Alma was the core library system at just one responding institution in 2013; however, since then, it has significantly increased in popularity so that it was the library system used at 29 responding institutions (29%) in 2019 and it has been the most popular library system since 2016. In contrast, the other Ex Libris systems (Ex Libris, Aleph and Voyager) have all fallen in popularity since 2013, and when we consider the 71 institutions responding in both 2013 and 2019, we see that of the 23 respondents indicating that they used Ex Libris, Ex Libris Aleph or Ex Libris Voyager in 2013, eleven used Ex Libris – Alma in the most recent year. Figure 6 illustrates that both Capita Alto and Sierra have increased in popularity in recent years and they were both in use at eleven responding institutions (11.1%) in 2019.

Talis started the ten-year period as the most popular library system (Table 6) and was in use at 42 responding institutions (32%); however, since then it has fallen in popularity overall so that it was the core library system at just four responding institutions (4.0%) in 2019 and currently lies outside of the top four library systems for the first time over the ten-year period.

Figure 6 Trends in the 4 most popular Library Systems of 2019

# VLE

Table 7 VLE Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Moodle | 22 | 29 | 31 | 39 | 44 | 33 | 45 | 49 | 54 | 44 | 40 |
| Blackboard - Blackboard | 58 | 60 | 51 | 44 | 43 | 30 | 46 | 51 | 50 | 47 | 37 |
| Canvas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 14 |
| Desire2Learn | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 |
| Sakai | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 9 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blackboard - WebCT | 41 | 34 | 20 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Pearson | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SharePoint | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Various | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| *Total respondents* | *134* | *136* | *111* | *100* | *102* | *75* | *103* | *117* | *125* | *116* | *98* |

Table 7 highlights that Blackboard-Blackboard started the ten-year period as the most popular VLE system and was in use at 58 responding institutions (43%). Since then there have been several fluctuations and an apparent decrease in the most recent year sees the popularity of Blackboard-Blackboard fall slightly so that it was the second most popular VLE system at responding institutions in 2019 (37 respondents, 38%). In contrast, Moodle was the third most popular VLE system at ucisa member institutions in 2009 and was in use at 22 responding institutions (16%). This was followed by a steady increase so that it replaced Blackboard-Blackboard as the most popular VLE system in 2013 (44 respondents, 43%) and 2014 (33 respondents, 44%). Since then, however, there have been fluctuations and an increase in the proportion of respondents indicating it was the VLE system at their institution in the most recent year sees it once again the most popular VLE system (40 respondents, 41%) in 2019.

However, it is important to note that the changes in the most recent year may be partially owing to the different institutions responding over the two years, and when we compare the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019 we see that in 2018 35 respondents (42%) reported using Blackboard-Blackboard compared to 34 respondents (40%) in 2019, with 31 respondents (37%) using Moodle in 2018 compared to 32 responding institutions (38%) in the most recent year.

Figure 7 illustrates that Canvas has increased in popularity since 2015 and was the core VLE system at fourteen responding institutions (14.3%) in 2019, and was ranked third, compared to just one respondent indicating it was the core VLE system at their institution in each year over the period 2013 to 2015.

Figure 7 Trends in the 4 most popular VLE Systems of 2019

# Timetabling

Table 8 Timetabling Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Scientia | 64 | 65 | 57 | 53 | 52 | 40 | 54 | 61 | 64 | 57 | 50 |
| Advanced Learning -CMIS | 32 | 33 | 26 | 26 | 22 | 19 | 22 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 22 |
| Celcat | 16 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 15 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 13 |
| Bespoke/in-house | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Tribal | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Infosilem - TPH | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| ASIMUT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Capita UNIT - eResource Manager | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Various | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| None | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total respondents* | *125* | *126* | *105* | *98* | *100* | *75* | *102* | *116* | *124* | *117* | *99* |

Table 8 highlights that there has been no change in the top three timetabling systems throughout the ten-year period, with Scientia being the chosen system at more than half of responding institutions in each year, except for 2018 when it was in use at 57 responding institutions (49%). This is followed by Advanced Learning – CMIS which has been in use at more than 20% of responding institutions in each year since 2009, and Celcat which has been in use at more than 10% of responding institutions throughout the ten-year period. In 2019 Scientia was the core timetabling system at 50 responding institutions (51%), Advanced Learning – CMIS was in use at 22 responding institutions (22%) and Celcat was selected by thirteen responding institutions (13.1%). Together these three systems accounted for 86% of timetabling systems at responding institutions in the most recent year.

Both Table 8 and Figure 8 appear to show a dip in the popularity of Celcat in the most recent year – from being the timetabling system at 20 responding institutions (17%) in 2018 to being the core system at thirteen responding institutions (13.1%) in 2019. However, when we consider the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019, eleven respondents (13.1%) reported that their core timetabling system was Celcat in each year.

Note that Figure 8 shows the top five timetabling systems in 2019 with a bespoke/in-house system and Tribal both in use at four responding institutions (4.0%).

Figure 8 Trends in the 5 most popular Timetabling Systems of 2019

# CRM

Table 9 CRM Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Microsoft Dynamics | 4 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 17 | 18 | 23 | 29 | 38 | 36 | 32 |
| Salesforce | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 12 |
| Hobsons | 12 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 11 | 9 |
| Azorus | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Achiever | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Blackbaud - Raiser's Edge | 3 | 1 | 16 | 13 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 4 |
| Data Harvesting | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 8 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Agresso/Unit 4 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| AR Remedy | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ESIT - thankQ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EzyRecruit | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Goldmine | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Donor Strategy | 9 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Maconomy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Oracle - CRM | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oracle - Peoplesoft | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oracle - Siebel | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sugar | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Various | 5 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 9 | 16 | 16 | 21 | 19 | 10 |
| Other | 9 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
| None | 12 | 9 | 4 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 13 | 13 | 10 | 9 |
| *Total respondents* | *87* | *86* | *89* | *83* | *90* | *71* | *101* | *117* | *125* | *114* | *98* |

Table 9 illustrates the wide range of CRM systems available to ucisa member institutions throughout the ten-year period, and highlights that Microsoft Dynamics has increased in popularity overall – from it being the core CRM system at four responding institutions (4.6%) in 2009 to it being the core system at 32 responding institutions (33%) in 2019, and it has been the top CRM system since 2013. Table 9 also shows that Agresso/Unit4 started the ten-year period as the most popular CRM system when it was in use at fourteen responding institutions (16%); however, since then, it has fallen in popularity so that it has not been the core CRM system at any responding institutions in the two most recent years. In contrast, Salesforce has increased in popularity overall and was the CRM system at twelve responding institutions (12.2%) in 2019 compared to just one institution (1.4%) indicating it was the core CRM system at their institution in 2014.

Figure 9 highlights that, apart from Microsoft Dynamics and Salesforce, there appears to be fluctuation over the ten-year period in the popularity of the individual CRM systems at responding institutions. Hobsons was the second most popular CRM system in 2009 and was in use at twelve responding institutions (13.8%); however, it appears to have fallen in popularity overall since 2015 and was in use at nine responding institutions (9.2%) in the most recent year – the same level as those institutions indicating that they did not have a core CRM in 2019. When we consider the 70 institutions responding in both 2015 and 2019 the number of respondents indicating that Hobsons was the core CRM system at their institution decreased from ten (14.3%) in 2015 to six (8.6%) in 2019. Overall, ten responding institutions (10.2%) indicated that they used ‘various’ CRM systems in the most recent year.

Figure 9 displays the five most popular types of CRM systems in 2019 due to Hobsons and ‘none’ each being selected by nine responding institutions (9.2%).

Figure 9 Trends in the 5 most popular CRM Systems of 2019

# Content Management System

Table 10 Content Management Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| TerminalFour | 19 | 23 | 25 | 26 | 20 | 19 | 30 | 33 | 32 | 30 | 25 |
| Drupal | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 20 | 19 | 13 |
| Contensis | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 8 |
| MySource Matrix (Squiz) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Sitecore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 7 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 |
| Microsoft Sharepoint | 8 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 4 |
| OpenText | 9 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Umbraco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| EpiBuilder | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Jadu | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Liferay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percussion - RythMyx | 8 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Plone | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Polopoly | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| WordPress | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Alterian - Morello | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C2 Activedition | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Easysite | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| FarCry Open Source | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Immediacy | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Luminis CMS | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| OpenCMS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Orchard CMS | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Serena | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Silva | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tridion | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Various | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Other | 6 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 9 |
| None | 5 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| *Total respondents* | *98* | *101* | *106* | *97* | *100* | *73* | *101* | *116* | *124* | *116* | *99* |

Table 10 highlights the wide range of content management systems available to ucisa member institutions since 2009. TerminalFour has been the most popular content management system throughout the ten-year period and was in use at 25 responding institutions (25%) in 2019. Figure 10 appears to highlight a decline in the popularity of TerminalFour since 2015; however, this is possibly as a result of the different institutions responding each year, and when we consider the 70 institutions responding in both 2015 and 2019, 17 (24%) indicated that they used TerminalFour in 2015 compared to 20 respondents (29%) in 2019.

Drupal has increased in popularity overall since 2010 – from just one respondent (1.0%) indicating it was the content management system used at their institution to thirteen respondents (13.1%) indicating it was the system used at their institution in 2019. However, Figure 10 illustrates that Drupal has fallen in popularity in the most recent year, although this is possibly as a result of the different institutions responding in each year, and when we consider the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019 the number reporting that Drupal was their content management system increased slightly from twelve (14.3%) to thirteen (15.5%).

In 2019 four respondents (4.0%) reported that they used various content management systems, with two respondents (2.0%) indicating that they did not use a core content management system.

Figure 10 Trends in the 4 most popular Content Management Systems of 2019

# Business Intelligence

Table 11 Business Intelligence Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| SAP - Business Objects | 34 | 35 | 34 | 26 | 22 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 14 | 18 |
| Tableau | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 16 | 17 |
| Microsoft - Reporting | 5 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 17 | 9 | 19 | 21 | 25 | 22 | 15 |
| Qlikview | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 11 |
| IBM-Cognos | 12 | 12 | 17 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| Oracle | 11 | 18 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 4 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 8 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Dynistics | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Microsoft - Performance Point | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| SAP - Business Intelligence | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Infor PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SAP - Crystal reports | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SAS | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Various | 5 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 10 |
| Other | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| None | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 4 |
| *Total respondents* | *85* | *95* | *101* | *96* | *100* | *74* | *100* | *116* | *123* | *115* | *98* |

Table 11 shows that the range of business intelligence systems available to ucisa member institutions has increased since 2009. SAP-Business Objects started the ten-year period as the most popular business intelligence system and was selected by 34 responding institutions (40%). This was followed by an overall fall in its popularity (Figure 11) until 2017 when SAP-Business Objects was in use at thirteen responding institutions (10.6%) and was no longer the top business intelligence system. The two most recent years have seen it increase in popularity, however, and it was in use at 18 responding institutions (18%) in 2019. When we consider the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019 the increase in the most recent year is confirmed with eleven respondents (11.1%) indicating that they used SAP-Business Objects in 2018 compared to fifteen respondents (18%) in 2019.

Tableau has increased in popularity overall since 2013, despite fluctuations, from just one institution indicating it was the core business intelligence system at their institution in 2013 to 17 responding institutions (17%) selecting it in 2019, so that it is currently slightly behind SAP-Business Objects (18 respondents, 18%). This is closely followed by Microsoft – Reporting which was the business intelligence system at fifteen responding institutions (15%) and Qlikview which was in use at eleven responding institutions (11.2%).

Overall, ten responding institutions (10.2%) reported that they used various business intelligence systems in 2019, with four responding institutions (4.1%) indicating that they did not have a core business intelligence system.

It is worth noting that in previous years all SAP packages (Business Objects, Crystal Reports and Business Intelligence) were combined in to one category; however, once again this year they are included individually as they are presented in the CIS survey.

Figure 11 Trends in the 4 most popular Business Intelligence Systems of 2019

# Enterprise Web Portal

Table 12 Enterprise Web Portal Systems 2009-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Microsoft Sharepoint | 18 | 18 | 27 | 21 | 28 | 14 | 23 | 25 | 29 | 19 | 19 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 15 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 24 | 23 | 19 | 16 |
| myday | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| oMbiel CampusM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| Ellucian Luminis CMS | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Tribal - SITS | 5 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Blackboard | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| Contensis | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| e-Vision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| uPortal | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Liferay | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| IBM Websphere | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Microsoft UAG | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Moodle | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| MySource Matrix (Squiz) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Oracle Portal | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Orchard CMS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| SAP Enterprise Portal | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| SUN Enterprise Server | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WordPress | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ektron | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Various | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 13 | 20 | 17 |
| Other | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| None | 4 | 4 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 4 |
| *Total respondents* | *71* | *74* | *94* | *89* | *98* | *72* | *97* | *115* | *124* | *113* | *97* |

Table 12 highlights the wide range of enterprise web and staff/student portals available to ucisa member institutions since 2009. Microsoft-Sharepoint started the ten-year period as the most popular system with 18 respondents (25%) indicating it was the core enterprise web and staff/student portal at their institution. Since then, however, it has fluctuated, although it has been the most popular system in nine out of the eleven years. The most recent year has seen a slight increase (Figure 12) in the proportion of respondents indicating that they used Microsoft-Sharepoint at their institution so that it was the most popular enterprise web and staff/student portal (19 respondents, 20%). When we consider the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019 the number of responding institutions indicating that Microsoft-Sharepoint was the core enterprise web and staff/student portal at their institution increased from thirteen (15%) to fifteen (18%).

In 2019, 17 responding institutions (18%) indicated that they used various enterprise web and staff/student portals at their institution, with four responding institutions (4.1%) indicating that they did not have a core system. It is worth noting that in the early years the option ‘none’ was not included in the survey which will have had some impact on the proportions of respondents selecting the different systems.

Figure 12 Trends in the 4 most popular Enterprise Web Portal Systems of 2019

# IT Service Management Systems (Service Desk)

Table 13 IT Service Management Systems 2010-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| TOPdesk | 1 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 14 | 13 | 14 |
| Service Now | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| Hornbill - Supportworks | 10 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 12 | 8 |
| Unidesk | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| Cherwell | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| HEAT | 2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| LANDesk | 3 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 5 |
| Sunrise | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| RT - Request Tracker | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| BMC Footprints | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| BMC Remedy | 2 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Dell KACE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| ManageEngineServiceDesk Plus | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Marval | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| SysAid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Web Helpdesk | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Alembra - Fire | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| Kayako Fusion | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Microsoft System Center Service Manager | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| OTRS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Richmond SupportDesk | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| RMS | 7 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| SiT | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| SiteHelpDesk | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Tribal | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Vivantio | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Zendesk | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| POB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Axios Assyst | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| House on the Hill | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ICCM Assure | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| iTop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Oracle - Siebel | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spiceworks | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| VivaDesk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| VMware Service Manager | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Various | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 6 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| *Total respondents* | *48* | *108* | *96* | *102* | *73* | *103* | *117* | *125* | *116* | *99* |

Figure 13 Trends in the 4 most popular IT Service Management Systems of 2019

Table 13 illustrates the wide range of IT service management systems available to ucisa member institutions since 2010. Hornbill – Supportworks started the nine-year period as the most popular system and was in use at ten responding institutions (21%); however, since then, and despite several fluctuations, it has fallen slightly in popularity overall, so that it was the core IT service management system at eight responding institutions (8.1%) in 2019.

In contrast, TOPdesk has increased in popularity overall since 2010 and has been the most popular IT service management system since 2017, with a slight increase in the most recent year resulting in fourteen responding institutions (14.1%) reporting it was the core system at their institution. When we consider the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019 the number of institutions reporting that TOPdesk was the core IT service management system at their institution increased from nine (10.7%) to twelve (14.3%). ServiceNow has also increased in popularity overall since 2010 and it was the second most popular IT service management system in 2019 with eleven responding institutions (11.1%) indicating it was the core system at their institution.

# Electronic Document Management and Records Management System (EDRMS)

Table 14 Electronic Document Management and Records Management Systems 2010-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Microsoft Sharepoint | 10 | 25 | 25 | 34 | 19 | 34 | 39 | 46 | 40 | 34 |
| SITS Document Manager | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| Serengeti | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| EMC Documentum | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Folding Space | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| OpenText | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Alfresco | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Bespoke/In-house | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Document Logistiix | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Objective | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| DocuWare | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Invu | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| LiveLink | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oracle UCM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| VersionOne | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| WinDIP | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Xerox DocuShare | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Perceptive Software | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Various | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 6 |
| Other | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 11 |
| None | 5 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 20 | 29 | 36 | 36 | 26 | 22 |
| *Total respondents* | *30* | *74* | *77* | *85* | *67* | *97* | *114* | *122* | *112* | *92* |

Table 14 shows that Microsoft Sharepoint has been the most popular electronic document management and records management system (EDRMS) throughout the nine-year period, except for 2014 when the number of respondents indicating that they did not have a core EDRMS at their institution was slightly higher. Despite a slight increase in the most recent year, Figure 14 highlights that the proportion of respondents indicating their EDRMS was Microsoft Sharepoint has fallen overall since 2013. However, when we consider the 71 institutions responding in both 2013 and 2019, the number of respondents reporting that Microsoft Sharepoint was the core EDRMS at their institution increased slightly from 22 (31%) in 2013 to 25 (35%) in the most recent year. In 2019, the next most popular individual system was SITS Document Manager – although it was some way behind with five respondents (5.4%) indicating it was the core EDRMS at their institution.

It is important to note that the large increase in the number of respondents indicating that they did not have an EDRMS since 2010 may be due to changes in the format of the survey and the introduction of drop-down boxes – prior to this, respondents may have chosen not to answer a question, rather than indicating that they did not have an EDRMS in the relevant year. Overall, 22 respondents (24%) indicated that they did not have a core EDRMS in 2019, with six responding institutions (6.5%) indicating that they used various systems.

Figure 14 Trends in the 4 most popular EDRMS of 2019

# Curriculum Management (Programme Planning)

Table 15 Curriculum Management Systems 2014-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Bespoke/in-house | 26 | 37 | 38 | 41 | 33 | 23 |
| SITS Curriculum Manager | 0 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
| Worktribe | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| Akari | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Banner | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| Unit4-Curriculum Management | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Quercus | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Kuali Student | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Oracle Campus Solutions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| SharePoint | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Therefore | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tribal EBS Curriculum Planner module | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Other | 2 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| None | 4 | 28 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 39 |
| *Total respondents* | *39* | *87* | *112* | *117* | *112* | *96* |

Figure 15 highlights that an increase in the most recent year results in a larger proportion of respondents indicating that they did not have a core curriculum management (programme planning) system in 2019 than the proportion of respondents selecting any of the individual systems. When we consider the 84 institutions responding in both 2018 and 2019 this trend is confirmed with 26 respondents (31%) reporting that they did not have a core curriculum management system in 2018 compared to 33 respondents (39%) in 2019. A bespoke/in-house system was the most popular curriculum management system in 2014 and was in use at 26 responding institutions (67%); however, since then, the proportion of respondents indicating that they used a bespoke/in-house curriculum management system has declined steadily (Figure 15), with 23 respondents (24%) indicating it was the system at their institution in 2019. The most popular individual system in 2019 was SITS Curriculum Manager and it was in use at nine responding institutions (9.4%), followed by Worktribe (6 respondents, 6.3%) and Akari (4 respondents, 4.2%).

Figure 15 Trends in the 4 most popular Curriculum Management Systems of 2019

# Student Evaluation of Teaching Software

Table 16 Student Evaluation of Teaching Software 2014-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| EvaSys | 13 | 21 | 29 | 33 | 31 | 29 |
| Blackboard | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| Turnitin | 0 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 6 |
| VLE | 5 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 |
| Bespoke/in-house | 12 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 5 |
| Bristol Online Surveys | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| SITS | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Paper-based | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Qualtrics | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| ReMark | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| SnapSurveys | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Various | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 9 |
| Other | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| None | 1 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 28 | 14 |
| *Total respondents* | *40* | *82* | *106* | *115* | *109* | *94* |

Table 16 shows that EvaSys has been the most popular student evaluation of teaching software since 2014, with 29 respondents (31%) reporting it was the core system at their institution in the most recent year. This was followed by those respondents indicating that they did not use student evaluation of teaching software in 2019 (14 respondents, 14.9%), those institutions indicating that they used various systems (9 respondents, 9.6%) and Blackboard (7 respondents, 7.4%). As with curriculum management systems, a bespoke/in-house system for student evaluation of teaching software appears to be decreasing in popularity from the second most popular system at responding institutions in 2014 (12 respondents, 30%) to five respondents (5.3%) indicating it was the system at their institution in 2019 (Figure 16). It is important to note that several institutions did not answer this question in 2014 rather than indicating ‘none’ and this will have an impact on the proportions of respondents for the individual systems in that year.

Figure 16 Trends in the 4 most popular Student Evaluation of Teaching Software of 2019

# Current Research Information System (CRIS)

Table 17 Current Research Information Systems 2015-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Pure | 22 | 31 | 31 | 28 | 25 |
| Elements (Symplectic) | 12 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 14 |
| Eprints | 3 | 13 | 16 | 19 | 12 |
| Bespoke/in-house | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 11 |
| Worktribe | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 8 |
| Converis | 4 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 5 |
| IRIS | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Vidatum | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Radar | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 6 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| None | 31 | 28 | 30 | 26 | 15 |
| *Total respondents* | *87* | *113* | *122* | *112* | *97* |

Table 17 shows the range of current research information systems (CRIS) available to ucisa member institutions since 2015, and illustrates that the number of respondents indicating that they do not use a CRIS at their institution has fallen steadily overall, with 15 respondents (15%) indicating this was the case in 2019 compared to 31 respondents (36%) in 2015. Pure has been the most popular individual CRIS at responding institutions since 2016, with the proportion of respondents indicating that it was the core system at their institution remaining relatively steady in the three most recent years (Figure 17). Overall, 25 responding institutions (26%) reported that they used Pure in 2019, followed by those respondents indicating that they did not have a core CRIS (15 respondents, 15%), Elements (Symplectic) (14 respondents, 14.4%) and Eprints (12 respondents, 12.4%).

Figure 17 Changes in the 4 most popular Current Research Information Systems of 2019

# Research Proposals, Grants and Contracts

Table 18 Research Proposals, Grants and Contracts Systems 2015-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| Bespoke/in-house | 9 | 18 | 16 | 21 | 16 |
| Unit4 ARCP | 16 | 17 | 20 | 17 | 16 |
| Worktribe | 8 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 13 |
| pFACT | 5 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| Pure | 1 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 6 |
| Unit4 X5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| InfoEd | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| IRIS | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Radar | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| TechnologyOne | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tribal Ideate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Converis | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 11 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 8 |
| None | 26 | 31 | 44 | 30 | 21 |
| *Total respondents* | *83* | *107* | *121* | *112* | *94* |

Table 18 shows that the number of respondents indicating that they do not use a core research, proposals, grants and contracts system has been higher than the number of respondents indicating that they used any of the individual systems in each year since 2015. Overall, 21 respondents (22%) indicated that they did not use a research, proposals, grants and contracts system in 2019, followed by 16 respondents (17%) selecting both a bespoke/in-house system and Unit4 ARCP and 13 respondents (13.8%) indicating that they used Worktribe.

Figure 18 Changes in the 4 most popular Research Proposals, Grants and Contracts Systems of 2019

# Enterprise Service Bus (ESB)

Table 19 Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) Systems 2018-2019

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2019 |
| In-House | 33 | 27 |
| Microsoft BizTalk Server | 12 | 12 |
| Windows Azure Service Bus | 7 | 7 |
| Oracle Enterprise Service Bus | 3 | 3 |
| Mule ESB | 2 | 1 |
| SAP Process Integration | 2 | 1 |
| Talend enterprise ESB | 0 | 1 |
| webMethods enterprise service bus | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 24 | 30 |
| *Total respondents* | *84* | *82* |

This question was introduced in 2018, so that only two years’ data are available. Table 19 shows that an in-house system has been the most popular enterprise service bus (ESB) in both 2018 and 2019 and was the core system at 27 responding institutions (33%) in the most recent year. Figure 19 highlights that an in-house system appears to be falling in popularity, however, and when we consider the 84 institutions submitting a survey in both 2018 and 2019 this trend is confirmed with 28 respondents (33%) indicating that they used an in-house system in 2018 compared to 22 respondents (26%) in 2019. Microsoft BizTalk Server has been the next most popular system in both years that data are available, although it is some way behind an in-house system and was the core ESB at twelve responding institutions (14.6%) in 2019.

Figure 19 Changes in the 4 most popular Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) systems of 2019

# Data Warehouse

Table 20 Data Warehouse Systems 2018-2019

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2018 | 2019 |
| Microsoft | 29 | 27 |
| In-House | 27 | 25 |
| Oracle | 20 | 13 |
| IBM | 1 | 0 |
| Amazon web services | 3 | 0 |
| Other | 18 | 20 |
| *Total respondents* | *98* | *85* |

This question was introduced in 2018, so that only two years’ data are available. Table 20 displays the core data warehouse systems at responding ucisa member institutions since 2018, and highlights that Microsoft was the most popular system in both years and was in use at 27 responding institutions (32%) in 2019. This was followed by an in-house system (25 respondents, 29%) and Oracle (13 respondents, 15%). Note that Figure 20 illustrates the three most popular data warehouse systems in 2019 as ‘other’ was the fourth most popular choice.

Figure 20 Changes in the 3 most popular Data Warehouse systems of 2019

# Appendix A Systems

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Finance | Systems included |
| Advanced Business Solutions | Advanced;Advanced Business Solutions - e5; Advanced Business Solutions - eFinancials; Advanced Business Solutions - OpenAccounts; Advanced Software - Open accounts/EBIS; CedAr; CedAr eFinancials; COA Solutions (e5); COA Solutions eFinancials; e5; Open Accounts; |
| Agresso/Unit 4 | Agresso; Agresso QL Finance; Agresso QLX; CODA; CODA Dream; Distinction; Unit 4 ABW; Unit 4/Agresso QLX; Unit 4: Agresso; Unit 4: Agresso Coda Dream; Unit 4: Agresso Financial Management; Unit 4: Business World; Unit 4: Campus Financial Management; Unit 4: Coda; Unit 4: Coda financials; Unit 4: Financials (formerly Coda Financials); Unit 4: QLF; Unit 4: QLX; Unit4 - Coda Dream; |
| B-plan Aptos | Aptos |
| Ellucian Banner Finance | Sungard Banner Finance; Sungard Banner; |
| SUN Account | SUN Systems; |
| Technology One | Technology One Financials; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| HR | Systems included |
| Accero Cyborg | Cyborg; |
| Agresso/Unit 4 | Agresso; Agresso QL Personnel (QLP); Unit 4 – Agresso ; Unit 4 - QLP; Unit 4 Business World; |
| Alta HR | Alter HR; |
| Bond HR | Bond; Bond HR Professional; Bond International; Bond Personnel Professional; Professional Personnel; Professional Personnel (Bond HR); |
| Ceredian Source | Source; |
| Ciphr - Compel | Ciphr; Ciphr (Compel); Compel; Compel CIPHR; Computers in Personnel - CIPHR; Cyphr; |
| Core HR | Core; |
| Frontier - Chris 21 | Chris 3; Chris 21; |
| HRPro | Advanced Business Solutions - HRPro; HRPro (Supplier: ASR); HRPro from ASR; HRPro from COA Solutions (Previously ASR); |
| Jane HR and Payroll | Jane Systems; |
| Midland HR/iTrent | Midland HR; Midland iTrent; Midland; |
| NorthgateArinso | Northgate; PSEnterprise; PSE; ResourceLink; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Payroll | Systems included |
| Accero Cyborg | Cyborg; Hewitt Cyborg; |
| Agresso/Unit 4 | Agresso; Agresso QL Personnel (QLP); Unit 4 - Agresso; Unit 4 - QLP; Unit4 Business World; |
| Bureau Service | Bureau; |
| Ceredian/Centrefile | Centrefile; Ceredian; Ceredian Source; Managed Service by Ceredian; Source; |
| Core Payroll | Core; Core Pay; CORE Payroll System; |
| Earnie IQ | Iris-Earnie; |
| Frontier - Chris 21 | Chris 3; CHRIS 21; |
| Logica | CMG (Payroll Bureau); Logica bureau service; Logica CMG; Logica Payfact; |
| Maxima | Maxima Paysolve; Paysolve; Paysolve from Maxima; |
| Midland HR/iTrent | Midland HR; Midland iTrent; Midland; Trent; |
| NorthgateArinso | Northgate; Resourcelink; PSE; |
| Outsourced | external; external agency; External agency service; outsourced to bureau; Outsourced to CMG; Outsourced to ISC; |
| Payrite | Paywrite |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student Records | Systems included |
| Agresso/Unit 4 | Agresso; Agresso QL Students; Unit 4- QLS; Unit 4 - Student Management; |
| Campus IT - Quercus | Campus IT Quercus; Campus IT Quercus Plus; Campus IT Querus Plus; CampusIT; Quercus; Quercus Plus from Campus IT; Ellucian – Quercus; |
| Ellucian Banner | SunGard; Banner; Ellucian; |
| ITS (Integrated Tertiary Software) | ITS; Integrated Tertiary Systems; Integrated Tertiary Systems(ITS); ITS (South African System); |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estates | Systems included |
| Archibus | Archibus plus AutoCAD; |
| Bespoke/in-house | Homegrown; In house built systems; In-House (less than sophisticated system); |
| CAFM | Technology Forge CAFM |
| ex-CHA (MAC initiative) | CHA (former MAC Powerhouse solution) |
| FSI Concept | Concept; FSI Evolution; |
| GVA | GVAS; GVA-S; |
| Serco | Serco Facility; Serco - Facility E; |
| None | No integrated system; Not used; N/A; We do not have….; |
| Not known | Not sure |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Library | Systems included |
| Ex Libris Voyager | Voyager; |
| Millenium | Innovative; Millennium; |
| SirsiDynix – Unicorn | Sirsi Unicorn; Unicorn; |
| Vubis Smart | Infor/Vubis; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| VLE | Systems included |
| Blackboard - Blackboard | Blackboard (Blackboard); |
| Blackboard – WebCT | Blackboard Vista; Blackboard (WebCT); |
| Desire2Learn | D2L; |
| Pearson | Pearson Learning Studio; Pearsons; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timetabling | Systems included |
| Advanced Learning –CMIS | Facility CMIS; Serco - Facility CMIS; Serco; |
| Capita UNIT - eResource Manager | Capita Resource Manager; Capita; |
| Infosilem - TPH | Infosilem; TPH (supplier Infosilem); |
| Scientia | Scientia Syllabus Plus, Scientia; Syllabus Plus (Scientia); |
| Tribal | Tribal (SITS); |
| None | n/a; No system; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CRM | Systems included |
| Agresso/Unit 4 | Agresso CRM; Agresso Distinction; Microsoft (Distinction); Unit 4 - Agresso; |
| Blackbaud - Raisers Edge | Blackbaud - Razers Edge; Blackbaud; |
| Hobsons | Honsons; Hobsons Connect; |
| Donor Strategy | Care; IRIS Donor Strategy; IRIS; |
| Microsoft Dynamics | Microsoft; Microsoft Dynamics CRM; MS Dynamics; MS Dynamix; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Content Management System | Systems included |
| Luminis CMS | Luminis CMS (Sungard); Luminis Content Management Suite; |
| Microsoft Sharepoint | Microsoft; MS Sharepoint; Sharepoint (Digital repository); |
| MySource Matrix (Squiz) | Squiz Matrix (open source); |
| OpenText | OpenText RedDot; Red Dot; RedDot; Redot; |
| Percussion – RhythMyx | Rythmix; Rythmx; |
| Serena | Serena's Collage; Serina; Serina Collage; |
| Silva | Infrae-Silva; |
| TerminalFour | Site Manager by TerminalFour; Terminal 4; t4; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Business Intelligence | Systems included |
| IBM-Cognos | Cognos 8 |
| Microsoft – Reporting | Microsoft Reporting Services; SQL Reporting Services ; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Enterprise Web Portal | Systems included |
| Blackboard | Blackboard (Blackboard); Blackboard for Students; Blackboard Learn 9 Portal; Blackboard portal; |
| Ellucian Luminis CMS | SunGard Luminis; |
| SAP Enterprise Portal | SAP; |
| Tribal - SITS | Tribal SITS eVision; |
| uPortal | JASIG uPortal; |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| IT Service Management Systems (Service Desk) | Systems included |
| BMC Footprints | Numara Footprints; |
| BMC Remedy | BMC Service Desk; BMC Service Desk Express; Remedy Force; |
| Hornbill - Supportworks | SupportWorks; SupportWorks Hornbill; |
| Kayako Fusion | Kayaco; Kyako; |
| LANDesk | Ivanti; Touchpaper; |
| ManageEngineServiceDesk Plus | ManageEngine; |
| Microsoft System Center Service Manager | Microsoft SCSM; SCSM; |
| Richmond SupportDesk | Richmond |
| RT - Request Tracker | Request Tracker |

# Appendix B ‘Other’ systems used

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Included in ‘other’ |
| Finance | Aptean Ross; Bespoke/in-house; Capital IB Solutions -Integra; COA Financials; Great Plains – Microsoft; Infor; Kuali Financials; Oracle ERP Cloud Service; Oracle – Peoplesoft; Oracle Peoplesoft/Symmetry; Powersolve; PS Financials; Resource 3200; Synergy; |
| HR | ADP HR.net; Cintra HR; Civica Resource; Paradigm; PWA; RedskyIT Genesis; Selima Vision; World Service - Software for People; |
| Payroll | ALBACS; CIPHR add-on; Cintra; Earnie; Envoy; HBS; HR Revolution – SD Worx; Logica; Oracle-Peoplesoft; Outsourced; Pegasus; Selima; Teamspirit; |
| Student records | Civica REMS; Corero LMS; OneAdvanced ProSolution; Oracle = OSS; RedSky IT Genesis; |
| Estates | 3iStudio Estate Manager; AFM/FACnet; Avon; Backtraq FM; Cardax access control, DeCAL; Excel based; Facilities Centre; FAMIS; Hornbill; Insite; Integrated FM – FACTS; Kinetix; Logger; Matrix Impact (now SoftSols); PEMAC; QUBE; SID (Hangs off SITS); Tabs FM; Unit4 Field Force; |
| Library | Bespoke/in-house; Capita Prism; Liberty Softlink; OCLC; OLIB; Pemac; RMS; |
| VLE | Blackboard-Moodlerooms; Brightspace; Google Classroom; Sunguard Luminis Campus Pipeline; |
| Timetabling | Civica – REMS; EventMap Optime; ItS Abacus; Kinetic; Meeting Room Manager; O! Timetable; OneAdvanced ProSolution; |
| CRM | Blackboard CRM; Blackboard NXT; BMC Fusion; Career Hub; Compass ProEngage; Diagonal; Ellucian-Advance; Ellucian Recruiter; Evolutive; Goldmine; Hubspot; iMIS; Kidz Africa; Maximiser CRM database; Onyx; RMS; Sage SalesLogix; Sage Act Professional; SAP; Teamscope; Tribal (SITS); |
| Content Management System | Adobe conribute; Alfresco; Arconics; Alterian Content Management; Blackboard; Celum; D Space; EMC; Ektron; Goss; Joomla; Kentico (MMT); Mediasurface; Oracle; Silverstripe; Straker Shado; Sitefinity; Silktide; Teamsite; Umbraco; Wagtail; Zope; |
| Business Intelligence | 360 Performance Solutions; CACI; Compass – ProMetrix; InPhase; IQ Objects; Jisc Learning Analytics; Logix4; Microsoft PowerBI; microstrategy; ProClarity; WebFOCUS (information builders); |
| Enterprise Web Portal | Alfreso; Alterian CMS; Campus EAI; Drupal; Elgg; Empresa e-ST; Google; Interact Intranet; JADU; Jboss; Kaleidoscope;Sitecore; T4; |
| IT Service Management Systems (Service Desk) | HP Service Manager; Infra; ITBM; JIRA; Microsoft Sharepoint; OneorZero; PCDuo; Peregrin Servie Centre; Quantarc Quemis; Quscient – ProRetention; Remedy Force; Samanage; SID (attached to SITS); Success CRM; |
| EDRMS | ADOS; Banner Document Management; Box; D Space; Documation Software Ltd; DocuShare; Knowledge tree; Ellucian Xtender/dms; Novell Teaming; Soft co R8; Therefore; Tokopen; Wisdom; Worksite; |
| Curriculum Management (Programme Planning) | MS Excel; Scientia; |
| Student Evaluation of Teaching Software | Empresa e-ST; Explorance Blue; Markclass; Questionmark Perception; |
| Current Research Information System (CRIS) | Haplo; Ideate; InfoEd; myProjects my impact; Research Administrator; Various; |
| Research Proposals, Grants and Contracts | Agresso Awards Management; Banner; Haplo; Infornetica; Microsoft Dynamics CRM; my projects proposal/ my projects; Not known; Oracle development; Oracle Grants Management System; SAP; Unit 4 Agresso Business World; Unit 4 PCB; Various; Vertigo Ventures Impact; |