International Journal on Science and Technology (IJSAT)
E-ISSN: 2229-7677 ● Website: www.ijsat.org ● Email: editor@ijsat.org

Digital Student ERP System: A Review of Integrated Information Systems and ERP Approaches in Higher Education

Dhanshri Wankhade[1], Ritika Pal[2], Harshad Wanode[3], Prof. Ravi Kumar Mohane[4]

Students[1,2,3], Assistant Professor[4]
[1,2,3,4]Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Shri Balaji Institute of Technology and Management, Betul, Madhya Pradesh, India.

Abstract:
The increasing use of digital technologies in education has created a need for efficient and integrated information management in higher education institutions. Many colleges manage student registration, attendance, academic records, fees, timetables, assignments, and notices through separate manual or computer-based processes. Such fragmentation can cause repeated data entry, delays, inconsistent records, and communication gaps. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) offers an integrated approach in which related institutional activities are supported through connected modules and shared information. This review analyses three selected publications: a 2022 systematic review of integrated information systems in higher education, a 2024 review of the evolution of higher-education ERP systems, and a 2026 study of Kerala's K-REAP digital transformation model. The studies are examined with respect to their focus, contributions, implementation perspectives, and relevance to student-oriented ERP systems. The comparison identifies opportunities for a unified platform that connects routine academic and administrative services while providing role-appropriate access. The paper also summarises the kinds of algorithms commonly used in ERP modules and identifies research gaps, challenges, and future scope for integrated, student-oriented ERP systems. As the full text of the 2026 article is not publicly accessible, its discussion is limited to information available in the publisher's abstract.

Keywords: Enterprise resource planning, ERP algorithms, higher education, digital transformation, student information system, integrated information systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

The education sector increasingly relies on digital technologies to support teaching, learning, administration, and institutional decision-making. Colleges and universities create and maintain large volumes of information about students, courses, faculty members, attendance, examinations, fee payments, timetables, and academic activities. When these records are managed through paper registers, spreadsheets, or independent applications, staff may need to enter the same information more than once. Students may also have to contact several departments to obtain routine information. These conditions can increase administrative effort and make it difficult to maintain a consistent view of student progress.

An Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system is an integrated software approach that coordinates multiple organisational functions through connected modules and shared data. In a higher-education environment, ERP may include student information, admissions, course registration, academic scheduling, examination records, finance, human resources, and institutional communication. The value of an ERP system is not limited to replacing paper records. Its broader purpose is to improve the flow of information between functions and support coordinated processes.

Skoumpopoulou and Abdelrahman [1] examine integrated information systems in higher education and discuss the organisational effects and research opportunities associated with their adoption. Gonugunta and Leo [2] review the evolution of higher-education ERP and identify functional areas such as Student Information Systems, Campus Solutions, Academic Scheduling, Financial Aid, and Human Capital Management. Sudheendran [3] examines the K-REAP digital transformation model in Kerala and discusses alternative ERP implementation approaches, including configurable cloud-hosted Software-as-a-Service (SaaS).

These publications provide complementary perspectives. The 2022 study helps explain why integration and organisational readiness matter; the 2024 study provides a view of the functional scope of higher-education ERP; and the 2026 study considers implementation models and sustainability at scale. Together, they provide a basis for understanding how integrated ERP systems can connect routine academic and administrative activities. Later reviews of ERP in higher education also report benefits such as lower operational costs and better decision support, alongside challenges such as system complexity and resistance to change [4], and report that implementation failure rates in the sector are higher than in other sectors [5].

1.1 Objectives

The objective of this paper is to review these three studies, compare their contributions, summarise the kinds of algorithms used in ERP systems, identify research gaps, and discuss challenges and future scope for integrated, student-oriented ERP systems in higher education. The review is limited to the three selected publications and does not claim to be an exhaustive survey of ERP literature.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Integrated Information Systems in Higher Education (2022)

Skoumpopoulou and Abdelrahman [1] published “Integrated Information Systems in Higher Education: Systematic Review and Research Opportunities” in 2022. The study examines the adoption and use of integrated information systems in higher education. The publication reports a review of 50 research articles published between 2000 and 2017 across 35 journals. It considers the ways integrated systems have been studied and the implications of implementation for higher-education institutions.

The paper is relevant because it places information-system integration within the organisational setting of a university or college. Educational institutions have different departments, professional roles, and established processes. Introducing an integrated system can therefore affect how information is collected, shared, and used. The value of integration depends not only on technical connectivity but also on coordination between the people and departments that use the system.

A key implication is that modules should not be treated as unrelated screens. Student registration should create reliable identity information that can be used by attendance, academic records, fees, and other authorised modules. Institutions should also define who is responsible for creating, updating, and

approving each type of record. These principles respond to the organisational dimension highlighted by the review.

The contribution of [1] is its broad synthesis of integrated information systems in higher education and its attention to organisational implications and research opportunities. A limitation for this review is that its underlying literature search ends in 2017. It therefore provides a useful foundation but does not cover all developments in ERP architecture and cloud delivery published in later years. It is also a literature review rather than an evaluation of a specific student ERP implementation.

2.2 Higher Ed ERP Systems—The Evolution (2024)

Gonugunta and Leo [2] published "Higher Ed ERP Systems – The Evolution" in 2024. The paper examines ERP research in the higher-education context and discusses functional areas that have become part of the ERP landscape. The areas identified include Student Information Systems (SIS), Campus Solutions, Academic Scheduling, Financial Aid, and Human Capital Management (HCM). This range illustrates that ERP in higher education extends beyond a student database and can connect academic and administrative operations.

The Student Information System area is directly relevant to student registration, enrolment, and academic records. Academic Scheduling is relevant to timetable and course organisation. Financial Aid and other financial functions show the connection between student administration and institutional finance. Human Capital Management concerns institutional staff and is broader than the student-facing scope of a student ERP, but it demonstrates the enterprise-wide nature of higher-education ERP.

The main lesson from [2] is that a useful system should be designed as a set of related functions rather than as a single-purpose attendance or registration application. A common student record can connect several modules, while access rules can ensure that each user sees only the information required for their role. Such a system can begin with a limited set of student-centred modules and be extended later.

The contribution of [2] is its overview of the functional evolution and research landscape of higher-education ERP. The present review does not treat the paper as proof that every institution uses all listed modules or that one implementation model is universally suitable. Its relevance is conceptual: it helps identify the breadth of functions that educational ERP may support. The detailed design and measured performance of a student ERP are not established by this review.

2.3 K-REAP Digital Transformation: A Kerala Model (2026)

Sudheendran [3] published "K-REAP Digital Transformation: A Kerala Model for Sustainable Enterprise Resource Planning in Large-scale Higher Education Systems" online in October 2026 in Higher Education for the Future. The publicly available abstract describes ERP strategies associated with Kerala's K-REAP initiative over the period 2013–2026. It identifies four implementation models: centralised software development, integration of existing university applications, institution-owned ERP, and configurable SaaS-based ERP.

The abstract argues for a cloud-hosted, configurable SaaS architecture supported by multi-level governance, centralised project management, distributed technical teams, and vendor-supported continuous customisation. This perspective is important because a higher-education ERP must remain useful as institutional requirements, policies, and technology change. A system that cannot be maintained or adapted may become difficult to sustain even if its initial implementation is successful.

For a student-focused ERP, the implications include modularity, maintainability, and the possibility of future cloud deployment. Student registration, attendance, academic records, and other modules can be logically separated while sharing consistent student identifiers and authorised data. If the institution later requires additional services, such as library management or online payment integration, new modules may be added without redesigning every existing function.

The limitation of this source in the present review is access to the full text. The publisher's abstract is available, but the full article is restricted. Therefore, this paper does not attribute detailed empirical methods, participant numbers, datasets, comparative measurements, or limitations to [3]. Its analysis is restricted to the four models and the sustainability argument stated in the abstract.

2.4 Algorithms and Techniques Used in ERP Systems

ERP systems are built mainly on transaction processing and database logic, but several families of algorithms are used inside their modules. The selected studies [1]–[3] do not describe algorithm-level detail, so this subsection summarises techniques commonly associated with ERP modules in general and indicates their relevance to a student ERP. Reviews of machine learning in ERP systems [6], university timetabling [7], [8], and student-performance prediction [9], [10] describe many of these techniques, and role-based access control is a long-established model for permission management [11]. The table below lists these categories.

Category	Typical algorithms	Use in student ERP
Data processing and validation	Hashing and indexing, sorting and searching, rule-based validation, duplicate record matching	Student ID lookup, marks ranking, cleaning migrated records
Planning and scheduling	MRP (bill-of-materials explosion), priority rules, constraint satisfaction, graph colouring, genetic algorithms [7], [8]	Timetable and examination scheduling, room allocation
Optimisation	Linear and integer programming, EOQ, greedy and simulated-annealing heuristics	Faculty–course allocation, resource planning
Forecasting	Moving average, exponential smoothing, ARIMA, regression	Enrolment and fee-collection forecasts
Machine learning	Decision trees, random forest, SVM, logistic regression, neural networks, k-means clustering [6], [9], [10]	At-risk student prediction, fee-default risk, attendance pattern grouping
Security and access	Password hashing, AES and TLS encryption, role-based access control [11]	Protecting records and enforcing role permissions
Workflow and rules	State machines, rule engines	Approval flows for results, fees, and requests

In practice, the core student ERP modules rely mainly on deterministic algorithms such as searching, sorting, validation, access control, and scheduling. Optimisation and machine-learning algorithms are usually optional analytics extensions, and their use should be justified by data availability and evaluated rather than assumed. The three reviewed studies [1]–[3] do not report algorithm-level detail, so these techniques are drawn from the additional sources cited in this subsection.

3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The three selected publications address related but distinct questions. Reference [1] considers the integration of information systems and the organisational changes associated with implementation. Reference [2] examines the expanding functional landscape of higher-education ERP. Reference [3] considers implementation models and the sustainability of large-scale ERP transformation. The papers can therefore be read as complementary perspectives on the design and operation of educational information systems.

Study	Primary focus	Main contribution	Design implication
2022 [1]	Integrated information systems	Reviews adoption and organisational implications	Plan shared data and user responsibilities
2024 [2]	Evolution of higher-ed ERP	Identifies SIS, scheduling, finance, and HCM areas	Connect academic and administrative modules
2026 [3]	K-REAP implementation models	Discusses configurable SaaS and governance	Consider modularity and long-term maintenance

Three themes emerge from the comparison. First, integration is a foundational requirement. When information is maintained in separate systems, users may face duplication and delays. A shared student identity and connected records can improve consistency, provided that data ownership and update rules are clearly defined. Second, functional coverage matters. Student services are connected to academic scheduling, assessment, and finance; a student ERP should therefore coordinate the modules that are relevant to the institution's needs. Third, sustainability must be considered from the beginning. A system needs maintenance, security updates, user support, and the ability to adapt to changing institutional processes.

The studies also differ in scope and evidence. The 2022 and 2024 publications are reviews of prior research, while the 2026 paper presents a model-focused discussion of a regional digital transformation initiative. The third paper's full text is not available for this analysis. These differences mean that the papers should not be compared as if they used the same dataset or evaluation method. The comparison is thematic and intended to identify common themes and gaps.

4. RESEARCH GAPS

The reviewed literature establishes the importance of integration, broad ERP functionality, and sustainable implementation. However, the selected studies leave several gaps, particularly for student-oriented platforms that bring frequently used academic and administrative services together through a simple interface. These gaps are framed as opportunities identified through this review rather than a claim that all existing ERP products lack these features.

First, student-facing functions may be distributed across separate portals or manual processes. A unified view of registration, attendance, marks, fee status, timetable, assignments, and notices can reduce the effort required to locate routine information. Second, the needs of students, teachers, and administrators are different. The interface and permissions should reflect these roles rather than exposing every function to every user. Third, information should be linked consistently. A student profile should act as a common reference for the student's academic and administrative records.

Fourth, usability deserves attention. A system can contain many functions but still be difficult to use if navigation is confusing or labels are unclear. A student-focused ERP should prioritise common tasks, provide understandable feedback, and work on commonly used browsers and screen sizes. Fifth, the system should be maintainable. Modular design, database backups, documentation, and controlled updates can support long-term operation.

These gaps are not claimed to have been measured by the three selected studies. Instead, they translate the studies' broader findings into open problems for future student ERP research and practice.

5. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE SCOPE

5.1 Challenges

Data Privacy and Security. Student profiles, marks, attendance, and fee information must be protected from unauthorised access. Implementations should apply least-privilege permissions, secure password hashing, session controls, secure transport, backups, and appropriate logging. Access to sensitive records should be limited to users with a legitimate institutional role.

Data Quality and Migration. If the institution transfers records from paper registers or spreadsheets, existing data may contain missing fields, inconsistent formats, or duplicate entries. A migration process should include data cleaning, validation, and verification by authorised staff. Incorrect migrated information can affect later reports.

User Adoption and Training. Students, teachers, and administrative employees may have different levels of digital experience. The interface should use familiar terms and provide guidance for common tasks. Training and support are important during initial deployment.

Maintenance and Availability. The system requires regular maintenance, security updates, database backups, and recovery planning. Institutions should identify who is responsible for hosting, technical support, and restoring service after a failure.

Institutional Process Differences. Different institutions may use different grading rules, fee schedules, semester structures, and attendance policies. A system should avoid hard-coding assumptions that do not apply to every institution. Configurable settings can help accommodate local requirements.

Scope Management. A project that attempts to implement too many modules at once may become difficult to complete and test. A phased approach is recommended: first implement authentication and student profiles, then core academic modules, and later optional services. Each phase should have clear acceptance criteria.

5.2 Future Scope

Student ERP systems can be extended after core modules are implemented and evaluated. A mobile application could provide convenient access to attendance, results, notices, and timetables. Online fee payment could be added through a secure payment gateway. QR-based attendance may be explored where institutionally approved, with safeguards against proxy attendance and misuse. Cloud deployment could

support availability and future growth, provided that data protection, backup, and service responsibilities are clearly defined.

Analytics dashboards could summarise attendance patterns, academic performance, fee status, and administrative activity for authorised users. Library management could connect book issue and return records to student profiles. A parent or guardian portal could provide selected information only with institutional approval and appropriate consent. Notification services through email, SMS, or in-app alerts could improve communication about deadlines and important events.

Future evaluation should include functional testing, security testing, usability assessment, and performance testing. A pilot deployment in a limited department or semester could help identify workflow problems before institution-wide adoption. Quantitative claims about reduced processing time, improved attendance, or user satisfaction should be made only after collecting and analysing actual evaluation data.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper reviewed three publications related to integrated information systems and ERP in higher education. Skoumpopoulou and Abdelrahman [1] provide a broad review of integrated information systems and highlight organisational implications. Gonugunta and Leo [2] discuss the evolution and functional scope of higher-education ERP, including student information and academic scheduling. Sudheendran [3] examines ERP implementation models associated with Kerala's K-REAP initiative and, in the publicly available abstract, emphasises configurable SaaS architecture and governance for sustainable transformation.

The comparative analysis identifies integration, functional coverage, usability, security, and sustainability as important considerations for student-oriented ERP systems. Algorithms used in ERP modules range from deterministic methods such as searching, sorting, scheduling, and access control to optional machine-learning analytics. The review also identifies research gaps and implementation challenges, including data security, data quality, user adoption, and maintenance, that should be addressed in future work.

The reviewed evidence is limited to three publications, and the full text of the 2026 study was not available. Future work should include implementation studies, usability evaluation with students and staff, and measurement of system performance under realistic conditions to establish the practical benefits of integrated student ERP systems.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. Skoumpopoulou and M. Abdelrahman, “Integrated Information Systems in Higher Education: Systematic Review and Research Opportunities,” ANWESH: International Journal of Management & Information Technology, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 57–64, 2022.

[2] K. C. Gonugunta and K. Leo, “Higher Ed ERP Systems – The Evolution,” The Metascience, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 1–13, 2024.

[3] K. Sudheendran, “K-REAP Digital Transformation: A Kerala Model for Sustainable Enterprise Resource Planning in Large-scale Higher Education Systems,” Higher Education for the Future, published online Oct. 11, 2026, doi: 10.1177/23476311261480399.

[4] M. B. Sholeh, R. F. Samodra, and A. P. Widodo, “Benefits and challenges of ERP implementation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review,” Jurnal Sistem Informasi Bisnis, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 21–33, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.14710/vol15iss1pp21-33.

[5] A. Abu Madi, R. M. Ayoubi, and M. Alzbaidi, "Spotting the critical success factors of enterprise resource planning implementation in the context of public higher education sector," Int. J. Public Administration, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 73–89, 2022, doi: 10.1080/01900692.2022.2085300.
[6] Z. N. Jawad and B. Villányi, "Machine learning-driven optimization of enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems: A comprehensive review," Beni-Suef Univ. J. Basic Appl. Sci., vol. 13, Art. no. 4, 2024, doi: 10.1186/s43088-023-00460-y.
[7] M. C. Chen, S. N. Sze, S. L. Goh, N. R. Sabar, and G. Kendall, "A survey of university course timetabling problem: Perspectives, trends and opportunities," IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 106515–106529, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3100613.
[8] S. Abdipoor, R. Yaakob, S. L. Goh, and S. Abdullah, "Meta-heuristic approaches for the university course timetabling problem," Intell. Syst. Appl., vol. 19, Art. no. 200253, Sep. 2023.
[9] K. Alalawi, R. Athauda, and R. Chiong, "Contextualizing the current state of research on the use of machine learning for student performance prediction: A systematic literature review," Engineering Reports, Art. no. e12699, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1002/eng2.12699.
[10] P. Balaji, S. Alelyani, A. Qahmash, and M. Mohana, "Contributions of machine learning models towards student academic performance prediction: A systematic review," Appl. Sci., vol. 11, no. 21, Art. no. 10007, Oct. 2021, doi: 10.3390/app112110007.
[11] R. S. Sandhu, E. J. Coyne, H. L. Feinstein, and C. E. Youman, "Role-based access control models," Computer, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 38–47, Feb. 1996.