CSU Technology Metrics Staff Survey Report

Conducted for:

The California State University Chancellor's Office

Prepared by:

The Social and Behavioral Research Institute

California State University, San Marcos

Study Team:

Richard T. Serpe, Ph.D.; Director
Allen J. Risley, M.A.; Associate Director
Michael D. Large, Ph.D.; Study Director
Lori Brown Large, M.A.; Survey Study Director
Kimberly D. Brown, B.A.; Field Research Coordinator

March, 2003

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

DATA 2

Measures 3

RESULTS 4

Respondent Characteristics 4

Technology Attitudes 9

General Attitudes Regarding Technology 9

Workstations, Software, and Help 12

Computer Use 12

Workstations 12

Software 14

Help with Workstation 16

Connectivity and Equipment 18

Connectivity 18

E-mail Services 18

Internet Access 19

Campus Network Access 21

Equipment 23

Administrative Information Systems 24

Financial Information System 24

Human Resources Information System 29

Student Information Systems 32

Help and Technical Support 36

Training 39

SUMMARY 41

General Findings 42

Attitudes 42

Access 42

Use 43

Satisfaction 44

CSU Technology Metrics Staff Survey Report

INTRODUCTION

The Social and Behavioral Research Institute at California State University, San Marcos produced the CSU Staff Technology Metrics 2002 report for the California State University Chancellor's Office. The report summarizes responses of staff members in the California State University (CSU) system concerning access to, use of, and satisfaction with computing and network technology. This report also addresses CSU staff's attitudes regarding computing and network resources at their campus.

The report contains a description of the data, an account of the results, and a summary of the key findings. Additionally, Appendix A contains the questionnaire items.

DATA

The data for the 2002 staff survey came from telephone interviews with 2,154 CSU system staff members in 2002. These data are compared to the 2,320 interviews with CSU staff members collected in 2000. These staff members come from 21 campuses in the CSU system. Interviews were conducted with staff members at each of the campuses except the Maritime Academy and Channel Islands campuses, which were excluded because they do not have staff populations adequate for sampling.

More than 100 interviews were conducted at each campus. The interview questions addressed attitudes about, access to, use of, and satisfaction with computing and network technology. Additionally, data regarding respondent characteristics were obtained from interview questions and institution databases.

Measures

A number of attitudes regarding technology were assessed using 11-point scales. For example, respondents were asked about the importance of computing and network resources for the completion of their job tasks. They were asked to respond "using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all important and ten equals extremely important." Similarly, satisfaction items used an 11-point scale "where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals extremely satisfied." (See Appendix A for the full text of the questions.) On each of the 11-point scales, higher numbers indicate higher levels of the quantity being measured. Most of the items regarding access to and use of technology were yes/no type questions. Additionally, some demographic information was provided in campus databases.

RESULTS

Respondent Characteristics

Most (67.1%) of the respondents in 2002 were female, and 32.9 percent were male. This is similar to the gender distribution of the 2000 survey, as shown in Table 1, though there are more female respondents in 2002. The respondents in 2002 averaged 45.18 years of age, compared to 45.72 years in 2000.

Table 1: Gender of Staff.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
GENDER Gender Code - Imported	1 Male	Count	871	709	1580
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	37.6%	32.9%	35.3%
	2 Female	Count	1447	1445	2892
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	62.4%	67.1%	64.7%
Total		Count	2318	2154	4472
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The race or ethnicity of the respondents is displayed in Table 2. In 2002, whites constituted 64.7 percent of the respondents, Hispanics were 14.3 percent, and the other categories were each less

than 10 percent of the respondents. This table shows there consistency in the race or ethnicity of staff members in 2000 and 2002.

Table 2: Race or Ethnicity of Staff.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
ETHNIC2 Ethnic Origin	1 African American	Count	166	170	336
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	7.2%	7.9%	7.5%
	2 Asian	Count	170	159	329
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	7.3%	7.4%	7.4%
	3 Other - Non White	Count	47	59	106
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	2.0%	2.7%	2.4%
	4 Hispanic	Count	340	308	648
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	14.7%	14.3%	14.5%
	5 White	Count	1520	1393	2913
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	65.6%	64.7%	65.2%
	6 Pacific Islander	Count	74	64	138
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	3.2%	3.0%	3.1%
Total		Count	2317	2153	4470
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Over half (52.8%) of the staff members had a bachelor's degree or higher. This is indicated in Table 3, which also shows that 18.1 percent of staff members had an advanced degree. Level of education in 2002 did not differ from 2000.

Table 3: Education Level of Staff.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
EDLEVEL Respondent's Education Level	1 Some Elementary School Completed	Count		1	1
		% within ADMIN Year of Study		.0%	.0%
	2 Elementary School Completed	Count	1		1
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	.0%		.0%
	4 Junior High School Completed	Count	1		1
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	.0%		.0%
	5 Some High School Education	Count	12	6	18
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	.5%	.3%	.4%
	6 High School Diploma or GED	Count	244	205	449
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	10.5%	9.5%	10.0%
	7 Some College	Count	705	607	1312
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	30.4%	28.2%	29.3%
	8 Trade or Craft Certificate	Count	28	25	53
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
	9 Associate Degree	Count	197	171	368
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	8.5%	7.9%	8.2%
	10 Bachelor's Degree	Count	734	748	1482
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	31.7%	34.7%	33.1%
	11 Master's Degree	Count	274	295	569
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	11.8%	13.7%	12.7%
	12 Professional Degree	Count	21	26	47
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	.9%	1.2%	1.1%
	13 Doctorate	Count	101	70	171
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	4.4%	3.2%	3.8%
Total		Count	2318	2154	4472
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The number of years a staff member had been at their campus, and how long they had been in their current position was asked. Table 4 shows that in 2002, staff had been at their campus for an average of 11.21 years, and had been 6.29 years in current position. Though there was a slight drop ($p<.05$) in the number of years staff members had been on campus in 2002, the number of years in their current position did not change.

Table 4: Years at Campus and in Current Position.

ADMIN Year of Study		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
1 2000	JOBYRS Years Working at the Campus	2318	.00	41.75	11.7481
	POSYRS Years Working in Current Position	2305	.00	41.75	6.6430
	Valid N (listwise)	2304			
2 2002	JOBYRS Years Working at the Campus	2152	.00	39.67	11.2064
	POSYRS Years Working in Current Position	1706	.00	60.00	6.2865
	Valid N (listwise)	1706			

Table 5 shows the job family class of the respondents. Given the focus of the survey, and the relative inaccessibility of those in skilled crafts, those in the skilled crafts job family were excluded from the sample in the 2002 survey.

Table 5: Job Family Class of Staff.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
FAMCLASS Job Family Class	1 Secretarial/Clerical	Count	604	602	1206
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	26.0%	27.9%	27.0%
	2 Executive, Administrative	Count	369	368	737
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	15.9%	17.1%	16.5%
	4 Service/ Maintenance	Count	66	13	79
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	2.8%	.6%	1.8%
	5 Professional Non-Faculty	Count	731	726	1457
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	31.5%	33.7%	32.6%
	6 Skilled Crafts	Count	98		98
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	4.2%		2.2%
	7 Technical/Paraprofessional	Count	452	445	897
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	19.5%	20.7%	20.0%
Total		Count	2320	2154	4474
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Technology Attitudes

General Attitudes Regarding Technology

All respondents were asked a series of questions regarding their impressions and beliefs about computing and network technology. Staff members believed computing and network resources are very important in completing their job tasks. Where zero indicates *not at all important* and ten indicates *extremely important*, the respondents, on average, rated the importance of computing and network resources at 9.39. This is seen in Table 6. This was an increase ($p<.05$) from an average rating of 9.05 in 2000.

Table 6: Importance of Computing and Network Resources.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
QGLOB2 Importance of Computing and Network Resources for Completion of Job Tasks	1 2000	2316	9.05	1.63
	2 2002	2153	9.39	1.21

Staff members rated their satisfaction with the computing and network resources available to them. Staff members tended to be fairly satisfied. This item used the satisfaction rating that was utilized throughout the interview. This satisfaction rating ranged from zero, indicating the respondent was *not at all satisfied*, to ten, indicating the respondent was *extremely satisfied*. Thus, the average rating of 7.65 in Table 7 suggests staff in 2002 were fairly satisfied with the available computing and network

resources. Year of administration affected the respondents' satisfaction with the available computing and technology resources. That is, there was an increase in satisfaction from 2000 to 2002 ($p<.01$).

Table 7: Satisfaction with Computing and Network Resources Available.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
QGLOB3 Satisfaction with the Computing and Network Resources Available	1 2000	2304	7.47	2.00
	2 2002	2149	7.65	1.75

Staff were also asked if they were aware of any efforts to improve computing and network resources on their campus in the last two years. Most (85.2%) of the respondents in 2002 were aware of such efforts to improve their computing and network resources. However, Table 8 shows that respondents were slightly less likely to be aware of these efforts in 2002 than were the respondents in 2000 ($p<.01$).

Table 8: Awareness of Efforts to Improve Computing and Network Resources.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
QGLOB4 Aware of Efforts to Improve Computing and Network Resources	0 No	Count	272	315	587
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	11.8%	14.8%	13.3%
	1 Yes	Count	2024	1813	3837
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	88.2%	85.2%	86.7%
Total		Count	2296	2128	4424
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those respondents who were aware of improvement efforts were asked about the consequences of these efforts. They were asked to rate on a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals *no improvement at all* and ten equals *extremely improved*, how much they thought these efforts to improve computing and network resources have improved their work conditions. On average, the respondents in 2002 offered a rating of 6.67, suggesting these efforts have been perceived as somewhat helpful in improving work conditions for many respondents. This is seen in Table 9. This rating did not differ from the 2000 rating.

Table 9: How much Computing Improvements Have Improved Work Conditions.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
QGLOB5 How Much Efforts to Improve Computing and Networking Resources Have Improved Work Conditions	1 2000	1987	6.72	2.29
	2 2002	1735	6.67	2.34

In 2002, staff members offered ratings of their computer knowledge for teaching and research activities. They were asked to respond on a scale of zero to ten, where zero means *not at all knowledgeable* and ten means *extremely knowledgeable*. On this zero-to-ten scale, the staff members, on average, said their knowledge of computer hardware and software important to their teaching and research activities was 7.72. This question was not asked of staff in 2000.

Workstations, Software, and Help

Computer Use

Staff members were asked how often they use a computer for any purpose. This question was asked only at Administration 2. The responses summarized in Table 10 show that virtually all (99.4%) staff members indicated that they use a computer almost every day.

Table 10: Frequency of Computer Use in 2002.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Almost Every Day	2142	99.4	99.4	99.4
	2 Weekly	7	.3	.3	99.8
	3 Monthly	2	.1	.1	99.9
	5 Almost Never	2	.1	.1	100.0
	6 Never	1	.0	.0	100.0
	Total	2154	100.0	100.0	

Workstations

Respondents were asked about access to the computer workstations, software, and maintenance. They were asked if they had access to a university-provided computer workstation to complete their work. Their responses are summarized in Table 11. Almost all (98.7%) of the respondents in 2002 said they had access to a university-provided computer workstation. The

percentage of staff members reporting that they had access to a computer workstation rose from 97.2 percent in 2000 to 98.7 percent in 2002 ($p<.01$).

Table 11: Access to a University-Provided Computer Workstation to Complete Work.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4A1 Respondent Has Access to a University-Provided Computer Workstation to Complete Work	0 No	Count	64	28	92
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	2.8%	1.3%	2.1%
	1 Yes	Count	2255	2124	4379
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	97.2%	98.7%	97.9%
Total		Count	2319	2152	4471
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those people reporting that they had access to a university-provided computer workstation were asked how satisfied they were with the workstation provided to them. Overall, staff members were fairly satisfied; the average satisfaction rating was 8.46. As Table 12 shows, this was a slight increase over the satisfaction rating in 2000 of 8.16 ($p<.001$).

Table 12: Satisfaction with University-Provided Workstations.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4A1C Satisfaction with the University-Provided Computer Workstation Available to Respondent	1 2000	2252	8.16	1.966
	2 2002	2119	8.46	1.707

Software

The availability of necessary software was also addressed in the survey. Staff were asked if they had access to university-provided software they needed to complete their work. The results are in Table 13. As with workstations, almost all (97.9%) of the respondents said they had what they needed with respect to software. The percentage of staff stating that they had the university-provided software they needed to complete their work had increased from 95.2 percent in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 13: Access to a University-Provided Software Needed to Complete Work.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4A2 Respondent Has Access to a University-Provided Computer Software Needed to Complete Work	0 No	Count	109	45	154
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	4.8%	2.1%	3.5%
	1 Yes	Count	2144	2071	4215
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	95.2%	97.9%	96.5%
Total		Count	2253	2116	4369
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those stating that they had access to university-provided computer software necessary for their work were asked how satisfied they were with that software. Overall, staff members who had access to software were quite satisfied with that software, as indicated by an average satisfaction rating of 8.26, though this is slightly lower than the average satisfaction level of 8.45 in 2000 ($p<.001$). This is seen in Table 14.

Table 14: Satisfaction with University-Provided Software.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4A2C Satisfaction with the University-Provided Software Available to Respondent	1 2000	2138	8.45	1.546
	2 2002	2068	8.26	1.695

Help with Workstation

Respondents were asked about assistance with installation and maintenance of computers. Almost all (95.8%) of the staff stated that they had access to assistance on campus to set up, upgrade, maintain, or repair a university-provided computer or computer equipment in 2002. As indicated in Table 15, this is the same proportion as in 2000.

Table 15: Access to Help on Campus to Set up, Upgrade, Maintain, or Repair University-Provided Computer Equipment.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4A3 Respondent Has Access to Help on Campus to Set up, Upgrade, Maintain, or Repair University-Provided Computer Equipment	0 No	Count	97	90	187
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	4.3%	4.2%	4.3%
	1 Yes	Count	2150	2030	4180
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	95.7%	95.8%	95.7%
Total		Count	2247	2120	4367
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those reporting that assistance was available on campus to set up, upgrade, maintain, or repair a university-provided computer or computer equipment were asked if they had made use of this assistance. Almost all (95.3%) of the respondents had received help, as indicated in Table 16. This is an increase from the 91.0 percent of staff members receiving help in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 16: Respondent Received Assistance from the Campus with Installation, Upgrading, or Maintenance of University-Provided Computer Equipment.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4A3B Respondent Received Assistance from the Campus with Installation, Upgrading, or Maintenance of University-Provided Computer Equipment	0 No	Count	193	96	289
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	9.0%	4.7%	6.9%
	1 Yes	Count	1955	1927	3882
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	91.0%	95.3%	93.1%
Total		Count	2148	2023	4171
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those that had received campus assistance with university-provided computer equipment were asked how satisfied they were with the service they received. Overall, staff members were fairly satisfied and offered an average satisfaction rating of 8.18. As Table 17 shows, this represents a significant increase from 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 17: Satisfaction with Service from the Campus with Computer Installation, Upgrading, and Maintenance.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4A3C Satisfaction with Service from the Campus with Installation, Upgrading, or Maintenance of University-Provided Computer Equipment	1 2000	1952	7.82	2.051
	2 2002	1924	8.18	1.816

Satisfaction with upgrade or replacement of computer workstations frequency was assessed in 2002. On a zero-to-ten scale, staff rated their satisfaction at 7.58, suggesting that staff members were fairly satisfied.

Connectivity and Equipment

Connectivity

E-mail Services. The use and satisfaction with connectivity was assessed. Staff members were asked if they had used campus e-mail services. The responses are summarized in Table 18. Almost all (98.8%) staff reported using campus e-mail services in 2002. This represents an increase from 96.2 percent in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 18: Use of Campus E-mail Services.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4B1A Respondent Used Campus E-mail Services	0 No	Count	89	26	115
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	3.8%	1.2%	2.6%
	1 Yes	Count	2229	2125	4354
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	96.2%	98.8%	97.4%
Total		Count	2318	2151	4469
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those who had used their campus e-mail services were asked about how satisfied they were. An average satisfaction rating of 8.86 shows that staff members were quite satisfied. Table 19 indicates that the level of satisfaction was higher in 2002 than it was in 2000 ($p<.01$).

Table 19: Satisfaction with Campus E-mail Services.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4B1B Satisfaction with Campus E-mail Services	1 2000	2224	8.74	1.476
	2 2002	2123	8.86	1.344

Internet Access. Table 20 shows the percentage of staff members with access to the Internet, including the World Wide Web. Almost everyone (98.9%) reported having used their campus access to the Internet. Table 20 shows that this rate is slightly higher than it had been in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 20: Use of Campus Access to the Internet.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4B2A Respondent Used Campus Access to the Internet, Including the World Wide Web	0 No	Count	68	24	92
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	2.9%	1.1%	2.1%
	1 Yes	Count	2252	2129	4381
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	97.1%	98.9%	97.9%
Total		Count	2320	2153	4473
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Staff who had used their Internet access were asked how satisfied they were with it. Table 21 shows their average responses. The average satisfaction rating of 8.50 shows that satisfaction was fairly high, and did not differ from 2000.

Table 21: Satisfaction with Campus Access to the Internet.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4B2B Satisfaction with Campus Access to the Internet	1 2000	2249	8.52	1.661
	2 2002	2127	8.50	1.634

Campus Network Access. Staff members were asked if they had used their campus network from off-campus. Three out of five (60.2%) of the staff members reported that they had accessed their campus network from off-campus. Table 22 shows that this is a large increase from 50.3 percent in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 22: Accessed Campus Network from Off-Campus.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4B3A Respondent Accessed Campus Network from Off-Campus	0 No	Count	1145	856	2001
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	49.7%	39.8%	44.9%
	1 Yes	Count	1159	1295	2454
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	50.3%	60.2%	55.1%
Total		Count	2304	2151	4455
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Staff members who had accessed their campus network from off campus were asked about how they connected. Table 23 shows their responses. This question was asked only in 2002.

Table 23: Mode Respondent Used to Connect to Campus Network from Off-Campus.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Dialing Directly to Campus with a Modem	554	25.7	43.8	43.8
	2 Cable	118	5.5	9.3	53.1
	3 DSL	133	6.2	10.5	63.6
	4 ISDN	14	.6	1.1	64.7
	5 Internet Service Provider	447	20.8	35.3	100.0
	Total	1266	58.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	29	1.3		
	System	859	39.9		
	Total	888	41.2		
Total		2154	100.0		

Those that did access their campus network from off-campus were asked how satisfied they were with that access. Respondents were somewhat satisfied, offering an average rating of 7.20. Table 24 shows that this is a significant increase from 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 24: Satisfaction with Campus Network Access from Off Campus.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4B3B Satisfaction with Access to Campus Network from Off-Campus	1 2000	1145	6.65	2.386
	2 2002	1285	7.20	2.212

Equipment

Staff members were asked about their satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of various forms of equipment on campus. They were asked about computing, telephone, and video-conferencing equipment. Staff members expressed satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of the computer equipment they use at their university. The overall rating was 8.26, as shown in Table 25. The level of satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of computer equipment showed a significant increase over the 7.90 rating in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 25: Satisfaction with Computing Equipment.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4A9A Satisfaction with the Working Order and Capabilities of the University-Provided Computing Equipment	1 2000	2240	7.90	1.760
	2 2002	2120	8.26	1.611

Staff members expressed satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of the telephone equipment that they use. Overall, the average satisfaction rating was 8.07. Table 26 shows that this is an increase from the 2000 administration ($p<.01$).

Table 26: Satisfaction with Telephone Equipment.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4A9B Satisfaction with Working Order and Capabilities of Telephone Equipment	1 2000	2313	7.88	1.905
	2 2002	2149	8.07	1.856

The staff was moderately satisfied with the working order and capabilities of the video conferencing equipment. The average satisfaction rating with the video conferencing equipment was 7.22, which was a slight drop-off from the average rating of 7.50 in 2000 ($p<.01$). This is shown in Table 27.

Table 27: Ssatisfaction with Video Conferencing Equipment.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4A9C Satisfaction with Working Order and Capabilities of Video Conferencing Equipment	1 2000	873	7.50	2.127
	2 2002	768	7.22	2.136

Administrative Information Systems

Financial Information System

Staff members were asked if they used their campus financial information system for completing their job tasks. More than a third (38.7%) of the respondents reported using their campus financial

information system. Table 28 shows that a greater percentage use the system in 2002 than had in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 28: Use of the University's Financial Information System for Completing Job Tasks.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q3B1 Respondent Uses the University's Financial Information System for Completing Job Tasks	0 No	Count	1526	1308	2834
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	66.4%	61.3%	64.0%
	1 Yes	Count	772	825	1597
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	33.6%	38.7%	36.0%
Total		Count	2298	2133	4431
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In 2002, the staff members who used the university's financial information system were asked if the system they were using was CMS/PeopleSoft. The responses of these staff members are displayed in Table 29. Half of the respondents indicated that they were using CMS/PeopleSoft.

Table 29: Uses the CMS/PeopleSoft Financial Information System.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	392	18.2	49.9	49.9
	2 No	394	18.3	50.1	100.0
	Total	786	36.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	38	1.8		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	1329	61.7		
	Total	1368	63.5		
Total		2154	100.0		

Those who reported using their campus financial information system were asked how satisfied they were with the speed or response time of the university's financial information system. As Table 30 shows, respondents were somewhat satisfied with the speed of the system. The average satisfaction rating was 6.28, a decrease from 2000 when the average satisfaction rating was 6.70 ($p<.01$).

Table 30: Satisfaction with the Response Time of the Financial Information System.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B1B Satisfaction with the Speed or Response Time of the University's Financial Information System	1 2000	713	6.70	2.346
	2 2002	812	6.28	2.653

Table 31 shows the 2002 satisfaction ratings of the university's financial information system for those with and those without CMS/PeopleSoft. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft were less satisfied than those using other systems ($p<.001$).

Table 31: Satisfaction with the Response Time of the Financial Information System.

	Uses CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B1B Satisfaction with the Speed or Response Time of the University's Financial Information System	1 Yes	383	5.72	2.785
	2 No	390	6.75	2.463

Respondents in 2002 also rated their satisfaction with their financial system's ease of use. Table 32 shows that staff members' ratings of satisfaction with the ease of use of the system was not very high, with an average rating of 5.56.

Table 32: Satisfaction with the Financial Information System.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B1C Satisfaction with the University's Financial Information System in Terms of How Easy It Is to Use	812	0	10	5.56	2.711
Q3B1D Satisfaction with the Quality of Information the University's Financial Information System Provides	809	0	10	6.04	2.609
Valid N (listwise)	801				

Table 33 shows that the average level of satisfaction varied depending on whether or not the respondent was using CMS/PeopleSoft. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft were less satisfied than those using other systems ($p<.001$).

Table 33: Satisfaction with the Ease of Use of the Financial Information System.

	Uses CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B1C Satisfaction with the University's Financial Information System in Terms of How Easy It Is to Use	1 Yes	383	4.88	2.750
	2 No	391	6.08	2.582

As Table 32 above indicates, staff members were somewhat satisfied with the quality of information provided by their financial information system. The respondents gave an average satisfaction rating of 6.04.

Satisfaction with the quality of information provided by their financial information system was also qualified by whether or not the respondent was using CMS/PeopleSoft. This is shown in Table 34. CMS/PeopleSoft users were less satisfied than were those using other systems ($p<.001$).

Table 34: Satisfaction with the Quality of Information from the Financial Information System.

	Uses the CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B1D Satisfaction with the Quality of Information the University's Financial Information System Provides	1 Yes	382	5.39	2.740
	2 No	388	6.56	2.392

Human Resources Information System

Staff members were also asked about their human resources information system. Table 35 shows that a quarter (24.2%) of the respondents do use their university's human resources information system. Use of the human resources information system did not vary by year of administration.

Table 35: Use of the University's Human Resources Information System.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q3B2 Respondent Uses the University's Human Resources Information System to Complete Job Tasks	0 No	Count	1764	1618	3382
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	76.6%	75.8%	76.2%
	1 Yes	Count	539	516	1055
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	23.4%	24.2%	23.8%
Total		Count	2303	2134	4437
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

About two out of five of the respondents that use their university's human resources information system indicated that the system they were using was CMS/PeopleSoft. This is seen in Table 36.

Table 36: Uses the CMS/PeopleSoft Human Resources Information System.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	276	12.8	58.1	58.1
	2 No	199	9.2	41.9	100.0
	Total	475	22.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	41	1.9		
	System	1638	76.0		
	Total	1679	77.9		
Total		2154	100.0		

Those using their university's human resources information system were asked how satisfied they were with the system's response time. Their answers are summarized in Table 37. The satisfaction level was lower in 2002 than it was in 2000 ($p<.001$).

Table 37: Satisfaction with the Human Resources Information System Speed.

	ADMIN Year of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B2B Satisfaction with Speed or Response Time of the University's Human Resources Information System	1 2000	481	7.03	2.132
	2 2002	502	6.39	2.586

Table 38 shows the satisfaction with the system's response time for those using CMS/PeopleSoft or other systems. The satisfaction level was higher for those not using CMS/PeopleSoft systems ($p<.001$).

Table 38: Satisfaction with the Response Time of the Human Resources Information System.

	Uses CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B2B Satisfaction with Speed or Response Time of the University's Human Resources Information System	1 Yes	269	5.94	2.862
	2 No	193	6.80	2.112

In 2002 respondents were also asked about the ease of use and the quality of the information from their university's human resource information system. Table 39 displays the results. Overall, respondents were somewhat satisfied with these aspects of their university's human resource information system.

Table 39: Satisfaction with the Human Resource Information System in 2002.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B2C Satisfaction with the University's Human Resources Information System in Terms of How Easy it Is to Use	500	0	10	6.02	2.554
Q3B2D Satisfaction with the Quality of Information the University's Human Resources System Provides	499	0	10	6.41	2.450
Valid N (listwise)	492				

The staff members' level of satisfaction with ease of use of their human resource information system varied by the system they were using. That is, respondents using CMS/PeopleSoft systems were less satisfied with the ease of use than were those using other systems ($p<.001$). This is seen in Table 40.

Table 40: Satisfaction with the Human Resource Information System Ease of Use.

	Uses CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B2C Satisfaction with the University's Human Resources Information System in Terms of How Easy it Is to Use	1 Yes	270	5.50	2.831
	2 No	191	6.46	1.991

Table 41 shows that staff members' level of satisfaction with the quality of the information in their human resource information system varied by the system they were using. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft systems were less satisfied with the quality of information than were those using other systems ($p<.001$).

Table 41: Satisfaction with the Human Resource Information System Information Quality.

	Uses CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B2D Satisfaction with the Quality of Information the University's Human Resources System Provides	1 Yes	265	5.93	2.688
	2 No	195	6.83	1.994

Student Information Systems

Less than half (41.2%) of the respondents reported using their university's student information system. This is illustrated in Table 42. Of those reporting that they had used their university's student information system, 18.0 percent said they were using a CMS/PeopleSoft system for their student information system.

Table 42: Use and Type of Student Information System.

	1 Yes		2 No	
	Count	%	Count	%
Respondent Uses the University's Student Administration Information System to Complete Job Tasks	880	41.2%	1256	58.8%
Respondent Uses the CMS/PeopleSoft Student Information Information System	148	18.0%	676	82.0%

Those reporting use of their student information system were asked how satisfied they were with different aspects of the system. The responses to these questions are summarized in Table 43. Overall, respondents using their university's student information system were fairly satisfied with the response time (7.50 satisfaction rating), ease of use (7.06), and quality of information (7.61).

Table 43: Satisfaction with the University's Student Information System.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B3B Satisfaction with the Speed or Response Time of the University's Student Administration Information System	865	0	10	7.50	2.231
Q3B3C Satisfaction with the University's Student Administration Information System in Terms of How Easy it Is to Use	865	0	10	7.06	2.357
Q3B3D Satisfaction with the Quality of Information the University's Student Administration System Provides	863	0	10	7.61	2.078
Valid N (listwise)	857				

The satisfaction with response time ratings varied depending on whether or not the respondent was using CMS/PeopleSoft. This is shown in Table 44. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft offered a satisfaction with response time rating of 6.65, while those using other systems offered a satisfaction rating of 7.67 ($p<.001$).

Table 44: Satisfaction with the Response Time of the Student Information System.

	Q3B3PS Respondent [illegible]	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B3B Satisfaction with the Response Time of the University's Student Administration Information System	1 Yes	143	6.65	2.874
	2 No	668	7.67	2.029

Table 45 shows that there was a difference in satisfaction with ease of use between those using CMS/PeopleSoft and those using other systems. Staff members using CMS/PeopleSoft were less satisfied with the ease of use of their system than were those using other student information systems ($p<.001$).

Table 45: Satisfaction with the Ease of Use of the Student Information System.

	Uses CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B3C Satisfaction with the University's Student Administration Information System in Terms of How Easy it Is to Use	1 Yes	143	6.11	2.773
	2 No	669	7.23	2.219

Satisfaction with the quality of information from the student information systems varied the type of information system being used. This is illustrated in Table 46. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft rated their satisfaction with the quality of information at 6.94, while those using other systems rated their satisfaction at 7.73 ($p<.01$).

Table 46: Satisfaction with the Quality of Information from the Student Information System.

	Uses CMS/PeopleSoft	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3B3D Satisfaction with the Quality of Information the University's Student Administration System Provides	1 Yes	142	6.94	2.534
	2 No	668	7.73	1.935

Help and Technical Support

Staff members were asked about their access to help with university-provided computer equipment if they have trouble after it has been installed. Almost all (97.5%) respondents said they had access to help if they have trouble with their university-provided computer after it has been installed. As Table 47 shows, there was no change in the percentage of respondents with access to with their university-provided computer from 2000.

Table 47: Access to Help if He/She Has Trouble with a University-Provided Computer.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4A5 Respondent Has Access to Help if He/She Has Trouble with a University-Provided Computer	0 No	Count	62	53	115
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	2.8%	2.5%	2.6%
	1 Yes	Count	2181	2066	4247
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	97.2%	97.5%	97.4%
Total		Count	2243	2119	4362
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In the 2002 administration, those reporting that they had access to help if they had trouble with their university-provided computer were asked a number of follow-up questions. They were asked if they had received help in the past two years. Most (94.0%) of the respondents with access to help had used that help in the past two years. These respondents were asked about the frequency with which they received technical help to solve a problem with their university-provided computer. Table 48 shows that a third (36.3%) of the staff members reported receiving technical help six or more times in the past two years.

Table 48: Number of Times Respondent Received Technical Help to Solve a Problem with University-Provided Computer in the Past Two Years.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 One to Two Times	467	21.7	24.3	24.3
	2 Three to Five Times	756	35.1	39.3	63.6
	3 Six to Ten Times	390	18.1	20.3	83.8
	4 More than Ten Times	311	14.4	16.2	100.0
	Total	1924	89.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	11	.5		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	217	10.1		
	Total	230	10.7		
Total		2154	100.0		

Staff receiving help were also asked how frequently the problems they had were solved to their satisfaction. Their responses depended on their rank, as illustrated in Table 49. Over half (56.8%) of the respondents reported being satisfied all of the time, and 91.1 percent were satisfied most or all of the time.

Table 49: Number of Times Problems with University-Provided Computer Were Resolved to Respondent's Satisfaction.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 All of the Time	1097	50.9	56.8	56.8
	2 Most of the Time	664	30.8	34.4	91.1
	3 Some of the Time	160	7.4	8.3	99.4
	4 None of the Time	11	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	1932	89.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't Know	4	.2		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	217	10.1		
	Total	222	10.3		
Total		2154	100.0		

Respondents were asked about how satisfied they were with the time it took to resolve the problem with their university-provided computer. In general, staff members indicated that they were satisfied, offering an average satisfaction rating of 7.86. A majority (61.0%) of the staff said that technical help they received was provided by someone in their own unit or department.

All staff members in 2002 were asked about the extent to which they rely on technical support people to solve computer problems. On average, staff members rated their reliance on technical support people to solve computer problems on a zero-to-ten scale at 7.07, suggesting that they were somewhat reliant on technical support people.

Training

The importance of, participation in, and satisfaction with training programs to help staff improve basic computing skills were assessed. Overwhelmingly, staff regarded training programs help improve basic computing skills to be very important. They offered an average importance rating of 9.25 on a zero-to-ten importance scale. This question was asked only in 2002.

The different types of programs that staff members participated in was of interest. They were asked about the types of training programs they participated in, and how satisfied they were with the training programs in general. They types of programs in which staff in 2002 had participated are displayed in Table 50. Workshops were the most commonly used type of training. Over two-thirds (68.8%) of the respondents had participated in a computer skills workshop, and half (51.6%) the respondents had participated in computer-based training.

Table 50: Types of Training Programs Participated in by Staff.

	0 No		1 Yes	
	Count	%	Count	%
Computer-Based Training	2063	48.4%	2203	51.6%
Workshop	1333	31.2%	2933	68.8%
Other	4103	96.2%	163	3.8%

Participation in a computer-based training was more likely in 2002 than it was in 2000 ($p<.001$). That is, 55.4 percent of respondents in 2002 participated in a computer-based training to improve basic computer skills compared to 47.8 percent in 2000. This is shown in Table 51. Participation in a workshop or other computer skills training did not differ by year of administration.

Table 51: Participated in Computer-Based Training.

			ADMIN Year of Study		
			1 2000	2 2002	Total
Q4A8A_1 Participated in Computer-Based Training	0 No	Count	1103	960	2063
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	52.2%	44.6%	48.4%
	1 Yes	Count	1010	1193	2203
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	47.8%	55.4%	51.6%
Total		Count	2113	2153	4266
		% within ADMIN Year of Study	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SUMMARY

The data for the 2002 staff survey came from telephone interviews with 2,154 CSU system staff members in 2002. This data was combined with similar data collected in 2000. The purpose of the survey was to provide information about CSU staff access to, use of, and satisfaction with computing and network resources and services considered to be within the scope of the technology infrastructure as defined in the CSU Integrated Technology Strategy.

The results of this survey provide an indication of differences from the first administration to the second in the way CSU staff use and think about information technology. Changes in use, opinion, and satisfaction will be tracked by comparing the results of these biennial staff surveys planned through 2006.

In the first two administrations, a total of 4,474 staff from 21 CSU campuses have been interviewed. The California Maritime Academy and CSU Channel Islands were excluded because the number of staff members on these campuses is too small to provide a sufficient sample. In both administrations, more than 100 individuals were interviewed at each campus.

The findings central to this study involve the differences between the first administration of the survey and the second. This summary gives focus to general findings and differences between Administrations 1 and 2. On the items indicating access, it generally increased. Similarly, use of technology resources tended to increase from Administration 1 to Administration 2. Overall, satisfaction measures were more likely to increase than decrease from 2000 to 2002.

General Findings

The CSU Staff Technology Survey covers three broad areas: attitudes regarding information technology, its availability and use, and satisfaction with resources and services.

Attitudes

- Staff members' ratings of the importance of computing and network resources increased from an already high rating of 9.05 in 2000 to 9.39 in 2002.
- In general, staff were less aware in 2002 of efforts to improve computing resources on their campus than respondents had been in 2000.

Access

- The percentage of staff members reporting that they had access to a computer workstation rose from 97.2 percent in 2000 to 98.7 percent in 2002, and the percentage of staff stating that they had the university-provided software they needed to complete their work increased from 95.2 percent in 2000 to 97.9 percent in 2002.
- Almost all (95.8%) of the staff had access to assistance on campus to set up, upgrade, maintain, or repair a university-provided computer or computer equipment in 2002.

Use

- Almost all (95.3%) of those reporting that assistance was available on campus to set up, upgrade, maintain, or repair a university-provided computer or computer equipment were asked if they had made use of this assistance. This is an increase from the 91.0 percent of staff members receiving help in 2000.
- Almost all (98.8%) staff used campus e-mail services in 2002 compared to 96.2 percent in 2000.
- Almost everyone (98.9%) used their campus access to the Internet.
- Staff members' use of their campus network from off-campus increased from 50.3 percent in 2000 to 60.2 percent in 2002.
- Campus financial information systems were used by 38.7 percent of the respondents, human resources information system were used by 24.2 percent, and 41.2 percent used their university's student information system.
- Over 90 percent of staff members had used help in the past two years.
- Nearly two-thirds (68.8%) of the respondents had participated in a computer skills training workshop, and half (51.6%) the respondents had participated in computer-based training.
- Participation in a computer-based training was more likely in 2002 (55.4%) than it was in 2000 (47.8).

Satisfaction

- Satisfaction with the computing and network resources available to them increased slightly from 2000 to 2002.
- Staff members were quite satisfied with the available software, giving an average satisfaction rating of 8.26, though this is slightly lower than the average satisfaction level of 8.45 in 2000.
- Staff members were fairly satisfied with university-provided computer equipment and offered an average satisfaction rating of 8.18, a significant increase from 2000.
- The level of satisfaction with campus e-mail services increased in 2002 to 8.86.
- Respondents were somewhat satisfied with access to their campus network from off-campus, offering an average rating of 7.20, which is a significant increase from 2000.
- The satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of computer equipment as well as telephone equipment increased in 2002, but satisfaction with video conferencing equipment decreased slightly.
- Staff members in 2002 were less satisfied with the response time of the administrative information systems than were staff members in 2000.
- In 2002, those using CMS/PeopleSoft were less satisfied with response time, ease of use, and quality of information of their administrative information systems than were those using other systems.

- Over half (56.8%) of the respondents reported having their problems with their university-provided computer solved to their satisfaction all of the time, and 91.1 percent were satisfied most or all of the time.

APPENDIX A

CSU Technology Metrics Staff Questionnaire

Job Status

<QJOB1> How many years and months have you worked at [name of campus]?

_____

<QJOB2> How long in years and months have you worked in your current position at [name of campus] ?

_____

<QJOB3> To which division of the university do you primarily report? Academic Affairs, Administration, or Student Services?

1. Academic Affairs
2. Administration
3. Student Services
4. Other (specify) _____

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

Global Questions

<QGLOB2> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all important and ten equals extremely important, how important would you say computing and network resources are to you in completing your job tasks?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<QGLOB3> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals extremely satisfied, overall, how would you rate your satisfaction with the computing and network resources available to you?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<QGLOB4> Are you aware of any efforts to improve computing and network resources on your campus in the last two years?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO Q4A9]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO Q4A9]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO Q4A9]

<QGLOB5> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals no improvement at all and ten equals extremely improved, how much would you say these efforts to improve computing and network resources on your campus have improved your work conditions?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4A9> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all knowledgeable, and ten equals extremely knowledgeable, how would you rate your knowledge in the use of computer hardware and software you believe are important to your own work?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

General Computer Use

<QUSE1> How often do you use a computer, for any purpose?

1. Almost every day
2. Weekly
3. Monthly
4. At least once a semester or quarter
5. Almost never
6. Never [SKIPTO Q4A9b]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIPTO Q4A9b]
9. REFUSED [SKIPTO Q4A9b]

Workstation

<Q4A1> Do you have access to a university-provided computer workstation to complete your work?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <T4B1>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <T4B1>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <T4B1>]

<Q4A1c> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university-provided computer workstation available to you?

_____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4A2> Do you have access to university-provided computer software you need to complete your work?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q4A3>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q4A3>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q4A3>]

<Q4A2c> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university-provided software available to you?

_____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4A3> Do you have access to help on campus to set up, upgrade, maintain, or repair a university-provided computer or computer equipment?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q4B5C>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q4B5C>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q4B5C>]

<Q4A3b> Have you received assistance from the campus with installation, upgrading, or maintenance of a university-provided computer and/or computing equipment?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q4B5C>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q4B5C>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q4B5C>]

<Q4A3c> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with this service?

_____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4B5c> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with how often your computer workstation is upgraded or replaced?

_____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

Connectivity

Initiative 4B: Faculty/Staff/Students

<Q4B1a> Have you used campus e-mail services?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q4B2a>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q4B2a>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q4B2a>]

<Q4B1b> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with campus e-mail services?

_____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4B2a> Have you used campus access to the Internet, including the World Wide Web?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q4B3a>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q4B3a>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q4B3a>]

<Q4B2b> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with campus access to the Internet?

_____
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4B3a> Have you accessed your campus network from off-campus?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <T4A10>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <T4A10>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <T4A10>]

<Q4B3mode> When you access your campus network from off-campus do you typically connect:

1. by dialing directly to a campus number with a modem,
2. by cable
3. by DSL
4. by ISDN, or by
5. an Internet service provider

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q4B3b> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with access to your campus network from off-campus?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

Equipment

[ASK IF <Q4A1> = 1, ELSE SKIP TO <Q4A9b>]

<Q4A10a> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of the computer equipment you use at the university?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4A9b> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of the telephone equipment you use at the university?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4A9c> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the working order and capabilities of the video conferencing equipment you use at the university?

_____

97. DO NOT USE VIDEOCONFERENCING EQUIPMENT
98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

[IF QUSE1 $ 6, SKIP TO QDEM1]

Administrative Information Systems

Initiative 3B: Staff Only

<Q3B1> Do you use the university's financial information system for completing your job tasks?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q3B2>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q3B2>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q3B2>]

<Q3B1ps> Is the system you are using the CMS/PeopleSoft financial information system?

1. YES
2. NO
8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q3B1c> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university's financial information system for performing your job tasks in terms of how easy it is to use?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B1d> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university's financial information system for performing your job tasks in terms of the quality of information that it provides?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B1b> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the speed or response time of the university's financial information system?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B2> Do you use the university's human resources information system for completing your job tasks?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q3B3>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q3B3>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q3B3>]

<Q3B2ps> Is the system you are using the CMS/PeopleSoft human resources information system?

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q3B2c> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university's human resources information system for performing your job tasks in terms of how easy it is to use?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B2d> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university's human resources information system for performing your job tasks in terms of the quality of information that it provides?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B2b> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the speed or response time of the university's human resources information system?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B3> Do you use the university's student administration information system for completing your job tasks?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <T4A2>]
8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <T4A2>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <T4A2>]

<Q3B3ps> Is the system you are using the CMS/PeopleSoft student administration information system?

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON’T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q3B3c> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university's student administration information system for performing your job tasks in terms of how easy it is to use?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B3d> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the university's student administration information system for performing your job tasks in terms of the quality of information that it provides?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q3B3b> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with the speed or response time of the university's student administration information system?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

**Initiative 4A [Faculty/Students/Staff]

Technical Support (General)

[IF Q4A1 > 1, SKIP TO T4A4]

<Q4A5> Is technical help available to you if you have trouble with your university-provided computer after it has been installed?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <T4A4>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <T4A4>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <T4A4>]

<Q4A5E2> In the last two years, have you received technical help to solve a problem with your university-provided computer?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q4A5E7>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q4A5E7>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q4A5E7>]

<Q4A5E3> In the last two years, how often have you needed to receive technical help to solve a problem with your university-provided computer? Would you say...

1. One to two times
2. Three to five times
3. Six to ten times
4. More than ten times

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q4A5E4> How often were the problems with your university-provided computer resolved to your satisfaction? Would you say . . .

1. All of the time
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. None of the time [SKIP TO <Q4A5E6>]

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <Q4A5E6>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <Q4A5E6>]

<Q4A5E5> On a scale from zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, how satisfied were you with the time it took to resolve the problem(s)?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4A5E6> Was help provided by someone (employee or colleague) in your own unit or department?

1. YES
2. NO

8. DON'T KNOW
9. REFUSED

<Q4A5E7> On a scale from zero to ten, where zero equals not at all reliant and ten equals completely reliant, how reliant are you on technical support people to solve computer problems?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

Training

<Q4A7> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all important and ten equals extremely important, how important do you believe it is for your campus to offer training programs or activities such as self-paced training or workshops to help staff improve basic computing skills, for example, word processing, spreadsheets, email, or web browsers?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

<Q4A8a> Which of the following types of training programs or activities have you participated in?

1. Computer-based training
3. A workshop
4. Other (specify)

8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO <QDEM1>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO <QDEM1>]

<Q4A8a1a> Using a scale of zero to ten, where zero equals not at all satisfied and ten equals completely satisfied, in general, how would you rate your satisfaction with the training programs or activities you have participated in?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED

Demographics

<QDEM1> For categorization purposes, can you tell me the year in which you were born?

_____

98. DON'T KNOW
99. REFUSED