

# **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

**October, 2004**

## Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	1
DATA .....	2
Measures .....	3
RESULTS .....	4
Respondent Characteristics .....	4
Technology Attitudes .....	4
Workstations and Equipment .....	5
Workstations .....	6
Software .....	6
Help with Workstation .....	7
Equipment .....	8
Connectivity .....	8
E-mail Services .....	8
Internet Access .....	9
Campus Network Access .....	9

Administrative Information Systems .....	10
Financial Information System .....	10
Human Resources Information System .....	12
Student Information Systems .....	13
Help and Technical Support .....	15
Training .....	17
SUMMARY .....	19

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Social and Behavioral Research Institute at California State University San Marcos produced the CSU Staff Technology Metrics 2004 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. Appendix A contains the text of the questionnaire items.

## **DATA**

The data for the 2004 staff survey came from telephone interviews with 2,146 CSU system staff members in 2004. These data are compared to 2,154 interviews conducted in 2002 and 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**

Two thirds (66.1%) of the respondents in 2004 were female, while 33.9 percent were male. The gender distribution of the 2004 and previous surveys are shown in Table 1.

Over half (56.5%) of the staff members in 2004 had a bachelor's degree or higher. This is indicated in Table 2, which also shows that 19.8 percent of staff members had an advanced degree. Level of education has been consistent across administrations.

The number of years a staff member had been at their campus, and how long they had been in their current position is indicated in Table 3. The table shows that in 2004, staff had been at their campus for an average of 11.40 years, and had been 6.84 years in current position. These averages are similar to those for 2000 and 2002.

Table 4 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 and 2004 surveys.

### **Technology Attitudes**

A series of questions regarding their impressions and beliefs about computing and network technology were presented to all respondents . Staff members believed computing and network resources to be very important in completing their job tasks. Where zero indicates *not at all important* and ten indicates *extremely important*, the respondents in 2004, on average, rated the importance of computing and network resources at 9.43. This is seen in Table 5. The 2002 and 2004 ratings were higher than the average rating of 9.05 in 2000.

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 7.70 in Table 6 suggests staff in 2004 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, staff members were more satisfied with the available computing and network technology in 2002 and 2004 than they were in 2000.

Starting in 2002, staff members gave ratings of their computer hardware and software 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 7.86 in 2004. This is an increase over the 7.72 rating in 2002.

## Workstations and Equipment

### Workstations

Staff 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 8. Almost all (99.0%) of the respondents in 2004 said they had access to a university-provided computer workstation. The percentage of staff members reporting that they had access to a computer workstation, initially very high, rose from 97.2 percent in 2000 to 98.7 percent in 2002 and 99.0 percent in 2004.

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 quite satisfied; the average satisfaction rating in 2004 was 8.47. Table 9 shows that the satisfaction level with computer workstations was higher in 2002 and 2004 than it was in 2000.

Beginning in 2004, staff members were asked about the type of workstation that was provided to them by their university. Table 10 shows that just over three quarters (78.9%) of the respondents worked exclusively on a desk-top computer.

### 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 11. As with workstations, almost all (97.1%) of the respondents in 2004 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 to 97.9 percent and 97.1 percent in 2002 and 2004 respectively.

Those with 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 8.29 in 2004. This is seen in Table 12. However, the average satisfaction ratings in 2002 and 2004 were lower than they had been in 2000.

#### Help with Workstation

Respondents were asked about assistance with installation and maintenance of computers. Almost all (95.3%) of the staff in 2004 stated that they had access to assistance on campus to set up, upgrade, maintain, or repair a university-provided computer or computer equipment. As indicated in Table 13, this is the same proportion as in the previous two survey administrations.

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 in 2004 had received help, as indicated in Table 14. The percentages in 2002 and 2004 represent an increase from the 91.0 percent of staff members receiving help in 2000.

Staff who had received campus assistance with university-provided computer equipment were asked how satisfied they were with the service they received. Overall, staff members were very satisfied and offered an average satisfaction rating of 8.25 in 2004. As Table 15 shows, satisfaction was higher in 2002 and 2004 than it had been in 2000.

Satisfaction with upgrade or replacement of computer workstations frequency was assessed starting in 2002. Staff rated their satisfaction at an average of 7.58 in both 2002 and 2004, suggesting that staff members were fairly satisfied. This is seen in Table 16.

## Equipment

Staff members were asked about their satisfaction with the video-conferencing equipment on campus. 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 7.36 in 2004. This is not significantly different from previous administrations, though the 7.22 rating in 2002 was a slight drop-off from the average rating of 7.50 in 2000. This is shown in Table 17.

## Connectivity

### E-mail Services

Staff members were asked about how satisfied they were with campus e-mail services. An average satisfaction rating of 8.03 shows that staff members were quite satisfied. Table 18 indicates

that the level of satisfaction was higher in 2002 than it was in 2000, but in 2004 the average satisfaction level dropped below what it had been in 2000.

#### Internet Access

Staff were asked how satisfied they were with their Internet access. Table 19 shows their average responses. The average satisfaction rating of 8.84 in 2004 shows that satisfaction was very high, and in 2004 satisfaction was higher than it had been in 2000 and 2002.

#### Campus Network Access

Staff members were asked if they had used their campus network from off-campus. The percentage of staff accessing their campus network from off-campus has grown from each administration to the next. Table 20 shows that the percentage has grown to 66.1 percent in 2004.

Staff members who had accessed their campus network from off campus were asked if they connected using cable or DSL. Table 21 shows that about two thirds (65.3%) of the staff members connecting to their campus network from used high speed cable or DSL to connect.

Those that did access their campus network from off-campus were asked how satisfied they were with that access. Respondents were fairly satisfied, offering an average rating of 7.36 in 2004. Table 22 shows that this 2004 rating, along with the 7.20 average rating in 2002 is significantly higher than the average rating of 6.65 in 2000.

The satisfaction with access to their campus network from off-campus was examined for those with and without cable or DSL access. Table 23 shows that for respondents in 2004, those accessing their campus network from home using cable or DSL were more satisfied than were those without cable or DSL access.

Staff members in 2004 were asked if their campus provided wireless access to their campus network. As Table 24 indicates, 73.3 percent of staff reported that their campus provided wireless access to their campus network.

Staff reporting that their campus provided wireless access to their campus network were asked if they had used that access. Less than a quarter (23.9%) of these respondents said they had used the campus wireless network access. Table 25 shows that this represents 11.9 percent of all respondents in 2004.

Staff satisfaction ratings for those who had used their campus wireless access to their network are shown in Table 26. The table shows that the average satisfaction rating was 7.52, demonstrating that staff members who had used their campus' wireless access were fairly positive about it.

## **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 (39.0%) of the respondents in 2004 reported using their campus

financial information system. Table 27 shows that a greater percentage used the system in 2002 (38.7%) and 2004 (39.0%) than had in 2000 (33.6%).

Starting 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 28. Half of the respondents in 2002 indicated that they were using CMS/PeopleSoft, and this grew to two thirds (68.2%) in 2004.

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 29 shows, respondents were somewhat satisfied with the speed of the system, offering an average satisfaction rating of 6.45 in 2004. The average satisfaction rating was lower in 2002 (6.28) than it had been in 2000 (6.70).

Table 30 shows the 2004 satisfaction ratings with 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.

Starting in 2002 respondents rated their satisfaction with their financial system's ease of use. Table 31 shows that staff members' ratings of satisfaction with the ease of use of the system was not very high, with an average rating of 5.77 in 2004. The table shows that satisfaction with ease of use did not differ from 2002 to 2004.

Table 32 shows that the average level of satisfaction in 2004 varied depending on whether or not the respondent was using CMS/PeopleSoft. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft were less satisfied than those using other systems.

Staff members were somewhat satisfied with the quality of information provided by their financial information system. As Table 33 shows, the respondents in 2004 gave an average satisfaction rating of 6.38. This is an increase over the 6.04 rating in 2002.

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 in terms of the quality of information provided.

#### Human Resources Information System

Staff members were asked about use of their human resources information system. Table 35 shows that 28.9 percent of the respondents in 2004 used their university's human resources information system. This is an increase over the use in 2000 and 2002.

Table 36 shows that in 2002 about three out of five (58.1%) of the respondents that use their university's human resources information system indicated that the system they were using was CMS/PeopleSoft. This increased to about four out of five (83.2%) in 2004.

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 and 2004 than it had been in 2000.

Table 38 shows the satisfaction with the system's response time for those using CMS/PeopleSoft or other systems. The response-time satisfaction level did not differ based on the use of CMS/PeopleSoft systems.

Starting 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 average satisfaction with the ease of use ratings. Overall, respondents were somewhat satisfied with the ease of use of their university's human resource information system. Their satisfaction level was slightly higher in 2004 than it had been in 2002.

The staff members' level of satisfaction with ease of use of their human resource information system is displayed in Table 40 by the system they were using. The table shows no difference in 2004 in staff satisfaction with the ease of use of their human resource information system by the type of system being used.

Satisfaction with the quality of the information in their human resource information system was assessed. Table 41 shows that satisfaction with the quality of the information in their human resource information system was a little higher in 2004 than it had been in 2002.

Table 42 displays the staff members' level of satisfaction with the quality of the information in their human resource information system by the system they were using. The table shows no difference in satisfaction by use of CMS/PeopleSoft systems in 2004.

#### Student Information Systems

Table 43 shows that less than half (41.6%) of the respondents in 2004 reported using their university's student information system. The percentage using this system is unchanged from 2002.

Of those reporting that they had used their university's student information system, 18.0 percent in 2002 said they were using a CMS/PeopleSoft system for their student information system, and this more than doubled to 43.7 percent in 2004. This is illustrated in Table 44.

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 45. Overall, respondents using their university's student information system were fairly satisfied with the response time, but their satisfaction was lower in 2004 than it had been in 2002.

The satisfaction with response time ratings varied considerably depending on whether or not the respondent was using CMS/PeopleSoft in 2004. This is shown in Table 46. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft offered a satisfaction with response time rating of 5.70, while those using other systems offered a satisfaction rating of 7.79.

The satisfaction level staff expressed with the ease of use of their campus student information system is displayed in Table 47 by survey administration. The table shows that staff in 2004 were less satisfied with their student information system terms of ease of use than they had been in 2002.

Table 48 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 much less satisfied with the ease of use of their system than were those using other student information systems.

The average satisfaction levels with the quality of information provided in the campus student information system is displayed in Table 49 for both 2002 and 2004. Satisfaction with the quality of information was higher in 2002 than it was in 2004.

Satisfaction with the quality of information from the student information systems varied with the type of information system being used. This is illustrated in Table 50. Those using CMS/PeopleSoft rated their satisfaction with the quality of information lower than did those using other systems.

As noted above, while reasonably high, satisfaction with the student information system dipped in 2004 with respect to response time, ease of use, and quality of information. These dips in satisfaction levels correspond with a large proportion of staff switching to a new system.

## Help and Technical Support

Almost all (97.7%) respondents in 2004 said they had access to help if they have trouble with their university-provided computer after it has been installed. As Table 51 shows, there was no change in the percentage of respondents with access to with their university-provided computer from previous administrations.

Starting with 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. In 2004, most (93.9%) of the respondents with access to help had used that help in the past two years. This figure did not change from 2002, as Table 52 indicates.

Those receiving help were asked about the frequency with which they received technical help to solve a problem with their university-provided computer. Table 53 shows that help was used often. Three quarters (75.3%) of the staff members in 2004 reported receiving technical help six or more times in the past two years. The frequency of receiving help reported in 2004 was the same as the frequency in 2002.

Staff who received help were asked how frequently the problems they had were solved to their satisfaction. Their responses are displayed in Table 54. Just as with staff in 2002, over half (56.9%) of the respondents in 2004 reported being satisfied all of the time, and 91.0 percent were satisfied most or all of the time.

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 7.97 in 2004. There was no difference between satisfaction ratings in 2002 and 2004, as Table 55 shows.

A majority (59.2%) of the staff in 2004 said that technical help they received with their university-provided computer came from someone in their own unit or department. Table 56 shows that this is the same percentage as in 2002.

Starting in 2002, staff members were asked about the extent to which they rely on technical support people to solve computer problems. They rated their reliance on technical support people to solve computer problems on a zero-to-ten scale with higher numbers indicating greater reliance. Staff gave an average rating of 7.11 in 2004, suggesting that they were somewhat reliant on technical support people. This is unchanged from 2002, as is illustrated in Table 57.

## **Training**

The survey addressed staff's perceptions of their campus' training programs to help staff improve basic computing skills. Overwhelmingly, staff regarded training programs to help improve basic computing skills to be very important. They offered an average importance rating of 9.07 on a zero-to-ten importance scale in 2004. This is a reduction from 9.25 in 2002, as seen in Table 58.

The different types of programs that staff members participated in were 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. The types of programs in which staff in 2004 had participated are displayed in Table 59. Workshops were more commonly used than were computer-based trainings.

Table 60 shows that for each administration more than half of the respondents participated in a computer-based training. Participation in a computer-based training was more likely in 2002 and 2004 than it was in 2000.

Participation in a workshop is shown by administration in Table 61. Participation in a workshop also varied by administration, though the pattern differs from that for computer-based training. Workshop training participation declined in 2004 from participation levels in 2000 and 2002.

Satisfaction with the trainings was assessed in 2002 and 2004. Table 62 shows that in both 2002 and 2004 staff were fairly satisfied with the trainings in which they participated, and there was no difference in satisfaction levels between 2002 and 2004.

## SUMMARY

The data for the 2004 staff survey came from telephone interviews with 2,146 CSU system staff members in 2004. This data was combined with similar data collected in 2000 and 2002. 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 a picture of the access, use, and satisfaction with computing and network technology as well as an indication of how these outcomes may be changing over time. Changes in access, use, and satisfaction will be tracked by comparing the results of these biennial staff surveys planned through 2006.

In the first three administrations, a total of 6,620 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 each administration, more than 100 individuals were interviewed at each campus.

The findings central to this study involve the differences from one administration of the survey to another. This summary gives focus to general findings and differences between administrations. The generally very high access actually increased for some things. Similarly, use of technology resources was much more likely to increase or stay the same than it was to decrease from one administration to the

next. Overall, satisfaction measures were more likely to increase than decrease from 2000 to 2002, but from 2002 to 2004 there were as many decreases as increases.

## **General Findings**

The CSU Staff Technology Survey covers three broad areas: access, use, and satisfaction with computing resources and services.

### Access

1. The percentage of staff members with access to a computer workstation, initially very high, rose from 97.2 percent in 2000 to 98.7 percent in 2002 and 99.0 percent in 2004.
2. The percentage of staff that had the university-provided software they needed to complete their work increased from 95.2 percent in 2000 to 97.9 percent and 97.1 percent in 2002 and 2004 respectively.
3. About two thirds (65.3%) of the staff members connecting to their campus network from used high speed cable or DSL to connect.
4. Three quarters (73.3%) of staff reported that their campus provided wireless access to their campus network.

## Use

5. Those 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 in 2004 reporting that assistance was available had received help, and the percentages in 2002 and 2004 represent an increase from the 91.0 percent receiving help in 2000.
6. The percentage of staff accessing their campus network from off-campus has grown from each administration to the next, reaching 66.1 percent in 2004.
7. Less than a quarter (23.9%) of these respondents said they had used the campus wireless network access.
8. More than a third of the respondents in 2004 used their campus financial information system, and a greater percentage used the system in 2002 (38.7%) and 2004 (39.0%) than had in 2000 (33.6%).
9. Half of the respondents in 2002 indicated that they were using CMS/PeopleSoft as their financial information, and this grew to two thirds in 2004.
10. Three out of five (58.1%) of the respondents in 2002 that use their university's human resources information system were using CMS/PeopleSoft, and this increased to four out of five in 2004.
11. Two out of five of the respondents in 2002 and 2004 were using their university's student information system.

12. In 2004, most (93.9%) of the respondents with access to help had used that help in the past two years.

#### Satisfaction

13. Staff in 2004 were fairly satisfied with the available computing and network resources, and were more satisfied with the available computing and network technology in 2002 and 2004 than they were in 2000.
14. Satisfaction with computer workstations was higher in 2002 and 2004 than it was in 2000.
15. Staff members in 2004 were very satisfied with the help they received in setting up, upgrading, maintaining or repairing their computer, and satisfaction was higher in 2002 and 2004 than it had been in 2000.
16. Staff members were very satisfied with e-mail services as well as Internet access.
17. Satisfaction with the financial information system was moderate with respect to the system response time, ease of use, and quality of information provided.
18. For the human resources information system, satisfaction increased in 2004 with respect to the system ease of use and quality of information.
19. Though reasonably high, satisfaction with the student information system dipped in 2004 with respect to response time, ease of use, and quality of information.

## 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

<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

<QCOMP> Is your university-provided computer [F5 HELP SCREEN: A docking station is a platform into which you can install a portable/laptop computer. Once inserted in a docking station, the portable computer essentially becomes a desktop computer. When it is taken out, it becomes a portable or laptop computer again.]

1. a desktop computer,
2. a laptop computer,
3. or do you have both, a desktop and a laptop?
4. LAPTOP WITH A DOCKING STATION
  
8. DON'T KNOW
9. 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

<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

<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>]

<QDSL> Do you have cable or DSL access at home? [F-5 HELP SCREEN: We are interested in knowing if you have a high-speed connection.]

1. YES
2. NO
  
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 home using a modem, cable, DSL, or ISDN? [F-5 HELP SCREEN: DSL - Digital Subscriber Line Internet access at about 50x faster than a 28.8 modem. Uses your existing line, but also allows you to use your traditional phone at the same time. ISDN - Integrated Services Digital Network 4-5x faster than normal 28.8 lines. Allows for networking across the internet.]

- 
98. DON'T KNOW
  99. REFUSED

<QWIRL1> Does your campus provide wireless access to your campus network?

1. YES
2. NO [SKIP TO <Q4A9c>]
  
8. DON'T KNOW [SKIP TO < Q4A9c>]
9. REFUSED [SKIP TO < Q4A9c>]

<QWIRL2> Do you use the campus wireless network?

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

<QWIRL3> Using the same scale, how would you rate your satisfaction with using your campus wireless network? [F5 HELP: Interviewer: If the respondent has not used or has not tried using the wireless network and they are confused with the question, choose "97. Have Never Used". If they have tried using the service at least once ask them to rate their satisfaction with trying the service.]

- 
- 97. HAVE NEVER USED
  - 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

### **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

## Technical Support (General)

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

<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