

# **CSU Student Technology Focus Groups Report**

**Conducted for**

**The CSU Chancellor's Office**

**Prepared by:**

**The Social and Behavioral Research Institute  
California State University, San Marcos  
San Marcos, California 92096  
760/750-3288**

**Study Team:**

**Richard T. Serpe, Ph.D.; Director  
Allen J. Risley, M.A.; Assistant Director  
Michael D. Large, Ph.D.; Study Director  
Lori A. Ballwey, M.A.; Survey Study Director  
Michael M. Harrod, B.A.; Research Assistant  
Sandra M. Martinez, B.A.; Research Assistant**

# **CSU Student Technology Focus Group Report**

**Conducted for**

**The CSU Chancellor's Office**

**Prepared by**

**The Social and Behavioral Research Institute  
California State University, San Marcos  
San Marcos, California 92096  
760/750-3288**

**Study Team:**

**Richard T. Serpe, Ph.D.; Director  
Allen J. Risley, M.A.; Assistant Director  
Michael D. Large, Ph.D.; Study Director  
Lori A. Ballwey, M.A.; Survey Study Director  
Michael Harrod, B.A.; Research Assistant  
Sandra Martinez, B.A.; Research Assistant**

**July 1999**

## Table of Contents

FOCUS GROUP STUDY DESIGN .....	1
DESCRIPTION AND DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE FOCUS GROUPS .....	3
FOCUS GROUP TOPICS .....	4
Instructional Experience with Computers .....	5
Suggestions for Improved Access .....	7
Interest in Computer Purchase or Lease Plans .....	8
PIRK–Software Suite .....	9
PIRK– 24 Help Desk .....	11
PIRK–Dial-up Access .....	11
PIRK– Web-based Training .....	12
PIRK– Evaluation of PIRK Package .....	13
PIRK– Funding Issues .....	13

## CSU Student Technology Focus Group Report

The CSU Student Technology Focus Group report was produced for the Technology Steering Committee of California State University by the Social and Behavioral Research Institute (SBRI) at California State University, San Marcos. The report summarizes responses of students in the CSU system focusing on their experience, attitudes, and opinions regarding computer technology use and funding of technology access for students at the campuses of the university.

This report contains a analysis from four focus groups conducted throughout the state to gain a deeper understanding of patterns of responses identified from the larger survey. These questions revolved around: 1) student experience with using technology in meeting course requirements or in assisting them in course related activities, 2) interest in a CSU sponsored program to provide personal access to computers through a purchase or lease plan, 3) interest and evaluation in each of the four components of the PIRK, 4) viewpoints regarding the funding necessary provide the PIRK.

### FOCUS GROUP STUDY DESIGN

The Focus Group component was part of the overall study design for the CSU Student Technology Study. The Focus Group component was an option that was to be completed after the telephone surveys of the CSU students system-wide was completed if the Technology Steering Committee of California State University wanted more detailed information in reference to the results of

the survey. In March of 1999, the preliminary report from the telephone sample was presented and as a result, the decision was made to go forward with the focus groups. The Technology Steering Committee of California State University identified a set of issues to be addressed within the focus groups. The Social and Behavioral Research Institute designed the CSU Technology Focus Group Discussion Guide (which is presented as Appendix A) to be used in four focus group sessions.

The SBRI proceeded to recruit four students from each of the 20 campuses involved in the survey. Two of the students were recruited as alternates to fill in if one the students canceled their participation. The students were recruited at random from the original sample of students provided by each campus. Only students who were not contacted for the telephone interview were eligible for participation in the focus groups. This decision was made to reduce any reactivity between the survey and the focus group questions. The study budget covered the cost of student travel, lodging (if necessary), and per diem. Additionally, as an inducement, students were given a fifty dollar stipend for their participation. The focus groups were held at California State University Fullerton on April 10, 1999, California State University Sacramento on April 24, 1999, California State University Hayward on May 1, 1999 and at California State University Northridge on May 8, 1999. The focus groups consisted of two sessions of two hours each with lunch provided between the sessions. The morning session began at 10 am and the afternoon session began at 1 pm.

## DESCRIPTION AND DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE FOCUS GROUPS

The CSU Fullerton Focus Group included students from the CSU campuses at Fullerton, California State Polytechnic University Pomona, California State University San Bernardino, California State University San Diego, and California State University San Marcos. There were a total of eleven participants, two from each of the campuses and three from San Diego. During our confirmation calls prior to the sessions, we were unable to reach one of the students from San Diego originally selected, so we requested that one of the alternates participate. The group consisted of six men and five women. The racial/ethnic background of the participants included five Asian, four Hispanic, one African American and one white student. The declared majors of the participants included two from biology and communications and one each from architecture, biochemistry, business, film, international business, psychology and sociology.

The CSU Sacramento Focus Group included students from the CSU campuses at Sacramento, California State University Chico, California State University Humboldt, and California State University Stanislaus. There were a total of eight participants, two from each campus. The group consisted of five men and three women. The racial/ethnic background of the participants included three whites, three Hispanics and two Asians. The declared majors of the participants included two from business and psychology and one each from environmental studies, geology, music, and social science.

The CSU Hayward Focus Group included students from the CSU campuses at Hayward, California State University Fresno, California State University San Francisco, California State University San Jose, California State Polytechnic University San Luis Obispo, and California State University Sonoma. There were a total of nine participants, two each from Hayward, San Francisco, and San Luis Obispo and one each from Fresno, San Jose and Sonoma. The group consisted of six

men and three women. The racial/ethnic background of the participants included four whites, three Hispanics, and two Asians. The declared majors of the participants included three from business and one each from communications, computer science, criminal justice, biology, dietetics, and multimedia specialist.

The CSU Northridge Focus Group included students from the CSU campuses of Northridge, California State University Bakersfield, California State University Domingues Hills, California State University Long Beach, and California State University Los Angeles. There were a total of eight participants, two from each campus except CSU Bakersfield. Despite two confirmations on Friday evening, no representatives from CSU Bakersfield attended the sessions. The group consisted of seven women and one man. The racial/ethnic background of the participants included five Hispanics, one white, one Asian, and one African American. The declared majors of the participants included two each from business, psychology and speech communication, and one each from communications and interdisciplinary studies.

### FOCUS GROUP TOPICS

The Focus Group Discussion Guide was followed at each group. The Focus Group Facilitator engaged each member of the group in discussion on each topic. Each group was audio taped and the tapes were transcribed. The full transcribed text of each group are presented in Appendix B.

In addition to the text of the interaction in the group, the participants were asked to list up three issues or points that were made during the discussion of each topic which they felt were the most important to consider. In focus groups where the participants have a considerable homogeneity of

experience with the topics, activities, or values that are discussed, sometimes the amount of discussion related to a specific statement is attenuated. By asking the participants to list those issues they believe to be important, the likelihood that a topic of great importance to the group will be missed by the facilitator is reduced. This process resulted in a list of the issues that the participants in each group and across all four groups felt were important. The following analysis is based on the transcripts of the groups. The list of important topics was used to organize the analysis and as a check to ensure that all important topics are included in the analysis.

#### Instructional Experience with Computers

The students who participated in the focus groups have a full range of knowledge and experience in using computers. All of the participants used computers for at least word processing, while others used the computer for everything from spreadsheets, to video editing, to music composition, to statistical analysis. Most of the participants had access to a computer at home and most also had access to a computer at their place of work. One student did not have a computer at either work or home and four students deemed their home computer to be too “old” or “not powerful enough” to really be assistance, beyond word processing, with the technical level of their assignments. About sixty percent of the participants demonstrated a very high level of technical experience and expertise, while about 5% demonstrated a very low level of technical knowledge or expertise. All but three students had used their campus computer labs for some aspect of their course work. With the exception of one student, who does not have a computer at home and who

demonstrated a high level of technical knowledge and expertise, all the participants indicated they do more than half of their computer based course work at a location other than the campus computer lab.

The students in the groups expressed little difficulty in finding access to basic software (word processing, spreadsheet, etc.). However, they all indicated that they are often frustrated in their attempts to use topic or program specific software related to their majors (e.g. video editing, SPSS, etc). The primary issues of concern for these students were the cost of the specialized software and access to computer a workstation on campus.

Four out of five of the student participants accessed the Internet from off-campus using a Internet Service Provider (AOL, CompuServ, EarthLink, MindSpring, etc.). Only twenty percent of the student participants ever accessed the campus for e-mail or to access the Internet from an off-campus location. However, seventy-five percent indicated that they have used a campus workstation to either access e-mail or to connect to the Internet. Most of the students listed log-on difficulties related to busy signals or software problems as their primary barrier to connecting to campus from an off-campus location.

Secondarily, they indicated that they found it difficult to obtain the assistance they needed from the campus help desks or consultants to solve their difficulties or learn how to use the dial-up facilities. These concerns were voiced more strongly by those participants with lower levels of technological experience or expertise.

#### Suggestions for Improved Access

In response to the question of improving access to computing on campus, most of the suggestions fall into the category of more resources. The following are the most common responses:

- More student workstations thus decreasing the student to computer ratio
- Increase “open lab” hours and make labs available 24 hours 7 days a week
- Specialized labs for software other than word processing
- Better monitoring of computer use by lab assistants during peak times to limit non academic computing activities
- Improved access from off-campus by increasing dial-up ports
- Better printing in student labs
- Increase the number of technical consultant and tutors in the labs

There was some discussion about the “choice” or “preference” for specific software. The most common concern in this discussion was Microsoft Products vs. “Another Product.” This always broke down to a preference for the software they knew or a general negative reaction to not having access to their choice of software. This theme was also raised around the Intel-based P.C.’s vs. Macintosh’s. Again, the issue revolved around both a negative view of the other hardware and their believe they should be able to work on their chosen platform.

The need for technical assistance was also high on the list of topics that kept coming up within the discussions. Their concerns ranged from getting help to learning how to use the software. In each group, the experience of having a lab consultant “just hitting the right key or clicking on screen” to solve their problem without explaining or teaching them what to do was expressed. In some cases, they needed to repeat the task several times and each time had to ask and “wait” for help. They often encountered negative reactions from the lab consultant who was irritated at the fact they had to keep asking the same question, but again felt like they were not taught how to do it themselves. In support of

lab consultants, many of the participants pointed out that on their campus, the lab consultants have too many workstations to cover to really do any teaching.

When probed on their knowledge and/or exposure to the availability of workshops, most had tacit knowledge that workshops are offered. However, their general impression was that they were offered too infrequently, or at inconvenient times, or when they found out about them they had little time to schedule attendance. Additionally those who had attended workshops, reported that the material covered in the workshop, while helpful, often did not prepare them to use the software at an advanced level (with the exception of word processing) to complete the tasks assigned by their professor.

#### Interest in Computer Purchase or Lease Plans

The response to this topic was the clearest across all four groups. With the exception of two students, all felt strongly that this was a very good thing. The two who did not, clearly stated that a taxpayer supported organization should not provide a product of any kind at a price less than the consumer can purchase the product on the open market. They felt it was an unfair advantage and an intrusion of government into commerce. That point aside, the group participants clearly supported the desktop computers purchase plan the strongest.

There was less interest among the participants for laptop computers on either the purchase or lease plans. They felt they were more expensive and while convenient, did not offer good value for them. They did however, think it should be an option for those who really wanted the flexibility with respect to where they did their work. Additionally, some indicated that if the campus had workstations

where laptops could be plugged in the network or if power sources were available in the classroom, the value and support of this option would increase.

They thought the lease plan was problematic and had too many concerns to clearly endorse this idea. Their concerns included what would happen if a student “stopped out” for a semester. Would the student lose their computer? Would it be considered “breaking” their lease? Could they replace the computer with a better model before the three years are up? What if they had less than three years to complete their degree, would they still be eligible to lease the computer? Suppose their lease expired and they had one more semester to complete their degree, would they be without a computer for that semester, could they extend the lease a semester, etc.? From the Facilitator’s viewpoint, there was not enough concrete information regarding the lease option. The participants keep asking very detailed questions designed to get more information before they could make a clear statement of their views. Therefore from these focus groups, I would not make any recommendation regarding the availability of a lease program.

#### PIRK–Software Suite

In general, the participants felt the software suite was a good idea. They clearly saw the advantage to having the same software at home that was available in the campus student labs. They also felt it would be good to have the same software their professors were using, but were somewhat skeptical as to the veracity of the fact that their faculty would use the chosen software. They were most supportive of the basic software programs for word processing, spreadsheet, presentation graphics, and databases. They were less supportive about both an Internet Browser (most preferred Netscape

to any other browser) or a specific e-mail package. It was clear that those participants who use of on-line computing the most seemed to have the strongest reticence to using a “designated” software package. Overall, the students with less access currently, expressed the strongest support.

However, there was also a considerable amount of concern about software suite proposal in general. The strongest concern revolved around choice of software. The majority of the participants had strong feelings about standardizing on one software suite and one manufacturer. These feelings extended beyond just software preference. The discussion included concern about giving one software manufacturer an unfair advantage over others, thus leading to a form of monopoly. Overall, most of the students who participated, preferred Microsoft products, but most also felt that other software suites should also be offered and supported. The most often mentioned alternative was Corel Word Perfect Office Suite. They indicated that learning more than one package would prepare them to be more competitive in the job market. Having more than one software package to choose from would enhance the students understanding of the various strengths and weakness of each package and allow them to use the best package for a specific assignment.

Secondarily, they expressed concern about having to purchase additional software, beyond what they now own and use, simply because the CSU endorses a particular product. The participants also had difficulty understanding the value of a “licenced” suite of software that included all upgrades. Most had never upgraded their own software and did not see the value in doing so. They seemed to believe that this was a component designed to raise the price of the PIRK over the course of their education. They also wondered what would happen to their licenced copy when they graduated? Would they get to keep it, even if they were no longer students?

## PIRK– 24 Help Desk

The participants in the focus groups really liked this idea. They felt that this would be a very helpful component since many of them work on their assignments late at night or very early in the morning. Their concerns revolved around access and level of assistance. How many people would be working? How long would they have to wait on the phone or how long before they received an on-line response? What kind of training would the people who staffed the Help Desk receive? Would they be students much like those currently working in the student labs or would they be full-time employees whose job it is to assist others? Would there be a limit to how often a student could call the Help Desk? Would there be referrals if the person working the Help Desk could not answer their question or solve their problem? Those students with less access to computing and with less technological expertise were very supportive of the help desk component and far less concerned about these questions and issues than those participants with greater access and experience.

## PIRK–Dial-up Access

As with the prior topics, dial-up access received almost unanimous support. Unlike the prior two topics, however, support was greatest among those participants who have a great deal of access and currently use an Internet Service Provider. Those who have less access were also very supportive, but these students also tend to have less expertise and clearly did not see this component as important as either the software suite or the help desk. About half of the participants who currently use an ISP indicated that would cancel their service and use the CSU dial-up access.

There were two concerns about the dial-up access proposal: speed and availability to successfully connect to the campus. The speed issue revolves around modem/cable speed. Will they be able to get “high” speed connections? Most of the participants were concerned about 56k connections. Those less likely to give up their ISP are currently using cable providers and thus see 56k connections as too slow now. The second concern addresses the issue of the number of ports/connections that would be available at any one time. Most of the participants who had successfully connected to their campus indicated that most of the time they encountered a busy signal prior to successfully connecting. Additionally, many of the participants have experienced crowded connections with their ISP. Those students with less access were less concerned about this issue, with the following exception. As they talked about dial-up access, they began to see how faculty might then expect them to do more computer-based work and therefore, the demand for access would increase. Among those students who currently have less access, their concern about the number of connections per campus focused on the “due date” times of the term. How crowded would the system be at mid-terms and during the last couple of weeks of the term.

#### PIRK– Web-based Training

The participants in the groups reacted positively to the idea of web-based training. They saw it as much more flexible than workshops. There was no clear patterns of which students supported the concept of web-based training more. In general, of all the PIRK components, web-based training generated the least interest among the participants. While they liked the concept, they doubted this component would be used very much unless the materials presented were required as part of a course.

The primary concern had to do with not understanding or having difficulty with some aspect of training and not having anyone (peer or teacher) to query. This was a greater concern among those participants with the least access or experience.

There were several suggestions about how to make web-based training more useful. These suggestions fell into two categories: interactivity and instructional follow-up. Many of the experienced participants thought web-based training should be like an automated manual. You find the topic or task you wish to learn about, click on it and begin an interactive session. In a sense, they wanted “training modules” within any topic. The participants with more experience thought they would use the resource more as an “on demand” expert. The second suggestion was to have “mini-instructional workshops” that introduced the user to a program and how to use the web-based training. The user could then work through the remaining sections of the training on their own. This suggestion was made more often by participants with less access and expertise. Clearly, they felt a little face-to-face instruction would assist them in using a web-based training program.

#### PIRK– Evaluation of PIRK Package

The focus group participants were asked to evaluate the PIRK package in its entirety. Overall, they were very supportive of the PIRK concept. Of the four components, dial-up access and the help desk captured and held their attention. The participants identified these two components as likely to be most helpful to students. The software suite was deemed to be important with the caveats stated above. The web-based training component was seen as good idea, but with less interest overall.

#### PIRK– Funding Issues

The funding questions produced a great deal of conversation. All four groups changed their position and understanding regarding the funding options as a result of the groups interaction. Initially, all four groups expressed concern over the funding questions. Their concerns were expressed as questions. “Why can’t the system pay for the PIRK out of the current funding?” “Could this program be organized so those students who wish to buy the PIRK could do so without everyone having to pay?” “Who decides the price and what assurances would students have that the price will not increase?”

Over the course of the discussion, the questions turned into comments. These comments were generally favorable. Support for and willingness to pay a fee for the PIRK parallels the survey results. Approximately three fourths of the students in the focus groups supported the an across the board fee for all students. The participants with the least access and expertise were the most supportive of the fee. The students who currently have higher levels of access and expertise were less supportive. However, many of the participants who were less supportive indicated that if the dial-up access was well designed and they could cancel their ISP, they would be much more willing to support a fee. Almost all of the participants who did not support the fee, did support the PIRK. Generally, these participants supported any option that would make the PIRK available to students as long as they did not have to pay anything.

In summary, the focus groups participants favored all students having access to the PIRK. They would prefer that someone else pay for the cost of the components or that the CSU find a way to reduce or offset the cost students are asked to pay. However, if the CSU cannot cover the cost, they

support a student fee. Again the support for the fee was strongest among those participants with less access and least technical skill and expertise.

## **Appendix A**

### **CSU Student Technology Focus Group Discussion Guide**

Good Morning and Welcome to the CSU Technology Focus Group. My name is Richard Serpe, I'm a Sociology Professor at CSUSM and I direct the Social and Behavioral Research Institute. I will be leading our discussions today. This is Sandy Babcock, Sandy is a Graduate Student and Research Assistant in the SBRI and she will be assisting in this process today.

Let me begin by telling you how much we appreciate that fact that is a Saturday and that your time is valuable. I also want to impress upon you how valuable your ideas, opinions, and insights are to not only this research project, but to current and future students of the CSU. You have been selected randomly from your campus. We believe that talking to members of the general student population will provide us with a very representative view of what CSU students think about technology issues. The CSU is seeking information that will be used to assess, propose and plan those aspects of the overall technology platform for the system that impact the access and needs of students. This is one of four focus groups which will be conducted throughout the state. In addition to this group at [CSU Fullerton or CSU Sacramento or CSU Hayward or CSU Northridge], we will be conducting groups at [List other locations CSU Fullerton, CSU Sacramento, CSU Hayward, CSU Northridge]. You represent students from [List campuses present].

The process today will include two sessions. This morning session and a second session in the afternoon. We will break for lunch between the two sessions. For those of you who have questions about the reimbursement for travel or the stipend for participation, we will answer those during lunch.

My role in today's session to ask you to talk about a set of issues. On occasion, I will ask you to

elaborate or I may ask a follow-up question in an attempt to get a full understanding of what you have said. Additionally, it is important that we hear from everyone in the group. So I may ask you directly what you think about one of the issues. There are no “right” answers. And we are not going to debate things people say. This is an open process and we want to hear as many different opinions and viewpoints as possible. Therefore, I am asking you to treat each other with respect and civility. After we have talked about the topic, you will have an opportunity to endorse the ideas presented that you believe are the most important. In a sense, you will be “voting” for the top three points discussed on each topic before we begin the next topic.

These focus groups are the second stage of this research project. In the first stage, we interviewed 3,107 students from twenty of the campuses in the CSU. We did not speak with students from CSU Monterey Bay or the Maritime Academy. The topics we are going to discuss today parallel the survey and are designed to give us a more complete understanding of the pattern of responses we received from the survey. We will be tape recording these discussions today to help us to accurately account for what has been said. The tapes will be transcribed, but your names and identities will not be included in the transcription.

Does anyone have any questions about the tape recording?

Okay, since we will be together for most of the day, lets take a few minutes to get to know one another before we get started. I want each of you to talk to one of the people next to you and find out about them. What is their name? What campus are they from? What is their major? You know, things that you would ask another student who you are meeting for the first time. After a few minutes, I will ask you to introduce the person to the group. (If we have an odd number of people, Sandy will pair up with one of the other students.)

Okay, let’s meet everyone.....

Alright, now we will begin the with the first topic for discussion.

1. When you have a course that requires you to use a computer to complete your assignments, where do you do the work?

Probes:

- a. Access to computers: campus labs, home and work.
- b. Software availability
- c. Are there any barriers to computer or software access

Okay, Sandy has a list of the issues you discussed. On one of the three by five cards, list in order the three issues that you believe are the most important with regards to CSU students using computers to complete course assignments.

2. What type of things could your campus or the CSU do to improve your access or skills and to meet your needs for computing and access to technology?

Probes:

- a. Workshops
- b. Technical Assistance
- c. Software

Okay, Sandy has a list of the issues you discussed. On one of the three by five cards, list in order the three issues that you believe are the most important with regards what would improve the access and skills of CSU students.

[Transition to PIRK Questions]

The CSU has been investigating ways to make personal computing resources more available for students when they are off-campus. I would like to ask you a few questions regarding some of the some of the resources and services that could be available to CSU students in the future.

3. One strategy that the CSU is working on is developing computer purchase or lease plans where students could buy or lease new computers. The computers offered would be name brand models with standard features. These computers would be priced below typical market prices, primarily because of the large group-purchase plan the CSU could represent to a computer manufacturer.
  - 4.1. If you could purchase a desktop computer like this through your campus for less than \$1,000, would you be interested in a University-sponsored computer purchase plan?
  - 4.2. If you could purchase a laptop computer like this through your campus for less than

\$2,500, would you be interested in a University-sponsored computer lease plan?

- 4.3. If you could lease a desktop computer like this through your campus for about \$120 per semester or quarter for a three year lease, would you be interested in a University-sponsored lease plan?
4. The CSU is considering a package of products and services that might be provided to CSU Students. This package is currently called the Personal Information Resource Kit or PIRK. The products and services that could be included in the PIRK are: a Suite of Software, 24 Hour Help Desk, Dial-up Access to Campus and the Internet, and Web-based training courses. We are going to talk about each of these separately.
- 4.1 The CSU is considering offering a standard suite of software to students as part of the PIRK. This package would include: Word Processing, Spreadsheet, Database, Internet Browser and E-Mail software. What do you think of the idea of providing students with a standard suite of software? (If students ask, I will indicate that the CSU has begun to work on a plan with Microsoft, but I will not entertain a discussion of specific software manufacturers.)

Probes:

1. Ask which of these distinct software products they would use?
2. What do they think about having software that is compatible with other students and faculty?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about the software suite. List the three issues you believe are most important.

- 4.2 As one part of the PIRK, the CSU is exploring the possibility of providing a 24 Hour Help Desk accessible via the telephone to answer questions and assist in solving problems students may encounter in using the software suite. What do you think of the idea of a 24 Hour Help Desk

Probes:

- a. How would you use the Help Desk?
- b. Do you see any drawbacks to a 24 Hour Help Desk?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about the 24 Hour Help Desk. List the three issues you believe are most important.

- 4.3 Another service the CSU is considering is to provide all students with Dial-up Access

to the Campus and Internet. This service would allow students to connect to campus to complete course work, e-mail their instructors, and browse the Internet. What do you think about the CSU providing this service as part of the PIRK? (If asked about number of ports or ease of access, I will comment that providing enough lines would be part of this aspect of the PIRK.)

Probes:

- a. Would you use the campus connection rather than an independent ISP?
- b. Do you see any drawbacks to a Dial-up Access?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about the Dial-up Access. List the three issues you believe are most important.

- 4.4 The last component of the PIRK under consideration is Web-Based Training Courses to provide training on the use of software included in the suite and possibly some other technology based curriculum. What do you think about the CSU providing this service as part of the PIRK?

Probes:

- a. Would you use the Web-based training?
- b. Do you see any drawbacks to Web-based training?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about Web-based Training. List the three issues you believe are most important.

- 4.5 Okay now that we have discussed all the various aspects of the PIRK, what do you think about the PIRK as a concept? Do you think the PIRK will be helpful to students? What parts of the PIRK do you think are most helpful or useful to CSU students?

Probes:

- a. Are there other computer/technology products and services that you think should be included in the PIRK?
- b. Do you see any drawbacks to the proposed PIRK?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about the PIRK in general. List the three issues you believe are most important.

5. The last issue we wish to discuss today concerns the funding the PIRK. Of course, it is easy to say someone else ought to pay for it. However, in today's world, that is not often possible.

We would like you to discuss a range of possible funding strategies that have been suggested by others. We want you to tell us what you think is fair and reasonable.

- 5.1 One possibility would be for students to purchase the PIRK on a school term or yearly basis. Students would have a choice as whether or not to purchase the PIRK. What do you think about this plan? How much do you think the PIRK should cost?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about the student choice to purchase PIRK. List the three issues you believe are most important.

- 5.2 Another possibility would be to include the PIRK as part of the student fees you pay. This plan would require each campus to vote on a fee increase. In this plan, all students would have the PIRK. What do you think about this plan? How much do you think a student fee should be?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about a student fee to cover the cost of PIRK. List the three issues you believe are most important.

- 5.3 It has also been suggested that another alternative is to ask the State Legislature to increase the funding to CSU from state tax revenues. What do you think about this plan? If the State Legislature was to provide only part of the funding, how do think the students should pay for the balance?

Okay, look at the list of issues you discussed about seeking funding for PIRK from the State Legislature. List the three issues you believe are most important.

Is there anything else you would like to add to the issues to that we discussed today?

Okay, that completes the Focus Group. Thank you for your participation. Be sure to give Sandy your reimbursement forms.