

TABLE OF CONTENTS: MEASUREMENTS AND METRICS

Detailed information related to specific MOS metrics is displayed in the tables in this appendix. The numbering of tables corresponds to the Measurements and Metrics for each ITS initiative as discussed in previous editions of the MOS. Table titles and numbers have been retained to facilitate comparison with previous reports.

INDEX

TABLES

❖ Academic Initiatives	
I. Library Resource Sharing (ITS Initiative 1D)	8.1-8.4B
II. Multimedia Repository (ITS Initiative 1C)	7.1-7.2
III. Distributed Learning and Teaching (ITS Initiative 1A)	5.5-5.7
IV. Centers for Instructional Technology Development (ITS Initiative 1B)	6.1-6.3, 6.5-6
❖ Student Services Initiatives	
I. See page 6	
❖ Administrative Initiatives	
II. Common Management Systems (ITS Initiative 3A).....	10.4, 10.3a1-10.3d2, 10.6a-b
III. Streamlining Information Technology Delivery (ITS Initiative 3B)	11.1
❖ Information Technology Infrastructure Initiatives	
I. Telecommunications Infrastructure (ITS Initiative 4B: Access Infrastructure)	13.1-13.5
II. Baseline User Hardware, Software Access, Training, and Support (ITS Initiative 4A)	12.1-12.24
❖ Master Plan Goals	
	4.1-4.2

This page intentionally left blank.

MEASUREMENTS AND METRICS

ACADEMIC INITIATIVES

I. Library Resource Sharing (ITS Initiative 1D)

OUTCOME

- To increase research opportunities by students and faculty by increasing the availability of a wide range of print and electronic resources.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in faculty and student usage of electronic resources.
- Increase in satisfaction of faculty and students in usage of electronic resources.



Table 8.1—System Profile: Faculty and Student Use of and Satisfaction with Online Information Resources

User Group	Used Online Information Resources (Percent)	Satisfaction with Quality (Mean Score)	Satisfaction with Quantity (Mean Score)	Satisfaction with Ease of Use (Mean Score)
2000/01				
Faculty	90.0	7.61	7.26	7.35
Students	81.8	7.81	7.66	7.59
2001/02				
Faculty	86.2	7.65	7.28	7.52
2002/03				
Students	84.4	7.93	--	7.75
2002/04				
Faculty	90.7	7.72	7.13	7.58
2004/05				
Students	83.7	8.03	--	7.84
2005/06				
Faculty	Survey item discontinued			

Source: Faculty and Student Technology Surveys

OUTCOME

- To leverage the purchasing power of the CSU by the cooperative buying and acquisition of library resources.

MEASUREMENT

- Tracking of costs of cooperative purchasing of electronic resources compared with single library purchasing of the same resources.



Table 8.2—System Profile: Cost Comparisons for Multi- Versus Single-Campus Acquisition of Core Library Resources

Fiscal Year	Expenditure for Collaborative Purchase of ECC	Estimated Expenditure for Individual Campus Purchase of ECC	Estimated Cost Avoidance Through Collaborative Purchase of ECC	Estimated Cost Avoidance as Percentage
1999/00	\$1,500,000	\$1,875,000	\$375,000	20.0%
2000/01	\$1,875,000	\$2,241,600	\$373,600	16.7%
2001/02	\$2,300,000	\$2,760,000	\$460,000	16.7%
2002/03	\$2,440,000	\$2,928,000	\$488,000	16.7%
2003/04	\$2,342,400	\$2,810,900	\$468,500	16.7%
2004/05	\$2,590,230	\$3,237,787	\$647,557	20.0%
2005/06	\$3,611,360	\$4,514,200	\$902,840	20.0%

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

OUTCOME

- To create a unique gateway system that allows any member of the academic community to access the CSU libraries' resources.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in unmediated and direct borrowing of print materials (books and articles).

Table 8.3—System Profile: Remote Borrowing Requests Processed by Automated Systems—Total and Annual Change

Fiscal Year	Campuses with Automated Borrowing Systems		Total Borrowing Transactions between CSU Libraries	Automated Borrowing Transactions between CSU Libraries		Remote Borrowing Transactions Processed by Pharos		Borrowing Transactions Process by Other Automated Systems	
	Number	Percentage		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1999/00	10	45.5%	100,890	26,837	26.6%	0	0.0%	26,837	26.6%
2000/01	10	43.5%	97,459	24,990	25.6%	0	0.0%	24,990	25.6%
2001/02	18	81.8%	96,497	30,085	31.2%	1,232	1.3%	28,853	29.9%
2002/03	19	82.6%	126,979	48,527	38.2%	5,736	4.5%	42,791	33.7%
2003/04	20	87.0%	140,502	39,749	28.3%	6,256	4.5%	33,493	23.8%
2004/05	20	87.0%	143,675	47,204	32.9%	7,622	5.3%	39,582	27.5%
2005/06	20	87.0%	141,495	43,760	30.9%	6,557	4.6%	37,203	26.3%

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

MEASUREMENT

- Tracking of mediated costs compared to unmediated borrowing of materials.

Table 8.4A—System Profile: Total Costs of Borrowing Between CSU Libraries

Fiscal Year	Mediated Borrowing Transactions		Automated Borrowing Transactions		Total Borrowing Transactions		Average Cost Per Remote Borrowing Transactions
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	
1999/00	74,053	\$1,853,536	26,837	\$163,889	100,890	\$2,017,425	\$20.00
2000/01	72,469	\$1,875,498	24,990	\$157,687	97,459	\$2,033,185	\$20.86
2001/02	66,412	\$1,769,880	30,085	\$195,252	96,497	\$1,965,131	\$20.36
2002/03	78,452	\$2,132,325	48,527	\$321,249	126,979	\$2,453,574	\$19.32
2003/04	100,753	\$2,803,956	39,749	\$269,498	140,502	\$3,073,454	\$21.87
2004/05	96,471	\$2,818,883	47,204	\$336,092	143,675	\$3,154,975	\$21.96
2005/06	97,735	\$2,932,050	43,760	\$320,761	141,495	\$3,252,811	\$22.99

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

Table 8.4B—System Profile: Comparison and Automated Remote Borrowing

Fiscal Year	Average Cost Per Mediated Borrowing	Average Cost Per Automated Borrowing
1999/00	\$25.03	\$6.11
2000/01	\$25.88	\$6.31
2001/02	\$26.65	\$6.49
2002/03	\$27.18	\$6.62
2003/04	\$27.83	\$6.78
2004/05	\$29.22	\$7.12
2005/06	\$30.00	\$7.33

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

OUTCOME

- To increase student information competence skills.

MEASUREMENT

- Longitudinal study that shows the development of skills from freshman to senior.

II. Multimedia Repository (ITS Initiative 1C)

OUTCOME

- To provide a wide variety of multimedia teaching resources across the Web to CSU faculty and students.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the usage of Web-based learning materials by faculty and students.
- Satisfaction of faculty and students with the learning applications.



Table 7.1—System Profile: Participation in MERLOT—Totals by Category and Annual Change as Percentage

Fiscal Year	CSU Members		All Members		Peer Reviews		Comments		Website Hits/Year*	
1999/00	149		3,922		35		430		188,175	
2000/01	381	155.7%	4,027	2.7%	213	508.6%	1,035	140.7%	230,400	22.4%
2001/02	525	37.8%	9,154	127.3%	516	142.3%	1,447	39.8%	336,418	46.0%
2002/03	589	12.2%	14,783	61.5%	1,002	94.2%	1,862	28.7%	1,500,000	345.9%
2003/04	780	32.4%	20,030	35.5%	1,445	44.2%	2,044	9.8%	1,903,938	26.9%
2004/05	1,015	30.1%	26,247	30.0%	1,699	17.6%	4,169	104.0%	2,421,496	27.2%
2005/06	888	-12.5%	36,409	38.7%	2,040	20.1%	4,424	6.1%	3,200,000**	32.1%

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

* The definition of Website "hits" and "visits" has changed over the years, as have the technical means for tracking them. The data presented here are a best effort to indicate changes in the volume of requests for information from the MERLOT Website.

** Approximate number.

OUTCOME

- To increase faculty collaboration by the sharing of courseware.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the number of learning applications gathered in the repository from 2,000 to 5,000 by 2002 and to 10,000 by 2008.
- Increase in the number of learning applications that have assignments attached from 100 to 500 by 2002 and to 5,000 by 2008.



Table 7.2—System Profile: Online Learning Objects Available in MERLOT—Totals and Annual Change

Fiscal Year	Total Learning Objects		Learning Objects with Assignments	
1999/00	3,033		86	
2000/01	5,830	92.2%	183	112.8%
2001/02	7,037	20.7%	256	39.9%
2002/03	8,724	24.0%	356	39.1%
2003/04	9,806	12.4%	385	8.1%
2004/05	12,108	23.5%	780	102.6%
2005/06	14,789	22.1%	813	4.2%

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

III. Distributed Learning and Teaching (ITS Initiative 1A)

OUTCOME

- To support the development of new models of technology-based collaborative learning and teaching.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in interactive learning materials developed by faculty.



Table 5.5—System Profile of Instruction Requiring Use of the World Wide Web: Number of Course Sections, Faculty Teaching Them, and Enrollments

College Year All Campuses	No. of Course Sections	No. of Enrollments	No. of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty
1999/00			
All Instruction	126,425	3,466,098	20,601
Web-Assisted Instruction	3,572	101,867	2,369
Web-Based as Percentage of All	2.83%	2.94%	11.50%
2000/01			
All Instruction	129,508	3,559,523	21,223
Web-Assisted Instruction	6,213	111,195	3,143
Web-Based as Percentage of All	4.80%	3.12%	14.81%
2001/02			
All Instruction	129,695	4,410,064	22,514
Web-Assisted Instruction	10,330	206,015	4,574
Web-Based as Percentage of All	7.96%	4.67%	20.60%
2002/03			
All Instruction	132,053	3,778,640	23,057
Web-Assisted Instruction	18,359	332,256	7,269
Web-Based as Percentage of All	13.90%	8.79%	31.10%
2003/04			
All Instruction	136,655	3,604,580	22,034
Web-Assisted Instruction	23,448	469,504	9,859
Web-Based as Percentage of All	17.16%	12.19%	44.70%
2004/05			
All Instruction	127,640	3,758,809	21,094
Web-Assisted Instruction	33,292	611,663	14,874
Web-Based as Percentage of All	26.08%	16.27%	70.50%
2005/06			
All Instruction	138,838	4,044,423	22,444
Web-Assisted Instruction	39,271	709,783	13,655
Web-Based as Percentage of All	28.29%	17.55%	60.8%

Source: CSU Analytic Studies: Academic Planning Database and Annual Campus Technology Survey

OUTCOME

- To develop distributed-learning environments within the CSU to allow faculty and students greater flexibility and opportunities in teaching and learning anywhere and at any time.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the usage of online virtual labs and other Web-based simulations by faculty and students.
- Increase in interactive learning materials developed by faculty.



Table 5.6—System Profile: Usage of Virtual Laboratory Simulations

FY	California State University Campuses			National/International
	Identified Uses*	Site Licenses	Individual Licenses	Simulation Runs
1999/00	2,892			58,634
2000/01	4,035			169,344
2001/02	7,990		102	258,314
2002/03	5,316		557	227,684
2003/04	4,783	15	291	234,963
2004/05	5,023	12	477	250,148
2005/06	9,680	29	243	245,147

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

*For technical reasons it is not possible to ascertain the institutional affiliation of all individual simulation users or the number of times an individual may run a simulation. The numbers reported here are a proxy measure based on computer addresses known to be associated with specific campuses. They represent an unknown fraction of actual simulation use.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the number of online virtual labs from 7 to 15 by 2001, and in the number of subject areas supported by the labs.



Table 5.7—System Profile: Computer-Based Simulations Created by CSU Center for Distributed Learning

Fiscal Year	No. of CDL Simulations	No. of Subject Areas
(Baseline) 1999/00	10	10
2000/01	12	12
2001/02	14	15
2002/03	16	17
2003/04	17	18
2004/05	17	18
2005/06	17	18

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

OUTCOME

- To support the needs and to encourage retention of non-traditional students, working students, and traditional students interested in new learning environments.

MEASUREMENT

- Demonstration of user satisfaction with access to and the content of the simulations.

IV. Centers for Instructional Technology Development (ITS Initiative 1B)

OUTCOME

- Provide support to faculty in the creation of online learning materials.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the usage (e.g., number of faculty, hours spent using support) by faculty of the campus support structure



Table 6.1—Campus Profile: Modes of Support for Developing Technology-Mediated Instructional Materials by Number of Campuses

FY	Central Instructional Technology Center No. of Campuses	Non-Central Instructional Technology Center No. of Campuses	Central & Non-Central Instructional Tech. Centers No. of Campuses	Faculty Release Time No. of Campuses	Faculty Incentive Pay No. of Campuses	Other (e.g., equipment, licenses, travel) No. of Campuses
1999/00	5	2	12	18	11	5
2000/01	7	0	11	14	12	5
2001/02	20	11	10	14	13	5
2002/03	20	12	12	17	13	5
2003/04	21	15	14	17	11	3
2004/05	21	14	13	14	10	6
2005/06	22	14	13	13	9	2

Source: Annual Campus Technology



Table 6.2—System Profile: Number of Full-Time Faculty Utilizing Campus Instructional Technology Support Structures

FY	Number All Campuses	Percentage All Campuses	Median Percentage All Campuses
1999/00	4,205	38.5%	35.4%
2000/01	4,801	43.3%	43.4%
2001/02	6,484	57.0%	52.9%
2002/03	8,627	73.2%	61.1%
2003/04	9,513	81.5%	74.6%
2004/05	9,081	82.0%	75.9%
2005/06	8,105	71.9%	76.2%

Source: Annual Campus Technology

Table 6.3—Campus Profile: Level of Full-Time Faculty Utilization of Instructional Technology Support Services

FY	Less than 25% of Faculty No. of Campuses	25–49% of Faculty No. of Campuses	50–74% of Faculty No. of Campuses	75% (+) of Faculty No. of Campuses
1999/00	7	7	6	2
2000/01	5	7	8	2
2001/02	4	7	4	7
2002/03	3	5	6	9
2003/04	2	4	6	12
2004/05	3	6	2	12
2005/06	4	5	2	12

Source: Annual Campus Technology

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in campus support (e.g., hours of contact, number of support staff) for faculty in developing online learning materials.

Table 6.5—System Profile: Full-Time Equivalent Positions Assigned to Support the Development of Technology-Mediated Materials

FY	Faculty Assigned Time FTE All Campuses	Faculty Assigned Time Median FTE All Campuses	Staff Positions FTE All Campuses	Staff Positions Median FTE All Campuses
1999/00	109.6	1.8	126.0	6.0
2000/01	83.4	2.0	136.0	3.0
2001/02	71.3	2.3	134.0	4.7
2002/03	74.4	2.1	129.8	4.0
2003/04	75.0	1.8	137.0	4.0
2004/05	52.7	1.2	119.3	4.0
2005/06	62.6	1.0	137.8	4.0

Source: Annual Campus Technology

Table 6.6—System Profile: Campus Expenditures (in Addition to Position Costs) to Support the Development of Technology-Mediated Materials

FY	Wages for Student Assistants All Campuses	Faculty Compensation All Campuses	Additional Campus Support All Campuses	Support from Non- State Sources All Campuses	Total Direct Support All Campuses
1999/00					
Total Campus Expenditures	\$817,797	\$892,489	\$1,451,975	\$4,203,404	\$7,365,665
Median Campus Expenditure	\$25,250	\$28,840	\$30,250	\$19,000	\$103,340
2000/01					
Total Campus Expenditures	\$983,547	\$969,289	\$1,544,068	\$4,179,057	\$7,675,961
Median Campus Expenditure	\$32,656	\$35,000	\$33,000	\$30,350	\$160,759
2001/02					
Total Campus Expenditures	\$1,072,080	\$1,111,776	\$2,510,568	\$4,026,916	\$8,721,340
Median Campus Expenditure	\$33,500	\$22,500	\$27,028	\$6,000	\$124,722
2002/03					
Total Campus Expenditures	\$1,204,269	\$1,192,943	\$2,892,538	\$9,049,355	\$14,339,105
Median Campus Expenditure	\$40,500	\$22,650	\$16,486	\$12,500	\$118,545

2003/04					
Total Campus Expenditures	\$1,112,800	\$723,049	\$1,664,391	\$8,227,397	\$11,777,637
Median Campus Expenditure	\$32,000	\$10,025	\$21,250	\$18,350	\$125,000
2004/05					
Total Campus Expenditures	\$1,098,081	\$713,388	\$2,783,171	\$7,123,774	\$11,718,413
Median Campus Expenditure	\$29,509	\$9,450	\$10,000	\$39,994	\$209,475
2005/06					
Total Campus Expenditures	\$1,110,697	\$616,510	\$1,568,660	\$8,555,175	\$11,851,042
Median Campus Expenditure	\$30,000	\$7,144	\$23,000	\$10,000	\$81,795

Source: Annual Campus Technology

STUDENT SERVICES INITIATIVE

I. Student Friendly Services (ITS Initiative 2A)

This edition of the MOS omits the Student Friendly Services Initiative because, as reported in November 2003, the number of electronic applications had far exceeded the 2008 goal, rendering further tracking unnecessary.

ADMINISTRATIVE INITIATIVES

I. Common Management Systems (ITS Initiative 3A)

OUTCOME

- To implement the new CSU administrative systems across all campuses and the Chancellor's Office in an efficient and effective manner.

MEASUREMENT

- Tracking completion of project components against the published schedule.

OUTCOME

- To support the administrative best practices with an integrated suite of enterprise software initially including Human Resources, Financial Management, and Student Administration applications.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in usage of CMS applications.



Table 10.4—Campus Profile: Implementation of CMS Software by Information System and Number of Campuses

Information System	Financial No. of Campuses	Human Resources No. of Campuses	Student Administration No. of Campuses
1999/00	0	0	0
2000/01	5	2	0
2001/02	10	11	3
2002/03	15	16	6
2003/04	17	21	8
2004/05	21	21	9
2005/06	21	22	10

Source: CMS Campus Deployment Timelines

MEASUREMENT

- Tracking the cost of project components against the published budget.

Status Data: CMS Project Implementation Costs

- ◆ CMS is being implemented in phases, both across the system and on individual campuses. A campus, for example, may implement one or more modules of the Human Resources application in one year, modules of the Financial application in another year, and modules of the Student Administration application in yet another year. Consequently, most campuses and the central CMS operation will have both implementation and operations expenditures in any given year.
- ◆ In prior years, Table 10.3 provided an overview of CMS implementation expenditures for the central CMS implementation only. At the end of 2001–02, the CSU began collecting campus budget and expenditure data as more and more campuses began to implement CMS applications. This table has been adjusted to report systemwide expenditures in two major areas: implementation and operations (Tables 10.3a and 10.3b).

For information purposes, this report distinguishes the costs for implementing the required *core* CMS functionality from expenditures to implement optional, *non-core* functionality added by individual campuses. *Core* expenditures comprise both central and campus costs to implement and operate the defined core baseline system; *non-core* expenditures are generally costs to the campuses and are not included in calculating the overall cost to implement the CMS core baseline.

Table 10.3a reports expenditures related to the implementation of *core* CMS functionality (10.3a.1) and campus-optional, *non-core* functionality (10.3a.2). Where applicable, this and related tables have been extended to include 1998–99, the year in which the first CMS central expenditures were made. “Implementation” expenditures are new costs related to initial development and implementation of CMS. “Integration” expenditures are new costs incurred in developing and putting into operation interfaces between the CMS and other campus systems such as phone registration or room scheduling systems service. “In-kind” expenditures refer to the redirection of existing staff and resources to CMS project implementation and integration.



Table 10.3a.1—CORE—CMS Implementation: Summary of Expenditures

Budget Categories	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Implementation	\$6,205,995	\$16,758,355	\$44,923,367	\$48,471,467	\$36,161,591	\$26,880,813	\$21,856,2617	\$32,439,218
Integration	\$0	\$0	\$4,576	\$304,016	\$58,800	\$39,750	\$56,300	\$0
Total New Expenditures	\$6,205,995	\$16,758,355	\$44,927,943	\$48,775,4833	\$36,220,391	\$26,920,563	\$21,912,561	\$32,439,218
In-Kind	\$284,284	\$1,763,597	\$5,936,084	\$7,144,205	\$6,723,521	\$5,095,289	\$6,992,781	\$5,282,243
Total Core CMS Implementation	\$6,490,279	\$18,521,952	\$50,864,027	\$55,919,6883	\$42,943,912	\$32,015,852	\$28,905,342	\$37,721,461

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2006. Errors discovered in prior years' reports have been corrected.



Table 10.3a.2—NON-CORE—CMS Implementation: Summary of Expenditures

Budget Categories	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Implementation	\$47,435	\$99,977	\$264,624	\$551,944	\$795,295	\$482,388	\$164,490	\$528,285
Integration	\$0	\$0	\$500,654	\$275,882	\$1,311,715	\$1,177,715	\$408,654	\$1,049,940
Total New Expenditures	\$47,435	\$99,977	\$765,278	\$827,826	\$2,107,010	\$1,660,103	\$573,144	\$1,578,225
In-Kind	\$20,972	\$33,810	\$317,789	\$455,330	\$589,718	\$285,797	\$121,352	\$245,582
Total Non-Core CMS Implementation	\$68,407	\$133,787	\$1,083,067	\$1,283,156	\$2,696,728	\$1,945,900	\$694,496	\$1,823,807

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2005

Table 10.3b.1 and 10.3b.2 reports annual operations expenditures for core and non-core CMS functionality. These expenditures are costs for operating and upgrading CMS applications.

Table 10.3b.1—CORE—CMS Operations: Summary of Expenditures

Budget Categories	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Total Core CMS Operations	\$260,785	\$944,823	\$ 10,736,378	\$ 26,920,626	\$ 39,724,498	\$ 43,826,492	\$ 55,238,950	\$62,493,062

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2006. Errors discovered in prior years' reports have been corrected.

Table 10.3b.2—NON-CORE—CMS Operations: Summary of Expenditures

Budget Categories	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Total Non-Core CMS Operations	\$0	\$0	\$376	\$122,104	\$ 168,208	\$ 95,340	\$ 1,197,851	\$1,322,445

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2006. Errors discovered in prior years' reports have been corrected.

The CSU estimated the total project implementation cost for CMS prior to its inception at \$439 million. This estimate included \$112 million for central operations of the CMS applications at the Chancellor's Office and \$327 million for projected expenditures to implement CMS both on the campuses and at the central office. Not included in these early estimates were

- in-kind costs (as these were already imbedded in the CSU budget); and
- the costs for integrating existing campus systems (such as phone registration or room scheduling systems) with the new PeopleSoft applications (as these were considered normal operating expenses for changing to a new system).

Tables 10.3c.1 and 10.3c.2 provide a year-by-year comparison of the original estimated costs with the revised estimates for both core and non-core expenditures. The increase in projected implementation costs from the 2004 report is based on several factors. Beginning with the 2004 report, campuses reported the cost of financing interest for the project including interest that would be paid after the completion of the project in 2008–09. A few campuses made revisions to implementation cost estimates based on data gathered from other similar-sized campuses. This resulted in significant ongoing increases on a few campuses. The deferral of the project for an additional year also resulted in increased implementation expenditures on some campuses.

Table 10.3c.1—CORE—CMS Total Project Implementation: Summary of Expenditures (in millions)

Budget Categories	Projection Made in 1999	Rev. Projection Made in 2002	Rev. Projection Made in 2003	Rev. Projection Made in 2004	Rev. Projection Made in 2005	Rev. Projection Made in 2006
Implementation	\$327.00	\$291.30	\$305.03	\$362.49	\$364.28	\$365.83
Integration	Not Included	\$12.90	\$0.17	\$0	\$0	\$0.46
Total New Expenditures	\$327.00	\$304.20	\$305.20	\$362.49	\$364.28	\$366.29
In-Kind	Not Included	\$63.40	\$55.78	\$58.29	\$56.57	\$51.45
Total Core CMS Implementation	\$327.00	\$367.60	\$360.98	\$420.77	\$420.85	\$417.74

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2005

Table 10.3c.2—NON-CORE—CMS Total Project Implementation: Summary of Expenditures (in millions)

Budget Categories	Projection Made in 1999	Rev. Projection Made in 2002	Rev. Projection Made in 2003	Rev. Projection Made in 2004	Rev. Projection Made in 2005	Rev. Projection Made in 2006
Implementation	Not Projected	Not Projected	\$3.94	\$2.66	\$4.04	\$4.72
Integration	Not Projected	Not Projected	\$13.13	\$12.82	\$11.58	\$11.23
Total New Expenditures	Not Projected	Not Projected	\$17.04	\$15.48	\$15.62	\$15.95
In-Kind	Not Included	Not Projected	\$2.10	\$1.45	\$2.33	\$2.69
Total Non-Core CMS Implementation	Not Projected	Not Projected	\$19.13	\$16.93	\$17.95	\$18.64

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2005

In addition to collecting current-year data, campuses have projected annual operations expenditures through 2008–09. Tables 10.3d.1 and 10.3d.2 show the total projected annual operations expenditures in the final year for all campuses. The projection suggests what the annual ongoing operation costs may be for all CMS systems once they are fully operational on all campuses. It is anticipated that this projection will change annually as campuses become more familiar with actual operational costs and complete the implementation of all required applications and functionality.

Table 10.3d.1—CORE—CMS Annual Operations Cost Projection for 2008/09 (in millions)

Budget Categories	Projection Made in 2002	Projection Made in 2003	Rev. Projection Made in 2004	Rev. Projection Made in 2005	Rev. Projection Made in 2006
Total Core CMS Operations	\$65.00	\$59.03	\$68.12	\$69.83	\$78.05

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2005

Table 10.3d.2—NON-CORE—CMS Annual Operations Cost Projection for 2008/2009 (in millions)

Budget Categories	Projection Made in 2002	Projection Made in 2003	Rev. Projection Made in 2004	Rev. Projection Made in 2005	Rev. Projection Made in 2006
Total Non-Core CMS Operations	Not Included	\$.51	\$.01	\$1.21	\$1.09

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2005

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the availability (based on increasing number of offices and spaces with network connectivity) of different types of administrative systems to faculty, staff/administrators, and students.

Table 10.6a—System Profile: Faculty Use of Administrative Information Systems

Type of Information	Number of Faculty Who Used the System	Percentage of Faculty Who Used the System
2000		
Student records for academic advisement	1,692	54.2%
2002		
Student records for academic advisement	1,723	52.7%
2004		
Student records for academic advisement	1,953	62.4%
Human resources for personal information	359	11.6%
2006		
Student records for academic advisement	1,953	65.7%
Human resources for personal information	599	19.6%

Source: Faculty Technology Survey

MEASUREMENT

- Demonstration of faculty, staff, and student satisfaction with PeopleSoft systems.

Table 10.6b—System Profile: Faculty Satisfaction With Use of Administrative Information Systems

Types of Information	Mean Satisfaction Ratings			
	2000	2002	2004	2006
Student records for academic advisement	6.63	6.35	6.21	6.40
Human resources for personal information	not applicable	not applicable	6.65	7.11

Source: Student Technology Survey

II. Streamlining Information Technology Delivery (ITS Initiative 3B)

OUTCOME

- To create efficiency in CMS data center operations through consolidation of data venues.

MEASUREMENT

- Reduction in total amount of CSU data center resources required to support administrative information systems.

Data Center Cost Comparison Methodology

The data center cost comparison model was developed to facilitate the calculation of cost avoidance in data center expenditures. "Cost avoidance" is the difference between the estimated campus data center costs without the centralized data center and the actual costs related to the HOSS data center. Actual expenditures for the HOSS data center include the annual cost of the Unisys agreement and HOSS-related operational expenditures within central CMS including telecommunications between the campuses and the data center.

The model used for estimating campus data center expenditures compares three kinds of costs: computing and network equipment (hardware) required to process the data produced by the CMS applications; software used to operate this equipment; and operational expenses (personnel, supplies and services). Estimated costs to the campuses are calculated based on the percentage of CMS/PeopleSoft deployment.

The model uses three campus size ranges: small (under 10,000); medium (10,000–25,000); and large (over 25,000). Each campus is assigned to one of these groupings, resulting in eight small; eight medium; and seven large campuses. Hardware, software, and staffing cost estimates are based on campus size.

Campus hardware expenditure estimates reflect the cost of purchasing or leasing computing and network equipment.

Estimates of campus software expenditures to operate and maintain data center equipment and to support the CMS environment on the campuses are based on the suite of software used at the HOSS data center and include job scheduling and report replication software.

Operations

In 2004–05, an estimated cost avoidance of \$14.62 million was realized for the year, compared with \$3.38 million in the previous year. The appreciable gain in cost avoidance is attributable to a planned decrease in annual cost for the Unisys data center and to an increase in the number of applications that became operational on campuses using the center (thus increasing the projected cost for separate processing on each campus). It is expected that the annual projected cost avoidance will adjust in 2005–06 as a new data center contract is implemented.



Table 11.1—System Profile: Projected Cost Comparisons: Consolidated vs. Separate Campus Data Centers (in millions)

FY	Campuses Using HOSS	Active Campuses Projected Cost	HOSS Actual Cost	Cost Avoidance Achieved
2001/02	11	\$10.33	\$16.03	-\$5.70
2002/03	16	\$15.08	\$14.62	\$0.46
2003/04	21	\$17.96	\$14.62	\$3.38
2004/05	21	\$23.89	\$ 10.06	\$ 13.83
2005/06	22	\$28.48	\$14.31	\$14.17

Source: CMS Expenditure Report 2006. Errors discovered in prior years' reports have been corrected.

MEASUREMENT

- Satisfaction of campus users with the service of the consolidated data center.

Data Center Review

Only a small number of users interact directly with the Unisys Data Center staff and understand the technical and operational issues involved in providing the service. Surveys similar to those used to collect data from students, faculty and staff about use of, access to, and satisfaction with various aspects of Information Technology in the CSU

are, therefore, not practical or methodologically sound if applied to HOSS services. CMS and Unisys managers meet regularly to review the overall performance and services offered by the Unisys data center.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE INITIATIVES

I. Telecommunications Infrastructure Initiative (ITS Initiative 4B: Access Infrastructure)

OUTCOME

- To provide students, faculty, and staff with network access, which allows high-speed communications on and between campuses, other educational agencies, and around the world.

MEASUREMENT

- Reduction in service interruptions on the network.



Table 13.1—System Profile: Campus Network Downtime in Total/Average Downtime

Downtime	Best Month				Worst Month			
	Total Minutes All Campuses		Average Minutes All Campuses		Total Minutes All Campuses		Average Minutes All Campuses	
1999/00 (Baseline Year)								
Planned	420	7.0 hrs	19	0.3 hrs	4,119	68.7 hrs	187	3.1 hrs
Unplanned	125	2.1 hrs	6	0.1 hrs	5,414	90.2 hrs	246	4.1 hrs
2000/01								
Planned	245	4.1 hrs	11	0.2 hrs	9,785	163.1 hrs	425	7.1 hrs
Unplanned	365	6.1 hrs	16	0.3 hrs	11,667	194.5 hrs	507	8.5 hrs
2001/02								
Planned	240	4.0 hrs	11	0.2 hrs	7,950	132.5 hrs	361	6.0 hrs
Unplanned	215	3.6 hrs	10	0.2 hrs	6,560	109.3 hrs	298	5.0 hrs
2002/03								
Planned	118	2.0 hrs	5	0.1 hrs	14,242	237.4 hrs	619	10.3 hrs
Unplanned	155	2.6 hrs	7	0.1 hrs	8,550	142.5 hrs	372	6.2 hrs
2003/04								
Planned	93	1.6 hrs	4	0.1 hrs	3,540	59.0 hrs	154	2.6 hrs
Unplanned	161	2.7 hrs	7	0.1 hrs	4,138	69.0 hrs	180	3.0 hrs
2004/05								
Planned	58	1.0 hrs	2	0.0 hrs	3,760	62.7 hrs	157	2.6 hrs
Unplanned	141	2.4 hrs	6	0.1 hrs	4,343	72.4 hrs	181	3.0 hrs
2005/06								
Planned	372	6.2 hrs	16	0.3 hrs	7,814	130.2 hrs	326	5.4 hrs
Unplanned	105	1.8 hrs	4	0.1 hrs	10,493	174.9 hrs	437	7.3 hrs

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 13.2a—System Profile: Inter-Campus Network Performance as Measured by Minutes of Non-Availability*

Fiscal Year	4CNet Downtime				Internet Connection Downtime			
	Best Month		Worst Month		Best Month		Worst Month	
2000/2001 Baseline Year								
Planned	352 Minutes	-0.027%	1020 Minutes	-0.079%	352 Minutes	-0.027%	1,020 Minutes	-0.079%
Unplanned	200 Minutes	-0.015%	57,600 Minutes	-4.444%	200 Minutes	-0.015%	57,600 Minutes	-4.444%
2001/2002								
Planned	0 Minutes	0.000%	64 Minutes	-0.005%	0 Minutes	0.000%	0 Minutes	0.000%
Unplanned	0 Minutes	0.000%	314 Minutes	-0.024%	0 Minutes	0.000%	0 Minutes	0.000%

Fiscal Year	4CNet Downtime				Internet Connection Downtime			
	Best Month		Worst Month		Best Month		Worst Month	
2002/2003								
Planned	0 Minutes	0.000%	113 Minutes	-0.009%	0 Minutes	0.000%	60 Minutes	-0.005%
Unplanned	0 Minutes	0.000%	1,710 Minutes	-0.132%	0 Minutes	0.000%	480 Minutes	-0.037%
2004/05								
See Table 13.2b								
2005/06								
See Table 13.2b								

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

*The total number of "minutes per month" is 1.296 million (the number of minutes in 30 days times 30, the number of CSU sites served by 4CNet). Downtime for the inter-campus network is calculated by multiplying the number of minutes per outage by the number of sites affected. For example, if three campuses experience an outage of 10 minutes, 30 minutes of downtime is logged for the network. In the above table, the portion of all minutes per month of network connectivity not available is shown as a percentage.



Table 13.2b— Inter-Campus Network Performance as Measured by Minutes of Non-Availability ("downtime" in minutes)

CalREN-related		Carrier-related		Campus-related		Overall – Best Month		Overall – Worst Month	
Incidents	Downtime	Incidents	Downtime	Incidents	Downtime	Incidents	Downtime	Incidents	Downtime
2004/2005									
4	300	2	1,560	5	780	Data not available			
2005/2006									
3	1,169	10	1,745	24	7,219	1	9	7	1,1951

Source: Summer System Technology Survey



Table 13.3—System Profile: Inter-Campus Network Traffic as Percentage of Bandwidth Utilization*

Fiscal Year	Average Bandwidth Utilization	Peak Bandwidth Utilization
2000/01	13.00%	32.00%
2001/02	10.60%	46.50%
2002/03	14.20%	44.35%
2004/05	Data unavailable during transition from 4CNet to CENIC.	
2005/06	Data unavailable during transition from 4CNet to CENIC.	

Source: Summer System Technology Survey

*Utilization for the inter-campus network is calculated on a per-campus basis by measuring the demand on the campus' link to 4CNet every five minutes (or more frequently if feasible) on the first business day of each month and taking the largest measurement. (For campuses that are redundantly connected, only the primary link is measured.) The largest of the monthly measurements becomes the metric. Average and peak utilization percentages are derived by aggregating the data for all campuses and dividing the largest measurement by the physical capacity of the connections in place at the time the measurements were taken.

MEASUREMENT

- Compliance of all inter-campus and intra-campus networks with CSU-established standards by 2008.



Table 13.4—System Profile: Progress Toward Meeting Minimum Baseline Telecommunications Infrastructure Standards

Approved New TIP Outlets	Total Outlet Entitlement	Total Outlets at Baseline	Percentage at Baseline
2001/02			
16,271	284,577	59,181	20.8 %
2002/03			
12,517	298,012	118,536	39.8%
2003/04			
11,678	309,690	145,256	46.9%

Approved New TIP Outlets	Total Outlet Entitlement	Total Outlets at Baseline	Percentage at Baseline
2004/05			
0	304,726	183,695	60.3%
2005/06			
7,983	312,709	225,590	72.1%

Source: Annual Technology Survey

OUTCOME

- To provide students, faculty, and staff with network access that allows information searching, retrieval, and research within and beyond the CSU.

MEASUREMENT

- Provision of 24 x 7 network access to all faculty, staff, and students.
- Demonstration of user satisfaction with ease of use of the network.



Table 13.5a—System Profile: Faculty, Staff, and Student Use of and Satisfaction with Network Services

User Group	Percentage Using Network	On-Campus Satisfaction	Remote Satisfaction
2000			
Faculty	98.0	8.51	6.55
Staff/Administrators	50.3	8.74	6.65
2001			
Students	----	7.68	7.54
2002			
Faculty	98.0	8.23	6.90
Staff/Administrators	60.2	8.86	7.20
2003			
Student	Note: Student use of and satisfaction with campus network services for 2003 shown in Table 13.5b below.		
2004			
Faculty	99.6	7.67	7.19
Staff/Administrators	66.1	8.84	7.36
2005			
Student	Note: The wording and format of this question was changed in the 2005 Student Survey, rendering comparisons to previous years impossible.		
2006			
Faculty	Note: The wording and format of this question was changed in the 2006 Faculty and Staff Surveys, rendering comparisons to previous years impossible.		
Staff/Administrators			

Source: Faculty, Staff and Student Technology Surveys



Table 13.5b—System Profile: Student Use of and Satisfaction with Campus Network Services

Type of Service	Percentage Use			Mean Satisfaction		
	2000/01	2002/03	2004/05	2000/01	2002/03	2004/05
Internet/Web	84.6	83.4	*	8.38	8.48	*
E-mail	Not applicable	52.6	66.7	7.68	8.02	7.95
Dial-In Modem	53.2	64.6	Item deleted	7.54	7.43	Item deleted
Broadband (cable, DSL, etc)	Not applicable	73.7	87.1	Not applicable	8.23	8.47
Wireless	Not applicable	Not applicable	27.0	Not applicable	Not applicable	7.52

Source: Student Technology Survey

* Note: The wording and format of this question was changed in the 2005 Student Survey, rendering comparisons to previous years impossible.

II. Baseline User Hardware, Software Access, Training, and Support (ITS Initiative 4A)

OUTCOME

- To provide students, faculty, and staff with access to technology and support that will assist in the teaching, learning, and research process.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the number of faculty, staff, and students who have access to baseline capabilities.



Table 12.1—System Profile: Faculty, Staff, and Student Access to University-Provided Workstations and Software

User Group	Percentage Workstation Access	Percentage Software Access
2000		
Faculty	96.2	95.6
Staff/Administrators	97.2	95.2
2001		
Students	94.1	85.6
2002		
Faculty	97.5	93.6
Staff/Administrators	98.7	97.9
2003		
Students	93.5	87.2
2004		
Faculty	97.3	90.2
Staff/Administrators	99.7	98.0
2005		
Students	92.6	75.9
2006		
Faculty	Survey item discontinued	
Staff/Administrators	99.1	96.9

Source: Faculty, Staff, and Student Technology Surveys



Table 12.2—System Profile: University-Provided Computer Workstations by User Group—Totals and Annual Change

User Group	Total Number Each User Group		Number of University-Provided Workstations		Workstation-to-User Ratio 1: X
1999/00					
Full-Time Faculty	10,936		11,576		0.9
Part-Time Faculty	9,665		5,366		1.8
Staff/Administrators	19,213		17,569		1.0
Students	353,390		13,846		25.5
2000/01					
Full-Time Faculty	11,089	1.4%	12,136	4.8%	0.9
Part-Time Faculty	10,134	4.9%	5,048	-5.9%	2.0
Staff/Administrators	19,910	3.6%	19,031	8.3%	0.9
Students	362,283	2.5%	19,504	40.9%	18.6
2001/02					
Full-Time Faculty	11,367	5.2%	13,261	9.3%	0.9
Part-Time Faculty	10,847	7.0%	4,785	-5.2%	0.5
Staff/Administrators	20,831	4.6%	19,595	3.0%	0.0
Students	382,146	5.5%	20,441	4.8%	-6.8
2002/03					
Full-Time Faculty	11,782	3.7%	14,539	9.6%	0.8
Part-Time Faculty	11,275	3.9%	5,280	10.3%	2.1
Staff/Administrators	21,420	2.8%	21,062	7.5%	0.9
Students	397,397	4.0%	23,143	13.2%	17.2
2003/04					
Full-Time Faculty	11,674	-0.9%	14,316	-1.5%	0.8
Part-Time Faculty	10,360	-8.1%	5,830	10.4%	1.8
Staff/Administrators	21,493	0.3%	22,443	6.6%	0.9
Students	394,765	-0.7%	25,505	10.2%	15.5
2004/05					
Full-Time Faculty	11,069	-5.2%	14,833	3.6%	0.7
Part-Time Faculty	10,025	-3.2%	6,558	12.5%	1.5
Staff/Administrators	20,682	-3.8%	20,533	-4.2%	0.9
Students	378,461	-4.1%	27,849	9.2%	13.6

User Group	Total Number Each User Group		Number of University-Provided Workstations		Workstation-to-User Ratio 1: X
2005/06					
Full-Time Faculty	11,276	1.9%	15,367	3.6%	0.7
Part-Time Faculty	11,168	11.4%	6,815	3.9%	1.6
Staff/Administrators	21,094	2.0%	21,486	4.6%	0.9
Students	393,478	4.0%	28,141	1.0%	0.0

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

Table 12.3—Campus Profile: Ratio of University-Provided Computer Workstations to Full-Time Faculty, Staff, and Administrators by Number of Campuses

Workstation-to-People Ratio	1:1 or less No. Campuses	1:1 to 1:2 No. Campuses	1:2 to 1:3 No. Campuses	1:3 to 1:5 No. Campuses	1:5 or more No. Campuses
1999/00					
Full-Time Faculty	13	9	0	0	0
Staff/Administrators	13	8	1	0	0
2000/01					
Full-Time Faculty	15	7	0	0	0
Staff/Administrators	15	8	0	0	0
2001/02					
Full-Time Faculty	18	4	0	0	0
Staff/Administrators	13	9	0	0	0
2002/03					
Full-Time Faculty	21	2	0	0	0
Staff/Administrators	16	7	0	0	0
2003/04					
Full-Time Faculty	20	3	0	0	0
Staff/Administrators	18	5	0	0	0
2004/05					
Full-Time Faculty	20	3	0	0	0
Staff/Administrators	16	7	0	0	0
2005/06					
Full-Time Faculty	22	1	0	0	0
Staff/Administrators	16	7	0	0	0

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

Table 12.4—Campus Profile: Ratio of University-Provided Computer Workstations to Part-Time Faculty by Number of Campuses

FY	1:1 or less No. Campuses	1:1 to 1:2 No. Campuses	1:2 to 1:3 No. Campuses	1:3 to 1:5 No. Campuses	1:5 to 1:10 No. Campuses	1:10 or more No. Campuses
1999/00	4	5	5	2	1	3
2000/01	3	4	6	5	3	0
2001/02	3	4	7	5	2	1
2002/03	3	7	5	5	2	1
2003/04	3	10	4	4	2	0
2004/05	6	8	5	3	1	0
2005/06	3	11	6	2	1	0

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

Table 12.5—Campus Profile: Ratio of University-Provided Computer Workstations to Students by Number of Campuses

FY	1:10 or less No. Campuses	1:10 to 1:20 No. Campuses	1:20 to 1:50 No. Campuses	1:50 or more No. Campuses
1999/00	2	6	9	5
2000/01	4	9	7	3
2001/02	3	10	7	2
2002/03	5	10	6	2

FY	1:10 or less No. Campuses	1:10 to 1:20 No. Campuses	1:20 to 1:50 No. Campuses	1:50 or more No. Campuses
2003/04	6	10	6	1
2004/05	6	13	4	0
2005/06	6	10	6	4

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 12.6—System Profile: Classrooms and Mobile Multimedia Units Equipped to Support Computer-Based Presentations

FY	Number of Classrooms	Number of “Smart” Classrooms	Ratio of “Smart” to all Classrooms	Number of “Smart Carts”	Ratio of “Smart Carts” to all Classrooms
1999/00	2,742	507	5.4	324	8.5
2000/01	2,703	792	3.4	480	5.6
2001/02	2,768	1,164	2.4	589	4.7
2002/03	2,914	1,520	1.9	578	5.0
2003/04	2,760	1,684	1.6	752	3.7
2004/05	2,827	1,894	1.5	765	3.7
2005/06	2,936	2,082	1.4	705	4.2

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 12.7—System Profile: Workstation Currency by User Group

User Group	University- Provided Workstations	Number Meeting CSU Hardware Standards	Percentage Meeting CSU Hardware Standards	Number Meeting CSU Software Standards	Percentage Meeting CSU Software Standards
1999/00 (Baseline Year)					
Full-Time Faculty	11,576	8,525	73.6%	9,363	80.9%
Part-Time Faculty	5,366	3,267	60.9%	4,119	76.8%
Staff/Administrators	17,569	11,602	66.0%	13,815	78.6%
Students	13,846	9,557	69.0%	10,450	75.5%
2000/01					
Full-Time Faculty	12,136	9,186	75.7%	3,545	82.9%
Part-Time Faculty	5,048	2,662	52.7%	10,621	70.2%
Staff/Administrators	19,031	14,563	76.5%	10,061	83.7%
Students	19,504	14,156	72.6%	17,794	91.2%
2001/02					
Full-Time Faculty	13,261	10,891	82.1%	11,651	87.9%
Part-Time Faculty	4,785	2,889	60.4%	3,630	75.9%
Staff/Administrators	19,595	15,101	77.1%	16,304	83.2%
Students	20,441	15,053	73.6%	17,444	85.3%
2002/03					
Full-Time Faculty	14,539	12,409	85.3%	13,020	89.6%
Part-Time Faculty	5,280	3,136	59.4%	3,793	71.8%
Staff/Administrators	21,062	17,467	82.9%	18,637	88.5%
Students	23,143	18,022	77.9%	20,371	88.0%
2003/04					
Full-Time Faculty	14,316	11,954	83.5%	13,765	96.2%
Part-Time Faculty	5,830	3,426	58.8%	4,063	69.7%
Staff/Administrators	22,443	18,883	84.1%	20,654	92.0%
Students	25,505	19,898	78.0%	22,828	89.5%
2004/05					
Full-Time Faculty	14,833	12,227	82.4%	13,841	93.3%
Part-Time Faculty	6,558	3,823	58.3%	4,668	71.2%
Staff/Administrators	20,533	16,435	80.0%	18,998	92.5%
Students	27,849	21,792	78.3%	24,208	86.9%

User Group	University-Provided Workstations	Number Meeting CSU Hardware Standards	Percentage Meeting CSU Hardware Standards	Number Meeting CSU Software Standards	Percentage Meeting CSU Software Standards
2005/06					
Full-Time Faculty	15,367	12,805	83.3%	14,325	93.2%
Part-Time Faculty	6,815	5,131	75.3%	5,516	80.9%
Staff/Administrators	21,486	17,782	82.8%	19,717	91.8%
Students	28,141	22,382	79.5%	24,935	88.6%

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in user satisfaction with hardware, software, training, and support by the campus community.

Table 12.8—System Profile: Faculty, Staff, and Student Satisfaction with University-Provided Computer Workstations and Software

Resource:	Computer Workstations	Software Applications
User Group	Mean Score	Mean Score
2000		
Faculty	7.76	7.81
Staff/Administrators	8.16	8.45
2001		
Students	7.57	8.02
2002		
Faculty	7.82	7.85
Staff/Administrators	8.46	8.26
2003		
Students	7.76	8.11
2004		
Faculty	7.90	7.92
Staff/Administrators	8.47	8.29
2005		
Students	7.92	8.23
2006		
Faculty	Survey item discontinued	
Staff/Administrators	8.54	8.25

Source: Faculty, Staff and Student Technology Surveys

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the number of faculty, staff, and students who have access to technical support.
- Increase in user satisfaction with technical support by the campus community.

Table 12.9—Campus Profile: Level 1 Technical Support for Faculty, Staff, and Students by Mode of Access and Number of Campuses

Mode	Call Center				Walk-In Help Desk				E-Mail or Web			
	All	Most	Some	Few	All	Most	Some	Few	All	Most	Some	Few
1999/00 (Baseline Year)												
Faculty/Staff	19	1	1	1	17	2	2	1	17	3	2	0
2000/01												
Faculty	22	1	0	0	18	2	1	2	20	1	2	0
Staff	22	1	0	0	18	2	1	1	19	3	1	0
Students	20	1	2	0	17	2	1	3	16	2	2	3
2001/02												
Faculty	19	2	1	0	20	1	1	0	18	3	0	1
Staff	19	2	0	1	19	2	0	1	18	3	0	1
Students	17	2	3	0	15	5	2	0	18	2	1	1

Mode	Call Center				Walk-In Help Desk				E-Mail or Web			
	All	Most	Some	Few	All	Most	Some	Few	All	Most	Some	Few
2002/03												
Faculty	22	1	0	0	22	1	0	0	22	1	0	0
Staff	22	1	0	0	22	1	0	0	22	1	0	0
Students	18	3	2	0	15	4	4	0	19	2	2	0
2003/04												
Faculty	21	2	0	0	20	1	1	1	22	0	1	0
Staff	21	1	1	0	20	1	1	1	22	0	1	0
Students	20	2	1	0	16	6	0	1	21	1	1	0
2004/05												
Faculty	21	1	0	0	19	0	1	3	22	0	1	0
Staff	21	0	1	1	19	0	1	3	22	0	1	0
Students	22	0	1	0	16	5	0	2	22	0	1	0
2005/06												
Faculty	23	0	0	0	20	0	2	1	22	0	1	0
Staff	23	0	0	0	20	0	2	1	22	0	1	0
Students	20	2	1	0	17	4	1	1	20	2	1	0

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 12.10—Campus Profile: Level 2 and Level 3 Technical Support Available to Faculty, Staff, and Students by Number of Campuses

Fiscal Year	Level 2	Level 3
1999/00	21	17
2000/01	22	18
2001/02	21	17
2002/03	23	19
2003/04	23	19
2004/05	23	20
2005/06	23	20

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 12.11—Campus Profile: Call Center Technical Support Availability by User Group and Number of Campuses

FY	Less than 45	45-53 (5x9)	54-62 (6x9)	63-69 (7x9)	70-83 (7x10)	84-143 (7x12)	144-168 (6x24)	Over 168 (7x24)	System Average Hrs/Wk.
1999/00 (Baseline Year)									
Faculty/Staff	2	5	2	1	3	1	1	1	62:33
2000/01									
Faculty	0	12	1	1	3	3	0	1	57:36
Staff	0	10	10	2	2	3	0	1	58:36
Students	0	10	3	2	2	3	0	1	65:31
2001/02									
Faculty	0	8	2	1	2	3	0	2	52:51
Staff	0	8	2	1	2	3	0	2	53:31
Students	0	5	1	1	1	4	1	2	59:19
2002/03									
Faculty	2	8	2	3	4	3	2	2	56:23
Staff	2	8	2	3	3	3	2	2	56:28
Students	2	6	2	2	2	5	3	2	64:02
2003/04									
Faculty	1	10	3	1	1	5	3	3	52:58
Staff	1	10	3	1	2	4	3	3	52:15
Students	1	8	2	1	2	5	4	3	60:19
2004/05									
Faculty	1	10	2	0	2	4	3	2	55:45
Staff	1	10	2	0	2	4	3	2	55:45
Students	2	8	1	0	2	6	4	2	64:47
2005/06									
Faculty	3	9	4	0	2	3	3	2	58:44
Staff	3	9	4	0	2	3	3	2	58:44
Students	2	6	3	0	3	6	4	2	69:24

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

Table 12.12—Campus Profile: Baseline End-User Technical Support Quality by Level and Number of Campuses

User Group	0–2 Standards	3–4 Standards	5 Standards	At Baseline
2001/02				
Faculty	2	10	8	3
Staff	2	13	5	
Students	3	10	3	
2002/03				
Faculty	1	14	7	5
Staff	2	14	6	
Students	5	11	5	
2003/04				
Faculty	0	16	7	6
Staff	2	13	8	
Students	3	14	6	
2004/05				
Faculty	1	12	10	5
Staff	2	12	9	
Students	2	13	5	
2005/06				
Faculty	0	14	8	4
Staff	0	15	7	
Students	5	11	4	

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the number of faculty, staff, and students that have access to technology training.
- Increase in user satisfaction with training by the campus community.

Table 12.13—System Profile: Percentage of Faculty, Staff/Administrator, and Students Who Participate in Technology Training by Mode

Type of Training:	Computer-Based	Workshop	Other
2000			
Faculty	50.7%	63.5%	14.0%
Staff/Administrator	47.8%	68.1%	5.4%
2001			
Students	61.6%	54.4%	4.0%
2002			
Faculty	42.8%	63.4%	14.8%
Staff/Administrator	55.4%	69.4%	4.1%
2003			
Students	51.0%	61.8%	3.7%
2004			
Faculty	51.7%	68.1%	4.6%
Staff/Administrator	56.4%	62.6%	2.2%
2005			
Students	37.4%	53.5%	19.8%
2006			
Faculty	Note: The wording and format of this question was changed in the 2006 Faculty and Staff Surveys, rendering comparisons to previous years impossible.		
Staff/Administrator			

Source: Faculty, Staff, and Student Technology Surveys



Table 12.14—Faculty, Staff, and Student Importance and Satisfaction Ratings of Technology Training

Type of Training:	Mean Importance	Mean Satisfaction
2000		
Faculty	8.51	7.16
Staff/Administrator	8.61	7.77
2001		
Students	8.48	7.88
2002		
Faculty	8.24	7.12
Staff/Administrator	7.61	7.61
2003		
Students	8.48	7.88
2004		
Faculty	8.02	7.46
Staff/Administrator	9.07	7.63
2005		
Students	8.29	8.20
2006		
Faculty	Survey item discontinued	
Staff/Administrator	9.04	7.60

Source: Faculty, Staff, and Student Technology Surveys



Table 12.15—System Profile: Technology Training Resources and Support for Faculty

Training Mode	Approximate No. of Resources or Activities	Approximate Level of Fiscal Support	Avg. \$ Per Participant	Estimated Number of Participants
1999/00				
Self-Paced	9,609	\$40,100	\$20.04	6,766
Workshops	1,927	\$194,694		9,390
Off-Site	Not Requested	\$90,200		64
TOTALS		\$324,994		16,220
2000/01				
Self-Paced	1,242	\$22,284	\$17.25	5,164
Workshops	1,872	\$148,780		7,484
Off-Site	74	\$50,122		171
TOTALS		\$221,186		12,819
2001/02				
Self-Paced	1,179	\$13,310	\$26.57	631
Workshops	1,756	\$178,925		7,587
Off-Site	29	\$27,250		44
TOTALS		\$219,485		8,262
2002/03				
Self-Paced	1,084	\$122,500	\$29.35	2,785
Workshops	2,138	\$165,047		7,495
Off-Site	16	\$16,320		72
TOTALS		\$303,867		10,352
2003/04				
Self-Paced	953	\$12,500	\$6.14	862
Workshops	2,306	\$33,088		11,317
Off-Site	9	\$29,590		64
TOTALS		\$75,178		12,243
2004/05				
Self-Paced	1,357	\$17,075	\$5.19	494
Workshops	2,365	\$24,448		8,062
Off-Site	5	\$2,917		5
TOTALS		\$44,440		8,561
2005/06				
Self-Paced	1,120	\$300	\$11.57	784
Workshops	2,205	\$59,493		7,558
Off-Site	18	\$37,096		31
TOTALS		\$96,889		8,373

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 12.16—System Profile: Technology Training Resources and Support for Staff/Administrators

Training Mode	Approximate No. of Resources or Activities	Approximate Level of Fiscal Support	Avg. \$ Per Participant	Estimated Number of Participants
1999/00				
Self-Paced	9,674	\$51,295	\$83.75	4,287
Workshops	1,360	\$374,181		9,184
Off-Site	Not Requested	\$740,365		449
TOTALS		\$1,165,841		13,920
2000/01				
Self-Paced	1,444	\$48,504	\$40.05	4,484
Workshops	2,332	\$498,836		13,688
Off-Site	347	\$197,867		434
TOTALS		\$745,207		18,606
2001/02				
Self-Paced	994	\$14,546	\$45.92	688
Workshops	2,829	\$723,040		19,828
Off-Site	275	\$213,826		205
TOTALS		\$951,412		20,721
2002/03				
Self-Paced	924	\$161,761	\$36.06	1,276
Workshops	3,194	\$446,698		22,908
Off-Site	208	\$276,502		356
TOTALS		\$884,961		24,540
2003/04				
Self-Paced	836	\$44,500	\$32.85	1,718
Workshops	2,656	\$263,457		13,326
Off-Site	167	\$193,407		217
TOTALS		\$501,364		15,261
2004/05				
Self-Paced	1,173	\$89,300	\$33.83	2,244
Workshops	2,857	\$393,413		14,318
Off-Site	68	\$80,436		86
TOTALS		\$563,149		16,648
2005/06				
Self-Paced	1,152	\$117,516	\$39.98	6,503
Workshops	2,401	\$470,780		10,847
Off-Site	57	\$109,511		104
TOTALS		\$697,807		17,454

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 12.17—System Profile: Technology Training Resources and Support for Students

Training Mode	Approximate No. of Resources or Activities	Approximate Level of Fiscal Support	Avg. \$ Per Participant	Estimated Number of Participants
1999/00				
Self-Paced	10,273	\$75,098	\$3.21	19,324
Workshops	2,319	\$99,126		38,017
Off-Site	Not Requested	\$75,098		19,324
TOTALS		\$185,724		57,851
2000/01				
Self-Paced	15	\$20,400	\$5.89	19,468
Workshops	2,225	\$232,040		23,457
Off-Site	22	\$400		36
TOTALS		\$252,840		42,961
2001/02				
Self-Paced	945	\$15,000	\$7.85	3,909
Workshops	2,495	\$228,747		27,084
Off-Site	2	\$0		50
TOTALS		\$243,747		31,043

Training Mode	Approximate No. of Resources or Activities	Approximate Level of Fiscal Support	Avg. \$ Per Participant	Estimated Number of Participants
2002/03				
Self-Paced	874	\$16,000	\$2.92	1,110
Workshops	2,720	\$61,770		25,483
Off-Site	0	0		0
TOTALS		\$77,770		26,593
2003/04				
Self-Paced	772	\$2,000	\$0.47	840
Workshops	2,820	\$12,855		30,968
Off-Site	3	\$0		0
TOTALS		\$14,855		31,808
2004/05				
Self-Paced	1,106	\$12,400	\$3.30	4,256
Workshops	2,399	\$105,629		31,465
Off-Site	1	\$0		19
TOTALS		\$118,029		35,740
2005/06				
Self-Paced	965	\$10,000	\$2.82	6,490
Workshops	2,568	\$107,882		34,416
Off-Site	45	\$0		888
TOTALS		\$117,882		41,794

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey



Table 12.18—System Profile: Baseline Professional Development Resources and Support for Information Technology Staff

Training Mode	Approximate No. of Resources or Activities	Approximate Level of Fiscal Support	Avg. \$ Per Participant	Estimated Number of Participants
1999/00 Not Requested				
2000/01				
Self-Paced	1,427	\$16,000	\$600.64	857
Workshops	541	\$322,515		729
Off-Site	521	\$1,040,957		856
Courses	177	\$217,040		216
TOTALS		\$1,596,512		2,658
2001/02				
Self-Paced	1,772	\$23,980	\$1,016.49	70
Workshops	183	\$200,463		685
Off-Site	573	\$1,002,158		518
Courses	263	\$431,293		358
TOTALS		\$1,657,894		1,631
2002/03				
Self-Paced	996	\$27,878	\$719.93	140
Workshops	150	\$59,948		576
Off-Site	735	\$1,036,000		482
Courses	209	\$195,094		334
TOTALS		\$1,318,920		1,832
2003/04				
Self-Paced	935	\$31,970	\$625.37	136
Workshops	182	\$42,698		440
Off-Site	544	\$691,318		566
Courses	96	\$175,200		363
TOTALS		\$941,186		1,505
2004/05				
Self-Paced	1,168	\$25,812	\$702.71	113
Workshops	222	\$119,965		650
Off-Site	658	\$850,138		662
Courses	138	\$193,077		267
TOTALS		\$1,188,993		1,692

Training Mode	Approximate No. of Resources or Activities	Approximate Level of Fiscal Support	Avg. \$ Per Participant	Estimated Number of Participants
2005/06				
Self-Paced	1,337	\$47,955	\$784.73	179
Workshops	203	\$255,304		605
Off-Site	685	\$872,304		699
Courses	165	\$258,922		345
TOTALS		\$1,434,484		1,828

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

Table 12.19—Campus Profile: Baseline End-User Technical Training Quality

User Group	0–2 Standards	3–4 Standards	5 Standards	At Baseline
2001/02				
Faculty	1	14	6	0
Staff	1	17	3	
Students	1	14	1	
IT Staff	3	10	5	
2002/03				
Faculty	1	13	7	1
Staff	1	15	5	
Students	1	13	4	
IT Staff	3	12	4	
2003/04				
Faculty	1	14	6	0
Staff	1	14	6	
Students	2	14	3	
IT Staff	5	13	4	
2004/05				
Faculty	0	18	5	0
Staff	2	15	6	
Students	2	10	5	
IT Staff	6	12	4	
2005/06				
Faculty	1	17	5	0
Staff	0	16	7	
Students	3	10	5	
IT Staff	6	14	4	

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

OUTCOME

- To establish baseline capability for hardware, software, support, and training on each campus in order to provide equal opportunities for all campus communities.

MEASUREMENT

- Increase in the number of campuses that have established baseline capability.

Table 12.20—Campus Profile: Baseline Capability—Physical Infrastructure as Percentage of Network Outlets That Meet CSU Connectivity Standards

FY	<25%	25–49%	50–74%	75–89%	90–100%
2001/02	15	3	3	1	0
2002/03	11	2	2	2	6
2003/04	7	5	5	2	4
2004/05	6	2	4	1	10
2005/06	3	3	2	3	12

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

**Table 12.21—Campus Profile: Baseline Capability—Access to a Computer Workstation with Current Generation Hardware and Software**

FY	<25%	25–49%	50–74%	75–89%	90–100%
1999/00	4	5	8	0	5
2000/01	3	9	7	1	3
2001/02	2	3	9	4	4
2002/03	1	4	7	3	8
2003/04	0	2	10	4	7
2004/05	0	4	9	7	3
2005/06	2	2	10	2	7

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

**Table 12.22—Campus Profile: Baseline Capability—High-Speed Access to the Network**

Fiscal Year	<25%	25–49%	50–74%	75–89%	90–100%
1999/00	19	1	1	1	0
2000/01	Not available due to data collection error				
2001/02	13	2	1	2	3
2002/03	10	2	0	0	11
2003/04	8	0	0	0	15
2004/05	7	0	0	0	16
2005/06	3	2	0	1	17

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

**Table 12.23—Campus Profile: Baseline Capability—End-User Technical Support Services**

Fiscal Year	< 25%	25–49%	50–74%	75–89%	90–100%
2001/02	2	3	7	5	3
2002/03	1	7	7	2	5
2003/04	0	4	11	2	6
2004/05	1	3	9	5	5
2005/06	0	6	7	5	4

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

**Table 12.24—Campus Profile: Baseline Capability—End-User Technology Training Services**

Fiscal Year	< 25%	25–49%	50–74%	75–89%	90–100%
2001/02	1	4	12	5	0
2002/03	2	1	15	3	1
2003/04	3	2	10	8	0
2004/05	2	4	10	7	0
2005/06	3	5	11	6	0

Source: Annual Campus Technology Survey

MASTER PLAN GOALS

OUTCOME

- To increase the percentage of FTES taught in the “Other Earned” mode of instruction.

MEASUREMENT

- Tracking percentage of instruction taught in a distributed learning mode.



Table 4.1—System Profile: Enrollment (FTES) in Distributed or Distance-Learning Course Sections

Academic Year	Annual FTES	Face-to-Face Non-State Sites	Synchronous Non-State Sites	Asynchronous	All Instruction Non-State Sites
2001/02 (% of all FTES)	293,692.5	5,963.7 (2.03%)	439.5 (0.15%)	1,666.4 (0.57%)	8,069.5 (2.75%)
2002/03 (% of all FTES)	306,079.3	5,916.6 (1.93%)	486.3 (0.16%)	2,057.2 (0.67%)	8,460.1 (2.76%)
2003/04 (% of all FTES)	306,443.6	6,248.5 (2.04%)	412.1 (0.13%)	2,660.1 (0.87%)	9,320.7 (3.04%)
2004/05 (% of all FTES)	310,220.0	6,147.4 (1.98%)	985.5 (0.32%)	3762.2 (1.21%)	10895.1 (3.51%)
2005/06 (% of all FTES)	313,747.4	6,244.8 (1.99%)	281.6 (0.09%)	5,015.2 (1.60%)	11,541.6 (3.68%)

Source: CSU Analytic Studies: Academic Planning Database



Table 4.2—System Profile: Capital Outlay Requests Related to Instruction

Fiscal Year	Construction Category	Total Capital Outlay Funding to Support Instruction	Funding to Support Distance/Distributed Learning	Distance/Distributed Learning Construction as Percentage of Total Request
1999/00	New Construction	\$134,274,000	\$226,000	0.2%
	Renovation	\$125,759,000	\$1,757,000	1.4%
	Total	\$260,033,000	\$1,983,000	0.8%
2000/01	New Construction	\$59,009,000	\$3,917,000	6.6%
	Renovation	\$113,375,000	\$64,724,000	57.1%
	Total	\$172,384,000	\$68,641,000	39.8%
2001/02	New Construction	\$72,513,000	\$0	0.0%
	Renovation	\$152,487,000	\$59,562,000	39.1%
	Total	\$225,000,000	\$59,562,000	26.5%
2002/03	New Construction	\$234,362,000	\$22,269,000	9.5%
	Renovation	\$246,808,000	\$81,250,000	32.9%
	Total	\$481,170,000	\$103,519,000	21.5%
2003/04	New Construction	\$26,625,000		
	Renovation	\$172,810,000		
	Total	\$199,495,000	(See Section 7: IT Infrastructure Initiatives)*	(See Section 7: IT Infrastructure Initiatives)*
2004/05	New Construction	\$215,842,000		
	Renovation	\$96,903,000		
	Total	\$312,745,000	(See Section 7: IT Infrastructure Initiatives)*	(See Section 7: IT Infrastructure Initiatives)*
2005/06	Measurement has been discontinued			

Source: CSU Capital Planning, Design and Construction: Priority list for the State Funded Capital Outlay Program

* The capital outlay expenditures for the TII are not included in the Master Plan section of this year's report because distribution of bond funding was completed in fiscal year 2002–03, although construction activities for the telecommunications infrastructure buildout continue.