



# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY 2010 SURVEY ANALYSIS

JUNE 2010

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction.....  | 3  |
| 2. Use and Support of Multi-media in Teaching and Learning..... | 5  |
| 3. Wired and Wireless Networks.....                             | 6  |
| 4. IT Support .....   | 7  |
| 4.1 IT Help Center.....   | 8  |
| 4.2 Faculty Technology Center .....                             | 9  |
| 5. Assessment of Specific Technologies .....                    | 9  |
| 5.1 Email .....   | 9  |
| 5.2 Staff Technologies .....                                    | 10 |
| 6. Summary .....  | 11 |
| Appendix A – Overview of Respondents.....                       | 12 |
| Appendix B – Additional Tables and Figures .....                | 13 |

## 1. Introduction

For the third consecutive year, the division of Information Technology surveyed the University community regarding CSUN technology and technology support services. The survey measured how well the University's technology meets the needs and expectations of faculty, students and staff. The survey results inform University-wide priority setting for technology investments and help the IT division maintain alignment between its services and the needs of the community.

The survey included questions on the use of multi-media in coursework, wired and wireless networking, online learning, and support. The student survey included additional questions about students' ownership of computing devices, use of campus computer labs, and information about on-line courses. These questions were analyzed separately and the results are not presented in this report.

The student survey was distributed to a random sample of students between February 10<sup>th</sup> and February 24<sup>th</sup>. The faculty and staff survey was open for participation from March 10<sup>th</sup> to March 24<sup>th</sup>. Faculty, students and staff each received a survey tailored to their uses of technology. Where appropriate, questions that appeared in past surveys were repeated to provide a basis for longitudinal comparisons. The table below presents the response rates received by constituency.

**Table 1. 2010 Response Rates**

| Constituent | Invited to Participate | Surveys Received | Response rate |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| Students    | 10,000                 | 2317             | 23%           |
| Faculty     | 1,885                  | 301              | 16%           |
| Staff       | 1,636                  | 539              | 33%           |

Survey responses were received from representatives of nearly all university divisions and schools. Appendix A contains data tables that describe the distribution of responses by organizational area. Response rates in 2010 were comparable to 2009 for faculty and staff. Response rates for the student survey were considerably higher than the 6% received in 2009. This may be attributable to a change in the timing of the distribution of the survey to earlier in the semester and because gift certificates were offered as a prize incentive via a random drawing.

The remainder of this report presents the key findings. The discussion of the survey results is organized in the following categories:

- Use and Support of Multi-media in Teaching and Learning
- Wired and Wireless Networking
- Support
- Email and Select Staff Productivity Technologies

The report concludes with a summary of recommended follow-up and actions. Throughout the report, charts and figures are used to support the presentation of findings. Additional detailed data tables are provided in Appendix B. Except where noted, results from the staff survey include staff working within the IT division. We found few statistically significant and meaningful differences in response provided by IT staff. However, for consistency with the 2008 and 2009 analysis, we removed these responses from the analysis of the IT services themselves.

The key findings from the 2010 survey were:

#### Multi-media in Teaching and Learning

- Three-quarters of faculty (76.4%) reported the use of multimedia in the courses they teach. However, a minority of faculty make the creation of a multimedia product by students a requirement for their courses.
- On average, students were confident in their skills with multimedia and satisfied with their access to support for multimedia assignments.

#### Wired and Wireless Networking

- Faculty, students and staff agreed that the capacity and availability of the wired and wireless network met their needs.
- The mean agreement among faculty and staff that the capacity and availability of the wireless network met their needs was higher in 2010 than in 2009. Students reported a similarly strong level of mean agreement as they had in 2009.

#### Email

- Staff and students reported the highest mean agreement that email was easy to use (4.14 and 4.09 on a five point agreement scale). Mean agreement among faculty was lower but still relatively high at 3.61. Nearly two-thirds of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that email is easy to use.
- Despite the recent increase in email storage quotas, a quarter of faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed that email storage was sufficient to meet their needs.

#### Support

- Consistent with prior year results, faculty, students and staff on average are satisfied that the support they receive meets their needs. As we found in 2009, faculty, students and staff that use CSUN support mechanisms (Help Center, FTC, departmental IT support staff) agree more that they receive the support they need than those that access informal support networks (self-help, friends, colleagues).
- Mean agreement was fairly strong (3.50 or higher on a five point scale) that the Help Center resolved problems in a reasonable amount of time, was usually able to solve respondents' problems and has staff that are knowledgeable about technologies that respondents need to use.
- Among respondent faculty, 70.2% were aware of the services available from the Faculty Technology Center (FTC) and 55.9% had visited it at least one time. Among faculty that had visited the FTC, mean agreement was fairly high that the services were helpful, the staff are usually able to address questions, and the staff are knowledgeable about the technology that respondents' use.

## 2. Use and Support of Multi-media in Teaching and Learning

The increasing availability of mobile computing devices, digital video cameras and the ease of use of content sites such as YouTube and iTunes has expanded the possibilities for incorporating audio and video content into lectures, assignments and assessments. The 2010 survey asked faculty and students to report the extent of their use of multimedia products. In addition, students were asked to comment on the adequacy of their skills and the availability of the support to complete their multimedia assignments.

Multimedia (video or audio) is a prevalent part of many CSUN courses. Three-quarters of faculty (76.4%) reported the use of multimedia in the courses they teach. A slight majority (52.4%) find and use content created by others. In addition, a significant portion of faculty (39.7% of those who use multimedia) create their own content. Faculty share multi-media content with students in several ways. Among faculty that use multimedia, a small majority (53.9%) play content for students during class time. Others are sharing content with students in a digital form. A quarter of faculty (25.0%) post content within the learning management system. The remainder use a variety of other means including posting it on their v-drive (7.7%), posting it on YouTube (3.6%), iTunes (0.7%) or other methods (9.0%). Multimedia products are also used as part of student assignments and assessment by some faculty. Among respondent faculty, 30.2% report that students in their classes submit multimedia products for assignments and assessments. Among this sub-set, 68.8% report that the assignment to submit a multi-media product is mandatory.

The majority of students have not produced a multimedia product for a class assignment. In courses taken since Summer 2009, 60.8% of respondent students have never produced a multimedia product and 24.4% seldom (1-2 times) produced one. Among those who had produced a multimedia product for an assignment, doing so was never (12.9%) or seldom (53.5%) a requirement.

The most prevalent ways that faculty help students to produce a multimedia product are providing a handout created by the faculty member (55.9% of faculty who assign multi-media), faculty led demonstrations to students (54.8% of faculty who assign multimedia) and providing websites or links to the information on the internet (38.7% of faculty who assign multimedia). On average, students seem confident in their skills with multimedia and their access support for multimedia assignments. In fact, two-thirds of students (67.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that they have the skills required to produce multimedia products and half (52.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that they could access whatever support needed to complete multimedia products for their course assignments. (Table 2)

**Table 2. Students' Assessment of Multimedia Skills and Available Support**

| Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:                             | N   | Mean* | Std. Deviation |
|--|-----|-------|----------------|
| I have the skills I need to produce multimedia products for my course assignments.                 | 781 | 3.77  | 1.082          |
| I can access whatever support I require to complete multimedia products for my course assignments. | 744 | 3.49  | 1.120          |

\*Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

### 3. Wired and Wireless Networks

The survey asked students, faculty and staff to evaluate the capacity and availability of the wired and wireless networks. These questions have been a part of the survey since its inception. In past years, respondents have provided slightly higher mean agreement that the capacity and availability of the wired network met their needs than they did the wireless network. CSUN has recently completed projects to improve the availability and capacity of the wireless network, and the 2010 survey is the first opportunity to evaluate the impact of the improvements.

On average, we found faculty, students and staff to be in agreement that the wired and wireless network met their needs. Mean agreement for all respondents with statements regarding the wired network and the wireless network were similar. Table 3 reports respondents' mean agreement with each of the five questions related to the wireless and wired networks.

Among students, 61.5% agreed or strongly agreed that the capacity of the wireless network met their needs and 60.1% agreed or strongly agreed that the availability of the wireless network met their needs. A small portion (11%) of respondents indicated that they did not know if the wireless network availability or capacity met their needs. Excluding these respondents, the proportion of students agreeing that the capacity of the wireless network met their needs increased to 69.1% and the proportion agreeing that the availability met their needs increased to 67.8%. Unlike in 2008 and 2009, there was no meaningful relationship between the college students' enrolled in and their agreement that the wireless network met their needs. This may be attributable to enhanced wireless availability in and around academic buildings. The majority of students also agreed that the wired network met their needs. Excluding respondents that did not know if the wired network met their needs, 66.6% agreed or strongly agreed that the capacity of the wired network met their needs and 66.7% agreed or strongly agreed that the availability of the wired network met their needs.

Excluding respondent faculty that reported that they did not know, 74.0% agreed or strongly agreed that the capacity of the wireless network met their needs and 70.9% agreed or strongly agreed that the availability of the wireless network met their needs. Three-quarters of faculty respondents reported agreement or strong agreement that the capacity and availability of the wired network met their needs as well. Staff offered similar assessments as did faculty and students of the capacity and availability of both the wired and wireless networks. The portion of respondent staff that agreed or strongly agreed with each statement ranged from a low of 69.3% (availability of wireless network) to a high of 74.4% (availability of wired network).

The impacts of the wireless network upgrade are reflected in higher mean agreements reported by faculty and staff in 2010 that the availability and capacity of wireless met their needs. Table 3 reports the means for faculty, students and staff for the four questions related to wired and wireless networking since 2008. While reported means for the statements regarding the wired network have not changed significantly, the mean agreement that the capacity and availability of the wireless network met staff and faculty needs was higher in 2010. Interestingly, mean agreement reported by students did not appreciably change in 2010. It had gone up in 2009 and appears to be holding a similarly high level of agreement in 2010.

**Table 3. Assessment of Wired and Wireless Networks by Year**

|   | Students |      |      | Faculty |      |      | Staff (excluding IT Division) |      |      |
|---|----------|------|------|---------|------|------|-------------------------------|------|------|
|   | 2008     | 2009 | 2010 | 2008    | 2009 | 2010 | 2008                          | 2009 | 2010 |
| The capacity of the CSUN wireless network meets my needs.                         | 3.57     | 3.73 | 3.74 | 3.30    | 3.41 | 3.87 | 3.24                          | 3.30 | 3.76 |
| The availability (e.g., reliability) of the CSUN wireless network meets my needs. | 3.34     | 3.66 | 3.70 | 3.20    | 3.32 | 3.80 | 3.16                          | 3.29 | 3.71 |
| The capacity (e.g., bandwidth) of the CSUN wired network meets my needs.          | 3.62     | 3.83 | 3.75 | 3.38    | 3.60 | 3.90 | 3.38                          | 3.56 | 3.71 |
| The availability (e.g., reliability) of the CSUN wired network meets my needs.    | 3.56     | 3.77 | 3.88 | 3.40    | 3.66 | 3.95 | 3.41                          | 3.58 | 3.82 |

#### 4. IT Support

Consistent with prior year results, faculty, students and staff on average are satisfied that the support they receive meets their needs. As we found in 2009, faculty, students and staff that use CSUN support mechanisms (help desk, FTC, departmental IT support staff) agree more that they receive the support they need than those that access informal support networks (self-help, friends, colleagues). We asked all respondents to state their agreement with three statements regarding their access to support, its quality and timeliness. As Table 4 illustrates, mean agreement with each statement ranged from 3.45 to 3.92 on a five point agreement scale. Mean agreement with each statement did not differ meaningfully from those reported in 2008 or 2009.

**Table 4. Assessment of Availability, Timeliness and Satisfaction with IT Support**

| Q: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about technology support at CSUN: | Staff excluding IT (N = 494) |                | Faculty (N = 306) |                | Students (N = 2011) |                |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
|  | Mean*                        | Std. Deviation | Mean*             | Std. Deviation | Mean*               | Std. Deviation |
| I have access to the technology support I need.  | 3.92                         | 0.873          | 3.54              | 1.050          | 3.62                | 0.883          |
| My technology problems are resolved in a timely fashion.   | 3.81                         | 0.936          | 3.54              | 1.043          | 3.56                | 0.893          |
| I am satisfied with the quality of CSUN technology support.  | 3.81                         | 0.950          | 3.45              | 1.056          | 3.58                | 0.904          |

\*Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

Respondents acquire technology support from a variety of resources and places. As in the past, we found that some report the primary resource that they rely on for technology questions or problems is themselves, a friend, family member or colleague. The proportion of respondents who rely on these self-help methods differ among faculty, students and staff. Among faculty, a third (33.6%) reported that they rely on themselves, a colleague, a friend or family member or additional methods other than CSUN support organizations and staff as their primary resource. Among staff, a quarter (24.6) rely on self-help, colleagues, friends, family or other method. Among students, the comparable percentage of respondents was 59.7%. Students were the most self-reliant. More than a third (37.3%) reported that their primary resources for questions or problems was themselves.

Respondents who relied on self-help, friends, colleagues or other non-CSUN resources, reported lower mean agreements with all three statements regarding technology support. As Table 5 illustrates, faculty who reported that their primary resource for questions or problems was a division of IT resource or a local IT staff member in their college or department reported higher mean agreement than those who relied on self-help, friends or colleagues that they have access to the technology support they need, have their technology problems resolved in a timely fashion and are satisfied with the quality of CSUN technology support. A similar relationship was observed for students and staff. These findings suggest that there are opportunities to make more faculty, students and staff aware of the CSUN support resources that they can avail themselves. It also suggests that further analysis should be done of whether there are additional types of support resources that should be made available for those who prefer to help themselves.

**Table 5. Faculty Assessment of Support by Primary Resource for Support**

| Primary Resource for Problems and Questions |                | I have access to the technology support I need. | My technology problems are resolved in a timely fashion. | I am satisfied with the quality of CSUN technology support. |
|---|----------------|---|--|---|
| IT Division Support                         | Mean*          | 3.61  | 3.66   | 3.60  |
|   | N              | 107   | 107  | 107   |
|   | Std. Deviation | 1.035   | 0.990  | 1.036   |
| Department or College Support               | Mean*          | 3.73  | 3.73   | 3.66  |
|   | N              | 96  | 96   | 96  |
|   | Std. Deviation | 0.968   | 0.957  | 0.982   |
| Self-help, friends and colleagues           | Mean*          | 3.28  | 3.23   | 3.12  |
|   | N              | 103   | 103  | 103   |
|   | Std. Deviation | 1.097   | 1.113  | 1.069   |

\*Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

## 4.1 IT Help Center

Faculty, students and staff access the IT Help Center by phone, email or in-person to receive assistance with IT questions and problems. We asked respondents that had used the Help Center in the past 12 months to indicate their level of agreement with several statements regarding their service experience. As Table 6 illustrates, mean agreement was fairly strong that the Help Center resolved problems in a reasonable amount of time, was usually able to solve respondents' problems and has staff that are knowledgeable about technologies that respondents need to use. Means were all greater than 3.50 on a five point agreement scale. Similar mean agreement was reported by respondents that accessed the help center in person. Faculty, students and staff all reported similar mean levels of agreement.

**Table 6. Assessment of IT Help Center by Respondents who Accessed IT via Phone or Email**

| Q: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about your experience with the IT Help Center support accessed via phone or email: | Staff (Excluding IT Division, N = 436) |                | Faculty (N = 266) |                | Students (N = 857) |                |
|---|--|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
|   | Mean*                                  | Std. Deviation | Mean*             | Std. Deviation | Mean*              | Std. Deviation |
| The time required to resolve my problems is reasonable.   | 3.74                                   | 0.869          | 3.67              | 0.985          | 3.66               | 0.980          |
| The Help Center staff is usually able to solve my problems.   | 3.82                                   | 0.862          | 3.71              | 1.002          | 3.77               | 0.939          |
| The Help Center staff is knowledgeable about the technologies I need to use.  | 3.81                                   | 0.886          | 3.70              | 0.987          | 3.82               | 0.901          |

\*Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree



The primary reason that students gave for not visiting or contacting the Help Center in the past twelve months was that they either did not need help or were able to resolve their problems themselves. However, nearly a fifth (18.8%) of students that had not visited the Help Center reported that they did not know it existed. Awareness of the Help Center was higher among staff and faculty. Only 4.8% of staff and 10.3% of faculty who had not contacted or visited the Center indicated that it was because they were not aware it existed.

## 4.2 Faculty Technology Center

Among respondent faculty, 70.2% were aware of the services available from the Faculty Technology Center (FTC) and 55.9% had visited it at least one time. Nearly a third of faculty (32.0%) had attended a Teaching and Learning Bytes session sponsored by the FTC either in person, virtually or both. Among respondent faculty that had visited the Faculty Technology Center, mean agreement was fairly high that the services were helpful, the staff are usually able to address respondent questions, and the staff are knowledgeable about the technology that respondents' use (Table 7). In fact, less than 10% of respondent faculty that had used the Faculty Technology Center at least once in the last year disagreed or strongly disagreed each of the three statements. Mean agreement for all three statements was higher in 2010 than in 2009, although the difference was too small to be deemed significant.

**Table 7. Faculty Satisfaction with FTC (N = 171)**

| Q: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the service you receive from the FTC | Mean* | Std. Deviation |
|---|-------|----------------|
| The types of services available through the FTC are helpful to me.  | 3.84  | 0.772          |
| The FTC staff is usually able to address my problem or question.  | 3.85  | 0.852          |
| The FTC staff is knowledgeable about the technologies I need to use.  | 3.85  | 0.859          |

\*Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

## 5. Assessment of Specific Technologies

In this section, we report on respondents' assessment of several commonly used technologies. This year all faculty, students and staff were asked about their satisfaction with email. In addition, staff members were asked to evaluate four technologies important to the efficiency of their work: web conferencing (Elluminate), video conferencing, teleconferencing and document imaging (Hershey) and the portal.

### 5.1 Email

CSUN made significant changes to email during the past two years. Students are now provided with Google's Gmail solution and faculty and staff email has been transitioned to Exchange. We asked respondents to indicate their agreement with four statements regarding the ease of use of email, the sufficiency of storage, the effectiveness of spam blocking and the importance of a university provided email account. As Table 8 illustrates, mean agreement was between 3.40 and 4.29 for each of three statements pertaining to email's capabilities, storage and ease of use across all three populations. All three groups reported very high mean agreements that having a CSUN provided email account was important to them.

Staff and students reported the highest mean agreement that email was easy to use (4.14 and 4.09 on a five point agreement scale). Mean agreement among faculty was lower but still relatively high at 3.61. In fact, nearly two-thirds of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that email is easy to use. We found a statistically meaningful relationship between faculty's level of agreement that email had sufficient features and their agreement that it was easy to use. This may be an indication that some features important to some faculty are

missing and it is contributing to an overall less positive impression of email. Or, it may indicate that some faculty because they find email harder to use are not able to locate or use email features of interest to them even though they are present.

Mean agreement was also lower but still well above neutral for both faculty and staff that email had sufficient storage to meet their needs. There were a quarter of faculty respondents (25.8%) that disagreed or strongly disagreed that email had sufficient storage to meet their needs. Email storage quotas have recently been increased. This finding may suggest that some faculty may not be aware that they have access to more storage. Or, it may suggest that even at an increased level storage is insufficient for some faculty.

A similar level of mean agreement was reported by faculty and staff that spam email was being effectively blocked. Students reported a significantly higher mean agreement that spam was effectively blocked.

**Table 8. Assessment of Email**

| Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements: | Staff (Excluding IT, N = 497) |                | Faculty |       |                | Students |       |                |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|---------|-------|----------------|----------|-------|----------------|
|  | Mean*                         | Std. Deviation | N       | Mean* | Std. Deviation | N        | Mean* | Std. Deviation |
| My CSUN email account is easy to use.                                  | 4.14                          | 0.915          | 298     | 3.61  | 1.307          | 1991     | 4.09  | 1.045          |
| My CSUN email account has sufficient features to meet my needs.        | 3.97                          | 1.029          | 296     | 3.49  | 1.289          | 1954     | 4.12  | 0.967          |
| My CSUN email box storage capacity meets my needs.                     | 3.43                          | 1.309          | 288     | 3.50  | 1.299          | 1928     | 4.23  | 0.906          |
| Spam mail is effectively blocked from my CSUN email.                   | 3.52                          | 1.203          | 280     | 3.46  | 1.169          | 1820     | 4.29  | 0.897          |
| It is important that CSUN provides me with a university email account. | 4.44                          | 1.118          | 300     | 4.53  | 1.003          | 1986     | 4.27  | 1.019          |

\*Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

## 5.2 Staff Technologies

Staff were asked to indicate their level of agreement that four technologies that facilitate their work and to estimate how they likely they were to use these technologies in the next two years. Web conferencing, video conferencing and teleconferencing are all technologies that enable staff to collaborate at a distance. It is likely that these technologies are not widely used today as many respondents indicated that they did not know whether they were meeting their needs. A slight majority of staff indicated that they didn't know if Elluminate and video conferencing solutions met their needs. Among those that knew, 50.0% agreed or strongly agreed that Elluminate was meeting their needs and 36.5% were neutral. For video conferencing, among those that knew, 44.1% agreed or strongly agreed it met their needs and 44.4% were neutral. More respondents (62.2%) knew their level of agreement with the statement that CSUN's teleconferencing solution met their needs. Of the respondents who knew, 58.0% agreed or strongly agreed that it met their needs.

In the last question regarding technologies that supported their work, staff members were asked about document imaging. About half the respondents (49.5%) indicated their level of agreement with the statement that the document imaging solution Hershey met their needs. Among those who knew, 48.2% agreed or strongly agreed it met their needs and 37.3% were neutral.

The technology that respondent staff thought they would be most likely to use within the next two years was teleconferencing. Staff on average also reported that they would be between neutral and moderately likely to use web conferencing and document imaging. Respondents provided similar assessments of their likelihood for all three of these items with means ranging from 3.34 to 3.50. Mean likelihood was slightly lower (3.12) for the use of video conferencing in the next two years (Table 9).

**Table 9. Likelihood of Use of Select Collaboration and Document Imaging Technologies (Staff Respondents)**

| Technology                    | Q: Please indicate the likelihood that you will use these technologies within the next two years. |       |                |
|-------------------------------|---|-------|----------------|
|                               | N   | Mean* | Std. Deviation |
| Web conferencing (Elluminate) | 435   | 3.36  | 1.517          |
| Video conferencing            | 434   | 3.12  | 1.455          |
| Teleconferencing              | 451   | 3.50  | 1.438          |
| Document imaging (Hershey)    | 379   | 3.34  | 1.520          |

\* Scale: 1 = very unlikely, 2 = unlikely, 3 = neither likely or unlikely, 4 = moderately likely, 5 = likely

Finally, staff were asked whether the features available via the myNorthridge portal met their needs. Among respondents that use the portal, 73.4% agreed or strongly agreed that the features available met their needs. Conversely, only 9.7% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The remainder were neutral.

## 6. Summary

Overall, the 2010 survey results confirm that many CSUN technologies and support services are meeting the needs of faculty, students and staff. The impact of improvements that have been implemented to email and wireless network capacity and availability are evident in the improved level of agreement among respondents that these technologies are meeting their needs. Most faculty, students and staff that rely on CSUN IT staff and have utilized IT support organizations (Help Center and FTC) are satisfied with the support they receive. Given the resource constraints created by the recession, this is a significant accomplishment. The results also identify several issues that warrant follow-up analysis and monitoring, including:

- Additional outreach to students to make them aware of the services of the Help Center;
- Additional outreach to faculty to create greater awareness of the Faculty Technology Center;
- Provide additional communications regarding the features available in faculty and staff email and how to use them;
- Raise faculty awareness of the increased email storage quotas available to them; and
- Follow-up analysis (e.g., interviews, focus groups) to better understand how to extend support to students and faculty that do not rely on CSUN support as their primary resource to solve IT problems.

In addition, IT and Academic Affairs should continue to monitor the use of multi-media in teaching and learning. If the level of utilization for course assignments and assessments grows, additional support services and training may be required.

## Appendix A – Overview of Respondents

### Staff Respondents by Division (N = 616)

| Division                   | Percent |
|----------------------------|---------|
| Academic Affairs           | 28.6%   |
| Administration and Finance | 22.1%   |
| Student Affairs            | 15.3%   |
| University Advancement     | 5.2%    |
| Information Technology     | 9.9%    |
| University Corporation     | 0.0%    |
| Other                      | 19.0%   |

### Faculty Respondents by College (N = 335)

| College  | Percent |
|--|---------|
| Mike Curb College of Arts, Media and Communication | 10.8%   |
| Business and Economics                             | 9.3%    |
| Michael D. Eisner College of Education             | 14.6%   |
| Engineering and Computer Science                   | 7.5%    |
| Health and Human Development                       | 11.9%   |
| Humanities   | 12.2%   |
| Science and Mathematics                            | 13.4%   |
| Social and Behavioral Sciences                     | 17.9%   |
| Tseng College of Extended Learning                 | 0.6%    |
| Oviatt Library                                     | 1.8%    |

### Student Respondents by College (N = 2317)

| College  | Percent |
|--|---------|
| Mike Curb College of Arts, Media and Communication | 13.9%   |
| Business and Economics                             | 17.6%   |
| Michael D. Eisner College of Education             | 8.8%    |
| Engineering and Computer Science                   | 9.6%    |
| Health and Human Development                       | 12.9%   |
| Humanities   | 6.3%    |
| Science and Mathematics                            | 6.2%    |
| Social and Behavioral Sciences                     | 17.4%   |
| Tseng College of Extended Learning                 | 0.3%    |
| Undeclared major                                   | 4.3%    |
| Don't Know   | 2.9%    |

## Appendix B – Additional Tables and Figures

### Assessment of the Wired and Wireless Network Among 2010 Respondents

| Q: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the CSUN wireless and wired network. | Staff (Excluding IT Division) |       |                | Faculty |       |                | Students |       |                |
|---|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|---------|-------|----------------|----------|-------|----------------|
|   | N                             | Mean* | Std. Deviation | N       | Mean* | Std. Deviation | N        | Mean* | Std. Deviation |
| The capacity of the CSUN wireless network meets my needs.   | 386                           | 3.76  | 0.929          | 265     | 3.87  | 0.976          | 1806     | 3.74  | 1.087          |
| The availability (e.g., reliability) of the CSUN wireless network meets my needs.                                       | 388                           | 3.71  | 0.918          | 268     | 3.80  | 1.022          | 1799     | 3.70  | 1.097          |
| I can easily logon to the CSUN wireless network.  | 383                           | 3.79  | 0.900          | 263     | 3.90  | 1.006          | 1808     | 3.88  | 1.051          |
| The capacity (e.g., bandwidth) of the CSUN wired network meets my needs.  | 408                           | 3.71  | 1.001          | 263     | 3.90  | 1.031          | 1683     | 3.75  | 1.075          |
| The availability (e.g., reliability) of the CSUN wired network meets my needs.  | 423                           | 3.82  | 0.979          | 268     | 3.95  | 0.982          | 1679     | 3.77  | 1.068          |

\*Scale: 1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

### Sufficiency of Email Features by Assessment of Ease of Use (Faculty Respondents)

| My CSUN e-mail account is easy to use. | My CSUN e-mail account has sufficient features to meet my needs. |       |                |
|--|--|-------|----------------|
|  | N  | Mean* | Std. Deviation |
| Strongly disagree                      | 31   | 1.45  | 0.810          |
| Disagree                               | 35   | 2.26  | 0.852          |
| Neither disagree nor agree             | 38   | 2.82  | 0.896          |
| Agree                                  | 106  | 3.72  | 0.673          |
| Strongly agree                         | 86   | 4.74  | 0.578          |

\*Scale: 1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

### Email Forwarding by Respondents

| Do you forward e-mail from your CSUN email account to another email account? | Faculty (N = 307) | Staff (N = 555) | Students (N = 2023) |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Yes  | 35.8%             | 35.5%           | 54.3%               |
| No   | 63.5%             | 63.8%           | 43.4%               |
| I don't know.  | 0.7%              | 0.7%            | 2.4%                |

### Assessment of the IT Website

| When I visited the IT website, the information I found met my needs. | Faculty (N = 210) |                | Staff (N = 387) |                | Students (N = 1798) |                |
|--|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
|  | Mean*             | Std. Deviation | Mean*           | Std. Deviation | Mean*               | Std. Deviation |
|  | 3.41              | 0.940          | 3.57            | 0.753          | 3.45                | 1.019          |

\*Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = Neither disagree or agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree