2005 The Ohio State University Poll Results

Information Technology Questions
Office of the Chief Information Officer
2005 Ohio State Poll background

- Conducted between April and May 2005

- Survey contained information technology (IT) questions from the Chief Information Officer (CIO), including the Office of Information Technology (OIT), Technology Enhanced Teaching and Research (TELR), OSU Libraries and the Ohio Learning Network

- Faculty, Students and Staff – first contact was e-mail; then directed to online survey
# 2005 Ohio State Poll background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Sampled</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Valid Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (F)</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/Prof (G/P)</td>
<td>2,198</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad (U)</td>
<td>3,199</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (S)</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1292 respondents in total
Response rate

Sampled Respondents

F  G/P  U  S

Sampled  Respondents
Satisfaction with CIO instructional support services

Options changed in 2004
Faculty satisfaction with CIO communications

[Bar chart showing satisfaction levels for different years with labels: Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't Know]
Graduate/professional students satisfaction with CIO communications
Undergraduate students satisfaction with CIO communications
Ohio State meets your information technology needs

[Bar chart showing survey results for different years and categories, with categories labeled as follows:
- Yes
- No
- No Opinion]
Satisfaction with IT services at Ohio State in 2005

2005 F% 2005 G/P% 2005 U% 2005 S%

Very satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Very Dissatisfied
Don't know
Staff satisfaction with CIO communications

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't Know

Graph showing satisfaction levels for different years:
- 2003 S
- 2004 S
- 2005 S
IT was a factor in coming to Ohio State
IT is a factor for remaining at Ohio State
Satisfaction with helpfulness and responsiveness of other IT support resources at Ohio State in 2005

Very satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Very dissatisfied
Don't know
Satisfaction with the Ohio State central e-mail service in 2005

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know
Overall level of satisfaction with IT services at Ohio State in 2005
Familiarity with IT resources

- Very familiar
- Familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Not familiar
- Do not use
Familiarity with IT resources (trend line)
Familiarity with IT resources

- Very familiar or familiar with IT resources
  - 51% Undergraduate students
  - 34% Faculty
  - 30% Staff
  - 24% Graduate/Professional students
Faculty concern about security of electronic data

![Bar chart showing faculty concern over security of electronic data from 2003 to 2005.]

- **Very concerned**
- **Somewhat concerned**
- **Neither concerned nor unconcerned**
- **Somewhat unconcerned**
- **Unconcerned**

The chart indicates a trend of increasing concern over time, with a peak in 2003 F and a slight decrease in 2005 F.
Faculty concern about privacy of communications

- Very concerned
- Somewhat concerned
- Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- Somewhat unconcerned
- Unconcerned
Faculty concern about security of electronic data in 2005

- Very concerned: 7%
- Somewhat concerned: 6%
- Neither concerned nor unconcerned: 12%
- Somewhat unconcerned: 29%
- Unconcerned: 46%
Faculty concern about privacy of communications in 2005

- Very concerned: 5%
- Somewhat concerned: 6%
- Neither concerned nor unconcerned: 12%
- Somewhat unconcerned: 41%
- Unconcerned: 36%
Home Computers

2005 data
- 99% G/P
- 98% U
- 98% Faculty
- 93% Staff

2001  2002  2003  2004  2005
Laptop as primary computer among respondents having home computers

**2005 data**
- 36% Faculty
- 53% G/P
- 35% U
- 24% Staff
Windows PC vs. Mac as primary platform

2005 Mac data
- 23% Faculty
- 8% G/P
- 4% U
- 7% Staff
Presence of two or more computers at home in 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/P%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laptops as Secondary computers

F%  G/P%  U%  S%

2002: 46  40  30  30
2003: 44  47  45  41
2004: 52  43  33  36
2005: 51  44  43  39
Use of wireless connection for secondary computer

- Over 40% of all groups reported wireless connections for secondary computers in the 2005 poll.
Mac platform for secondary computer

![Chart showing data for F%, G/P%, U%, and S% for years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005.]
Presence of home Internet Service Provider (ISP)
Primary home ISP used to connect to university network

- Roadrunner
- WOW
- ResNet
- OSUWeb
- HomeNet
Absence of home ISP to connect to university network

2005 data
- 6% U
- 11% G/P
- 9% Faculty
- 26% Staff

No data for faculty in ’01 and ‘02
Undergraduates with ISP before Ohio State and retention

- In 2005, of the 93% who had an ISP before coming to Ohio State, 67% retained the ISP.
Graduates with ISP before OSU and retention

- In 2005, of the 75% who had an ISP before coming to Ohio State, 67% retained the ISP
Use of home ISP for more than 20 hours per week

2005 Data
- 51% U
- 40% G/P
- 34% faculty
- 19% Staff
Use of computer labs by graduate/professional students

2005 data
81% <10 hours
12% 10-20 hours
6% 21-60 hours
0.6% >60 hours
Use of computer labs by graduate/professional students in 2005

- 81% < 10 hrs/wk
- 12% 10-20 hrs/wk
- 6% 21-60 hrs/wk
- 1% > 60 hrs/wk
Use of computer labs by undergraduate students

2005 Data
- 73% <10 hours
- 20% 10-20 hours
- 4% 21-60 hours
- 0.3% >60 hours
Use of computer labs by undergraduate students in 2005
Experienced a virus on any computer

2005 data
- 33% Faculty
- 45% G/P
- 60% U
- 40% Staff

![Bar Chart]

- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
- 2005
Virus on personal vs. Ohio State computers

- Student data shows that computer labs tend to be free of viruses.
- But faculty and staff reported more viruses on Ohio State computers.
Use of personal firewalls

2005 Data
- 58% Faculty
- 58% G/P
- 59% U
- 52% Staff
Use of PDA’s

Overall use of PDA’s

- 16% in 2001
- 22% in 2002
- 28% in 2003
- 21% in 2004
- 29% in 2005
Use of PDA’s with wireless

Overall Use of PDA’s with wireless
21% in 2001
28% in 2003
24% in 2004
29% in 2005
Current IT environment supports faculty teaching/instruction
Current IT environment supports faculty teaching/instruction in 2005

- 49% Very well
- 16% Somewhat
- 13% Somewhat poorly
- 6% Very poorly
- 5% %DK
- 11% %Not teaching

Legend:
- %Very well
- %Somewhat
- %Somewhat poorly
- %Very poorly
- %DK
- %Not teaching
Current IT environment supports graduate/professional students in teaching/instruction
Current IT environment supports graduate/professional students in teaching/instruction in 2005

- 51% Very well
- 19% Somewhat
- 17% Somewhat poorly
- 8% Very poorly
- 3% %DK
- 2% %Not teaching
Ability to access Ohio State computing and electronic information from office/lab

![Bar chart showing the ability to access Ohio State computing and electronic information from office/lab over the years 2003 to 2005. The chart includes Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Don't Know categories.](chart.png)
Students were not polled in ’02; Options of ‘Don’t Know eliminated in 2004 survey
Option “Neither Agree or Disagree” eliminated in 2005
Ability to access Ohio State computing and electronic information from home (trend line)

Students were not polled in ’02; Options of “Don’t Know” eliminated in 2004 survey
Option “Neither Agree or Disagree” eliminated in 2005
Ability to access Ohio State information from home in 2005
Faculty - Ohio State IT helps increase my impact and productivity

Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Ability to use IT to contribute to professional development

Students were not polled in ‘02

Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Ability to use IT to contribute to professional development (trend line)

Students were not polled in ‘02
Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Faculty use of instructional technologies in 2005

- 49% Every class
- 22% Several
- 16% A Few
- 13% Never
Types of instructional technologies used

- 90% E-mail
- 74% Online syllabus and handouts
- 71% Web-based materials
- 66% Computer-projected materials
- 25% Computer labs during class
- 18% Interactive multimedia
- 18% Automated grade books/online grade checking
Faculty - Ohio State’s IT is important to my student’s success

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses from 2002 to 2005 for the statement: Faculty - Ohio State’s IT is important to my student’s success.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know

The chart displays the percentage of responses for each category across the years 2002 to 2005. The Y-axis represents the percentage, ranging from 0 to 60%.

- In 2002, most responses were in the Strongly Agree category, with a small portion in the Neither Agree or Disagree category.
- In 2003, the Strongly Agree category remains high, with a slight increase in the Neither Agree or Disagree category.
- In 2004, the Strongly Agree category remains dominant, with a slight decrease in the Neither Agree or Disagree category.
- In 2005, the Strongly Agree category continues to be the highest, with a slight decrease in the Neither Agree or Disagree category.

Overall, the chart shows a consistent trend with the Strongly Agree category being the highest across the years, while the Neither Agree or Disagree category is the second highest.
Faculty - Majors in my discipline should be required to demonstrate certain level of knowledge of computer applications.
Faculty - Majors in my discipline should be required to demonstrate certain level of knowledge of computer applications in 2005

- **Strongly Agree**: 37%
- **Agree**: 44%
- **Disagree**: 4%
- **Strongly Disagree**: 3%
- **Don't Know**: 12%
Incentives for faculty to use IT in instruction

- Help Desk
- Rewards
- Access to hw/sw
- IP Ownership
- Ease of use

Legend:
- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
- 2005
Faculty using a university-supported CMS (currently WebCT)

Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Faculty use of WebCT in 2005

- Using WebCT: 60%
- Not using WebCT: 40%
Reasons for faculty not using WebCT or another CMS

- Don't Know how to start
- No time for development
- Doesn't fit courses
- Don't Know
- Other means
- Lack Technology
- Other reasons
- Waiting for Carmen

Year:
- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
- 2005
Reasons for faculty not using WebCT or another CMS in 2005

- Don't Know how to start: 10%
- No time for development: 13%
- Don't Know what it is: 10%
- Doesn't fit courses: 18%
- Other means: 13%
- Other reasons: 5%
- Waiting for Carmen: 31%
Faculty concern about time it takes to learn and use technology

![Bar chart showing faculty concern levels for 2003, 2004, and 2005. The chart indicates the percentage of faculty concerned, somewhat concerned, neither concerned nor unconcerned, somewhat unconcerned, and unconcerned. The y-axis represents the percentage, ranging from 0 to 45, and the x-axis represents the years 2003, 2004, and 2005.]
Faculty concern about time it takes to learn and use technology in 2005

- Very concerned: 37%
- Somewhat concerned: 7%
- Neither concerned nor unconcerned: 18%
- Somewhat unconcerned: 5%
- Unconcerned: 2%
- No response: 31%
Faculty opinion about technical support needed to learn and use technology
Faculty opinion about technical support needed to learn and use technology in 2005

- 51% Have everything needed
- 29% Have much of what is needed
- 5% Lack a few things needed
- 5% Do not have what is needed
- 5% Don’t know/No Opinion

10% Other
Ways in which faculty would be interested in learning about instructional technology

- 50% General workshops (hands-on)
- 46% Self-instruction
- 42% Tutorials (self-paced)
- 41% Cohort workshops
- 40% Online workshops
- 35% One-on-one mentoring
Given adequate support, faculty interest in offering online/distance education courses

- % Yes
- % No
- % Don't Know
- Already offer fully online course
Undergraduate students on the role of IT in education
Graduate/professional students on the role of IT in education

Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Undergraduate student belief that use of IT at Ohio State has helped make them more marketable to future employers

Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Graduate/professional student belief that use of IT at Ohio State has helped make them more marketable to future employer
Undergraduate student belief that use of IT at Ohio State has helped make them more likely to succeed in academic work.
Graduate/professional student belief that use of IT at Ohio State has helped make them more likely to succeed in academic work.
Incorporation of IT in undergraduate classes

Option of Don’t Know eliminated in 2004 survey; option of No Response added in 2005
Incorporation of IT in undergraduate classes in 2005

- %Nearly every: 40
- %Several: 27
- %Few: 7
- %Did’s take: 3
- %Never: 20
- %No response: 4

Incorporation levels and their corresponding percentages are shown in the pie chart.
Incorporation of IT in graduate/professional classes

%Nearly every | %Several | %Few | %Never | %Didn’t take

- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
- 2005
Incorporation of IT in graduate/professional classes in 2005

- Nearly every: 39%
- Several: 23%
- Few: 15%
- Never: 12%
- Didn’t take: 11%
Undergraduate student preferences for method of instructional delivery

- Partly online
- Instructor led only online
- Fully online “self-paced”
- Primarily face-to-face

Years:
- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
- 2005
Graduate/professional student preferences for method of instructional delivery

- Partly online
- Instructor led only online
- Fully online “self-paced”
- Primarily face-to-face
