2006 Office of the CIO Technology Poll Results

Information Technology Questions
Office of the Chief Information Officer
2006 Technology Poll Background

• Conducted between January and February 2006
• Survey contained information technology (IT) questions from the Chief Information Officer (CIO), including the Office of Information Technology (OIT), Technology Enhanced Learning and Research (TELR), OSU Libraries and the Ohio Learning Network
• Faculty and Staff – first contact by campus mail; then sent an e-mail directing them to the online survey
• Students sent e-mail directing them to the web survey
# 2006 Technology 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>2,000</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad/Prof (G/P)</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad (U)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (S)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2683 respondents in total
Response rate

Sampled Respondents
Satisfaction with CIO instructional support services

Very Satisfied
Somewhat Sat.
Somewhat Dis.
V. Dissat. (Not sat.)
%Don't use service

2004 2005 2006
Faculty satisfaction with CIO communications
Staff satisfaction with CIO communications
Graduate/Professional students satisfaction with CIO communications

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

Undergraduate students' satisfaction with CIO communications
Ohio State meets your information technology needs
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IT was a factor in coming to Ohio State
IT is a factor for remaining at Ohio State

The diagram shows the percentage of respondents who strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, and don't know for the years 2002 to 2006. The categories are:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
Satisfaction with helpfulness and responsiveness of other IT support resources at Ohio State in 2006

- 2006 F%
- 2006 G/P%
- 2006 U%
- 2006 S%

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know
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Satisfaction with the Ohio State central e-mail service in 2006
Overall level of satisfaction with IT services at Ohio State in 2006
Familiarity with IT resources

- Very familiar
- Familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Not familiar
- Do not use
Familiarity with IT resources

- Very familiar or familiar with IT resources
  - 40% Undergraduate students
  - 29% Graduate/Professional students
  - 27% Staff
  - 25% Faculty
Faculty concern about security of electronic data

Very concerned
Neither concerned nor unconcerned
Unconcerned
Somewhat concerned
Somewhat unconcerned

2003 F 2004 F 2005 F 2006 F
Faculty concern about privacy of communications

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

Comparison across years:
- 2003 F: Very concerned (High), Somewhat concerned, Neither concerned nor unconcerned, Somewhat unconcerned, Unconcerned
- 2004 F: Very concerned, Somewhat concerned, Neither concerned nor unconcerned, Somewhat unconcerned, Unconcerned
- 2005 F: Very concerned, Somewhat concerned, Neither concerned nor unconcerned, Somewhat unconcerned, Unconcerned
- 2006 F: Very concerned, Somewhat concerned, Neither concerned nor unconcerned, Somewhat unconcerned, Unconcerned
Home Computers

2006 data
- 99% Faculty
- 99% G/P
- 99% U
- 93% Staff

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006
Laptop as primary computer among respondents having home computers

2006 data
- 36% Faculty
- 53% G/P
- 35% U
- 24% Staff
Windows PC vs. Mac as primary platform

2006 Mac data
- 23% Faculty
- 9% G/P
- 5% U
- 10% Staff
Presence of two or more computers at home in 2006
Laptops as Secondary computers

![Chart showing the percentage of laptops as secondary computers from 2002 to 2006. The chart includes data for F%, G/P%, U%, and S%. The data points for each year are as follows:

- 2002: F% 46, G/P% 40, U% 30, S% 30
- 2003: F% 44, G/P% 47, U% 45, S% 41
- 2004: F% 52, G/P% 43, U% 33, S% 36
- 2005: F% 51, G/P% 44, U% 43, S% 39
- 2006: F% 49, G/P% 43, U% 42, S% 37

The chart is used to show the trends in the use of laptops as secondary computers over the years.]
Use of wireless connection for secondary computer

- Over 40% of all groups reported wireless connections for secondary computers in the 2006 poll.
Mac platform for secondary computer

![Bar chart showing percentage of Mac platform usage for secondary computers from 2002 to 2006.](chart.png)
Presence of home Internet Service Provider (ISP)
Primary home ISP used to connect to university network

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

2006 data
- 9% Faculty
- 11% G/P
- 6% U
- 26% Staff

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

- In 2006, of the 90% who had an ISP before coming to Ohio State, 67% retained the ISP.
Graduate/Professional students with ISP before OSU and retention

- In 2006, of the 76% who had an ISP before coming to Ohio State, 85% retained the ISP.
Use of home ISP for more than 20 hours per week

2006 Data
- 50% U
- 47% G/P
- 32% faculty
- 23% Staff
Use of computer labs by graduate/professional students

2006 data
- 72% <10 hours
- 17% 10-20 hours
- 8% 21-60 hours
- 2% >60 hours
Use of computer labs by undergraduate students

2006 data
- 77% <10 hours
- 18% 10-20 hours
- 5% 21-60 hours
- 0.6% >60 hours
Aware of OSU Central Anti-Spam on Central E-mail

- 2006 F%
- 2006 G/P%
- 2006 U%
- 2006 S%
Aware of OSU Wireless Network on campus

2006 F%  2006 G/P%  2006 U%  2006 S%
Activated an OSU Wireless Account

2006 F%  2006 G/P%  2006 U%  2006 S%
Using an OSU Wireless Network on Campus

- 2006 F%
- 2006 G/P%
- 2006 U%
- 2006 S%
Aware of OSU/OIT System Status Page (monitoring E-mail, Carmen etc.)
Anti-Spam Service Is Helping Reduce Unwanted E-mail
Experienced a virus on any computer

2006 data
- 20% Faculty
- 34% G/P
- 51% U
- 23% Staff
Virus on personal vs. Ohio State computers

2006 data

• Student data shows that computer labs tend to almost free of viruses

• Faculty and staff reported only slightly more viruses on Ohio State computers (but under 10%)
Use of personal firewalls

2006 data
- 63% Faculty
- 66% G/P
- 70% U
- 57% 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
25% in 2006
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
- 32% in 2006
Current IT environment supports faculty teaching/instruction
Current IT environment supports graduate/professional students in teaching/instruction
Ability to access Ohio State computing and electronic information from office/lab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 G/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 G/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 G/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 G/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 2006
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
Types of instructional technologies used

- 87% E-mail
- 74% Online syllabus
- 69% Web-based materials
- 63% Computer-projected materials
- 27% Automated grade books/online grade checking
- 23% Online discussion forums
- 21% Computer labs during class
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

Faculty - Majors in my discipline should be required to demonstrate certain level of knowledge of computer applications.
Incentives for faculty to use IT in instruction

Graph showing incentives for faculty to use IT in instruction from 2002 to 2006. The graph includes categories such as Help Desk, Rewards, Access to hw/sw, IP Ownership, and Ease of use. The data is represented for each year from 2002 to 2006.
Faculty using a university-supported CMS (either Carmen or WebCT)

Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Faculty using a university-supported CMS (Carmen vs. WebCT) in 2006

Option of ‘Don’t Know’ eliminated in 2004 survey
Reasons for faculty not using WebCT or another CMS

- Don't Know how to start
- No time for development
- Don't Know what it is
- Doesn't fit courses
- Don't Know
- Other means
- Lack Technology
- Other reasons
- Using own Website
- Waiting for Carmen
- Not teaching

Faculty concern about time it takes to learn and use technology

- Very concerned
- Somewhat concerned
- Neither concerned nor unconcerned
- Somewhat unconcerned
- Unconcerned
Faculty opinion about technical support needed to learn and use technology

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

Graph showing opinions from 2003 to 2006.
Ways in which faculty would be interested in learning about instructional technology

- 48% General workshops (hands-on)
- 48% Self-instruction
- 47% Tutorials (self-paced)
- 39% Cohort workshops
- 38% Online workshops
- 35% One-on-one mentoring
Given adequate support, faculty interest in offering online/distance education courses
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

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

2002 2003 2004 2005 2006
Incorporation of IT in graduate/professional classes

- Didn't take: 2002: 15%, 2003: 10%, 2004: 5%, 2005: 0%, 2006: 0%
Undergraduate student preferences for method of instructional delivery

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

- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
- 2005
- 2006
Graduate/professional student preferences for method of instructional delivery

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partly online</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor led online</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully online “self-paced”</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily face-to-face</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty use of IT in class

%Every class  %Several  %A Few  %Never  % Do not teach

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006