

**Peer Study of Illinois State University**

**Campus Computing**

**Academic Year 2001**

**Compiled by Amy Wojak**

**Office of the Associate Vice President of Technology**

**January 21, 2003**

## **Campus Computing Project Results for Illinois State University**

### **Academic Year 2001**

The following are the compiled results from the 12<sup>th</sup> National Survey of Computing and Information Technology in American Higher Education for 2001, conducted by Kenneth Green's *National Campus Computing Project* ([www.campuscomputing.net](http://www.campuscomputing.net)). Before the start of each academic year, institutions like Illinois State complete a survey and submit the data for compiling along with 1,537 two- and four-year colleges and universities across the United States. Illinois State University requested a peer-group analysis from the following institutions:

- Ball State University Campus with an enrollment of 18,638 students
- Georgia Sate University Campus with an enrollment of 23,410 students
- Indiana-Purdue at Ft Wayne University Campus with an enrollment of 10,556 students
- Kent State University Campus with an enrollment of 21,653 students
- Northern Arizona University Campus with an enrollment of 19,981 students
- University of Memphis Campus with an enrollment of 20,301 students
- University of North Texas Campus with an enrollment of 25,514 students
- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Campus with an enrollment of 23,149 students
- Wichita State University Campus with an enrollment of 14,062 students

Based on the peer analysis provided by the Campus Computing Project, we have attempted to consolidate these data. We have divided our summary into four separate categories:

- Student technology use and support
- Faculty and classroom/library technology use and support
- Network/computer support
- Planning strategies and budget issues

Each of these sections begins with a summary of areas where it appears that Illinois State University provides *greater support* or *less support* than others in our peer group. Following each section is the statistical breakdown of how our institution, the peer group, and Doctoral-Research II institutions in general responded. As you examine these results, please consider that our response to the survey was completed with data immediately at hand. Nevertheless, there are places noted where the data are in error due either to a mistake or misinterpretation on our part, or a recording error on NCCP's part. Nevertheless, the report does offer some good indicators of how Illinois State University compares to our peer institutions

## Student Technology Use and Support

### Academic Year 2001

Areas where Illinois State University provides **greater support** when compared to our peer group:

- Our institution recommends formally or informally (as well as 44.4% of the peer group):
  - All students have a microcomputer
  - Particular brands/products for hardware
- For the 2000 academic year, the number of desktop/notebook computers purchased by our institution was 3000 compared to the average 2454 purchased by the peer group.
- For the 2001 academic year, the number of desktop/notebook computers purchased by our institution was 3500 compared to the average 2784 purchased by the peer group.
- Our institution has 210 FTE of IT help desk/technical support personnel compared to the peer group's 50 (ISU submitted total FTE across all academic areas, peers submitted central only) <sup>\*\*</sup>.
- Managing dial-up access from off campus users is very important to our institution compared the 4.1<sup>1</sup> ranking the peer group gave.
- The number of dial-up modem ports available for student use on our campus is 750 compared to the peer group's average 208.1.
- The ratio of user support from enrollment/help desk at our institution is 90.5/1 compared to the peer group's 356.1/1. <sup>\*\*</sup>
- We rated as the highest priority in the next 2-3 years "student portal service" and "online technical support."

Areas where Illinois State University provides **less support** when compared to our peer group:

- Our institution does not have a formal policy promoting or mandating computers/technology resources for graduates/professional students, but 55.6% of the peer group does.
- The average computer use fee (where charged) for our institution is \$75 (estimate % from tuition per student) compared to the \$119 charged by the peer group.
- The proportion of individuals who own desktop computers on our campus is 40% compared to 56% of the peer group.
- Our institution does not have the following academic resources/services are on our WWW site:
  - Course registration (88.9% of the peer group does)
  - Course add/drop options (88.9% of the peer group does)
  - E-commerce (fee payment, etc.) (66.7% of the peer group does)
  - Student transcripts (77.8% of the peer group does)
  - Student handbook (77.8% of the peer group does)

---

\* On a scale from 1= "not important" to 7= "very important."

\*\* Computationally ISU's response is out of synch here.

- Alumni information/services (100% of the peer group does)
  - Campus bookstore (77.8% of the peer group does)
- The percentage of “dormitory beds” with network connection on our campus is 58%, compared to the average 94.8% of the peer group.
- The number of “plug & play” ports on campus for mobile computer users on our campus is 200 compared to the average 312.3 of the peer group or 2% of the campus served versus 4.9% of the peer campuses.

Questions about student technology use and support	ISU	Peer Group	Doctoral & Public
--	-----	------------	-------------------

**Does your institution have:**

**A formal policy promoting or mandating computers/technology resources for:**

Undergraduates	yes	55.6%	39.1%
Graduates/professional students	no	55.6%	31.8%
Distance education	yes	44.4%	30.4%
A computer instruction, computer competency, technology literacy or information literacy requirement for all undergraduates	no	22.2%	43.5%
A special computer use/technology fee or annual/term computer use charge for all students (% of tuition)	yes	77.8%	77.3%
Average computer use fee (where charged)	\$75	\$119	\$232
Code of conduct/acceptable use policy for campus e-mail accounts and individual Web pages	yes	100%	100%

**Do you require or strongly recommend microcomputer ownership for:**

**All students:**

No		55.6%	59.1%
Recommend	yes	44.4%	40.9%
Require		0%	0%

**Students in specific disciplines or programs:**

No		22.2%	27.3%
Recommend	yes	66.7%	54.6%
Require		11.1%	18.2%

**Students in individual academic units/prof. programs:**

No		22.2%	22.7%
Recommend	yes	66.7%	45.5%
Require		11.1%	31.8%

**Does your institution recommend a particular brand/product for:**

Hardware	yes	44.4%	26.1%
Software	yes	55.6%	39.1%

**How strongly do you agree:**

We plan to require all students to own a computer by Fall 2003	no	11.1%	17.4%
--	----	-------	-------

**Proportion of individuals who own desktop or notebook computers:**

Desktop	40%	56%	61.3%
Notebook	20%	12.9%	16.7%

**Number of desktop/notebook computers purchased by students:**

2000-01	3000	2454	2432
2001-02	3500	2784	2836

FTE of IT help desk/technical support personnel	210*	50	56.7
Ratio of user support (enrollment/help desk)	90.5	356.1	261.4

**What academic resources/services are on your WWW site:**

Undergraduate admissions applications	yes	100%	100%
Financial aid application	yes	100%	95.7%
Current course catalog	yes	100%	100%
Program/major/degree requirements	yes	77.8%	91.3%
Course registration	no	88.9%	73.9%
Course add/drop options	no	88.9%	65.2%
E-commerce (fee payment, etc.)	no	66.7%	43.5%
Student transcripts	no	77.8%	65.2%
Student newspaper	yes	66.7%	82.6%
Student handbook	no	77.8%	95.7%
Athletic event schedule	yes	100%	100%
Alumni information/services	no	100%	95.7%
Press releases/media services	yes	100%	100%
Campus bookstore	no	77.8%	82.6%
Personalized student calendar	no	11.1%	26.1%

**How important are the following to campus/IT planning over the next 2-3 years (scale from 1= “not important” to 7= “very important”):**

Student portal services	6	5.8	6
On-line IT training	5	5.9	5.4
On-line technical support	7	5.9	5.6
Advertising on the student portal	1	3.3	2.6
Computer repair services	2	5	4.5
Alumni services via the campus web site	4	5	5

**Rating the technology infrastructure (scale from 1 = “poor” to 7= “excellent”):**

User support services	0*	5.2	5
Campus web site services/ student portal	4	4.8	4.5
IT training for students	4	4.1	4.3

**Strategic, budget and personnel issues (scale from 1 = “not important” to 7= “very important”):**

Acquiring a “campus portal” for Web-based student services	7	5.8	6
Moving more of our user support services to the Web	6	5.8	6
Surveying student about IT issues and services	5	5.2	5

**Current replacement cycle for desktop/notebook computers (years):**

Student Labs			
2 years	no	12.5%	4.4%

\* Data error

3 years	yes	87.5%	87%
4 years	no	0%	4.4%
5 years	no	0%	4.4%

**How important are the following issues on your campus (scale from 1= “not important” to 7= “very important”):**

Web/Network access for all students	7	6.2	6.1
Managing dial-up access from off campus users	7	4.1	4.3
Creating plug and play network for notebook computer users	6	5.4	4.7
User privacy	6	5.7	5.4

**How well developed are network connections and instructional infrastructures:**

Percentage of dormitory beds with network connection	58%	94.8%	90.4%
Percentage of campus coverage/served by wireless network access	2%	4.9%	15.1%

**Does your institution provide off-campus dial-up (ISP) services for students:**

No		22.2%	21.7%
Yes, without a fee	yes	66.7%	69.6%
Yes for a fee		11.1%	8.7%
Number of dial-up modem ports available for student use	750	208.1	297.1
Number of “plug & play” ports on campus for mobile computer users	200	312.3	260.9

**(Estimate) How well does your institution prepare students for the technology skills needed over the decade (scale from 1= “poor” to 5= “excellent”):**

**Academic field/program:**

Biological and physical sciences	5	3.6	3.8
Business	5	4	4
Education	4	4	3.9
Engineering	0	4	4.3
Fine/performing arts	5	3.7	3.6
Humanities	3	3.2	3.3
Mathematics	4	3.6	3.6
Social science	4	3.3	3.4
Occupational programs	4	3.7	3.6
Overall Campus preparation	4	3.7	3.8

## Faculty and Classroom/Library Technology Use and Support Academic Year 2001

Areas where Illinois State University provides **greater support** when compared to our peer group:

- Our institution has a formal policy promoting or mandating computers/technology resources for curriculum utilization and distance education compared to the 44.4% of the peer group.
- Fifty percent of our classes use presentation handouts compared to 33.6% of the peer group.
- The percentage of classes that use electronic mail on campus (80%) is higher than the peer group (64.8%).
- ISU faculty makes greater use of course management tools (40% vs. 25%) than peer schools.
- Only 22.2% of the peer group has a program to reward use of IT in faculty review/promotion process where ISU rewards IT in selected departments.
- In all labs, classrooms and clusters we are ahead in the number of desktop computers/workstations with 2050, compared to the 1425 in the peer group.
- Ninety percent of classrooms are connected to the campus network or have Internet access compared to the 78.6% of the peer group.

Areas where Illinois State University provides **less support** when compared to our peer group:

- In the 2000 academic year, our campus purchased 200 new desktop/notebook computers, compared to the average 423 purchased by the peer group.
- In the 2001 academic year, our campus increased the number of new desktop/notebook computers purchased to 300 units, but compared to the average 435 purchased by the peer group, our institution is still behind.
- Our current replacement cycle for desktop/notebook computers is every four years, but 50% of our peer group replaces desktop/notebook computers every three years.
- We only have 70 desktop computer labs, clusters, or classrooms differing from an average of 109 in the peer group.
- The majority of the peer group (88.9%) offers projects for developing desktop instructional software/courseware while Illinois State University does not. In contrast, ISU, and the entire peer group (100%), provide “support for faculty developing instructional software.”
- ISU has fewer estimated faculty with personal web pages than peer institutions (25% vs. 33.6%).
- Our faculty, as well as 22.2% of the peer group, is seen as having unreasonable expectations about user support.
- 66.7% of peers have programs for rewarding courseware development where ISU does not.

<b>Questions about faculty and classroom/library technology use and support</b>	<b>ISU</b>	<b>Peer Group</b>	<b>Doctoral &amp; Public</b>
---	------------	-------------------	------------------------------

**Does your institution have:**

**A formal policy promoting or mandating computers/technology resources for:**

Curriculum utilization	yes	44.4%	36.4%
Undergraduates	yes	55.6%	39.1%
Graduates/professional students	no	55.6%	31.8%
Distance education	yes	44.4%	30.4%

**Does your institution recommend a particular brand/product for:**

Hardware	yes	100%	73.9%
Software	yes	100%	69.6%

**How strongly do you agree:**

Faculty have unreasonable expectations about user support	yes	22.2%	39.1%
Technology has improved instruction on my campus	yes	88.9%	100%

**Proportion of individuals who own desktop or notebook computers:**

Desktops	70%	82.1%	82%
Notebooks	20%	23.6%	12.8%

**Number of desktop/notebook computers purchased by faculty:**

2000-01	200	423	487
2001-02	300	435	362
Percentage of faculty with individual/personal Web page	25%	35.6%	32.8%
Number of desktop computer labs, clusters and classrooms	70	109	409
How many dedicated to department or units	63	48	48

**Number of desktop computers/workstations in all labs/classrooms/clusters:**

Computers	2050	1425	1223
Unix Workstations	50	46	96

**Percentage of classes that use:**

Computer-based classrooms/labs	30%	26.3%	29.3%
Computer simulations	10%	15.3%	15.1%
Presentation handouts	50%	33.6%	35.9%
Electronic mail	80%	64.8%	70.3%
Commercial courseware/instructional resources	20%	15.4%	15%
Internet resources	50%	43.4%	45.6%
Course management tools for online course resources	40%	25%	24.6%
Web pages for class materials and resources	25%	37%	42.4%

**Does your campus/institution have/provide:**

Support for faculty developing instructional software/courseware	yes	100%	91.3%
Projects for developing desktop instructional	no	88.9%	87%

software/courseware			
Policy regarding ownership of Web-based resources developed by faculty	yes	62.5%	47.8%
Program for rewarding courseware development	no	66.7%	60.9%
Program assessing the impact of IT on instructing	yes*	22.2%	26.1%
Plan for integrating IT into the curriculum	no	33.3%	52.2%
Support for faculty developing for their research	yes	88.9%	69.6%
Technology resource center focusing on use of IT	yes	100%	100%
Assess impact of IT on instructional services and academic programs	yes*	33.3%	43.5%
Program to reward use of IT in faculty review/promotion process	yes	22.2%	17.4%

**Does your institution have a strategic plan for:**

**Deploying course management tools:**

No		44.4%	26.1%
Currently preparing a plan		11.1%	13%
Yes	yes	44.4%	60.9%

**What academic resources/services are on your WWW site**

On-line courses (i.e. full course online)	yes	88.9%	91.3%
Library/card catalog	yes	100%	100%
Interlibrary loan services	yes	100%	95.7%
Journals and reference resources	yes	100%	95.7%
Course reserves	yes	66.7%	82.6%
Instructional software	yes	100%	91.3%
Faculty/staff directory	yes	100%	100%

**Rating the technology infrastructure (scale from 1="poor" to 7="excellent"):**

On-line reference resources in campus library/library system	5	5.6	5.6
User support services	0*	5.2	5
IT training for faculty	5	4.2	4.8

**Future issues affecting campus computing (Scale from 1= "not important" to 7= "very important"):**

**Networking & internet/WWW issues & resources:**

Course management software	5	6.6	6.6
----------------------------	---	-----	-----

**Strategic, budget, and personal issues (scale from 1="not important" to 7="very important"):**

Using Internet/Web resources in instruction	6	6.7	6.5
Using technology based commercial curriculum products	4	5.1	5.2
Developing campus policies for web-based intellectual property	6	5.7	5.7
Using IT to enhance distance education program	5	6.7	6.1

\* Data error.

Negotiating site licensing with textbook publishers	5	5.1	4.1
Negotiating site licensing with academic publishers	5	5.1	4.2
Sharing digital resources with other campuses/institutions	4	5.4	5.2
Providing incentives for faculty to use technology	6	6	5.6
Faculty concerns about benefits of computing in the curriculum	5	4.8	4.4
Web-based instructional/course management systems	5	6.8	6.2
Surveying faculty about IT issues and services	5	5.2	5.0

**Current replacement cycle for desktop/notebook computers (years):**

3 years	no	50%	54.6%
4 years	yes	37.5%	31.8%
5 years	no	12%	13.6%

**How well developed are network connections and instructional infrastructure:**

Percentage of classrooms connected to the campus network/have Internet access	90%	78.6%	81.6%
Percentage of classrooms with fixed computer projection capacity	20%	29.1%	30%
Percentage of faculty connected to the campus network/have internet access	90%	98.4%	97.5%

**Does your institution provide off-campus dial-up (ISP) services:**

No		0%	19.1%
Yes, without fee	yes	87.5%	76.2%
Yes, for a fee		12.5%	4.8%

**What academic and operational units report to the CIO/CTO:**

Academic computing	no	100%	65.2%
Administrative computing	no	100%	73.9%
Libraries	no	11.1%	13%
Telecommunications	no	88.9%	65.2%

**Who makes decisions about selecting course management products:**

Individual department	yes	77.8%	44.8%
Central IT service unit	no	0%	17.4%
Both	no	22.2%	34.8%

**(Estimate) How well prepared are faculty to use technology as a resource (scale 1="poor" to 5="excellent"):**

**For instruction:**

Biological and physical sciences	4	3.6	3.6
Business	4	4	3.8
Education	4	4	3.6
Engineering	0	3.8	3.9
Fine/performing arts	4	3.4	3.4
Humanities	3	3.1	3.0
Mathematics	4	3.6	3.4

Social science	3	3.3	3.3
Occupational programs	4	3.7	3.5
Overall Campus preparation	4	3.6	3.5

**For scholarship and research:**

Biological and physical sciences	4	4.1	4
Business	4	4	3.7
Education	4	3.8	3.5
Engineering	0	3.8	4
Fine/performing arts	4	3.7	3.3
Humanities	3	3.3	3
Mathematics	4	3.8	3.6
Social science	3	3.6	3.4
Occupational programs	4	3.6	3.4
Overall Campus preparation	4	3.8	3.6

**Internet and Web resources:**

Biological and physical sciences	4	3.7	3.8
Business	4	3.9	3.9
Education	4	3.8	3.8
Engineering	0	3.8	3.8
Fine/performing arts	4	3.3	3.5
Humanities	4	3.1	3.3
Mathematics	4	3.3	3.3
Social science	4	3.3	3.6
Occupational programs	4	3.4	3.6
Overall Campus preparation	4	3.6	3.6

## Network/Computer Support Academic Year 2001

Areas where Illinois State University provides **greater support** when compared to our peer group:

- Our campus has recommended brands/kinds for use in both Apple/Macintosh and Windows Compatibles. We recommend:
  - iMacs (22.2% of peer group)
  - iBooks (33.3% of peer group)
  - PowerBooks (33.3% of peer group)
  - Pentium Celeron desktops/notebooks (44.4% of peer group)
  - Pentium III-IV (66.7% and 77.8%)
- Our single most important IT issue over the next 2 or 3 years is providing adequate user support along with 25% of the peer group.
- The number of institution-owned desktop or notebook computers and workstations is 8300 versus the average 7467 by the peer group.
- The number of desktop/notebook computers purchased by campus labs, clusters, and other instructional use for the 2000 academic year was 650 compared to 393 by the peer group.
- In the 2001 academic year, the number of desktop/notebook computers purchased by campus labs, clusters, and for other instructional use rose to 750. The average for the peer group was 402.
- The number of institutionally owned network servers at ISU is estimated at 250 versus 155 by the peer group.
- Percentage of Win NT servers is 25% for the peer group and 65% for our institution, where only 5% of Novell servers are used on this campus compared to 28.8% with peer institutions.
- For key strategic, budget and personnel issues ISU rated higher with “helping IT personnel stay current” (7 vs. 5.8)\*, “establishing/maintaining campus software standards” (6 vs. 5.4), and “retaining IT staff” (7 vs. 6.4).
- In terms of campus network transmission capability, ISU is among 50% of peers experimenting with Voice-over-IP, and ATM, now or next year.
- ISU, like 88.9% of its peers, uses fiber between buildings for connectivity and twisted pair (33.3%) within buildings.

Areas where Illinois State University provides **less support** when compared to our peer group:

- Our institution does not recommend or support Novell operating systems, where 77.8% of the peer group does.
- We disagree, but 77.8% of the peer group agrees that access to Internet 2 by Fall 2002 is essential to long-term needs.
- Our number of institution owned Unix workstations is 50, compared to the peer group's 617.

---

\* On a scale from 1= “not important” to 7 = “very important.”

- Percentage of institutionally owned servers with Unix is 5% compared to the 13.9% by the peer group, 3% with Linux compared to 8.5%, and 5% Novell compared to 28.8%.
- In terms of campus network transmission capability, ISU has less priority on high-speed video (77.8% of peers function now), wireless LAN (75% of peers), or gigabit Ethernet (87.5%).
- Our institution does not have a chief information/technology officer compared to the 88.9% of the peer group that have an officer.
- 33% of the peer institutions have implemented XP operating system where ISU had not.

Questions about network and computer systems support	ISU	Peer Group	Doctoral & Public
--	-----	------------	-------------------

**Operating systems recommended/supported:**

Mac OS 9 or earlier	yes	66.7%	69.6%
Mac OS X	yes	55.6%	65.2%
UNIX	yes	88.9%	91.3%
Linux	yes	55.6%	60.9%
Windows 95/98/ME	yes	100%	87%
Windows NT Workstation	yes	88.9%	87%
Windows 2000	yes	100%	91.3%
Windows XP	no	33.3%	30.4%
Open VMS	no	22.2%	30.4%
Novell	no	77.8%	47.8%
None	no	0%	4.3%

**Brands/kind recommended by your institution:**

**Apple/Macintosh:**

iMacs	yes	22.2%	26.1%
G-4 desktop computers	yes	77.8%	52.2%
iBooks	yes	33.3%	17.4%
PowerBooks	yes	33.3%	26.1%

**Windows Compatibles:**

Pentium III class desktops/notebooks	yes	66.7%	56.5%
Pentium Celeron desktops/notebooks	yes	44.4%	30.4%
Pentium IV class desktops/notebooks	yes	77.8%	65.2%

**Unix/Linux Systems:**

Compaq	no	22.2%	21.7%
IBM	yes n <sup>*</sup>	22.2%	26.1%
Sun	yes n <sup>*</sup>	77.8%	73.9%
Dell	yes n <sup>*</sup>	44.4%	56.5%
Silicon Graphics	yes n <sup>*</sup>	22.2%	21.7%
HP	no	11.1%	13%
Other	no	0%	8.7%

**Does your institution have a written policy regarding duplication of copywrited software/software piracy:**

No	yes n <sup>*</sup>	0%	4.4%
No, but under development		0%	0%
Yes	yes n <sup>*</sup>	100%	95.7%

**How strongly do you agree or disagree:**

Access to Internet 2 by Fall 2002 is essential to long-term needs	no	77.8%	78.3%
---	----	-------	-------

\* Data error.

\*\* Interpreted in terms of enterprise, up-to-date software systems for HR, e-commerce, student information; not people support.

Our adm. systems provide effective support for conducting college business	yes <del>no</del> **	77.8%	59.1%
--	----------------------	-------	-------

**The single most important IT issue over the next 2 or 3 years:**

Provide online/distance education via the web	no	0%	4.4%
Providing adequate user support	yes	25%	17.4%
Assist faculty integrate technology into instruction	no	25%	30.4%
Financing replacement of aging hardware/software	no	0%	4.4%
Integrating academic and administrative computing	no	0%	4.4%
Providing student portal services	no	0%	8.7%
Hiring/retaining qualified IT staff	no	12.5%	4.4%
Upgrading /replacing administrative IT/ERP systems	no	37.5%	26.1%
Number of institution owned desktop or notebook computers and workstations	8300	7467	5070
Number of institution owned Unix workstation	50	617	238

**Number of desktop/notebook computers purchased by:**

**Campus labs, clusters & other instructional use:**

2000-01	650	393	419
2001-02	750	402	444
Number of network servers	250	155	132

**Percentage of operating systems installed on institutionally-owned computers and servers:**

**Computers/clients:**

Mac	10%	7.1%	9.1%
Win 95/98/2000	70%	74.2%	62.3%
Win NT	15%	14.5%	22.2%
Unix	4%	4.1%	6.5%
Linux	1%	3%	3.7%

**Network servers:**

Mac	2%	2.1%	2.3%
Win NT	65%	25%	32.1%
Win 2000 server	20%	22%	15.5%
Unix	5%	13.9%	24.2%
Linux	3%	8.5%	7.9%
Novell	5%	28.8%	22.2%

**Does your campus/institution provide:**

Program to provide supplemental IT training for IT staff	yes	66.7%	78.3%
--	-----	-------	-------

ADA-compliant Web pages	yes	87.5%	82.6%
-------------------------	-----	-------	-------

**Has your institution established a single product standard for:**

**Desktop/notebook computer operating system:**

No	yes	88.9%	87%
Macintosh	no	0%	0%
Win 95/98	no	0%	4.4%
Win NT Workstation	no	0%	0%
Win 2000	no	11.1%	8.7%

**Desktop/notebook product or manufacturer:**

No	yes	77.8%	82.6%
Apple	no	0%	0%
Compaq	no	0%	0%
Dell	no	22.2%	17.4%
Gateway	no	0%	0%
HP	no	0%	0%
IBM	no	0%	0%
Other	no	0%	0%

**Groupware:**

No	yes	33.3%	65.2%
Lotus Notes	no	11.1%	0%
Microsoft Exchange	no	11.1%	17.4%
Novell GroupWise	no	33.3%	13%
Other	no	11.1%	0%

**Course management system:**

No	no	11.1%	26.1%
Blackboard	no	22.2%	39.1%
eCollege	no	0%	0%
Lotus Learning Space	no	0%	0%
Prometheus	no	0%	0%
WebCT	yes	66.7%	34.8%
Other	no	0%	0%

**What academic resources/services are on your WWW site:**

IT support resources	yes	100%	91.3%
IT training/tutorials	yes	77.8%	73.9%

**Rating the technology infrastructure (scale from 1= "poor" to 7= "excellent"):**

Computer networks and data connections	6	5.7	5.8
Telecommunications and phone systems	6	5.1	5.6
Wireless networks	3	4	3.6
Web resources to support instruction	5	5.3	5.4
E-commerce capacity	3	4.2	3.6
Network security against hackers and virus attacks	5	4.7	5

**Strategic, budget and personnel issues (scale from 1= "not important" to 7= "very important"):**

Charging fees to students for computer/network access	7*	4.6	4.7
Establishing/maintaining campus-wide hardware standards	5	5.4	4.8
Establishing/maintaining campus-wide software standards	6	5.4	5.2
Helping IT personnel stay current with new technologies	7	5.8	6.1
Retaining current IT personnel, given off campus competition	7	6.4	6.2
Electronic commerce	5	5.2	5

**How important are the following issues to your campus (scale from 1= “not important” to 7= “very important”):**

Creating web pages for dept. use and course resources	5	5.6	5.7
Network printing	4	4.2	4.4
Network computers/thin client computer strategies	4	3.7	3.6
Network security	7	6.6	6.5
Gigabit Ethernet	7	6.1	6.2
Electronic commerce	5	5.3	4.7
Wireless networks	6	5.9	5.3
E-mail accounts for alumni	3	3.9	3.5
Making campus networks accessible to PDA devices	5	4.6	3.9

**Primary medium for campus backbone/network:**

**Linking buildings:**

Fiber	yes	88.9%	78.3%
Gigabit Ethernet	no	11.1%	21.7%

**Within buildings:**

Fiber	no	11.1%	21.7%
Gigabit Ethernet	no	22.2%	13%
Std. Ethernet/coax	no	22.2%	13%
Twisted pair	yes	33.3%	43.5%
Other	no	11.1%	8.7%

**Current transmission capacity of your campus network:**

**High speed video:**

Functional now		77.8%	72.7%
Coming A/Y 2001-02		11.1%	9.1%
Scheduled for A/Y 2002-03	yes	11.1%	18.2%

**ATM:**

Functional now	yes	55.6%	60.9%
Not applicable		44.4%	39.1%

\* Data error.

<b>Local area wireless networks:</b>			
Functional now		<b>75%</b>	<b>72.7%</b>
Coming A/Y 2001-02	<b>yes</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>
Scheduled for A/Y 2002-03		<b>25%</b>	<b>13.6%</b>
Not applicable		<b>0%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
<b>Full campus wireless networks:</b>			
Functional now		<b>12.5%</b>	<b>20%</b>
Coming A/Y 2001-02		<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>
Scheduled for A/Y 2002-03		<b>50%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Not applicable	<b>yes</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>Gigabit Ethernet:</b>			
Functional now		<b>87.5%</b>	<b>78.3%</b>
Coming A/Y 2001-02	<b>yes</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
Scheduled for A/Y 2002-03		<b>0%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
Not applicable		<b>12.5%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>
<b>Voice over IP:</b>			
Functional now		<b>25%</b>	<b>21.7%</b>
Coming A/Y 2001-02		<b>0%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>
Scheduled for A/Y 2002-03	<b>yes</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>26.1%</b>
Not applicable		<b>50%</b>	<b>34.8%</b>
<b>Does your institution have a chief information/technology officer:</b>			
No	<b>yes</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>21.7%</b>
Currently under discussion		<b>11.1%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Yes		<b>88.9%</b>	<b>78.3%</b>
<b>Who provides tech support for most departmental computer labs:</b>			
Individual department	<b>yes</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>47.8%</b>
Central IT service unit	<b>no</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17.4%</b>
Both	<b>no</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>34.8%</b>

## Planning Strategies and Budget Issues

### Academic Year 2001

Areas where Illinois State University provides **greater support** when compared to our peer group:

- Our institution has strategic plans for:
  - Electronic commerce (22.2% of peers)
  - Distance education (22.2% of peers)
  - Wireless networks (22.2% of peers)
- Our institution is preparing a plan for:
  - Information technology (77.8% of peers)
  - Portal services (22.2% of peers)
  - Courseware tools (44.4% of peers)
- Our institution found the following campus computing/IT planning over the next 2-3 years important (6) \* or very important (7) compared to less a priority from our peer group:
  - Operating system/interface/development for:
    - Windows 2000 Server (peer group ranked 5.7)
    - Macintosh OS X (peer group ranked 3.9)
    - Macintosh OSX Server (peer group ranked 3.1)
    - Solaris (peer group ranked 5.6)
    - Unix (peer group ranked 5.8)
  - Hardware use of:
    - Macintosh computers (peer group ranked 1)
    - PDAs/handheld computers (peer group ranked 4.3)
  - Instructional applications and resources use of:
    - Use of instructional software in the classroom (peer group ranked 5.6)
    - e-Books/e-Textbooks (peer group ranked 4.9)
  - Networking & Internet/WWW issues & resources in:
    - Merging data & telecommunications networks (peer group ranked 5.4)
    - Java (peer group ranked 4.9)
  - User support services and campus IT services
    - On-line technical support (peer group ranked 5.9)
- 33% of peers, like ISU, had no change in overall computing budget from the past year. 44% indicated a 1-3% increase but no more.
- For individual computing issues, 66% indicated 1-5% increase in administrative computing budget (ISU, 1-3% increase), 44% an increase in budget for academic computer purchases (ISU, 3-5% increase), 22% an increase in administrative computer purchases (ISU, no change), 44% an increase in desktop/notebook computer (ISU 1-3%), 66% an increase in sever hardware budgets (ISU, 3-5%

---

\* On a scale from 1= "not important" to 7= "very important."

- increase), 66% an increase in sever software budgets (ISU, 1-3% increase), and 55% indicate no change in budget for training (ISU, 1-3% increase).
- Only 11% of peer institutions report a budget cut.

Areas where Illinois State University provides **less support** when compared to our peer group:

- Our institution found the following campus computing/IT planning issues less important than peers over the next 2-3 years:
  - System/interface/development with Linux desktop/client (ISU, 2)
  - System/interface/development with Linux server (ISU, 3)
  - Unix workstation hardware (ISU, 3)
  - IMS standards (ISU, 4)
  - Course management software (ISU, 5)
  - Advertising on the student portal (ISU, 1)
  - Computer repair services (ISU, 2)
- The entire peer group is already making greater use of student assistants and our institution indicated making greater use in upcoming year.
- This year's computing budget has had no change compared to last year's in terms of user training and support with 55.6% of the peer group.

Questions about planning strategies and budget issues	ISU	Peer Group	Doctoral & Public
---	-----	------------	-------------------

**How strongly do you agree (Scale from 1= “strongly agree” to 4= “strongly disagree”)**

My campus does a good job of planning our short- an mid- range tech needs	yes	77.8%	87%
---	-----	-------	-----

**Does your campus/institution have/provide**

Plan for integrating IT into the curriculum	no	33.3%	52.2%
Plan for using Internet resources in instruction	yes	44.4%	47.8%
Plan for using Internet resources in distance education	yes	55.6%	52.5%
Plan for using Internet for marketing to off-campus audiences	yes	55.6%	17.4%

**Does your institution have a strategic plan for:**

**Information technology:**

No		11.1%	8.7%
Currently preparing a plan		11.1%	13%
Yes	yes	77.8%	78.3%

**Electronic commerce:**

No		66.7%	52.2%
Currently preparing a plan	yes	22.2%	30.4%
Yes		11.1%	17.4%

**Distance education:**

No		44.4%	21.7%
Currently preparing a plan	yes	22.2%	30.4%
Yes		33.3%	47.8%

**Campus portal services:**

No		33.3%	30.4%
Currently preparing a plan		44.4%	39.1%
Yes	yes	22.2%	30.4%

**Wireless networks:**

No		55.6%	43.5%
Currently preparing a plan	yes	22.2%	26.1%
Yes		22.2%	30.4%

**Deploying course management tools:**

No		44.4%	26.1%
Currently preparing a plan		11.1%	13%
Yes	yes	44.4%	60.9%

**How important are the following campus computing/IT planning over the next 2-3 years (Scale from 1= “not important” to 7= “very important”):**

**Operating system/interface/development:**

Windows 95/98/ME	4	3.1	2.9
Windows NT Server	5	4.3	3.7
Windows 2000 Desktop	7	5.8	5.7

Windows 2000 Server	7	5.7	5.5
Windows XP	7	5.8	5.2
Macintosh OS X	6	3.9	3.5
Macintosh OSX Server	6	3.1	2.7
Solaris	7	5.6	5.6
Unix	6	5.8	5.5
Linux (desktop/client)	2	5.1	4.4
Linux (server)	3	5.4	5.1

**Hardware:**

Notebook computers	7	5.8	5.7
Macintosh computers	5	1	3.4
Unix workstations	3	5.1	4.5
Network computers	4	3	3
PDAs/handheld computers	6	4.3	4.6
Smart cards	5	4.4	4.3
DVD	5	4	3.9

**Instructional applications and resources:**

Developing instructional software	5	5.8	5
Using instructional software in classes	7	5.6	6.2
Using instructional software as a supplement to class	7	5.9	6.2
Computer-based classroom presentation facilities	7	6.4	6.3
Internet resources for instruction	7	6.9	6.5
Web pages for classes	7	6.2	6.3
Web-based tutorials	7	6.2	5.9
e-books (e-Textbooks)	7	4.9	4.5

**Networking & Internet/WWW issues & resources:**

Merging data & telecommunications networks	7	5.4	5.7
Wireless networks	5	6	5.6
Voice over IP	5	5.4	5.1
Bluetooth	4	3.7	3.6
Lotus Notes	1	2.2	1.6
Microsoft Exchange	5	4	3.4
Java	6	4.9	5.1
XML	6	5.4	5.6
Shockwave	4	4.3	4
QuickTime	5	4.9	4.2
Real Player	5	5.4	4.9
Microsoft Media Player	5	5	4.7
Gigabit Ethernet	7	6	6.2
ATM	4	3.6	3.7
Adobe Acrobat	6	5.8	5.5
Microsoft Reader	3	3.7	3.7
Internet 2	6	5.8	6
Internet videoconferencing	5	5.7	6

Network security	7	6.8	6.8
E-commerce on the Web	6	5.9	5.5
Open source software	5	4.7	4.9
Student portal services	6	5.8	6
IMS standards	4	5.6	4.9
Course management software	5	6.6	6.6

**User support services/campus IT services:**

On-line IT training	5	5.9	5.4
On-line technical support	7	5.9	5.6
Advertising on the student portal	1	3.3	2.6
Computer repair services	2	5	4.5
Alumni services via the campus web site	4	5	5

**Reducing purchases of computer technology:**

Doing this already		0%	18.2%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	0%
Decided not to do	yes	88.9%	81.8%

**Charging fees to departments and service units:**

Doing this already	yes	44.4%	47.8%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	4.4%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	8.7%
Decided not to do		44.4%	39.1%

**Requiring a computer/IT fee for all students:**

Doing this already	yes	66.7%	69.6%
Beginning in 2001-2002		11.1%	4.4%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	8.7%
Decided not to do		11.1%	17.4%

**Leasing rather than buying hardware:**

Doing this already		12.5%	9.1%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		0%	22.7%
Decided not to do	yes	87.5%	68.2%

**More active recycling of older equipment:**

Doing this already	yes	88.9%	78.3%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		0%	8.7%
Decided not to do		11.1%	13%

**Vendor financing:**

Doing this already		11.1%	21.7%
Beginning in 2001-2002	yes*	0%	4.4%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		0%	4.4%
Decided not to do		88.9%	69.6%

**Reducing hours in public access facilities:**

---

\* Data error

Doing this already		0%	9.1%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	9.1%
Decided not to do	yes	88.9%	81.8%

**Reducing services:**

Doing this already		11.1%	4.4%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		22.2%	8.7%
Decided not to do	yes	66.7%	87%

**Reorganizing operations:**

Doing this already	yes	66.7%	65.2%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	21.7%
Decided not to do		22.2%	13%

**Reducing staff:**

Doing this already		12.5%	30%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		0%	5%
Decided not to do	yes	87.5%	65%

**Using information technology to reduce instructional costs:**

Doing this already		33.3%	43.5%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	17.4%
Decided not to do	yes	55.6%	39.1%

**Making greater use of student assistants:**

Doing this already		100%	85.7%
Beginning in 2001-2002	yes	0%	8.7%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		0%	0%
Decided not to do		0%	4.4%

**Outsourcing Internet access to commercial providers:**

Doing this already		33.3%	34.8%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	4.4%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	8.7%
Decided not to do	yes	55.6%	52.2%

**Outsourcing computing services to commercial providers:**

Doing this already		11.1%	8.7%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	0%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	4.4%
Decided not to do	yes	77.8%	87%

**Outsourcing student portal services to commercial providers:**

Doing this already		0%	4.4%
Beginning in 2001-2002		0%	4.4%
Reviewing for 2001-2002		11.1%	17.4%
Decided not to do	yes	88.9%	73.9%

**This year's computing budget compared to last year's**

**Total academic computing budget:**

Reduced >5%		0%	4.4%
Reduced 3-5%		0%	0%
Reduced 1-3%		22.2%	8.7%
No change	yes	33.3%	39.1%
Increased 1-3%		44.4%	30.4%
Increased 3-5%		0%	8.7%
Increased >5%		0%	8.7%

**Total administrative computing budget:**

Reduced >5%		0%	4.4%
Reduced 3-5%		0%	0%
Reduced 1-3%		22.2%	4.4%
No change		11.1%	43.5%
Increased 1-3%	yes	33.3%	26.1%
Increased 3-5%		22.2%	13%
Increased >5%		11.1%	8.7%

**Purchases of computers by academic computing units:**

Reduced >5%		0%	4.4%
Reduced 3-5%		11.1%	0%
Reduced 1-3%		0%	0%
No change		44.4%	39.1%
Increased 1-3%		33.3%	30.4%
Increased 3-5%	yes	11.1%	17.4%
Increased >5%		0%	8.7%

**Purchases of computers by administrative computing units:**

Reduced >5%		0%	0%
Reduced 3-5%		11.1%	0%
Reduced 1-3%		0%	4.4%
No change	yes	66.7%	56.5%
Increased 1-3%		0%	17.4%
Increased 3-5%		22.2%	17.4%
Increased >5%		0%	4.4%

**All institutional purchases of desktop/notebook computers:**

Reduced >5%		0%	0%
Reduced 3-5%		11.1%	0%
Reduced 1-3%		0%	4.4%
No change		44.4%	34.8%
Increased 1-3%	yes	22.2%	39.1%
Increased 3-5%		22.2%	13%
Increased >5%		0%	8.7%

**Network servers:**

Reduced >5%		0%	8.7%
Reduced 3-5%		11.1%	0%
Reduced 1-3%		0%	4.4%
No change		33.3%	26.1%

Increased 1-3%		<b>44.4%</b>	<b>43.5%</b>
Increased 3-5%	<b>yes</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Increased >5%		<b>0%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>

**Server software and related services:**

Reduced >5%		<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Reduced 3-5%		<b>11.1%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Reduced 1-3%		<b>0%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
No change		<b>33.3%</b>	<b>26.1%</b>
Increased 1-3%	<b>yes</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>43.5%</b>
Increased 3-5%		<b>11.1%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Increased >5%		<b>0%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>

**User training and support:**

Reduced >5%		<b>0%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>
Reduced 3-5%		<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Reduced 1-3%		<b>22.2%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
No change		<b>55.6%</b>	<b>47.8%</b>
Increased 1-3%	<b>yes</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>26.1%</b>
Increased 3-5%		<b>22.2%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Increased >5%		<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Percentage institutions experiencing computing budget cut, 2000-2001	<b>no</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>
Percentage of budget that was cut	<b>no</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Total academic computing budget 2001-2002 (in thousand \$\$)	<b>5000</b>	<b>5319</b>	<b>5439</b>

**Percent of budget allocated to\* :**

Hardware	<b>30%</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
Contact licenses	<b>10%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
Software	<b>30%</b>	<b>9.8%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
User support	<b>45%</b>	<b>42.8%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
Personnel	<b>60%</b>	<b>61.7%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>
Network service/support	<b>20%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>

**Do you anticipate a reorganization of IS in the next 2 years:**

Academic computing	<b>no</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>36.4%</b>
Administrative computing	<b>no</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>28.5%</b>
Libraries	<b>no</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>

\* Data error, doesn't total 100%