

Appendix Materials

Figures A-2—A30

Figure A-2: Potential Focus Groups

- Cabinet
- Campus Technology Council
- Chancellor's Cabinet 2
- Chief Administrators Officers
- Data Stewardship Council
- Council of Deans
- Lead Policy Analysts Group
- Student Systems 2012
- IDMG Task Force and Advisory Group (Dec 12)
- Academic Senate(?)
- Campus Development Officers (?)
- Facilities Leaders (?)

Project plan assumes we will conduct 5 to 10 focus groups

Figure A-3: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Existence of Data You Need As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
STAFF: Staff funding patterns	54%	63	0.0903
STAFF: Hiring policy/practice	54%	82	0.0373
STAFF: Staff benefits/welfare iss.	53%	59	0.0603
STAFF: Compensation	52%	86	0.0141
UGRAD: Enrollment/course load plan.	52%	56	0.0513
STAFF: Staffing needs/FTE allocation	51%	86	0.0065
STAFF: Staff development (mentor.)	51%	83	0.0055
STAFF: Staff satisfaction/climate	50%	74	0.0071
UGRAD: GPA, Advancement, retention, and graduation	49%	45	0.0319
FAC: Faculty satisfaction/climate	49%	37	0.0514
STAFF: Staff workload/product./eval.	48%	77	0.0015
STAFF: Staff succession policy/plan.	46%	61	0.0018
OTHPOP: Extension	43%	21	0.046

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Office of Student Research Survey Databases	82%	17	0.0907
Student Data Warehouse (Pilot)	82%	17	0.0907
Payroll (PPS)	75%	61	0.0259
Berkeley Information Sys. (BIS)	72%	65	0.083
Facilities Database System (FDX)	48%	29	0.0813

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
College/school-level administ. (e.g., Associate Dean)	100%	6	0.0586
Policy analyst	95%	22	0.0011
Systems programmer	82%	17	0.0907
Institutional researcher/analyst	82%	22	0.0591
Staff member who supports non-acad. department decision maker	73%	78	0.0343
Campus-level decision maker	48%	29	0.0813
Non-academic depar. director	48%	29	0.0813
Other academic department directors (e.g., ORU Director)	29%	7	0.0552

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).

Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-4: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Established Procedures for Requesting Access to Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant diff. only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
FINANC: Funding patterns/trends	51%	68	0.0199
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	50%	111	0.0023
FINANC: Budget proj./expend. anal.	50%	120	0.0018
FINANC: Budget/fin. pol./develop.	49%	74	0.0593
UGRAD: GPA, Advan., retent., grad.	28%	40	0.0956
UGRAD: Enrollment/course plan.	27%	51	0.0532
OTHPOP: Visitors/Affiliates	27%	37	0.0977
GRAD: Admission planning/policy	27%	41	0.0741
UGRAD: Admission planning/policy	26%	35	0.0761
UGRAD: Course content/dev./eval.	24%	33	0.0575
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. productivity	23%	26	0.0733
UGRAD: Undergrad. learn. outcom.	22%	37	0.0174
FAC: Faculty support/mentoring	21%	39	0.0092
OTHPOP: Extension	19%	21	0.047
GRAD: Course content/dev./eval.	18%	28	0.0139

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Berk. Integr. Budg. and Staff. Syst. (BIBS)	66%	50	0
Berkeley Information Sys. (BIS)	52%	61	0.0188
Travel & Entert. Reimbursem.	49%	70	0.0716
Human Res. Man. Sys. (HRMS)	48%	119	0.0132
Berk. Financial System (BFS)	47%	124	0.0259
Cal Profiles	46%	106	0.0708
BAIRS	46%	163	0.0085
Student Information Systems	27%	37	0.0977
Off. of Stud. Research Datab.	18%	17	0.058
Financial Aid (SAMS)	11%	9	0.0772
Course File (Academic Senate)	0%	11	0.0063

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Campus-level decision maker	57%	28	0.0435
Staff who supp. campus-level decis. maker	49%	63	0.0721
Staff who supp. acad. depart. decision maker	27%	45	0.056

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-5: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Willingness of Other Units to Grant Data Access As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
UGRAD: Student profiles	44%	43	0.0923
FAC: Hiring policy/practice	40%	30	0.0633
GRAD: Course content/dev./eval.	36%	25	0.0356
FAC: Faculty support/mentoring	33%	36	0.0034
COURSE: Course offerings/profiles	32%	22	0.0177
COURSE: Approv./modific. of courses	32%	19	0.027
OTHPOP: Extension	30%	20	0.0154
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. devel./mentor.	25%	16	0.0103

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Admissions Database	84%	19	0.0099
Berk. Integr. Budg. and Staff. Syst. (BIBS)	73%	51	0.0078
Campus Alumni Development System (CADS)	69%	39	0.0697
Cal Profiles	64%	103	0.0336
UG Admissions (UGA) (var. syst.)	25%	8	0.0742
Facil. and Spat. Data Integ. (FASDI)	24%	17	0.0055

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Staff who supp. acad. depart. decision maker	44%	41	0.0937
Systems manager	41%	27	0.095

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-6: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating **Timeliness of Cross-Unit Response to Data Requests As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (*significant diff. only, p<.10*)**

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
SPACE: Parking/Transportat. Needs	73%	15	0.0398
GRAD: Grad. st. placement upon grad.	71%	17	0.0496
FINANC: Costing st./rate develop.	64%	47	0.0136
STAFF: Compensation	61%	69	0.0097
FINANC: Funding patterns/trends	61%	56	0.0261
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	60%	95	0.0022
SPACE: Facilities plan./dev./renov.	60%	47	0.0688
FINANC: Budget proj./expend. anal.	57%	105	0.0105
UGRAD: Enrollment/course load plan.	34%	47	0.0388
COURSE: Course offerings/profiles	28%	18	0.0803
COURSE: Approv./modific. of courses	13%	15	0.0061

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Berk. Integr. Budg. and Staff. Syst. (BIBS)	80%	46	0
Physical Plant (SPAN)	73%	11	0.0882
Visiting Scholars/Postdocs (VSPA)	71%	14	0.0664
Payroll (PPS)	61%	56	0.0261
Berk. Financial System (BFS)	55%	110	0.0284
UG Admissions (UGA) (var. syst.)	13%	8	0.0433

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Staff who supp. non-acad. depart. decis. maker	57%	65	0.0812
Systems manager	27%	26	0.0257

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. (p<.05; light red=p<.10).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square (p<.05; light green=p<.10).

Figure A-7: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Release of Up-to-Date Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
STAFF: Staff development/mentor.	42%	73	0.0493
STAFF: Staff succession pol./plan.	41%	58	0.0607
UGRAD: Student profiles/characteris.	41%	44	0.0991
STAFF: Staff workld./product./eval.	41%	69	0.0241
UGRAD: GPA, Advan., retent., grad.	40%	40	0.0923
UGRAD: Undergrad. satisfact./climate	40%	45	0.071
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	40%	63	0.0222
FAC: Faculty Compensation	39%	38	0.0884
FAC: Fac. teach., resrch., work.	39%	38	0.0884
GRAD: Admission planning/policy	38%	39	0.0619
FAC: Faculty renewal policy/plan.	36%	28	0.0639
FAC: Hiring policy/practice	34%	32	0.0308
UGRAD: Enrollment/course load plan.	34%	47	0.0059
FAC: Faculty support/mentoring	31%	35	0.0081
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. devel./mentor.	31%	16	0.0827
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. productivity	30%	23	0.0284
UGRAD: Admission planning/policy	30%	33	0.007
FAC: Faculty productivity	30%	27	0.013
RESRCH: Resear. compliance review	29%	21	0.0236
RESRCH: Proposal activity and trends	29%	28	0.008

By Sub-Decision (continued)		Tot N	Chisq
FAC: Faculty satisfac./climate	27%	30	0.0029
COURSE: Course offerings/profiles	25%	20	0.0112
COURSE: Approv./mod. of courses	24%	17	0.0143
GRAD: Course content/dev./eval.	21%	24	0.0012

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Berk. Int. Budg. & Staff. Sys. (BIBS)	78%	51	0
Payroll (PPS)	69%	58	0.004
Cashiers Deposit System (CDS)	69%	35	0.0381
Travel & Entertain. Reimbursement	65%	65	0.0217
Berkeley Information Sys. (BIS)	62%	60	0.0972
Human Res. Manag. Sys. (HRMS)	61%	116	0.0102
Berk. Financial System (BFS)	61%	117	0.0147
Cal Profiles	59%	102	0.0908
BAIRS	57%	152	0.0604
Course File (Academic Senate)	18%	11	0.0208
Library Systems	17%	6	0.0775
Univ. Relat. Warehouse (in devel.)	0%	6	0.0095

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
General analyst	65%	48	0.0589
Coll./school-level lead. (e.g., Dean)	14%	7	0.0415

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).

Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-8: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Availability of Data When You Need It As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
STAFF: Staffing needs/FTE allocat.	42%	76	0.0224
STAFF: Staff benefits/welfare iss.	42%	55	0.0604
STAFF: Staff workld./product./eval.	42%	67	0.0316
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	41%	61	0.0306
GRAD: Financial aid/fellowship supp.	40%	47	0.0557
FAC: Faculty Compensation	40%	35	0.0976
STAFF: Staff funding patterns	40%	55	0.0288
STAFF: Compensation	38%	74	0.0018
STAFF: Hiring policy/practice	37%	68	0.0016
STAFF: Staff development/mentor.	34%	70	0.0002
FAC: Faculty support/mentoring	33%	33	0.0152
RESRCH: Research compliance review	32%	19	0.0522
STAFF: Staff succession pol./plan.	31%	52	0.0003
GRAD: Course content/dev./evaluat.	30%	20	0.032
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. devel./mentor.	29%	17	0.044

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Off. of Stud. Research Surveys	91%	11	0.0098
Admissions Database	72%	18	0.088
Graduate Stud. Informat. Sys.	71%	21	0.0752
Cal Profiles	62%	97	0.0223

By Job Type

No significant differences

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-9: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Ease of Extracting/Accessing Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	55%	99	0.0193
STAFF: Staff workld./product./eval.	34%	70	0.0312
STAFF: Staff succession pol./plan.	34%	50	0.0752
STAFF: Staff benefits/welfare iss.	33%	54	0.048
UGRAD: Student profiles/characteris.	32%	38	0.0667
SPACE: Space allocation	31%	48	0.0309
UGRAD: Course content/dev./evaluat.	30%	27	0.0847
FAC: Faculty funding patterns	30%	27	0.0847
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	29%	66	0.0019
UGRAD: Enrollment/course load plan.	28%	43	0.0124
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. satisf./clim.	27%	22	0.0764
RESRCH: Research compliance review	27%	22	0.0764
FAC: Faculty support/mentoring	27%	30	0.0296
ALUM: Prospect. donor activ./wealth	26%	23	0.0529
ACAD: Teaching, research, workload	23%	22	0.0265
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. productivity	23%	22	0.0265
COURSE: Approv./modific. of courses	22%	18	0.0418

By Sub-Decision (continued)		Tot N	Chisq
OTHPOP: Extension	21%	19	0.0276
ALUM: Giving profiles	20%	20	0.0182
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. devel./ment.	18%	17	0.018
ALUM: Biographical profiles	17%	18	0.0115
GRAD: Course content/dev./evalu.	15%	20	0.0047
COURSE: Course offerings/profiles	14%	22	0.0018
ALUM: Relationships & affiliations	14%	22	0.0018
ALUM: Volunteer history	8%	12	0.0085

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Berk. Integ. Bud. & Staff. Sy. (BIBS)	62%	50	0.0084
Berkeley Information Sys. (BIS)	61%	64	0.0039
Campus Alumni Developmen System (CADS)	32%	37	0.0905
BearFacts	31%	51	0.0264
Student Information Systems	28%	32	0.0376

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Staff who supp. campus-level decis. maker	62%	63	0.0024

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-10: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Clear Documentation Regarding Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
SPACE: Library facilit./hold./plan.	56%	9	0.0835
OTHPOP: Visitors/Affiliates	47%	38	0.0098
FINANC: Budget/fin. pol./develop.	41%	66	0.0208
FINANC: Budget proj./exp. anal.	40%	110	0.0018
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	40%	101	0.0053
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	20%	65	0.0494
UGRAD: Enrollm./course load pln.	20%	46	0.099
GRAD: Admission planning/policy	17%	35	0.0817
GRAD: Course content/dev./eval.	9%	22	0.0274

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Physical Plant (SPAN)	60%	15	0.0081
Berk. Integr. Bud. and Staff. Sy. (BIBS)	46%	48	0.0067
Berk. Financial System (BFS)	38%	115	0.0071
BAIRS	35%	154	0.0225
BearFacts	14%	51	0.0055
Collect./Accounts Rec. Sy. (CARS)	14%	22	0.0857
Class Sched. & Instruct. Rec. (CSIR)	11%	28	0.0202
Graduate Stud. Information Syst.	10%	21	0.0352
Student Data Warehouse (Pilot)	7%	15	0.0447
Student Information Systems	6%	33	0.0015

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Staff who supp. coll./sch.-level decis. maker	41%	44	0.0734

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-11: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Accuracy/Quality of the Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types

Tot N Chisq

		Tot N	Chisq
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. productivity	52%	23	0.0871
FAC: Faculty FTE allocation	50%	26	0.0375
FAC: Faculty funding patterns	50%	26	0.0375
RESRCH: Proposal activity and trends	50%	28	0.0301
FAC: Faculty satisfac./climate	48%	29	0.0154
RESRCH: Contracts/grants policy	47%	32	0.0061
RESRCH: Research compliance review	45%	22	0.0175
FAC: Faculty support/mentoring	44%	32	0.0016
ALUM: Volunteer history	43%	14	0.0376
RESRCH: Technology licensing activity	33%	9	0.023

By Data Access

Tot N Chisq

		Tot N	Chisq
Cashiers Deposit System (CDS)	86%	36	0.0124
Berk. Integ. Bud. and Staff. Sy. (BIBS)	80%	50	0.0442
Payroll (PPS)	79%	58	0.0374
Archit. CAD floor plans/rm. numb.	33%	6	0.0649
Univ. Relat. Warehouse (in develop.)	33%	6	0.0649
Facil. and Spat. Data Integ. (FASDI)	33%	15	0.003

By Job Type

No significant differences

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-12: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Consistency of Data Across the Campus As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
ALUM: Relationships & affiliations	25%	28	0.0895
ALUM: Biographical profiles	22%	23	0.0633
ALUM: Giving profiles	19%	21	0.0423

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Berk. Integ. Bud. and Staff. Sy. (BIBS)	53%	36	0.0765
Cal Profiles	49%	84	0.0267
Off. of Stud. Research Surveys	15%	13	0.0652
Student Data Warehouse (Pilot)	9%	11	0.0335
Facil. and Spat. Data Integ. (FASDI)	8%	12	0.0225
Univ. Relat. Warehouse (in devel.)	0%	5	0.0668

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Data recorder	73%	11	0.0211
Staff who supp. acad. depart. decision maker	61%	31	0.0076
Staff who supp. other acad. depart. decis. mak.	61%	23	0.0274

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-13: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Consistency of Data Fields Across Systems As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	16%	44	0.0619
FAC: Faculty FTE allocation	11%	19	0.0907
FAC: Faculty satisfac./climate	10%	21	0.0576
OTHPOP: Extension	0%	16	0.0113

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
BearFacts	15%	41	0.0464
Class Sched. & Instruct. Rec. (CSIR)	5%	22	0.0121
Course File (Academic Senate)	0%	9	0.0626
Facil. and Spat. Data Integ. (FASDI)	0%	10	0.0491

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Systems manager	12%	25	0.0723
Policy analyst	6%	16	0.0521

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-14: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Access to Standardized Data Reports As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
OTHPOP: Outreach	67%	18	0.0522
SPACE: Eval. of client services	63%	19	0.0932
RESRCH: Contracts/grants policy	62%	29	0.046
RESRCH: Proposal activi. & trends	62%	26	0.069
FINANC: Budget proj./expen. anal.	55%	107	0.0042
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	54%	99	0.0235
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	36%	64	0.0994
GRAD: Financ. aid/fellowsh. sup.	33%	46	0.0663
FAC: Faculty satisfac./climate	31%	32	0.0996
GRAD: Grad. stud. satisf./climate	28%	39	0.0235
UGRAD: Undergrd. learn. outcom.	28%	32	0.0426
FAC: Faculty productivity	27%	22	0.084
UGRAD: Undergrad. satisfac./clim.	26%	46	0.0048
GRAD: Advan., retent., graduation	26%	27	0.0371
COURSE: Course offerings/profile	25%	20	0.0638
GRAD: Admission planning/policy	25%	32	0.016
UGRAD: Admission planning/pol.	24%	33	0.0109
UGRAD: Enrollm./course ld. plan.	24%	46	0.0016
UGRAD: Student profiles/characte.	24%	42	0.0027

By Sub-Decision (continued)		Tot N	Chisq
UGRAD: GPA, Advan., retent., & grad.	22%	36	0.0033
UGRAD: Advising	21%	28	0.0084
GRAD: Student profiles/characteris.	18%	38	0.0004

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Library Systems	83%	6	0.0544
Physical Plant (SPAN)	67%	15	0.0783
Berk. Integ. Bud. & Staff. Syst. (BIBS)	64%	47	0.0035
Cashiers Deposit System (CDS)	63%	35	0.0201
Berkeley Information Sys. (BIS)	59%	58	0.0153
Berk. Equipm. Track. Syst. (BETS)	58%	36	0.0764
Travel & Entertainment Reimburssem.	58%	64	0.0148
Berk. Financial System (BFS)	55%	116	0.002
BAIRS	50%	149	0.0302
Student Information Systems	30%	27	0.094
BearFacts	29%	45	0.018
Graduate Stud. Information Syst.	27%	22	0.084
Class Sched. & Instruct. Rec. (CSIR)	24%	21	0.0436
Course File (Academic Senate)	9%	11	0.015

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Staff who supp. campus-level decis. maker	54%	63	0.0887

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).

Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-15: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Access to Specialized Reports As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
FINANC: Budget proj./expend. anal.	40%	96	0.0398
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	38%	91	0.0966
UGRAD: Undergrad. satisfact./climate	17%	41	0.0209
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. productivity	17%	24	0.0832
FAC: Fac. teach., resrch., work.	17%	30	0.0491
UGRAD: Student profiles/characteris.	16%	38	0.0168
UGRAD: Enrollment/course load plan.	15%	40	0.0097
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. advan./retent.	15%	27	0.0383
UGRAD: Undergraduate learning outcom.	14%	28	0.0293
UGRAD: Advising	13%	23	0.0371
UGRAD: Admission planning/policy	10%	31	0.0037
FAC: Faculty productivity	9%	22	0.0142
UGRAD: GPA, Advan., retent., and grad.	9%	33	0.002
UGRAD: Undergr. placem. upon grad.	8%	12	0.0681

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Physical Plant (SPAN)	54%	13	0.0859
Berk. Financial System (BFS)	40%	101	0.0308
Cal Profiles	26%	86	0.0882
BearFacts	20%	41	0.0526
Facilities Database Syst. (FDX)	16%	25	0.0645
Student Information Systems	12%	25	0.0212
Class Schd. & Instr. Rec. (CSIR)	9%	22	0.0142
Univ. Relat. Warehouse (in dev.)	0%	6	0.0865
Course File (Academic Senate)	0%	11	0.0188

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Staff who supp. campus-level decis. maker	44%	57	0.0291

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-16: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating **Access to Trained Staff As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (*significant differences only, $p < .10$*)**

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	33%	60	0.0806
OTHPOP: Extension	20%	15	0.0629
RESRCH: Technology licensing activity	13%	8	0.0761

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Cal Profiles	50%	94	0.0819
Facilities Database System (FDX)	20%	25	0.0141

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Member of the Chancellor's Cabinet	64%	14	0.0981

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-17: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Access to User Friendly Reporting Tools As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
SPACE: Eval. of client services	50%	18	0.0724
FINANC: Budget proj./exp. anal.	40%	101	0.0147
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	38%	92	0.0665
UGRAD: Undergrad. satisf./clim.	18%	40	0.0401
FAC: Faculty support/mentoring	17%	29	0.0833
UGRAD: Enrollm./course ld. plan.	17%	41	0.0317
UGRAD: GPA, Advan., retent., grad.	16%	32	0.0408
OTHPPOP: Extension	7%	15	0.0341
RESRCH: Technology licensing activity	0%	8	0.0527

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Berk. Integr. Budg. & Staff. Syst. (BIBS)	45%	44	0.023
Berkeley Information Sys. (BIS)	45%	56	0.0124
BearFacts	19%	42	0.0608
Academic Personnel Data	14%	21	0.0798
Facilities Database System (FDX)	12%	25	0.0284

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Institutional researcher/analyst	56%	18	0.02
Policy analyst	48%	21	0.0878
Staff who supp. coll./sch.-level decis. maker	46%	39	0.0267
Staff who supp. campus-level decis. maker	45%	60	0.0072
Campus-level decision maker	14%	21	0.0798

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-18: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Access to Analytical Tools to Help with Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
FINANC: Budget develop./allocat.	18%	68	0.0793
STAFF: Staff funding patterns	14%	36	0.0892
FINANC: Costing st./rate develop.	14%	36	0.0892
STAFF: Staff workld./product./evl.	13%	46	0.0311
SPACE: Space allocation	13%	32	0.0749
STAFF: Staff benefits/welfare iss.	11%	36	0.0327
ALUM: Biographical profiles	6%	16	0.0718
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. productiv.	6%	18	0.0461
ACAD: Non-fac. acad. satisf./clim.	6%	18	0.0461

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Off. of Stud. Research Surveys	64%	14	0.0003
Off. of Stud. Research Databases	57%	14	0.0033
Student Data Warehouse (Pilot)	45%	11	0.0986
Berk. Financial System (BFS)	19%	84	0.0875
Travel & Entertainment Reimbursement	16%	45	0.0957
BearFacts	9%	32	0.0253
Facilities Database System (FDX)	5%	21	0.0234
Berk. Equipm. Track. Syst. (BETS)	4%	25	0.0092

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Institutional researcher/analyst	72%	18	0
Systems programmer	60%	10	0.0076
Policy analyst	50%	16	0.0136
Staff who supp. non-acad. depart. decis. maker	35%	40	0.0829
Campus-level decision maker	6%	16	0.0718

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-19: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Procedures to Protect Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
ALUM: Giving profiles	89%	19	0.0224
UGRAD: Advising	85%	34	0.0091
ALUM: Biographical profiles	85%	20	0.0563
ALUM: Prospect. donor activ./wealth	85%	26	0.0306
GRAD: Advan., retent., graduation	81%	27	0.0651
GRAD: Grad. stud. satisf./climate	78%	36	0.0951
STAFF: Hiring policy/practice	57%	67	0.0732
STAFF: Staff satisfact./climate	55%	64	0.0328
STAFF: Staff workld./product./eval.	55%	66	0.0273
STAFF: Compensation	54%	72	0.0152
SPACE: Eval. of client services	48%	21	0.0701

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Financial Aid (SAMS)	90%	10	0.0969
Student Information Systems	81%	32	0.0453
Human Resource Manag. Sys. (HRMS)	59%	98	0.0852
Travel & Entertainment Reimbursement	54%	63	0.0244
Cashiers Deposit System (CDS)	52%	33	0.0676
Berk. Equipm. Track. Syst. (BETS)	51%	35	0.057
Facil. and Spat. Data Integ. (FASDI)	42%	12	0.0738

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
Policy analyst	47%	19	0.082

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-20: Mapping the UCB Data Landscape: % Evaluating Procedures to Ensure Sharing of Data As Excellent/Good vs. Fair/Poor (significant differences only, $p < .10$)

By Sub-Decision Types		Tot N	Chisq
ALUM: Giving profiles	79%	14	0.0198
SPACE: Library facilit./hold./plan.	78%	9	0.0725
ALUM: Prospect. donor activ./wealth	75%	20	0.0126
SPACE: Eval. of client services	71%	14	0.0757
UGRAD: Financial aid/fellowship supp.	68%	22	0.0509
RESRCH: Proposal activity and trends	68%	22	0.0509

By Data Access		Tot N	Chisq
Admissions Database	74%	19	0.0212
Travel & Entertainment Reimbursement	38%	50	0.0864
Student Data Warehouse (Pilot)	23%	13	0.0577
Facil. and Spat. Data Integ. (FASDI)	18%	11	0.0384

By Job Type		Tot N	Chisq
College/school-level leader (e.g., Dean)	100%	5	0.0197
Campus-level decision maker	21%	19	0.0119
Member of the Chancellor's Cabinet	11%	9	0.0216

Red Shading=Significantly lower eval. based on chi-sq. ($p < .05$; light red= $p < .10$).
Green Shading=Sign. higher eval. based on chi-square ($p < .05$; light green= $p < .10$).

Figure A-21: Percent Making or Supporting Decisions in Sub-Areas by Job Type, Undergraduates

<i>Undergraduates</i>	Admission plan.	Stud. profiles	Financ. Aid	Enroll. /course load	Course content	GPA, Advan.	UG satisf./ climate	Learning outcomes	UG Placement	Advising	Other	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	28%	39%	39%	17%	6%	28%	33%	22%	11%	33%	6%	18
Campus-level decision maker	27%	42%	30%	18%	6%	24%	42%	24%	9%	30%	12%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	9%	0%	0%	27%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	44%	56%	33%	56%	67%	56%	56%	56%	22%	67%	0%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g., Chair)	14%	14%	0%	71%	57%	14%	29%	29%	0%	29%	0%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	25%	25%	50%	0%	50%	25%	25%	50%	25%	50%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	45%	45%	18%	45%	36%	45%	45%	45%	18%	36%	9%	11
Non-acad. department director	15%	26%	8%	18%	10%	18%	26%	18%	8%	10%	8%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	18%	27%	27%	27%	9%	27%	27%	27%	27%	18%	9%	11
Systems manager	10%	17%	7%	12%	7%	7%	7%	10%	0%	5%	12%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	39%	39%	30%	30%	9%	39%	39%	39%	17%	17%	17%	23
Systems programmer	16%	24%	16%	24%	8%	12%	12%	16%	0%	4%	8%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	11%	16%	9%	12%	5%	10%	16%	12%	4%	5%	9%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	9%	10%	5%	19%	7%	10%	14%	10%	2%	9%	7%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	9%	12%	10%	27%	18%	4%	9%	4%	4%	10%	4%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	12%	12%	6%	22%	12%	12%	8%	6%	6%	6%	6%	51
Staff member who supports non-acad. depart. decision maker	14%	15%	11%	14%	6%	12%	13%	13%	3%	8%	9%	97
Policy analyst	17%	31%	24%	17%	10%	24%	24%	21%	10%	14%	14%	29
General analyst	10%	13%	8%	17%	10%	11%	10%	8%	2%	6%	8%	63
Data recorder	10%	0%	10%	15%	10%	5%	5%	0%	5%	0%	25%	20
Other, please specify:	0%	11%	0%	18%	7%	11%	7%	0%	0%	14%	11%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-22: Percent Making or Supporting Decisions in Sub-Areas by Job Type, Graduate Students

<i>Graduate Students</i>	Admission plan.	Stud. profile	Financ. Aid	Enroll. /course	Course content	Advancemen.	GRAD satisf./	GD Placement	Advising	Other	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	22%	39%	44%	11%	0%	28%	28%	17%	17%	0%	18
Campus-level decision maker	21%	36%	33%	12%	3%	21%	30%	12%	15%	9%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	64%	45%	73%	55%	55%	45%	55%	18%	18%	0%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	11%	11%	11%	11%	22%	11%	22%	0%	11%	33%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g.,Chair)	71%	57%	57%	57%	57%	43%	43%	29%	14%	0%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	50%	0%	25%	0%	25%	25%	0%	0%	25%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	36%	36%	36%	27%	27%	27%	36%	18%	18%	9%	11
Non-acad. department director	13%	18%	15%	10%	8%	13%	18%	8%	13%	8%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	18%	27%	36%	18%	9%	27%	45%	27%	9%	18%	11
Systems manager	5%	12%	7%	7%	7%	0%	7%	0%	0%	12%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	22%	30%	26%	22%	0%	26%	17%	13%	9%	17%	23
Systems programmer	12%	28%	24%	20%	8%	8%	12%	8%	8%	8%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	9%	15%	12%	9%	4%	7%	13%	4%	4%	10%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	10%	12%	22%	12%	5%	9%	16%	7%	10%	9%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	22%	22%	33%	30%	19%	16%	19%	19%	15%	9%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	14%	16%	18%	20%	12%	12%	8%	6%	10%	12%	51
Staff member who supports non-acad. depart. decision maker	7%	11%	12%	10%	6%	6%	5%	3%	6%	9%	97
Policy analyst	10%	24%	21%	14%	3%	14%	21%	14%	3%	14%	29
General analyst	6%	10%	11%	8%	6%	8%	10%	5%	5%	8%	63
Data recorder	10%	10%	15%	10%	10%	10%	10%	15%	5%	20%	20
Other, please specify:	18%	14%	14%	11%	11%	7%	11%	11%	11%	25%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-23: Percent Making or Supporting Decisions in Sub-Areas by Job Type, Faculty

<i>Faculty</i>	Compen- sation	Benefits/ welfare	Advan- cement	Teach./, Res./Work	Product- ivity	Satisfac- tion	Support/ Mentor.	Funding patterns	Other	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	33%	28%	39%	22%	17%	28%	22%	28%	6%	18
Campus-level decision maker	24%	15%	27%	18%	12%	27%	24%	24%	12%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	64%	27%	73%	82%	73%	45%	64%	55%	0%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	22%	11%	22%	33%	22%	22%	0%	0%	0%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g.,Chair)	71%	14%	71%	86%	71%	57%	71%	57%	0%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	50%	0%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	18%	9%	0%	27%	0%	18%	27%	0%	9%	11
Non-acad. department director	8%	8%	8%	10%	8%	10%	13%	5%	13%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	18%	9%	18%	27%	9%	18%	27%	18%	27%	11
Systems manager	2%	0%	2%	5%	0%	5%	7%	5%	12%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	22%	9%	13%	22%	13%	9%	4%	17%	4%	23
Systems programmer	4%	4%	8%	20%	4%	8%	8%	4%	12%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	6%	5%	6%	9%	5%	11%	7%	4%	5%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	10%	7%	14%	10%	9%	21%	10%	14%	9%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	24%	24%	25%	28%	16%	16%	22%	24%	4%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	18%	14%	14%	22%	12%	8%	10%	14%	8%	51
Staff member who supports non- acad. depart. decision maker	8%	8%	7%	9%	6%	5%	5%	7%	4%	97
Policy analyst	14%	10%	10%	17%	7%	7%	7%	7%	3%	29
General analyst	11%	11%	13%	14%	10%	8%	6%	13%	6%	63
Data recorder	25%	20%	20%	20%	15%	5%	5%	20%	5%	20
Other, please specify:	7%	11%	11%	7%	4%	0%	7%	7%	18%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-24: Percent Making or Supporting Decisions in Sub-Areas by Job Type, Academic Staff

<i>Academic Staff</i>	Staffing Needs	Re-nenewal	Hiring	Comp-ensat.	Benefit/Welfare	Advan./Retent.	Work-load	Prod-uctiv.	Satisf./Climate	Mento-ring	Fund. Patter	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	22%	22%	28%	22%	22%	11%	6%	11%	28%	6%	0%	18
Campus-level decision maker	24%	24%	27%	24%	18%	15%	6%	9%	27%	15%	12%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	64%	36%	73%	55%	27%	64%	64%	36%	45%	45%	27%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	33%	33%	22%	44%	22%	44%	33%	33%	11%	0%	11%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g.,Chair)	57%	57%	71%	57%	14%	57%	86%	71%	43%	57%	29%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	9%	0%	9%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	11
Non-acad. department director	13%	8%	10%	15%	13%	10%	10%	8%	8%	5%	3%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	36%	18%	27%	27%	18%	18%	9%	18%	18%	9%	27%	11
Systems manager	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	2%	2%	2%	7%	2%	5%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	17%	9%	9%	13%	9%	4%	9%	4%	4%	0%	13%	23
Systems programmer	8%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	12%	0%	4%	0%	4%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	9%	7%	9%	10%	7%	4%	4%	5%	9%	9%	5%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	26%	19%	26%	22%	14%	14%	14%	10%	12%	14%	14%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	18%	9%	30%	30%	27%	18%	13%	13%	15%	9%	15%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	12%	6%	20%	24%	16%	8%	14%	8%	6%	8%	4%	51
Staff member who supports non-acad. depart. decision maker	5%	3%	9%	9%	7%	4%	6%	2%	2%	1%	3%	97
Policy analyst	10%	7%	10%	14%	10%	7%	10%	3%	3%	3%	7%	29
General analyst	11%	10%	13%	13%	8%	8%	11%	6%	5%	3%	6%	63
Data recorder	5%	5%	10%	15%	15%	5%	5%	5%	5%	0%	5%	20
Other, please specify:	11%	11%	18%	14%	14%	11%	7%	7%	11%	11%	7%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-25: Percent Making or Supporting Decisions in Sub-Areas by Job Type, Non-Acad. Staff

<i>Non.-Acad. Staff</i>	Staffing needs	Succes. Plann.	Hiring	Comp-ensation	Benefit/welfare	Workload/Product.	Satisfac./ Climate	Devel./ Mentor.	Funding Patterns	Other, please	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	44%	39%	39%	33%	22%	22%	28%	39%	33%	6%	18
Campus-level decision maker	39%	36%	33%	36%	24%	21%	33%	36%	33%	9%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	36%	36%	55%	55%	36%	36%	18%	45%	27%	9%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	11%	11%	11%	11%	0%	11%	0%	11%	0%	0%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g.,Chair)	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%	43%	57%	29%	0%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	25%	0%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	9%	0%	9%	0%	0%	9%	0%	9%	0%	0%	11
Non-acad. department director	28%	21%	28%	28%	23%	33%	28%	33%	13%	8%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	55%	45%	45%	45%	45%	55%	64%	45%	45%	9%	11
Systems manager	24%	17%	12%	19%	10%	21%	17%	29%	12%	12%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	17%	13%	13%	13%	9%	9%	22%	9%	4%	9%	23
Systems programmer	24%	12%	12%	16%	8%	12%	12%	16%	16%	12%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	30%	23%	22%	28%	18%	26%	27%	26%	21%	5%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	47%	36%	38%	47%	29%	45%	48%	45%	36%	5%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	30%	27%	31%	34%	30%	36%	34%	36%	25%	3%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	18%	16%	24%	24%	16%	22%	20%	24%	10%	4%	51
Staff member who supports non-acad. depart. decision maker	18%	15%	21%	20%	18%	21%	22%	24%	13%	4%	97
Policy analyst	21%	14%	17%	24%	21%	14%	24%	21%	17%	7%	29
General analyst	25%	17%	27%	24%	22%	21%	22%	25%	24%	8%	63
Data recorder	15%	10%	15%	20%	25%	10%	15%	15%	15%	10%	20
Other, please specify:	18%	14%	25%	29%	21%	14%	14%	21%	25%	18%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-26: Percent Making or Supporting Decisions in Sub-Areas by Job Type, Financial/Courses

<i>Financial/ Courses</i>	Budget dev./alloc	Budget proj./exp	Costing studies	Funding patterns	Budget/fin. pol.	Other	Course offer/prof	Approv./modif.	Other,	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	67%	61%	39%	39%	39%	0%	0%	0%	11%	18
Campus-level decision maker	67%	67%	33%	42%	48%	3%	6%	3%	9%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	73%	82%	36%	55%	64%	0%	45%	45%	0%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	11%	11%	0%	0%	0%	11%	11%	11%	0%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g.,Chair)	86%	86%	43%	43%	57%	0%	86%	86%	0%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	18%	36%	9%	9%	18%	0%	18%	18%	0%	11
Non-acad. department director	33%	33%	18%	18%	18%	0%	3%	3%	0%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	64%	82%	27%	27%	55%	18%	9%	9%	9%	11
Systems manager	21%	21%	12%	14%	10%	5%	0%	2%	2%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	35%	43%	22%	26%	22%	4%	4%	4%	4%	23
Systems programmer	16%	24%	12%	4%	12%	0%	4%	8%	0%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	39%	43%	17%	24%	24%	7%	4%	1%	2%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	45%	47%	24%	34%	31%	2%	9%	5%	0%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	33%	37%	15%	27%	21%	1%	16%	12%	0%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	27%	31%	10%	16%	12%	2%	12%	8%	0%	51
Staff member who supports non-acad. depart. decision maker	32%	35%	18%	18%	18%	2%	3%	4%	0%	97
Policy analyst	31%	34%	14%	28%	24%	7%	7%	3%	3%	29
General analyst	30%	40%	19%	21%	17%	0%	3%	5%	0%	63
Data recorder	40%	55%	25%	25%	20%	0%	5%	5%	0%	20
Other, please specify:	21%	25%	7%	18%	18%	11%	4%	4%	4%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-27: Percent Making or Supporting Decisions in Sub-Areas by Job Type, Research/Space												
Research Grants/ Space & Facilities	Contr. Grants	Propos. Activ.	Extram. Awards	Resrch. Compli.	Tech. Licens.	Industr. Fellow	Space Alloc.	Facilit. Plan.	Library Facil.	Parking Transp.	Client Serv.	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	22%	17%	22%	22%	17%	0%	22%	33%	17%	11%	11%	18
Campus-level decision maker	24%	12%	21%	18%	12%	6%	33%	30%	15%	15%	9%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	36%	27%	9%	18%	18%	0%	64%	55%	27%	18%	18%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g.,Chair)	29%	14%	14%	14%	14%	0%	57%	57%	29%	14%	0%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	25%	25%	25%	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	0%	0%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	9%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	27%	27%	0%	0%	0%	11
Non-acad. department director	5%	5%	5%	8%	0%	0%	8%	15%	0%	3%	10%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	45%	36%	36%	45%	9%	0%	36%	36%	0%	27%	18%	11
Systems manager	2%	2%	5%	2%	5%	2%	5%	10%	2%	0%	10%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	13%	13%	17%	13%	4%	4%	0%	4%	0%	4%	0%	23
Systems programmer	12%	8%	16%	4%	4%	4%	12%	8%	0%	0%	4%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	12%	9%	7%	10%	4%	1%	12%	17%	5%	9%	9%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	16%	12%	12%	14%	3%	2%	21%	26%	2%	7%	10%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	13%	13%	9%	15%	3%	0%	28%	28%	9%	6%	6%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	10%	4%	2%	14%	2%	0%	14%	18%	2%	2%	2%	51
Staff member who supports non-acad. depart. decision maker	5%	2%	3%	7%	1%	0%	12%	16%	3%	5%	7%	97
Policy analyst	10%	10%	10%	10%	14%	7%	7%	10%	0%	0%	7%	29
General analyst	8%	8%	6%	11%	5%	2%	14%	16%	2%	3%	6%	63
Data recorder	10%	10%	5%	10%	10%	0%	15%	15%	0%	0%	0%	20
Other, please specify:	7%	4%	4%	4%	4%	0%	11%	11%	7%	0%	7%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-28: Percent Making or Supp. Decisions in Major Areas by Job Type, Alumni/Other

Alumni/ Other Populations	Alumni Biogr.	Giving Profiles	Prosp. Donors	Relat. Affiliat.	Volunt. History	Other	Visitors Affiliat.	Extension	Out-reach	Other	Other Areas	Total N
Member of the Chancellor's Cab.	22%	22%	28%	28%	17%	6%	0%	11%	11%	6%	22%	18
Campus-level decision maker	18%	21%	33%	27%	15%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	24%	33
Coll./sch.-level leader (e.g. Dean)	45%	36%	55%	55%	9%	0%	36%	18%	27%	0%	9%	11
Coll./sch.-level adm. (Ass. Dean)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9
Acad. depart. leader (e.g.,Chair)	14%	14%	29%	29%	14%	14%	57%	43%	43%	14%	14%	7
Acad. dep. Adm. (Assoc. Chair)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	0%	0%	4
Oth. Acad. dep. Direct. (ORU Dir.)	0%	9%	18%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	18%	0%	0%	11
Non-acad. department director	13%	10%	18%	18%	8%	3%	18%	3%	10%	0%	18%	39
Manager of institutional research unit/office	9%	18%	0%	9%	9%	18%	27%	9%	18%	0%	27%	11
Systems manager	12%	10%	10%	7%	5%	5%	7%	10%	0%	7%	12%	42
Institutional researcher/analyst	4%	4%	0%	9%	0%	4%	4%	4%	0%	0%	13%	23
Systems programmer	8%	4%	12%	8%	4%	0%	12%	12%	4%	4%	4%	25
Staff member who supp. campus-level decision maker	6%	5%	6%	7%	0%	1%	9%	4%	5%	2%	17%	82
Staff member who supp. coll./sch.-level decision maker	16%	16%	16%	17%	10%	5%	10%	7%	9%	2%	12%	58
Staff who supports academic departmental decision maker	3%	1%	3%	4%	1%	3%	19%	10%	6%	1%	4%	67
Staff member who supp. oth. acad. depart. decision maker	6%	2%	4%	10%	0%	4%	10%	12%	6%	2%	4%	51
Staff member who supports non-acad. depart. decision maker	4%	3%	5%	5%	1%	1%	11%	6%	4%	3%	4%	97
Policy analyst	3%	3%	3%	14%	0%	0%	14%	14%	7%	0%	17%	29
General analyst	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	8%	8%	3%	5%	3%	63
Data recorder	0%	0%	5%	5%	0%	0%	20%	10%	5%	5%	5%	20
Other, please specify:	7%	4%	4%	7%	4%	7%	7%	4%	4%	4%	11%	28

Note: **Green Shading** indicates Top 5 highest average rate among job groups; **Red Shading** indicates Top 5 lowest rate.

Source: IDMG Survey, 2008.

Figure A-29: Principal Component Analysis, Factor Analysis*: Access to Campus-Wide Data Systems among All IDMG Respondents (factors 1- 5)

Factor 1	
BAIRS	0.73
Berkeley Information Sys. (BIS)	0.61
Human Resource Management Sys. (HRMS)	0.63
Berkeley Equipment & Tracking Sys. (BETS)	0.53
Berkeley Financial Sys. (BFS)	0.82
Berkeley Integ. Budget and Staff. Sys. (BIBS)	0.71
Cashiers Deposit Sys. (CDS)	0.63
Payroll (PPS)	0.64
Travel & Entertainment Reimbursement	0.71

Variance Explained: 4.79

Factor 2	
Student Athletes (various Sys.)	0.51
Office of Student Research Database Sys.	0.79
Office of Student Res. Survey Databases	0.87
Student Data Warehouse (Pilot)	0.75

Variance Explained: 2.51

Factor 3	
Admissions Database	0.55
BearFacts	0.58
Departmental Student Award Sys.	0.55
Graduate Student Information Sys.	0.74
Collection and Accounts Receivable Sys. (CARS)	0.55

Variance Explained: 2.49

Factor 4	
Project Information Sys. Management (PRISM)	0.87
Architectural CAD floor plans & room numbers	0.89

Variance Explained: 1.96

Factor 5	
Physical Plant (SPAN)	0.58
Facilities and Spatial Data Integration (FASDI)	0.54
Facilities Database Sys. (FDX)	0.55
Educational Technology Room Inventory	0.59

Variance Explained: 1.67

*Using varimax rotation, Eigen value criterion for retention of factors, and displaying correlation values over .50 only.

Figure A-30: Principal Component Analysis, Factor Analysis*: Access to Campus-Wide Data Systems among All IDMG Respondents (factors 6-13)

Factor 6	
Class Schedule and Instruct. Rec. (CSIR)	0.66
Course File (Academic Senate)	0.77

Variance Explained: 1.60

Factor 7	
Cal Profiles	0.54
Planning and Analysis Databases	0.64

Variance Explained: 1.57

Factor 8	
Academic Personnel Data	0.80
Visiting Scholars and Post Doct. Aff. (VSPA)	0.60

Variance Explained: 1.54

Factor 9	
Extramural Funds Accounting (EFA)	0.76
COEUS	0.60

Variance Explained: 1.53

Factor 10	
Financial Aid (SAMS)	0.63
UG Admissions (UGA) (var. sub sys.)	0.81

Variance Explained: 1.49

Factor 11	
Campus Alumni Develop. Sys. (CADS)	0.75
University Relations Warehouse (in devel.)	0.72

Variance Explained: 1.39

Factor 12	
UNEX Student Sys.	0.80

Variance Explained: 1.39

Factor 13	
Library Sys.	0.86

Variance Explained: 1.32

*Using varimax rotation, Eigen value criterion for retention of factors, and displaying correlation values over .50 only.