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Executive Summary
An anonymous survey of Michigan Tech's Information Technology (IT) was conducted in April and May of 2017. Participation was voluntary, and 903 responses were recorded.

Participation rates were 24% of faculty, 26% of staff, 6% of undergraduate students, and 8% of graduate students.

The questions, originally developed in 2014 in collaboration with two Social Sciences faculty members, remained consistent with the 2015, 2016, and 2017 surveys with a few exceptions: since 2014, four questions were added to measure satisfaction with new service offerings; in 2015, one question was reworded to make the measurement more meaningful. Each year, survey results are used to initiate continual improvement within the IT organization.

This year’s results once again indicate an improvement in almost every aspect of satisfaction. Overall satisfaction with the IT environment on campus improved from an average score of 3.89 to 3.97; IT strives for a minimum average score of 4.0 in all metrics. New service offerings such as the wireless at the Houghton County Memorial Airport (CMX), remote assistance, and online customer support center exhibit high levels of satisfaction.

While IT is pleased that customer satisfaction levels continue to trend upward, we remain committed to continual improvement and sincerely value our customers’ feedback. The following report shows year-to-year progress tracking.
Introduction

An anonymous survey of Michigan Tech’s Information Technology (IT) was conducted in April and May of 2017. As in previous years, the survey generated quantitative data and text-based comments. In addition to reviewing the summarized data responses, all 186 text-based comments were closely reviewed by IT leadership, and actionable items were considered and implemented whenever possible. These actions have contributed to continued improvement within the IT organization, and the addition of new services.

In the 2017 survey 903 responses were recorded, compared to 1,078 in 2016, 1,436 in 2015 and 1,652 in 2014. The participant response rate is as follows:

- 111 faculty (24%)
- 355 staff (26%)
- 318 undergraduate students (6%)
- 108 graduate students (8%)
- 11 “other”

The questions, originally developed in 2014 in collaboration with two Social Sciences faculty members who do surveying as part of their research programs, remained consistent on the 2015, 2016, and 2017 surveys with a few exceptions. Since 2014, four questions were added to measure satisfaction with new service offerings; in 2015, one question was reworded to make the measurement more meaningful. Each year, survey results are used to initiate continual improvement within the IT organization. This report shows year-to-year progress tracking.

Participation rates for the last four surveys (2014–2017) are included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>111 (24%)</td>
<td>122 (26%)</td>
<td>154 (30%)</td>
<td>189 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>355 (26%)</td>
<td>369 (28%)</td>
<td>367 (28%)</td>
<td>435 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>318 (6%)</td>
<td>427 (8%)</td>
<td>718 (14%)</td>
<td>816 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>108 (8%)</td>
<td>153 (10%)</td>
<td>190 (14%)</td>
<td>177 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other”</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment counts for the last four surveys (2014–2017) are included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative Results—General Satisfaction

Figures 1 and 2 show “overall satisfaction” with the IT environment on campus. In all of these figures, the mean value of the responses is given for all years on a scale of 1–5, i.e., “very satisfied” = 5, while “very dissatisfied” = 1.

The survey data was also filtered and analyzed based on constituent groups. In cases where this filtering provided useful information, the constituent-based data is presented in this report. For example, Figure 2 shows the responses given in Figure 1 filtered by constituent group.

Figures 1 and 2 show substantial improvement in user satisfaction among faculty and staff.
Satisfaction with User Support

Figure 3 shows distributions of overall user support satisfaction by constituent group.

Figure 3. Overall satisfaction with User Services by constituent group
The survey asked for satisfaction on a wide range of categories of user support; the distributions are presented in Figure 4. All metrics have exceeded the goal of a minimum 4.0 average user satisfaction.

**Overall satisfaction with IT user support**

- Somewhat Satisfied: 2017: 4.01, 2016: 3.95, 2015: 3.89, 2014: 3.43
- Neutral: 2017: 3.98, 2016: 3.92, 2015: 3.87, 2014: 3.43

**Resolution of the issues.**

- "My problems were solved."

- Somewhat Satisfied: 2017: 4.01, 2016: 3.87, 2015: 3.73, 2014: 3.32
- Neutral: 2017: 3.85, 2016: 3.72, 2015: 3.61, 2014: 3.21
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.70, 2016: 3.57, 2015: 3.45, 2014: 3.05
- Very Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.65, 2016: 3.52, 2015: 3.41, 2014: 3.01

**Timeliness of problem resolution**

- Very Satisfied: 2017: 4.12, 2016: 3.87, 2015: 3.73, 2014: 3.28
- Neutral: 2017: 3.85, 2016: 3.72, 2015: 3.61, 2014: 3.21
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.70, 2016: 3.57, 2015: 3.45, 2014: 3.05
- Very Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.65, 2016: 3.52, 2015: 3.41, 2014: 3.01

**Timeliness of initial response when help is requested by e-mail or voice-mail**

- Somewhat Satisfied: 2017: 4.17, 2016: 3.95, 2015: 3.81, 2014: 3.43

**Frequency and helpfulness of communications and updates**

- Neutral: 2017: 3.85, 2016: 3.72, 2015: 3.61, 2014: 3.21
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.70, 2016: 3.57, 2015: 3.45, 2014: 3.05
- Very Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.65, 2016: 3.52, 2015: 3.41, 2014: 3.01

**Staff level of knowledge**

- Neutral: 2017: 3.85, 2016: 3.72, 2015: 3.61, 2014: 3.21
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.70, 2016: 3.57, 2015: 3.45, 2014: 3.05
- Very Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.65, 2016: 3.52, 2015: 3.41, 2014: 3.01

**Attitude of the staff**

- Neutral: 2017: 4.05, 2016: 3.97, 2015: 3.87, 2014: 3.69
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.90, 2016: 3.82, 2015: 3.72, 2014: 3.55
- Very Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.85, 2016: 3.78, 2015: 3.69, 2014: 3.52

**Professionalism of the staff**

- Neutral: 2017: 4.05, 2016: 3.97, 2015: 3.87, 2014: 3.69
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.90, 2016: 3.82, 2015: 3.72, 2014: 3.55
- Very Dissatisfied: 2017: 3.85, 2016: 3.78, 2015: 3.69, 2014: 3.52

*Figure 4. Satisfaction with User Services by category*
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Satisfaction with the Computing Environment in the Library

Figure 5 shows student satisfaction with the overall computing and collaboration environment in the Library. A second chart compares the overall satisfaction amongst undergraduate (UG) and graduate (GR) students in 2017.

IT and the Library continue to collaborate and respond to feedback from faculty, students, and staff to ensure continual improvement to the support and services IT offers in the Library.

Figure 6 shows specific aspects of satisfaction with the Library computing environment.
Figure 6 reveals substantial improvement in satisfaction with “Availability of computers.” Improvements introduced from actions taken based on customer feedback and collaboration with the Library contributed to this increase.

The decrease in satisfaction with “Computer – quality” may be attributed to the computer fleet entering its fourth year of service. These computers were replaced as part of their regular cycle in August of 2017, after this survey was conducted.
Satisfaction with the Wireless Network

The wireless network was a primary focus for IT in 2015 and 2016, and continues to be in 2017. Network expansion and increased stability in the network is the likely cause of the improved satisfaction for both metrics shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Satisfaction with the wireless network overall and with coverage in the residence halls

IT continues to work with the Residential Life staff to improve the wireless network and coverage in response to specific student complaints. Feedback is also gathered through participation in the bi-annual housing survey when students are asked to rate their IT services. Results are aggregated by each hall.

Figure 8 shows more details of satisfaction with the wireless network. Satisfaction improved significantly, likely due to the increased coverage and stability of the network.

Figure 8. Satisfaction with the wireless network; specific topics
Satisfaction with IT Purchasing System

Figure 9 shows quantitative data regarding satisfaction with the IT purchasing system. After some metrics dropped slightly in 2016, IT reviewed its purchasing operations and made improvements based on feedback. Each metric increased beyond its 2015 and 2016 level.

Figure 9. Satisfaction with the IT purchasing system
**Miscellaneous**

Figure 10 shows satisfaction with miscellaneous IT services.

The technology in the classrooms meets my needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hardware available to me meets my needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The software available to me meets my needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helpfulness of the IT staff in the library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10 shows that people are generally highly satisfied with the miscellaneous services listed. Satisfaction of available hardware and software amongst graduate students is lower than the remainder of constituent groups and will be reviewed by IT.
Satisfaction with Banner and Administrative Application Support

Figure 11 shows faculty and staff satisfaction with Banner and administrative application support such as Banweb, MyMichiganTech, Canvas, and grad submission/changes.

This question was reworded slightly for the 2016 survey. Formerly, it specifically focused on the Enterprise Application Services (EAS) IT group. The question is now more focused on measuring the support and service they (and other groups which contribute behind the scenes) provide.

The satisfaction with the Michigan Tech mobile app included all constituent groups and decreased in 2017; IT will review the feedback and consider options for improvement.
Two new questions were added in 2016, and one new question was added in the 2017 survey related to satisfaction of new IT service offerings. IT now offers our wireless network at the Houghton County Memorial Airport, and continues to offer a self-help customer support center as well as a standard remote assistance tool. Figure 12 shows that our customers appreciate these new services.

Figure 12. Satisfaction with customer support center (support.it.mtu.edu), remote assistance, and our wireless at Houghton County Memorial Airport
Summary

Information Technology constructed a survey in 2014 using best practices to measure customer satisfaction. Survey responses and feedback launched a new focus on customer service and listening to customers. Much of IT’s improvement is a direct result of survey responses and customer feedback.

This year’s results once again indicated an improvement in many aspects of satisfaction with the IT environment on campus.

While IT is pleased that customer satisfaction levels continue to trend upward, we remain committed to continual improvement and sincerely value our customers’ feedback.