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Executive Summary
An anonymous survey of Michigan Tech's Information Technology (IT) was conducted in April and May of 2019. Participation was voluntary, and 940 responses were recorded.
Participation rates were 22% of faculty, 25% of staff, 7% of undergraduate students, and 9% of graduate students.
Introduction

An anonymous survey of Michigan Tech’s Information Technology (IT) was conducted in April and May of 2019. As in previous years, the survey generated quantitative data and text-based comments. In addition to reviewing the summarized data responses, all 172 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 2019 survey, 940 responses were recorded, compared to 991 in 2018, 903 in 2017, 1,078 in 2016, 1,436 in 2015 and 1,652 in 2014. The participant response rate is as follows:

- 103 faculty (22%)
- 344 staff (25%)
- 376 undergraduate students (7%)
- 111 graduate students (9%)
- 6 “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 2015-2019 surveys with a few exceptions. Since 2014, new questions were added to measure satisfaction with new service offerings; in 2015, one question was reworded to make the measurement more meaningful; in 2018, two questions were added to measure satisfaction with research [high performance (HPC) and general research] computing support. 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 six surveys (2014–2019) are included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>103 (22%)</td>
<td>103 (20%)</td>
<td>111 (24%)</td>
<td>122 (26%)</td>
<td>154 (30%)</td>
<td>189 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>344 (25%)</td>
<td>340 (25%)</td>
<td>355 (26%)</td>
<td>369 (28%)</td>
<td>367 (28%)</td>
<td>435 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>376 (7%)</td>
<td>423 (8%)</td>
<td>318 (6%)</td>
<td>427 (8%)</td>
<td>718 (14%)</td>
<td>816 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>111 (9%)</td>
<td>119 (9%)</td>
<td>108 (8%)</td>
<td>153 (10%)</td>
<td>190 (14%)</td>
<td>177 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other”</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment counts for the last five surveys (2014–2019) are included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>228</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.

How satisfied are you with the overall IT environment on campus?

![Bar chart showing overall satisfaction with IT environment on campus from 2014 to 2019.](chart)

Figure 1. Overall satisfaction reported by all respondents

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.

![Bar chart showing overall satisfaction with IT by Staff from 2014 to 2019.](chart)

Overall satisfaction with IT (Faculty)

![Bar chart showing overall satisfaction with IT by Faculty from 2014 to 2019.](chart)

Overall satisfaction with IT (Staff)

![Bar chart showing overall satisfaction with IT by Staff from 2014 to 2019.](chart)
Satisfaction with IT Support

Figure 3 shows distributions of overall IT support satisfaction by constituent group. Metrics for each group remained above the goal of a minimum 4.0 average satisfaction.
The survey asked for satisfaction on a wide range of categories of IT support; the distributions are presented in Figure 4. All metrics remained above the goal of a minimum 4.0 average satisfaction.
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 2019.

Figure 5. Satisfaction with Library computing environment

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. For the first time, metrics for all groups exceeded the goal of a minimum 4.0 average satisfaction. Satisfaction with the availability of computers in the Library improved substantially.
Satisfaction with the Wireless Network

The wireless network was a primary focus for IT in 2015-2018 and continues to be in 2019.

**Figure 6.** Satisfaction with Library computing environment; specific topics

**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 feedback. Input 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. Average satisfaction remained above 4.0 in academic areas and reliability/performance. Coverage in non-academic areas remains an opportunity and point of focus; for example, coverage in campus green space was extended as part of the recent blue light phone project.
Satisfaction with IT Purchasing System Process

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 again in 2019 and all metrics exceed the goal of a minimum 4.0 average satisfaction.
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

The technology in the classrooms meets my needs (2019)
Helpfulness of the IT staff in the Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hardware available to me meets my needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The software available to me meets my needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Satisfaction with miscellaneous IT systems

Figure 10 shows that people are generally highly satisfied with the miscellaneous services listed. Satisfaction of available hardware and software amongst graduate students is a continual point of focus; the software metric (2019: 3.68) remained nearly consistent with 2018 (2018: 3.66, 2017: 3.39), and the hardware metric (2019: 3.72) increased from 2018 (2018: 3.52, 2017: 3.55).
Satisfaction with Banner and Administrative Application Support

Figure 11 shows faculty and staff satisfaction with Banner and administrative application support for services 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; satisfaction remained lower in 2019; 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.
Overall satisfaction with our remote assistance

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neutral
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

- 2019: 4.53
- 2018: 4.51
- 2017: 4.43
- 2016: 4.40
- 2015: N/A
- 2014: N/A

Overall satisfaction with our remote assistance (2019)

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neutral
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

- UG: 3.96 (26)
- GR: 4.39 (36)
- FA: 4.42 (57)
- ST: 4.67 (178)

Overall satisfaction with our wireless at the Houghton County Memorial Airport

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neutral
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

- 2019: 4.16
- 2018: 4.08
- 2017: 4.21
- 2016: N/A
- 2015: N/A
- 2014: N/A

Overall satisfaction with our wireless at the Houghton County Memorial Airport (2019)

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neutral
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

- UG: 4.03 (39)
- GR: 4.07 (28)
- FA: 4.04 (53)
- ST: 4.37 (68)

Are you satisfied with the support that you receive for HPC resources?

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neutral
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

- 2019: 3.74
- 2018: 3.39
- 2017: N/A
- 2016: N/A
- 2015: N/A
- 2014: N/A

Are you satisfied with the support that you receive for HPC resources? (2019)

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neutral
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

- GR: 4.00 (12)
- FA: 3.53 (15)
High Performance Computing (HPC) focuses on research initiated on the Superior.research and Portage.research clusters, which is governed by the HPC Advisory Board. The responses regarding HPC have been provided to the HPC Advisory Board. General research computing includes all research not initiated on the aforementioned clusters.

**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.