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Abstract

Assessing the effectiveness of Information Technology Services is an essential element in providing services that meet faculty and staff needs. The Vice President for IT Services at Georgia Southern University utilized the Techqual+ instrument to collect 314 responses representing 2303 faculty and staff. The Techqual+ instrument includes 12 items that measure three dimensions: Connectivity and Access; Technology and collaboration services; and Support and Training. Respondents rating services below minimum expectations were invited to provide written comments. Finally, respondents were also asked to provide comments on current and future services through three open-ended questions.

The findings indicate that staff reported perceived experiences with IT services that met or exceeded their minimum expectations in all categories. The findings also indicated that faculty have higher expectations for IT services than staff. Moreover, faculty perceived less than minimum expected performance on eight items: technology support staff knowledge and ability to resolve problems (-.19); provide timely resolution to problems (-.15); Internet service that is reliable and consistent (-.08); Internet service that is fast (-.14); the ability to use personal laptop, tablet or other device for work purposes (-.11); and ability to use mobile devices on important websites (-.07).

The most poorly rated measure was associated with campus websites and online services that are easy to use satisfaction with website services that are easy to use (-.39); ability to use technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information (-.30); Comments of respondents who rated their experience below minimal expectations cited an overly “busy” university website, lack of or problems with accuracy of data, and navigational difficulties.

When compared to other low-research institutions, Georgia Southern rated better on adequacy gap measures than peers in the areas of connectivity and access, and technology and collaboration services. Georgia Southern scored lower on adequacy measure with respect to support and training. The expectations of Georgia Southern participants were generally higher than those of peer group institutions.

Respondents identified 10 different themes in their responses to needed service improvements. Top issues identified included WiFi access and bandwidth, website development, ease an deficiency of technology procurement, process automation, pace and communication of change, mobile apps, MacIntosh support, timeliness of technical service, training for expert users, and ADP.

ITS is currently using the data to guide activities in key service areas: website improvements; increasing Internet bandwidth and WIFI access; mobile applications; business process improvements; and technology procurement. Other identified service issues are being explored through university community forums and advisory groups at the campus and USG levels.
Introduction

Demonstration of successful outcomes is a required competency for all higher education administrators, particularly those who lead information technology organizations. The task is difficult: how can one objectively assess the quality of technology services from the perspective of one outside the IT organization? When viewed with the eyes of faculty, students, and staff, what are the key performance indicators that reflect high quality technology outcomes at a college or university? The Higher Education TechQual+ Project provides IT leaders with the tools to assess, analyze, and report on the effectiveness of technology services at their institution, while shielding them from the burden and rigors of conducting survey research.

Georgia Southern University annually assess IT Services performance based on faculty and staff perceptions using the Techqual+ instrument (http://www.techqual.org). The objectives of this assessment are to determine:

1. How does Georgia Southern University staff perceive IT Services?
2. How does Georgia Southern University faculty perceive IT Services?
3. How does Georgia Southern University IT Services performance ratings compare with other research institutions?

The assessment of IT services organization performance informs the University leadership with valuable information concerning faculty and staff needs for technology services. The study is essential to building and maintaining a strong technology service organization that adequately supports the diverse needs of the University community.

Techqual+ Instrumentation

This report is the result of a survey of technology service outcomes conducted at Georgia Southern University. The survey instrument has been developed through a collaborative effort between multiple institutions of higher education, a project known as the Higher Education TechQual+ Project. The goal of this project is to create a standardized, scientifically valid instrument that assesses IT service outcomes in higher education, in a way that provides for benchmarks and comparisons between institutions.

The TechQual+ instrument was developed through multiple rounds of qualitative and quantitative data collection from participating institutions. Using this data, the TechQual+ instrument is continually refined with the goal of insuring that the resulting instrument is considered to be scientifically reliable, valid, and universal. The TechQual+ Core Instrument is a web-based survey that asks respondents to provide evaluations regarding minimum expectation levels, desired service levels, and perceived service levels for 12 core IT service outcomes and provides ability for institutions to define additional items.

This project instrument contains 13 core items in three standard TechQual+ categories:

- Connectivity and Access – four items measure the quality of the Internet service on campus.
- Technology and Collaboration Services – four items measure the quality of Web sites, online services, and technologies for collaboration.
- Support and Training - four items measure participant experiences when obtaining assistance with technology on campus.

One additional question measures experiences in the use of a personal device (BYOD). The questionnaire appears in Appendix A.
Procedures
The Techqual + website (www.techqual.org) was used to manage the data collection process. Respondents were asked to self identify as faculty or staff and indicate their sex, and age group. For each question, respondents are asked to rate the service dimension in three ways based on a rating scale (1 is lowest, 9 is highest). Respondents were requested to indicate their minimum service level expectation, desired service level expectation, and perceived service performance for each question:

Minimum Service Level Expectation - the number that represents the minimum level of service that the respondent finds acceptable. If a respondent has minimal expectations for the statement, his or her rating is typically closer to the lower end of the rating scale. If the respondent has higher expectations, the rating is typically closer to the higher end of the rating scale.

Desired Service Level Expectation - the number that represents the level of service that the respondent personally wants. The respondent selects a rating that represents the level of services he or she desires.

Perceived Service Performance - the number that represents the level of service that the respondent believes is currently provided. This rating is typically considered in light of the minimum and desired ratings that were previously selected. Generally speaking, this rating typically falls between the minimum and desired service level ratings. However, if the respondent feels that the actual performance is below the minimum service levels, the rating is equal to or below their minimum service level rating. If the respondent feels that the actual performance exceeds the desired expectations, the rating is typically equal to or greater than the desired service level rating.

Data Collection
Georgia Southern University Human Resources Office supplied data on faculty and staff. The Population (N) contained 836 faculty and 1467 staff for a total of 2303. A simple random sample produced 566 participants. These participants were invited to participate in the assessment through email invitations. Participants self identified their role. An overall response rate of 55.5% was obtained. See Results section for information on the sample, completion and participation rates.

Data Analysis
Descriptive Statistics
For each item in the survey, both the means and standard deviations are reported, along with the number of respondents (n) who actually completed this question on the survey. Respondents who selected 'n/a' or who failed to enter a rating across all three service dimensions (minimum, desired, perceived), or, who failed to enter a response are not included in these statistics (thus the variation in n across all questions). Additionally, two other important measures are included:

Service Adequacy Gap Score
This score indicates the degree to which end users basic, minimum service levels are being met. This score is computed by subtracting the minimum level of service score from the perceived level of service score. A positive number indicates the extent that perceived service levels exceeds end users minimum expectations, a negative number indicates a gap between the perceived performance and minimum expectations.

Service Superiority Gap Score
This score indicates the degree to which end users desired service levels are being met. This score is computed by subtracting the desired level of service score from the perceived level of service score. A positive number indicates the extent that perceived service exceeds end users desired expectations, a negative number indicates a gap between perceived service performance and end users desired expectations.

Zones of Tolerance
For each type of service, expectations are measured as a range as opposed to a single, scaled point. The range between end users minimum expectations and desired expectations constitutes what is known as the "zone of
tolerance”. A second range, the service adequacy gap range (minimum to perceived) is also computed and displayed against the zone of tolerance for each respective service dimension. This chart graphically displays the end users range of expectations across all service dimensions and your organization performance against those expectations.

**Radar Charts**

For each dimension of service, the minimum, desired, and perceived quality of service is plotted on a radar chart. This chart is helpful in viewing how each data point is related to the overall service dimension as well as to other service dimensions. The one to nine (1-9) scale is plotted along the y axis of the chart, and each ‘spoke’ represents one dimension of service. The colors green, yellow, blue, and red are used to express the perceived service levels against end users range of expectations (or, zones of tolerance).

**Outliers**

Outliers were dropped and not included in the analysis. Outliers by definition are observations that are numerically distant from other cases and have the potential to result in misleading results. For this project, an outlier is defined as a case where the Adequacy Gap Score is either greater than or less than two standard deviations from the mean Adequacy Gap Score. This has the effect of removing the top 2.275% and bottom 2.275% of cases on an item by item basis.

**Incomplete Surveys**

Incomplete surveys were eliminated from the analysis.

**Suggestions**

When the perceived rating is below the minimum level of service, the end user is provided the opportunity to make suggestions on how the quality of this service can be improved. While these responses remain subjective, they can be useful in plotting strategies to improve service quality over the long term.

**Qualitative Analysis**

Suggestions and the open-ended questions were exported into NVIVO™ for qualitative analysis. The data were coded into nodes and aggregated into themes that lead to summative statements and conclusions.
Findings

Participants Analysis

As the following tables illustrate, the questionnaire was completed by 314 participants (116 faculty and 193 staff) from a sample of 566 faculty and staff. Women represented 58% of the completed responses. There was a relatively even distribution of responses of participants ranging from age 25 to 55 and above.

Table 1. Participation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pop (N)</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>(n) %</th>
<th># Attempted</th>
<th># Complete</th>
<th>Comp. Rate</th>
<th>Part. Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Declared</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>2303</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pop (N) = Total Population; Sample (n) = Sample Size; (n) % = n/N x 100; # Attempted = # Attempted Surveys; # Complete = # Complete Surveys; Comp. Rate = # Complete / # Attempted; Part. Rate = # Complete / Sample (n)

Table 2. Gender Distribution of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Attempted</th>
<th># Complete</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Comp. Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Declared</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: # Attempted = # Attempted Surveys; # Complete = # Complete Surveys; Comp. Rate = # Complete / # Attempted

Table 3. Age Distributions of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Attempted</th>
<th># Complete</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Comp. Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Declared</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 &amp; ABOVE</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td>342</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: # Attempted = # Attempted Surveys; # Complete = # Complete Surveys; Comp. Rate = # Complete / # Attempted
Result Summary for All Respondents

Figure 1 indicates that, for all respondents, the perceived level of service met or exceeded minimal expectations. In all service areas except for question 5, “Campus websites and online services that are easy to use” which scored a nominal perceived adequacy gap of -0.01. Figure 2, represents same data in a radar map. Refer to the appendix or the data tables below for the complete list and corresponding number of the survey questions.

![Figure 1, Zones of tolerance and adequacy gaps for all respondents.](image-url)
Figure 2. Radar chart for all respondents.
Data Tables for All Respondents

For each IT service outcome the statistical mean, standard deviation are calculated for the minimum expected services level, desired service level, perceived level of service, adequacy gap, and superiority gap scores. \( n^* \) represents the number of respondents who provided a complete rating for this service dimension. Thus, there may be variation in \( n^* \) across all service dimensions. Items shaded red highlight a negative service adequacy gap score indicating that the average perceived level of service was lower than the average minimum expectation for that item.

### Connectivity and Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>( n^* )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Having a campus Internet service that is reliable and that operates consistently across campus.</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having a campus Internet service that is fast and that provides speedy access to Web sites and rapid downloads.</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Having wireless Internet coverage in all of the places that are important to me on campus.</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support for accessing the campus Internet service using my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology and Collaboration Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>( n^* )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Having campus Web sites and online services that are easy to use.</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accessing important campus Web sites and online services from my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Having campus technology services available that improve and enhance my collaboration with others.</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Having technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information.</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>( n^* )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Technology support staff who are consistently courteous and thoughtful.</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Technology support staff who are knowledgeable and can help me resolve problems with campus technology services.</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Getting timely resolution to problems that I am experiencing with campus technology services.</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Receiving timely communications regarding campus technology services, explained in a relevant and easy-to-understand form.</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Getting access to training or other self-help information that can enable me to become more effective in my use of campus technology services.</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Min = Minimum Level of Service; Des = Desired Level of Service; Per = Perceived Service Quality; Adeq = Adequacy Gap Score (perceived - minimum); Supr = Superiority Gap Score (perceived - desired); \( n^* \) = Total Respondents Who Completed Item; Mean = Statistical Mean; Dev = Standard Deviation; Red Color = Perceived < Minimum; Green Color = Perceived > Desired; Yellow Color = Potential Problem Areas
Other Important Information Technology Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ability to use my own personal laptop, tablet or other device for work purposes. Self-reported faculty, staff only.</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Min = Minimum Level of Service; Des = Desired Level of Service; Per = Perceived Service Quality; Adeq = Adequacy Gap Score (perceived - minimum); Supr = Superiority Gap Score (perceived - desired); n* = Total Respondents Who Completed Item; Mean = Statistical Mean; Dev = Standard Deviation; Red Color = Perceived < Minimum; Green Color = Perceived > Desired; Yellow Color = Potential Problem Areas

Discussion

Connectivity and Access
The composite adequacy score for the dimension Connectivity and Access is 0.33.

Participants’ minimum expectations were met on all four measures of this dimension. Speed of network access to resources was rated the lowest in this group. Representative comments from participants who rated the service below their minimum expectations focused on two key issues - speed of downloads and spotty access to wireless service:

- **Key business websites that feature 1-3 minutes videos download slowly and pause frequently.**
- **Downloads can be slow depending on network and location.**
- **In the past the library has hesitated to subscribe to new, video-based resources because of the bandwidth issue.**
- **Download speeds seem to have improved, but they can still be remarkably slow. This is frustrating in the middle of class when I’m trying to teach and use something from the Internet.**
- **... to address the needs of the students and to keep up with grading, etc it helps to have internet access where ever we may be on campus.**
- **There are a lot of places on campus, Hollis building especially, where I have noticed that I, personally, do not get the best wifi. I’m not sure what the reason is, but I have noticed it.**
- **We need to have better wireless access in the Russell Union. I overhear students all the time that are not able to access sites or even the wireless internet.**
- **In faculty offices in the College of Education the wireless if VERY difficult to obtain and 'hold'. Recent upgrades to the classroom building (COE) have helped to some extent the classrooms (could still be stronger) but upgrades are needed in the faculty / administrative offices in the COE.**

Technology and Collaboration Services
The composite adequacy score for the dimension, Technology and Collaboration Services was 0.25.

The most poorly rated measure was associated with campus websites and online services that are easy to use with an adequacy gap of -0.01. Comments of respondents who rated their experience below minimal expectations cited an overly “busy” university website, lack of or problems with accuracy of data, and navigational difficulties. ADP’s user interface shortcomings were also mentioned. Representative comments include:

- **“The University websites are sometimes difficult to navigate. The menu options are not as streamlined as they could be, and it is difficult to find items if I do not already know where to look. The directory and search functions are helpful.”**

- **The major problem I perceive is with sites that are difficult to navigate or do not provide necessary information.**

Respondents also commented on the limitations of the mobile environment in the context of access to campus websites and online services:

- **The GSU website forces mobile devices to use the mobile version whether or not the user wants it. It forces my tablet to use the cell phone version when I want the real version - very frustrating.**
The mobile versions of many of our sites seem limited. I could spend more time searching them, but I lose interest quickly. I think they could be a little more user friendly. [#1169677]

The mobile site is ridiculously difficult to navigate and does not provide access to all options that the full site provides.

Once, I had to use Folio on my Iphone and it was better than I expected, I could download course slides on an Iphone which was nice. My GeorgiaSouthern.edu is not that manageable on an Iphone.

I would like to be able to do everything I can do with a computer on my mobile phone.

Regarding technology within classrooms or meeting areas that enhance presentation, respondents cited issues with missing equipment, presenter stations problems, who to call for help and the fact that not all classrooms have multimedia capabilities. Representative comments include:

I am fortunate to teach in a classroom that has the latest presentation technology. This is needed in more classrooms throughout the University. I have not found this to be an area of need, but others in my department and college have expressed a desire for more enhanced technology in their own teaching areas.

We need a continued investment in making spaces in the Russell Union more tech-capable.

Support and Training
Composite adequacy score for Support and Training was 0.29

The overall assessment of IT Services Technology support staff who are consistently courteous and thoughtful (.42), overall strong response on the dimension Support and Training but lowest gap was getting timely resolution to problems (.09).

Respondents who rated items below minimum acceptable levels cited issues with the pace of change:

Please don’t keep changing the basic programs we use. As soon as one is implemented, it seems another is put in its place.

What would help is not to have to re-learn programs every few months...

Online training is time-consuming and not always applicable to my issues. Going to yet another class on training is difficult to manage, though they are scheduled generously, and offers made in a variety of modes. My frustration stems from a learning curve that NEVER peaks. Just when I cobble together enough knowledge to manage basic functions, the system changes and I must learn it all again.

The continual changing of software/applications due to personal preferences keeps you in cycle of constant training, constant down time during the learning curve and frustration on the part of the users. When you finally get your head wrapped around a process, it changes.

A consistent issue among staff respondents was the need for more or mandatory training and indicated the need for more training options and expert content:

There should be mandatory training on new technology. It does no good for GSU to offer new services to increase productivity if you have people who refuse to attend training and learn. Building-a-better-you program could be better utilized.

Campus technology training and self-help information is very poorly done. It is almost exclusively remedial, with very little training and assistance for the more advanced applications that a remotely tech-savvy faculty member might find useful. It also relies extensively on lengthy, slow-moving web lectures, rather than far more useful, quick-reference guides accessible by specific topics/issues.

Many trainings are geared toward beginners. We need to know about these far in advance so that we can make plans to attend.
Comments about technical support varied greatly citing various issues with timeliness of service, disposition of service personnel:

*Problems are not always fixed in a timely manner, but they are eventually resolved.*

I would like to see all IT personnel under one umbrella working for the good of the campus as opposed to you can only talk with a tech from your area. If you have a question/concern/issue, you should be able to ask any Tech and receive an informed answer and not the following "you will need to put in a ticket and your tech will respond."

Some areas of IT reply promptly. Others require numerous contacts before getting a response and sometimes require going through a Dean or VP before getting attention.

The timeliness of response is phenomenal. However, the courteous and thoughtful abilities of the support staff is sometimes a little wanting.

There's not much middle ground here. If it's a quick-fix, we usually get a near-instant response (often with the staff member dropping everything to do it right then, even if it's not urgent).

If it's something that might take more than 15 minutes, much less require follow-up, we usually get told that someone will get back to us, it seems to get forgotten, and it can take weeks or even months of inquiries to get addressed.

**Tell us about three University IT Services you find helpful and why.**

Respondents generally identified four themes about helpful services:

1. Overall helpfulness of IT support staff assigned to buildings and via the help desk
2. Chat services as an element of IT support
3. The availability of training
4. Software available to faculty (e.g. Folio and Google)

Comments were generally positive and highlighted by the following representative comments:

*Overall the relationship between IT Services and [the college] has been phenomenal. They have supported our academic program in ways difficult to find at other universities. In doing so, our program is much stronger than many other […] programs I know about. The have supported several initiatives with computing resources, human support and open-mindedness…*

*Friendly service goes a long way when "issues" happen (no tech is perfect) - here GSU is doing well with their current staff! Also, the switch to GoogleApp was a blessing (Google has really mastered the power of sharing and joint-work in ways I had never known and am still expanding into! Efficiency with collaborators has gone way up!)*

*The Help Desk: I use them occasionally when my account locks. They are always friendly and helpful. What happens here on campus is fairly similar to what I have seen happening on other campuses . . . the rapid move toward Google, jumping from one content management system to another including the use of different versions of the one in use, reasonable access to software when a person is on campus, access to an OK number of library data bases, and websites composed of new and old pages that can be a bit jumbled at times. All of these services are very helpful, but not optimized, and probably can never be.*
Tell us about three University IT services that need improvement, and why?

Respondents identified 10 different themes in their responses to needed service improvements. They are listed here in a ranked order by the frequency of responses.

1. WiFi access and bandwidth

   *Wireless access should be reliable throughout campus so that staff members who use iPads to perform their job duties can do so consistently.*

   *Wireless in the Residence Halls - although I believe we offer plenty of avenues to get students connected in the halls, I feel that our students would like more wireless capabilities throughout the halls now that phones and tablets have the ability to connect wirelessly;*

   *Wireless ability across the entire campus, because employers who are visiting on campus need this.*

   *Easier access to wireless when moving building to building. Security settings require establishment of profile in each new building.*

   *There are many times when the internet goes down on Sunday nights because there is such a high volume of traffic on Folio and other resources our students use.*

   *We need to have better wireless access in the Russell Union. I overhear students all the time that are not able to access sites or even the wireless internet.*

   *Again, It seems impossible to believe that some buildings just “can’t” get campus wireless access. Students alone should be able to log on anywhere they are on the physical campus. It's important with deadlines, last minute add ons to a google doc or folio file, and all the online instruction that we have to make internet wirelessly accessible and that goes for mobile devices too as many people just use tablets for work/homework.*

   *This may or may not be related or the responsibility of campus IT, but cellphone provider service is very spotty across campus.*

2. Website development.

   [*] need more assistance in developing webpages for units and faster turnaround.

   *New web template - the whole thing was a bad experience. Over two years of constant changes in direction, plan, approval, look, etc.*

   *Not all websites are up to date. It is also sometimes hard to find what you are looking for.*

   *All departmental websites need to have contact information, (Phone Numbers) and physical address information, on the home page. This is the number one problem that students have with departmental webpages...it seems to be purposely omitted or hidden. Perhaps a link to a map service would be a good addition. (Students can’t find buildings).*

   *Make sure the consistency while designing the university web pages. The university global menu bar should stay above each university web pages. Unfortunately, several university web pages, such as Course Selection, GeorgiaView, and IT Services in Faculty/Staff section and other pages in Future Students section do not meet this standard. Faculty and students are confused at different web designs without standard global menu bar. They should be fixed as soon as possible.*

3. Ease and efficiency of technology procurement.

   *To long when ordering a piece of hardware that is on contract with the university*

   *There are times when my IT contact provides me a quote for an SCW item and when I go to search for the item in ePro I cannot find it. I am then told to just purchase the item from the vendor and pay with my p-card. I spend much more time ordered items through ePro than I did when I just used my p-card. I appreciate the benefits this system offers; such as, reducing budget checking*
errors and electronic submissions between departments, but this system causes more aggravation for the admins who are processing the orders.

*IT Purchasing* website need to be kept updated with the most current configurations.

Currently, departments need to go through a mindless bureaucratic nightmare to order computers, printers and supplies. Initiate a system in which we can purchase from the computer store saving us time and making money for GSU.

4. Process Automation

*Push for departments to move as paperless as possible!* Many departments are scared of implementing systems so it is going to take a lot of PR from the IT departments, but would make the University run more efficiently.

*I wish there was more of a "push" to make ALL departments incorporate technology into their processes and automate as much as possible.*

*I would love to see some type of electronic submission process for curriculum items that are approved through the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. This would help reduce manual processes and also ensure program proposals go through the correct stages for approval.*

5. Pace and communication of change.

*I can’t keep up with the services we have now*

*Please don’t keep changing the basic programs we use. As soon as one is implemented, it seems another is put in its place.*

*Better communication and support from IT when software that is used by faculty is discontinued.*

*I would simply recommend much greater coordination with other departments that are affected by the IT department’s decisions. This includes lower-level staff members who are often left out of the loop, but frequently are the people that have to directly deal with changes.*

*The biggest improvement IT Services can make is to remove the word NO from their vocabulary. We need a more “yes we can” attitude. Yes we can but, here are my concerns. Yes we can but, we need to watch out for X. These are all acceptable alternatives to “NO we can’t.” Legitimate concerns can be addressed, but more importantly, valuable work can proceed.*

[...]*The continual changing of software/applications due to personal preferences keeps you in cycle of constant training, constant down time during the learning curve and frustration on the part of the users. When you finally get your head wrapped around a process, it changes.*

[...]Too many things, all at once, means lack of efficiency, lack of knowledge, and a sense that we should all assume that technology can fix things about a college that it just really cannot fix. If we can all work together, then we can stay current but stay out of an inappropriate frenzy that just wastes time and effort, and comes to nothing as the newness of the next fad fades.

6. Mobile Apps

[...] more [mobile] apps relating to events on campus (guidebook would be great for SOAR as well as OMI just to name a few).

*Mobile app needs direct link to regular site on the first page.*

7. Mac Support

*Mac/Apple support does not appear to be on par with our other platforms’ support. I have had multiple colleagues mention to me that they can’t get their Apple computer fixed. Mac/Apple standards seem to be missing. I can’t say for certain, but I don’t believe that Apple computers are held to the same security standards that our PC computers are.*

8. Timeliness of technical service
Not sure it’s the services that need improvement, it’s the staff. More are needed! Projects aren’t always completed in a timely manner due to lack of staff.

Having a dedicated tech to address computer issues - the only problem is that they are assigned to several units and sometimes you have to ask numerous times before you get the assistance you need. Having procedures change and not be notified, i.e. being told in past that all service request need to go through helpdesk and then after following procedure, being told that you are supposed to go to your tech directly.

9. Training for expert users in academic and administrative applications.

Increase in training provided to students across the board. This includes Folio training, Google stuff, SPSS, etc. Students have repeatedly asked for training on all of these, and I have provided what I can on a one-to-one basis, but an ‘open lab’ in the Union/Library would be helpful.

There needs to be more clarity communicated on the differences between training for COL and training that is less specifically about online teaching issues

10. ADP.

ADP is a piece...of garbage

What new University IT services are missing, and should be implemented in the future?

Respondents were asked to provide comments regarding missing services that should be implemented in the future. Respondents returned to themes associated with expanded WiFi access, mobile applications, paperless processes. New issues included adding research computing resources. Notably, there were requests for services and items that are already available, signaling the need for improved communications about the technological capabilities already deployed for the University.

The following themes and representative comments were identified as missing or future enhancements:

1. Wireless Access
   -better access to WIFI -standard technology available in all conference rooms
   Better wireless access better ability to use tablets and tablet like devices wirelessly in the classroom
   Complete campus connectivity.
   Continue improving wireless connectivity in the buildings (COE Office building and classroom building) which has either diminished or not kept up.

2. Paperless Business processes

   Push for departments to move as paperless as possible! Many departments are scared of implementing systems so it is going to take a lot of PR from the IT departments, but would make the University run more efficiently [#1169317]

   I would love to see some type of electronic submission process for curriculum items that are approved through the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. This would help reduce manual processes and also ensure program proposals go through the correct stages for approval. [#1169318]

   Online form submission for tuition waivers and residency petitions would make for a more clean review process.
3. Research/Cutting Edge Technology

Our researchers and students should have access to HPC cluster computing resources. Whether we use a service such as Amazon EC2 or we build our own. Anyone that wants to submit a problem should have the opportunity. [#1169331]

Lastly, 3D printing should become ubiquitous and readily available. There are so many low cost options now such as Makerbot and CubeX that we really have no excuse not to provide this service. Here’s a chance to do something innovative. Many other schools already have invention labs or idea labs, we could be one of the first to provide wider, open access.

Support for LINUX research systems. Hosting of cloud computing for research (e.g. student computer labs have resources not used at late night).

4. Mobile Applications

Some way to get programs/apps for tablets that departments can purchase (like Office) rather than requiring staff to buy using their own money.

Access to resources on personal devices (like RMS, Stanley BASIS, and Editable PDFs) for specific job functions that require them.

-More apps relating to events on campus (guidebook- would be great for SOAR as well as OMI just to name a few)

Mobile apps for Folio / Desire to learn that are functional and allow me to grade, etc.

A more robust tablet/smartphone app.

I guess it would be great to have more apps for different departments on the Georgia Southern website.

Mobile apps for Folio / Desire to learn that are functional and allow me to grade, etc. Projection remotes in every classroom that WORK on ALL the dedicated computers. Clicker systems that work from phones or laptops instead of clicker devices.

5. Training

Offer an online or 1-2 hour class to understand or navigate the newer technology items that many staff and faculty are using. [#1169623]

Increase in training provided to students across the board. This includes Folio training, Google stuff, SPSS, etc. [#1169691]

See above. More classes that relate to the misc. programs currently in use. [#1169833]

More classes offered through Build a Better U.
Is there any other technology related issue, need, question or topic not covered by this questionnaire that you'd like the Vice President for IT to address?

Respondents identified the need to clarify service offerings, improve coordination among IT service entities, moving away from fixed PC labs in favor of tablet technology, improved instructional technology tools, structure training differently, and address research technology support among other diverse items. Representative comments include:

**Improved Communication and Coordination**

_Honestly, I'm confused about distinguishing between IT services, CATS, and contract service providers who are with independent companies. I've found all of these people helpful and responsive, but I think it needs to be clearer how IT Services is organized and how we make requests and collaborate with staff members. We need to be personally acquainted with individual people and what they can do for us, not just given a directory or a list._

_I would simply recommend much greater coordination with other departments that are affected by the IT department's decisions. This includes lower-level staff members who are often left out of the loop, but frequently are the people that have to directly deal with changes._

_I would also listen more to students and find out what their needs are. IT, above all, should support academic achievement at Georgia Southern, and I see this as being perhaps its greatest weakness._

After making sure faculty and staff keep their jobs and are paid appropriately, promoting academic success through funding is the next most important goal, and excellent IT is critical to achieving that.

_I would like to see all IT personnel under one umbrella working for the good of the campus as opposed to you can only talk with a tech from your area. If you have a question/concern/issue, you should be able to ask any Tech and receive an informed answer and not the following " you will need to put in a ticket and your tech will respond."_

**Technology Improvements**

_More emphasis on the use of video in both teaching and research._

We need to figure out how to structure online courses so that our students can be successful.

_We need a good wiki._

_A viable and cost effective replacement for scantron machines is needed ASAP._

_need to start transition away from fixed PC labs released space will be needed in future for faculty and classrooms suggest checkout system for tablets at help desks as a transition strategy money saved in PC labs can be invested in state-of-the-art software._

_I would really appreciate an enhanced collaboration engine that integrates with Folio better. I teach online and want my students to be able to collaborate more. Adobe Connect only allows me to deal with my students but not my students with each other in my absence. If they could IM or have video chat (such as Google Hangouts) within Folio, that would be phenomenal._

**Training**

_Training is readily available but often difficult to schedule both for the faculty and the trainers. Most of the students have had no training in using Folio, and can do so only going through self-instruction materials. This presents a problem in that we cannot get them to read their textbooks, let alone going through a self instruction course._
Folio training needs to be reset for beginners, intermediate and advanced application users. It would be beneficial to cluster training limiting certain sessions to beginners and other sessions for existing users. The trainers are excellent: it is composition of the small group of attendees that get things bogged down.

Research

Research is very important on this campus, but there appears to be very little attention/effort directed toward facilitating research. Sometimes faculty have specific research related needs for IT support, but there does not appear to be any mechanism in place for addressing these. The general attitude seems to be that faculty should find a way to make their research fit within some standard model set up for administration of computers/labs on campus... rather than on finding a way for IT to serve the diverse research needs of faculty. I realize that we are working with limited resources, but it would be very beneficial to have a few individuals that could focus on working with faculty to resolve research related problems.

Comparison to Other Low Research Institutions

When compared to other low research institutions, Georgia Southern rates the adequacy of services higher than peers on 8 of 12 core measures. However, Georgia Southern exceeds peers on every measure with regard to perceived level of service. Expectations of minimum service among Georgia Southern respondents were higher than that of peer respondents on 9 of the 11 measures.

The tables in this section compare IT service items scores for Georgia Southern (My Survey) to the low research university peer group (Peer Group). As in the item analysis, the statistical mean, standard deviation are calculated for the minimum expected services level, desired service level, perceived level of service, adequacy gap, and superiority gap scores. n* represents the number of respondents who provided a complete rating for this service dimension. Thus, there may be variation in n* across all service dimensions. Items shaded red highlight a negative service adequacy gap score indicating that the average perceived level of service was lower than average minimum expectation for that item.

Connectivity and Access

Georgia Southern rated higher on perceived level of service on all four items in the category of Connectivity and Access. Peer institutions, over all, fail to meet expectations of minimal service for wireless internet coverage.
Technology and Collaboration Services
When compared to other low research institutions, Georgia Southern rates higher than peers on 3 of 4 items. Although GSU scores higher on perceived service level regarding campus web sites and online services, the adequacy gap score is slightly below the average desired minimum acceptable level (-0.01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeg</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Having campus Web sites and online services that are easy to use.</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accessing important campus Web sites and online services from my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>2296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having campus technology services available that improve and enhance my collaboration with others.</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Having technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information.</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates a lower adequacy gap score than peer institutions. * indicates higher adequacy gap score than peer institutions.

Support and Training
Georgia Southern scored below peers on 3 out of 5 adequacy gap measures of support and training. GSU surpassed peers on the adequacy of staff knowledge and ability to resolve problems. Perceptions as to the adequacy of access to effective training were identical to that of peers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeg</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Technology support staff who are consistently courteous and thoughtful.</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Technology support staff who are knowledgeable and can help me resolve problems with campus technology services.</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Getting timely resolution to problems that I am experiencing with campus technology services.</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Receiving timely communications regarding campus technology services, explained in a relevant and easy-to-understand form.</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Getting access to training or other self-help information that can enable me to become more effective in my use of campus technology services.</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates a lower adequacy gap score than peer institutions. * indicates higher adequacy gap score than peer institutions.
Comparison of Faculty versus Staff Perceptions

Faculty generally had higher expectations for services than did staff. Moreover, they consistently rated their perceived levels of performance below average minimum expectations for that service on 7 of the 13 core items and on the supplemental item. The biggest concern among faculty was associated with item 5, easy to use online services and web sites; and item 8, technology within classrooms.

Faculty Ratings
# Georgia Southern University TechQual+ Study of Faculty and Staff Perspectives, Spring 2013

## Data Tables for self-reported University Role='Faculty'

### Connectivity and Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Having a campus Internet service that is reliable and that operates consistently across campus.</td>
<td>Mean 7.64</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.26</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having a campus Internet service that is fast and that provides speedy access to Web sites and rapid downloads.</td>
<td>Mean 7.61</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.41</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Having wireless Internet coverage in all of the places that are important to me on campus.</td>
<td>Mean 6.84</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.96</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support for accessing the campus Internet service using my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
<td>Mean 6.85</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.95</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology and Collaboration Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Having campus Web sites and online services that are easy to use.</td>
<td>Mean 7.41</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.32</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accessing important campus Web sites and online services from my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
<td>Mean 6.76</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.76</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Having campus technology services available that improve and enhance my collaboration with others.</td>
<td>Mean 6.95</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.70</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Having technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information.</td>
<td>Mean 7.56</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.50</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Technology support staff who are consistently courteous and thoughtful.</td>
<td>Mean 7.58</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Technology support staff who are knowledgeable and can help me resolve problems with campus technology services.</td>
<td>Mean 7.87</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Getting timely resolution to problems that I am experiencing with campus technology services.</td>
<td>Mean 7.76</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.29</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Receiving timely communications regarding campus technology services, explained in a relevant and easy-to-understand form.</td>
<td>Mean 7.50</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.38</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Getting access to training or other self-help information that can enable me to become more effective in my use of campus technology services.</td>
<td>Mean 7.05</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.61</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Important Information Technology Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeq</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ability to use my own personal laptop, tablet or other device for work purposes. Self-reported faculty, staff only.</td>
<td>Mean 7.45</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dev 1.56</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Min = Minimum Level of Service; Des = Desired Level of Service; Per = Perceived Service Quality; Adeq = Adequacy Gap Score (perceived - minimum); Supr = Superiority Gap Score (perceived - desired); n* = Total Respondents Who Completed Item; Mean = Statistical Mean; Dev = Standard Deviation; Red Color = Perceived < Minimum.
Data Tables for self-reported UniversityRole='Staff'

### Connectivity and Access
Tell us about the quality of the Internet service on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeg</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Having a campus Internet service that is reliable and that operates consistently across campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Having a campus Internet service that is fast and that provides speedy access to Web sites and rapid downloads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Having wireless Internet coverage in all of the places that are important to me on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support for accessing the campus Internet service using my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology and Collaboration Services
Tell us about the quality of Web sites, online services, and technologies for collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeg</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Having campus Web sites and online services that are easy to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accessing important campus Web sites and online services from my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Having campus technology services available that improve and enhance my collaboration with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Having technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support and Training
Tell us about your experiences when obtaining assistance with technology on campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeg</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Technology support staff who are consistently courteous and thoughtful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Technology support staff who are knowledgeable and can help me resolve problems with campus technology services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Getting timely resolution to problems that I am experiencing with campus technology services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Receiving timely communications regarding campus technology services, explained in a relevant and easy-to-understand form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Getting access to training or other self-help information that can enable me to become more effective in my use of campus technology services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Important Information Technology Services
Assesses other important IT service outcomes on campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>When it comes to...</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Des</th>
<th>Per</th>
<th>Adeg</th>
<th>Supr</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ability to use my own personal laptop, tablet or other device for work purposes. Self-reported faculty, staff only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superiority Gap Score (perceived - desired); n* = Total Respondents Who Completed Item; Mean = Statistical Mean; Dev = Standard Deviation; Red Color = Perceived < Minimum; Green Color = Perceived > Desired; Yellow Color = Potential Problem Areas
Conclusions and Implications

The results of the survey both confirm prior understanding of limitations and identify areas of concern not yet addressed. The Vice President of Information Technology will pursue current and new action plans to address the major issues identified. An open discussion forum of the university community will be held in the fall to discuss the results of the survey, specific plans and activities undertaken to address the identified issues, and any observations by university members.

1. **Web Site Improvements.** Last year the University formed the Web Advisory Committee (WAC) to help guide future development of web services and information. The committee was also instrumental in facilitating a campus-wide initiative to update web content, improve consistency and timeliness of information, implement templates to standardize navigation and organization, utilize a web content management system, Wordpress™ to distribute control of web content to designated editors in each university department. The University will complete the major portions of this project by September, and the WAC will continue to guide incremental enhancements to our web information space. ITS is constrained on improvements it can make to applications such as Wings and ADP, but additional work is being planned to improve the visual aspects of the portal service. Moreover, ITS seeks to integrate all of our systems, where technically feasible, with single sign-on capabilities.

2. **Wi-Fi Access, and Internet Bandwidth.** A State-wide project conducted by the University System of Georgia is expanding PeachNet to alleviate bandwidth constraints on Georgia Southern University. This project should be completed in FY14 and allow the university to expand bandwidth and improve internet access speeds considerably—especially for video applications which constitute approximately 50% of the 1 gigabyte of bandwidth allocated to Georgia Southern. With respect to WiFI, additional access points are being deployed and configurations changed to accommodate the significant increase in number of devices attaching to this service on campus. Under-served areas are also being built out and include Southern Pines, Southern Courtyard and any buildings being renovated or constructed such as the new dining halls, Biology building, and others.

3. **Mobile Apps** - ITS is investigating options for upgrading the mobile application environment to take advantage of recent capabilities in this rapidly changing and expanding area of technology. Once a new mobile application development platform is identified, ITS will seek additional input from the university community to identify areas of development. Concomitantly, new applications are being vetted with consideration of their ability to be mobile friendly and current software vendors are being encouraged and driven by the market to produce new interfaces and applications that are mobile friendly. This will certainly continue to be a rapidly developing area of technology.

4. **Business Process Improvements.** This is a wide-ranging issue that is being addressed on several fronts. First, many departments are currently engaged in projects to image paper documents to reduce paper-storage, ensure preservation, and improve access to information. In addition, Sharepoint is being upgraded to the most recent version and many online forms are being created in electronic workflows to improve efficiencies in document management. IT analysts are trained and practicing process mapping and improvement exercises to simplify processes and eliminate unnecessary steps. Although ITS is technically restricted in our ability to have automation control over all of the systems used at the university, there are many opportunities to reduce or eliminate paper processes.

5. **Technology Procurement.** ITS implemented new procedures in April of 2013 and is currently developing new resources to streamline technology procurement around the USG Peoplesoft E-procurement system. Our goal is to maintain an accurate web-based catalog of technology items and provide a dedicated resource to assisting departments with purchase and ensuring coordination with departments for receiving and deployment.

6. **Timely and Accurate Resolution Services.** Faculty demand more knowledgeable technicians who can resolve problems quickly and efficiently.
When the Techqual+ instrument is run again, it will be interesting to see if these activities produce any changes in the satisfaction levels of the faculty and staff.

There are numerous other areas and issues that require further study and discussion. ITS utilizes numerous advisory committees to address topics related to administrative applications, instructional technology, web information technology, and technology infrastructure. The following issues will be explored in greater depth to identify possible courses of action to address their development and evolution such that they address the needs and expectations of the university community:

1. Research technology resources and support
2. Diversification and relevance of training
3. Service coordination and timeliness of service delivery.
Appendix

TechQual+ Questionnaire Items

Connectivity and Access
1. Having a campus Internet service that is reliable and that operates consistently across campus.
2. Having a campus Internet service that is fast and that provides speedy access to Web sites and rapid downloads.
3. Having wireless Internet coverage in all of the places that are important to me on campus.
4. Support for accessing the campus Internet service using my tablet or other mobile device.

Technology and Collaboration Services
5. Having campus Web sites and online services that are easy to use.
6. Accessing important campus Web sites and online services from my tablet or other mobile device.
7. Having campus technology services available that improve and enhance my collaboration with others.
8. Having technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information.

Support and Training
9. Technology support staff who are consistently courteous and thoughtful.
10. Technology support staff who are knowledgeable and can help me resolve problems with campus technology services.
11. Getting timely resolution to problems that I am experiencing with campus technology services.
12. Receiving timely communications regarding campus technology services explained in a relevant and easy-to-understand form.
13. Getting access to training or other self-help information that can enable me to become more effective in my use of campus technology services.

Other Important Information Technology Services
14. Ability to use my own personal laptop, tablet or other device for work purposes.

Open Ended Questions
15. Tell us about three University IT services that need improvement, and why?
16. What new University IT services are missing, and should be implemented in the future?
17. Is there any other technology related issue, need, question or topic not covered by this questionnaire that you'd like the Vice President for IT to address?