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This report summarizes results from Furman University’s 2013 surveys of perceptions of information technology service quality. We are grateful for the students, faculty and staff who completed the survey, and for all who work to improve IT service quality.

This is Furman’s sixth year using the TechQual survey. Over the years we’ve seen the survey improve, and we’ve measured service quality improvements. The 2013 results are Furman’s best.

The survey’s key findings are:
• All groups rated Internet reliability positive; with some students concerned about WIFI reliability in their dorm rooms.
• Response to the University web redesign was mixed: students were positive; faculty not.
• Perceptions of Microsoft’s Office 365 email and calendar service improved.
• Furman’s results compare well with other institutions using the TechQual survey.

The survey’s key findings are:
• All groups rated Internet reliability positive; with some students concerned about WIFI reliability in their dorm rooms.
• Response to the University web redesign was mixed: students were positive; faculty not.
• Perceptions of Microsoft’s Office 365 email and calendar service improved.
• Furman’s results compare well with other institutions using the TechQual survey.

The TechQual survey is one way we identify IT services needing improvement. The survey results inform our IT governance, and our IT strategic planning.

About the TechQual Survey
The TechQual survey is based on the SERVQUAL model used by surveys such as LibQual+. Over 260 higher education institutions are involved with the TechQual project, including 22 outside the United States. The project lets us compare our results with broad classes of higher education institutions (e.g., Baccalaureate institutions, Masters, etc.)

The survey asked respondents to rate 13 standard service areas (table 1.) In addition, we added a rating for our email and calendar service. Respondents rate services on a scale of 1 to 9 for:
• My minimum acceptable service level,
• My desired service level, and
• The service level delivered by Furman University.

Respondents may provide comments or suggestions for each service. Finally, we asked three open-ended questions:
• Could you identify three technology services at Furman that you find especially helpful?
• If you could suggest a single improvement for information technology at Furman University, what would it be?
• Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about Furman's information technology services?

Response Rates
We collected data in October 2013 with two instances of the survey: one for students, and another for faculty and staff. We invited all students, faculty, and staff. Students completing

---

2 Participating institutions shown here: https://www.techqual.org/docs/participants.aspx
the survey had a chance to win one of ten pairs of movie tickets. Faculty and staff could win one of four pairs of tickets. We had a 23% response from students; consistent with prior surveys, and good for a web survey. We had a 50% response from faculty and staff; also consistent with past surveys, and exceptional for a web survey.

Findings
The survey results show progress. We pay particular attention to “service adequacy” ratings: the difference between minimum and perceived service level. Highlights of the 2013 survey include

- All 13 standard services exceeded minimum expectations.
- This was the first time Internet reliability was rated adequate.
- Our students are very happy with classroom technology.
- This was the first time faculty rated the IT Service Center positive.
- Email/calendar was rated slightly negative, just missing minimum expectations (-.01).
- Our faculty are unhappy with the new University web site.
- Our faculty want HD video in classrooms, and faster fixes.
- Demand for mobile device support and services is rising.

Improving problem resolution is a focus of our IT strategic plan, and we are happy to see ratings improve for the IT service center and customer support.

Service suggestions are especially helpful for understanding faculty, staff, and students’ perceptions. The suggestions provide insights into why a service may need improvement. After reviewing the survey ratings, suggestions, and open responses, we can better discern how our community perceives the quality of information technology services.

Student insights
The average student ratings were positive for all services. However, students continue to be concerned about our Network Access Control (a.k.a., NAC, Bradford, or “remediation”). Network Access Control ensures student computers have security patches and required anti-virus software. If a student computer fails a NAC check, the computer cannot use the Internet until its software is updated. We will switch anti-virus software in Spring 2014 to address problems with our current anti-virus solution.

This was the first survey where we noted a number of student complaints about reliability of wireless in their residences (charts 7 and 10.) Students also said they would like to see better integration between Office 365, the MyFurman portal, and OrgSync.

Faculty insights
As on prior surveys, the 2013 survey shows faculty hardest to please. Faculty are critical of technology in classrooms; yet students rate classroom technology higher than any other service. Faculty would like to see more HD video in classrooms, support for wireless iPad projection, and faster fixes for problems.
In addition, faculty say the campus website and portal need improvement. They were critical of the University web redesign, especially navigation (charts 3 and 8.) Faculty are least happy with the Office 365 email and calendar service, but this service rating improved from 2012.

**Staff insights**
Average staff ratings were positive for almost all services; the exception being web services. Staff gave higher ratings to the Office 365 email and calendar service, but indicated they would like more training. Some also wished that more people would use their Office 365 calendars.

**Peer comparisons**
Furman does well in peer group comparisons (Chart 5.) Furman leads all groups in these areas:
- Wireless coverage
- Campus technology for collaboration
- Classroom technology
- Courteous support
- Training and online support

We note that other institutions are rated higher for communications from IT. We will work to improve our communications in 2014.

**Conclusions**
The Furman community’s responses shows progress improving service quality, and we have more work ahead. The 2013 survey highlights needs for
- Continued improvements to campus web services;
- Investigating reports of problems with wireless reliability in student residences;
- More timely communications from ITS; and
- Improved student experience with “remediation” for Network Access Control.

This report summarizes survey highlights. The detailed responses contain a wealth of suggestions, constructive criticisms, and praise for progress. We are grateful for all who helped with this survey, our campus community’s support, and the daily efforts of Furman’s Information Technology Services staff and student workers.
Appendices

Table 1: Service areas measured by the 2013 TechQual survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service areas measured by the 2013 TechQual survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity &amp; Access</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Having a campus Internet service that is reliable and that operates consistently across campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Having a campus Internet service that is fast and that provides speedy access to Web sites and rapid downloads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Having wireless Internet coverage in all of the places that are important to me on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Support for accessing the campus Internet service using my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology &amp; Collaboration Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Having campus Web sites and online services that are easy to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Accessing important campus Web sites and online services from my tablet or other mobile device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Having campus technology services available that improve and enhance my collaboration with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Having technology within classrooms or other meeting areas that enhances the presentation and sharing of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support and Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Technology support staff who are consistently courteous and thoughtful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Technology support staff who are knowledgeable and can help me resolve problems with campus technology services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Getting timely resolution to problems that I am experiencing with campus technology services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Receiving timely communications regarding campus technology services, explained in a relevant and easy-to-understand form.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custom service rating added for Furman University</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Having a system for email and calendaring that meets my needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About the Zone of Tolerance Charts
The TechQual survey shows results in several formats. The “Zone of Tolerance” charts show average ratings for all 14 surveyed services. The high part of the gray bar shows the “desired service level”, the low part of a gray bar shows the minimum acceptable service level. The orange bar represents the “adequacy gap”: the difference between minimum and perceived service level.

Chart 1: 2013 Student Survey Ratings

The 2013 student survey shows positive ratings for ALL services (top of orange bar within the gray “tolerance zone”).

Services students rated as marginally meeting expectations are:
1) Having a campus Internet service that is reliable and that operates consistently across campus.
14) Having a system for email and calendaring that meets my needs

These results are remarkable. This was the first time students rated all IT services as meeting expectations.
Chart 2: 2013 Faculty/Staff Survey Ratings

The 2013 faculty/staff survey shows positive ratings for most services, with advances from 2012. The response to #11 “Getting timely resolution to problems that I am experiencing with campus technology services” improved to meet minimum expectations. Although still needing improvement, the response for email and calendaring (#14) is up considerably from the 2012 survey.

The response for #5 “Having campus web sites and online services that are easy to use” did not improve. This was despite the introduction of a new design for the university web site. Faculty were most unhappy with the redesign, especially site navigation (see Charts 3 and 8.)
Chart 3: Service Adequacy Ratings by Constituency

Showing service ratings either below or above minimum expectations.
Chart 4: Furman Technology Service Adequacy Scores Over Time

- Reliable Internet
- Fast Internet
- Wireless Coverage
- Mobile Internet Support
- Easy to use campus web
- Campus services on mobile
- Campus tech for collaboration
- Classroom technology
- Courteous support
- Knowledgeable support
- Timely Problem fixes
- Timely IT communications
- Training & online support
- Email/calendar
Chart 5: 2013 Peer Group Comparisons

BA = Baccalaureate, MA = Masters, RU = Research (Low, Medium, High); responses per group in parentheses.
Peer institution allowed Furman to view its ratings with the caveat that the institution not be identified.
Chart 7: Selected Student Service Suggestions Categorized

Students: Internet Reliability suggestions (67)

- NAC/Antivirus: 25%
- Wireless reliability: 22%
- My room: 18%
- Outside wireless: 7%
- Connection trouble: 7%
- Wireless coverage: 5%
- Other: 5%
- Slow connecting: 3%
- Important: 3%
- Good: 5%
- Important: 3%

Students: email/calendar suggestions (64)

- Prefers FirstClass: 16%
- Prefers Google: 19%
- Other: 14%
- Office365 Bad: 13%
- Office365 mixed: 5%
- Needs training: 6%
- Calendar lacking: 6%
- Integration: 9%
- OrgSync Bad: 9%
- Good: 3%

Number of suggestion responses indicated in parentheses. Category definitions are in Table 2.
Chart 8: Selected Faculty/Staff Service Suggestions categorized

**Faculty/Staff: Web Site suggestions (70)**

- **Web Navigation**: 43%
- **Web design**: 15%
- **Web content**: 13%
- **MyFurman**: 6%
- **Sharepoint**: 6%
- **OrgSync**: 3%
- **Single Sign On**: 4%
- **Search**: 3%
- **Other**: 7%

**Faculty/Staff: email/calendar suggestions (82)**

- **Office365 mixed**: 15%
- **Office365 Problem**: 6%
- **Office365 Bad**: 10%
- **Mac support**: 10%
- **Good**: 10%
- **Calendar lacking**: 11%
- **Prefers FirstClass**: 13%
- **Prefers Google**: 13%
- **Needs training**: 4%
- **Other**: 6%
- **Android support**: 2%
Chart 9: Open responses categorized: “...technology services you find especially helpful”

**Students: Especially Helpful Tech Services (238)**

- Service Center: 28%
- Web services: 21%
- Email: 10%
- Wireless: 9%
- Class/Lab: 8%
- Library: 8%
- Printing: 4%
- Net-Speed: 3%
- Other: 7%
- No: 2%

**Faculty/Staff: Especially Helpful Tech Services (186)**

- Service Center: 26%
- Web services: 18%
- Email/calendar: 11%
- Training: 7%
- Class/Office: 7%
- Wireless: 10%
- Other: 8%
- Library: 5%
- ITS individual: 5%
- No: 1%
- Net-Speed: 5%
- Other: 2%

---
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Chart 10: “...suggest a single improvement for information technology”

**Students: One Thing to Improve IT (257)**

- Wireless: 19%
- NAC/anti-virus: 16%
- Web services: 14%
- ITS-staff: 7%
- email: 6%
- NA/No: 5%
- Mobile: 5%
- OrgSync: 4%
- Printing: 4%
- Good: 2%
- Other: 9%
- My Room: 9%

**Faculty/Staff: One Thing to Improve IT (198)**

- Web services: 19%
- Other: 18%
- ITS-staff: 12%
- Class/Office: 11%
- Training: 8%
- Communication: 3%
- Good: 2%
- NA/No: 7%
- email/calendar: 6%
- Wireless: 7%
- Mobile: 7%
Chart 11: “...anything else you'd like to tell us?”

Students: What Else About Tech Services? (106)

- Good: 36%
- NA/No: 25%
- Other: 11%
- NAC/anti-virus: 9%
- Web services: 5%
- My Room: 4%
- ITS-staff: 4%
- Communication: 3%
- email: 3%

Faculty/Staff: What Else About Tech Services? (110)

- Good: 64%
- NA/No: 13%
- Other: 6%
- Web services: 6%
- ITS-staff: 3%
- Class/Office: 2%
- Training: 2%
- email/calendar: 2%
- Communication: 2%
### Table 2: Open response and suggestion category definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar lacking</td>
<td>email OK, but calendar wanting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection trouble</td>
<td>Has trouble connecting to WIFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Noted satisfaction with this service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Comment that this service is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Wants more integrated web services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Room</td>
<td>Complaint about residence hall WIFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC/Antivirus</td>
<td>Complaint about network access control (NAC) or antivirus software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs training</td>
<td>Would like training for Office 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office365 Bad</td>
<td>Dislikes Office365 for email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office365 mixed</td>
<td>Likes some Office 365, but not all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgSync Bad</td>
<td>Dislikes the OrgSync Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Comments not fitting a category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside wireless</td>
<td>Request for WIFI outside buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers FirstClass</td>
<td>Preferred FirstClass for email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers Google</td>
<td>Responder prefers Google for email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow connecting</td>
<td>WIFI takes too long to connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless coverage</td>
<td>Wants more/better WIFI coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless reliability</td>
<td>General comment about WIFI reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart 9: helpful technology services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class/Lab</td>
<td>Praise for classroom or lab technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Office</td>
<td>Praise for classroom or office technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td>Praise for Office 365 email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email/calendar</td>
<td>Praise for Office 365 email and calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS individual</td>
<td>Praise for an ITS staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Praise for services offered by the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net-Speed</td>
<td>Praise for the campus Internet speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No technology service especially helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Unique comments not fitting a category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>Praise for printing services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Center</td>
<td>Praise for the IT Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Praise for technology training provided by ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web services</td>
<td>Includes the university web site, MyFurman, Moodle, and other web services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>Praise for campus WIFI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Charts 10 & 11: most needed improvement or other comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class/Office</td>
<td>Complaint about classroom or office technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Request for better/more ITS communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td>request improving campus email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email/calendar</td>
<td>request improving email and calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfaction noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS-staff</td>
<td>Request for better/more ITS staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>Request for more/better mobile device support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Room</td>
<td>Complaint about residence hall WIFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/No</td>
<td>Not applicable, or no suggested improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC/Antivirus</td>
<td>Complaint about Network Access Control (NAC) or required antivirus software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgSync</td>
<td>Complaint about OrgSync</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Comments not fitting a category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>Complaint about campus printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Request for more/better category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web services</td>
<td>includes the university web site, MyFurman, Moodle and other web services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>General comment about campus WIFI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>