UNIVERSITY SERVICES IT CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS

Summarized FY2011 customer satisfaction survey results for University Services Infrastructure Services (USIS) and University Services PMO.
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USIT CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FY11 was the third year that University Services Information Technology conducted its Customer Satisfaction Survey. We are pleased to present the FY11 findings to you, USIT’s customers, together with some discussion and comparisons with last year’s results.

University Services Infrastructure Support (USIS) Desktop Support received outstanding feedback on its customer support, workstation-management, and communications services. Overall satisfaction with Desktop Support’s services rose to 96%, with no individual service receiving dissatisfaction ratings over 7%. Several services received the highest possible rating from as many as 65% of respondents. Given these uniformly positive results, the key challenge for Desktop Support in the coming year will be to sustain these high satisfaction levels, even as the group increases the number of desktops supported.

This year, for the first time, the Desktop Support survey also requested feedback on the new Google services, for which USIS provides 1st-line helpdesk support; here, the survey showed satisfaction levels around 81% and dissatisfaction levels around 15%. In the coming year, the Desktop Support group will also focus on finding ways to raise levels of satisfaction with Google through increased communication and training.

USIS Data Center & Server Operations group also received highly favorable ratings in this year’s survey, with negligible dissatisfaction marks for any of its services. The key finding for the Operations group was the number of survey respondents—approximately 50%—who said they “cannot evaluate” the service. To some extent, this is expected, since Operations services are typically “behind-the-scenes” and “out-of-sight”. Nevertheless, there may be opportunities to better communicate and educate end-users on the many vital services performed by Data Center and Server Operations, and the team will examine those opportunities in the coming year.

In the University Services IT Program Management Office (PMO), the survey again examined not only satisfaction levels, but also degrees of relevance and utilization by business-line departments. As a result of a strategic decision in 2009 to contract PMO resources and services, business lines’ participation in PMO-sponsored enterprise projects remained moderate, decreasing from 41% in FY10 to 29% in FY11.

At the same time, use of PMO-generated templates/tools/training continued at 65% - 70% of all responders. In addition, 69% rated project-management consulting as important, and 61% rated hands-on project-management similarly. These findings suggest that the demand for professional-level project-management skills and services remains strong across U Services. The PMO’s current plans to add a full-time project-manager to its staff, and to leverage “Shared Resources” to access business and systems analysts across U Services, should start to help in addressing some of these needs.

As University Services Information Technology progresses with plans for FY12 and beyond, we will incorporate this valuable customer feedback and these findings on satisfaction levels. USIT remains committed to sustaining high levels of satisfaction in areas of top performance, and raising levels in other areas. Please feel free to send any comments on these survey findings, or any additional feedback or comments about USIT’s performance, directly to me or to any of the other members of the USIT management team.
OVERALL, HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH USIT'S ABILITY TO PARTNER WITH YOU IN IDENTIFYING, PLANNING AND PRIORITIZING YOUR IT NEEDS?

2011

66% of respondents were either very satisfied or satisfied with USIT’s ability to partner with them in identifying, planning and prioritizing their needs. This is an 8% favorable increase from FY10 which was 58%. 6% of respondents were either very dissatisfied or dissatisfied. This is a 3% unfavorable increase from FY10 which was 3%.
PMO CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY OVERVIEW

This survey provides action items for FY2011 work planning and includes feedback on both internal U Services cross-departmental projects as well as U of M enterprise projects:

- 122 surveys were distributed and 33 people completed the survey (27% response rate).
- Survey respondents were evenly distributed between management (45%) and staff (55%).
- More Survey respondents were from business (60%) then IT (40%).

**Department Split**

- 33.3% Capital Planning & Project Management
- 21.2% University Health & Safety
- 18.2% Facilities Management
- 15.2% Auxiliary Services
- 9.1% Department of Public Safety (DPS)
- 3.0% U Services VP Office (includes HR, USIT, Finance, Purchasing)
- 0.0% Other

**Position**

- Staff 55%
- Mgmt, 45%

**Role**

- IT, 40%
- Business, 60%
Survey Goal: To gauge and assess how often our customers utilize our PMO offered services and what skills and services are valued.

TO WHAT DEGREE HAVE YOU USED PMO OFFERED SERVICES?

2011

6% have sponsored a project either often or frequently. This is a 5% decrease from FY10 which was 11%.

66% of respondents have either never sponsored a project that is managed by the PMO or only been involved occasionally. This is a 23% increase from FY10 which was 89%.

2011

29% have participated in a PMO led project all the time or frequently. This is a 12% decrease from 2010 which was 41%.

71% responded that they never or only occasionally participated in a PMO led project. This is a 12% decrease from 2010 which was 59%
2011

23% responded that they used PMO tools and templates frequently or all the time. This is an unfavorable 3% decrease from FY10 which was 26%.

83% responded that they do not use or only use occasionally PMO provided tools and templates. This is an unfavorable 6% increase from FY10 which was 77%.

2011

17% responded that they received consulting and advice on project management either frequently or all of the time. This is a 14% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 31%.

83% responded that they received consulting advice occasionally or never. This is a 14% unfavorable decrease over FY10 which was 69%.
2011

16% responded that they attended PMO sponsored training and professional development events and workshops frequently or all of the time. This is a 8% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 24%.

84% responded that they attended PMO sponsored training occasionally or never. This is an unfavorable 8% decrease from FY010 which was 76%.
61% responded that enterprise project management was very important or important. This is a 6% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 67%.

16% responded that project management was unimportant. This is a 6% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 10%.

69% responded that project management consulting was very important or important. This is a 15% favorable increase from FY10 which was 54%.

9% responded that project management consulting was unimportant. This is a 17% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 26%.

68% responded that self service tools and templates available on the PMO website were very important or important. This is a 2% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 70%.

13% responded that self service tools available on the PMO website were unimportant. This is a 3% unfavorable increase from FY10 which was 10%.
2011

61% responded that project management training and professional development events and workshops were very important or important. This is a 2% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 63%.

16% responded that project management training and professional development workshops were unimportant. This is a 6% unfavorable increase from FY10 which was 10%.

OVERALL, HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE SELF-SERVICE TOOLS AND TEMPLATES THAT THE PMO PROVIDES FOR APPLYING PROJECT MANAGEMENT BEST PRACTICES?

2011

46% were either very satisfied or satisfied with the self-service tools and templates that are available on the PMO website. This is a 36% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 80%.

16% were dissatisfied with the self-services tools and templates. This is a 16% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 0%.
HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE PMO’S SKILLS AND CAPACITY TO COMPLETE ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

2011

63% responded that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the PMO’s project management skills and capacity to complete enterprise projects. This is a slight 4% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 67%.

15% were dissatisfied with the PMO project management skills. This is a 5% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 20%.

2011

56% responded that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the PMO’s business analysis skills and capacity to complete enterprise projects. This is a slight 1% decrease from FY10 which was 57%.

19% were dissatisfied with the PMO’s business analysis skills. This is a slight 1% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 20%.

2011

37% responded that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the PMO’s quality assurance skills and capacity to complete enterprise projects. This is a 33% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 70%.

19% were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This is a 9% unfavorable increase from FY10 which was 10%.
2011

78% responded that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with PMO training/documentation skills and capacity to complete enterprise projects. This is a 8% favorable increase from FY10 which was 70%.

3% were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This did not change from FY10.

2011

44% responded that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the PMO’s transition to customer support for projects. This is a 6% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 50%.

12% were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This is a 2% unfavorable increase from FY10 which was 10%.
### FY11 Interpretation of Findings: PMO Service Catalog and Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Findings</th>
<th>Area Impacted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U Services Strategic goal: Enterprise culture</strong></td>
<td>All areas (PM, BA, QA and training/technical writing)</td>
<td>All project teams – departmental and enterprise and Managed Work, Fast-track and Enterprise – should be using PMO templates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Finding 1:** Central repository of project management tools, templates, examples/samples is under-utilized.

**Finding 2:** PMO primary role to deliver enterprise projects and professional development (versus departmental project delivery) appears unclear

**Finding 3:** The impact of no PMO PM (Previous PM was on stimulus and was assigned to 2 projects full-time) and no PMO BA has not been fully understood by departments expecting these services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY11 Steps to Address Finding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, PMO</td>
<td>Project Delivery</td>
<td>Continue to focus on the Small Project concept, making sure the values of project management are translated to short, small departmental projects as well as large enterprise projects. Leverage EPM 2010.</td>
<td>William Kanfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Continue to share examples/samples of completed documents within the US PMO website. Given PMO staffing levels, carefully set and manage PMO involvement expectations.</td>
<td>Diane Kleinman, Aaron Demenge, Dan Sward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Project Delivery</td>
<td>Continue to refine, react and identify industry updates within the individual PMO practices of Project Management, Business Analysis, Application Development, Quality Assurance and Professional Development.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Assumption:** Not using existing central services creates redundancies for units that create their own services that increases costs, decreases professional development and limits cross-organizational learning.
Responsiveness

How satisfied are you with the responsiveness of the PMO to your requests for project management consulting?

Survey Goal: To gauge and assess responsiveness of the PMO customer requests.

FY2011

63% responded that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the responsiveness of the PMO for project consulting. This is a 11% favorable increase from FY10 which was 52%.

3% were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This is a 3% unfavorable increase from FY10 which was 0%.

FY11 Interpretation of Findings: Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Finding</th>
<th>Area Impacted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Services Strategic Goal: Excellent Service</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>PMO was still able to respond to project delivery requests, in part by expanded roles and responsibilities within the PMO and shared services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding 1: Increased satisfaction of PMO responsiveness

FY11 Steps to Address Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director, PMO</td>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Review current Service Level Agreements to ensure that the obligations documented match the reduced staffing of the PMO.</td>
<td>William Kanfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, PMO</td>
<td>Work Assignments</td>
<td>Revised the process of incoming project management and project delivery requests for a more streamlined response using the EPM 2010 portfolio and proposal profiles.</td>
<td>William Kanfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Project Delivery</td>
<td>Log and communicate all consulting requests to sequence and assign. Become proficient in creating actionable Statement of Work documents.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMPETENCY

PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMPETENCY IS THE ABILITY TO PLAN, ORGANIZE AND MANAGE RESOURCES IN ORDER TO SUCCESSFULLY SOLVE PROBLEMS BY COMPLETING A PROJECT WITHIN SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET. PLEASE SELECT A COMPETENCY RANKING FOR THE FOLLOWING:

2011

57% responded that they were either very proficient or proficient in project management competency. This is a 16% favorable increase from FY10 which was 41%.

23% felt that they were only somewhat proficient.

2011

57% responded that their department was either very proficient or proficient in project management competency. This is a 11% favorable increase from FY10 which was 46%.

43% felt that their department was somewhat proficient or not at all proficient in project management competency. This is a 7% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 50%.
2011

51% responded that the PMO was either very proficient or proficient in building project management competency. This is an unfavorable 2% decrease from FY10 which was 53%.

23% felt that the PMO was somewhat proficient or not at all proficient in building project management competency. This is a 7% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 30%.

FY11 Interpretation of Findings: Project Management Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Findings</th>
<th>Area Impacted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U Services Strategic Goal:</strong> Excellent Service</td>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>Self-assessment of individual project management skills increased during the period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption: Departments must be proficient in project management methodology of all disciplines (project management, business analysis, quality assurance and training) to increase the total delivery capacity of University Services.</td>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>Self-assessment of departmental project management skills increased during the period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps to Address Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Continue to reinforce within UServices leadership the importance of methodological project management approach to doing more with less.</td>
<td>Steve Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, PMO</td>
<td>Project Delivery</td>
<td>Continue EPM 2010 training as well as project management refresher workshops.</td>
<td>William Kanfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Communicate importance of documenting benefits realized for all projects delivered.</td>
<td>Diane Kleinman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USIS SURVEY RESULTS

USIS CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY OVERVIEW

This survey sets a baseline for the future and provides action items for FY2012 work planning. It also validates recent changes and gains in successful technology solutions and resource skills/capabilities.

- 264 surveys were distributed and 89 people completed the survey (34% response rate).
- Survey respondents were distributed between management (43%) and staff (57%).
- Significant majority of respondents (94%) were from business users in the departments we support (FM, CPPM, DPS, UHS, U Services VP Office). 6% of responses were from IT users in these departments.
What business unit do you work for?

- Facilities Management (FM) 40%
- University Health and Safety (UHS) 18%
- Capital Planning & Project Management (CPPM) 8%
- U Services VP Office (includes HR, USIT, Finance & Purchasing) 27%
- Department of Public Safety (DPS) 2%
- Building Codes Division (BCD) 5%

Management and Staff

- Staff 57%
- Management 43%

Business and IT Split

- Information Technology (IT) 39%
- Business 61%
CUSTOMER SERVICE

Survey goal: To gauge and assess the overall quality of our customer service

Are USIS Staff courteous and professional when responding to your issue or request?

2011

Systems Support

96% found the Systems Support staff to be courteous and professional either always or most of the time. This was a 7% favorable increase from 2010 which was 89%.

4% found the staff to be courteous and professional sometimes or never. This was a 4% favorable decrease from 8% in FY10.

Data Center Operations

45% found the Data Center Operations staff to be courteous and professional either always or most of the time. This is a 16% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 61%.

2% found the staff to be courteous and professional sometimes. This was the same as in FY10.
2011

66% were satisfied or very satisfied with the process for ordering new hardware and software. This is a 1% favorable increase from FY10 which was 65%.

4% were dissatisfied with the process for ordering new hardware or software. This was an 8% favorable decrease from 12% in FY09.

2011

93% responded that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the standard hardware and software configuration. This was a 5% favorable increase from FY10 which was 88%.

1% were dissatisfied with was a 2% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 3%.
Overall, how satisfied are you with the support offered by University Services Infrastructure Support (USIS) during the past year?

2011

Systems Support

96% responded that they were very satisfied or satisfied with the support offered by USIS Systems Support. This is a 3% favorable increase from FY10 which was 93%.

4% were dissatisfied with the support offered by USIS. This is the same as in FY10.

Data Center Operations

54% responded that they were very satisfied or satisfied with USIS Data Center Operations support. This is an 18% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 72%.

1% were dissatisfied with the support provided by Data Center Operations. This is a 1% unfavorable increase from FY10 which was 0%.
Interpretation of Findings: Customer Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Findings</th>
<th>Area Impacted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Services strategic goal: Valued Partnerships Assumption: Dissatisfied users could result in less use of central services, increasing organizational costs through redundant servicing or risk by doing configuration.</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Increased satisfaction with USIS customer service and hardware/software standards Successful FY10 actions included increasing staff awareness of excellent customer service along with improving and providing some flexibility with hardware and software standards and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent understanding of Data Center provided services</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Some customers were unaware of who the Data Center team is and what specific services were provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps to Address Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Training/Customer Service</td>
<td>Continue refreshing Customer Service skills with articles, discussions and OHR assistance.</td>
<td>Peggy Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Training/Technical</td>
<td>Continue expanding technical knowledge to offer improved technical solutions to customers.</td>
<td>Peggy Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Consider cost/benefit to better “marketing” of Data Center team and services (especially Business Application Consulting), to raise visibility.</td>
<td>Gabe Garlets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNICATION

Survey Goal: To gauge and assess how effective communications is between USIS and our customers.

2011

93% responded that they were always or most of the time kept informed about the status of requests or issues that couldn’t be resolved immediately. This is an 10% favorable increase from FY10 which was 83%.

5% responded that they sometimes were not kept informed about the status of requests that could not be resolved immediately. This is a 9% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 14%.
2011

100% responded that they were kept informed about planned system downtime most of the time or always. This is a 5% favorable increase from FY10 which was 95%.

87% responded that they were kept informed about unplanned system downtime. This is a 3% favorable increase from FY10 which was 84%.
Interpretation of Findings: Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Findings</th>
<th>Area Impacted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U Services strategic goal: Excellent Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assumption:</strong> Knowledge of outages – planned and unplanned – allows effective decision-making around how University Services maintains business operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased satisfaction with customer communication</td>
<td>Excellent Service</td>
<td>Enhancing communication to customers and setting expectations for service on incidents. Expanding communication to customers regarding planned and unplanned outages, including working with department IT Directors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps to Address Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Service Center enhancements</td>
<td>Continue to improve Incident/Problem management ticketing updates for customer and USIS knowledge documentation.</td>
<td>Peggy Talbot/USIS Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Discuss alternative customer communication tools or process in the event E-mail and/or network is down.</td>
<td>Gabe/Peggy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSIVENESS

Survey Goal: To gauge and assess how our customers feel about the response time of the USIS help desk.

How satisfied are you with the response time from USIS after contacting them?

2011

93% of respondents were either very satisfied or satisfied with the USIS help desk response time. This is a 8% favorable increase from FY10 which was 85%.

7% were very dissatisfied or dissatisfied. This is a 5% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 12%.

49% of respondents were either very satisfied or satisfied with Data Center Operations response time. This is a 9% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 58%.

2% were very dissatisfied or dissatisfied. This is a 2% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 8%.
When you make a request or report an issue to USIS, is it generally resolved in a satisfactory manner?

2011

94% responded that issues that were reported to USIS Help Desk were resolved in a satisfactory manner all of the time or most of the time. This is a 3% favorable increase from FY10 which was 91%.

6% responded that issues were resolved in a satisfactory manner never or sometimes. This is the same as in FY10.

2011

46% responded that issues that were reported to Data Center Operations were resolved in a satisfactory manner all of the time or most of the time. This is a 16% unfavorable decrease from FY10 which was 62%.

2% responded that issues were resolved in a satisfactory manner sometimes. This is a 1% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 3%.
2011

90% responded that simple requests were handled in a timely and accurate manner always or most of the time. This is a 1% improvement from FY10 which was 89%.

5% responded that simple requests were handled in a timely manner only sometimes. This is a 4% favorable decrease from FY09 which was 9%.

2011

95% responded that more complicated requests were handled in a timely manner always or most of the time. This is an 13% favorable increase from FY10 which was 82%

5% responded that more complicated requests were handled in a timely manner sometimes. This is a 6% favorable decrease from FY10 which was 11%.
Interpretation of Findings: Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Findings</th>
<th>Area Impacted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Services strategic goal: Excellent Service</td>
<td>Excellent Service</td>
<td>Technical enhancements and staff training have improved response time to issues and requests resulting in increased customer satisfaction. Sharing monthly metric results have also educated the customer in regards to service levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customer survey results have increased in the area of Responsiveness, especially the survey results that have moved from Most of the Time to Always ratings.

Steps to Address Finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>SLA’s / Reporting</td>
<td>Continue to improve communication and expectation of service deliverables by creating a dashboard with updated strategic and operation metrics.</td>
<td>Peggy Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>SLA’s / Availability</td>
<td>Continue to monitor system availability and proactively look for opportunities for improvement.</td>
<td>Gabe Garlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>SLA’s / Performance</td>
<td>Consider cost / benefit of incorporating application efficiency improvements, such as x.500 authentication, for more applications.</td>
<td>Gabe Garlets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Goal: To gauge and assess how our customers feel about the availability of the systems that they work with.
**USIT CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT – FY11**

**What is your level of satisfaction with Gmail & Calendar?**

![Bar Chart]

*This question was added in FY11*

**Interpretation of Findings: System Availability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Findings</th>
<th>Area Impacted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U Services Strategic Goal: Excellent Service</strong></td>
<td>Excellent Service</td>
<td>While E-mail and calendar system availability has improved after moving to Google, USIS will need to educate customers on functionality to increase satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption: Appropriate system availability is critical for the University and University Services to complete its mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year results after move to Google for Gmail and Calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Steps to Address Finding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Process Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Enhance communications related to systems and application availability.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy Talbot/Gabe Garlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Enhance USIS website with Google tips/tricks/knowledge base articles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>USIS Systems Support staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>