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Prelude

The OCIO annual voice of the community poll was conducted during the first quarter of calendar 2011. The initial e-mail notification was released on 2/18/11 and the poll closed on 3/11/2011. The survey was administered by the statistical team in the Office of the CIO. Subjects were randomly selected from databases provided by the Office of Human Resources and Office of the Registrar.

The poll was comprised of 14 questions on a 5 point scale ranging from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. Neutral was considered valid. Not applicable and no response to a question were not considered valid.

The random sampling included 2000 Faculty, 2000 Staff, 2500 Graduate Student, and 2500 Undergraduate students. An error rate ranging from 4.3 to 5.6 was calculated based upon the percentage of returned surveys per group.

Two questions were asked to gauge overall satisfaction. The first was “how satisfied are you with the overall service experience with services provided by the Offices of the CIO?” The positive satisfaction from respondents in 2011 increased to 68% from 65% in 2010. The 2nd question asked “When I think about information technology on campus I perceive the Office of the CIO as information technology leaders.” 48% of the respondents to this question either agreed or strongly agreed representing an increase from 45% in 2010.

To gain the most value when reading this report, one should pay attention to the trends in negative responses, positive responses, neutrals, and even the percentage of n/a responses. Positive ratings ranged from 55% to 76%. Dissatisfied ratings ranged from a low of
3% to a high of 20%. Neutrals ranged from 16% to 40% and n/a were as low as 5.7% and went as high as 69.8%.

Overall, the combined percentage of dissatisfaction for services improved or remained equal for ten of the questions and declined on four questions. Security represented the largest change in negative satisfaction, over 2010, with an increase of 13%. SIS with a 10% improvement and E-mail showing a 6% improvement over 2010, represented areas of noticeable change to the better.

The combined percentage of satisfied responses increased in all areas with the exception of Security. Services with the greatest improvement included Buckeye Link, E-mail, and SIS with all showing a 9 point increase over 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Improvement over 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Link</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mails</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Bar</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Union</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Computing</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Wireless</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUNet (wired)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8help</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neutrals declined or remained the same in all areas. Changes over 2010 show as much as 7% variance. The data suggests that respondents were more opinionated toward satisfied in 2011 than in 2010 and were more likely to select neutral over dissatisfied for all questions with the exception of e-mail.
### Highest positive satisfaction ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8help</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUNet</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lowest positive satisfaction ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital union</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media services</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest % of N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Bar</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest % of dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSUWireless</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How did Security compare?

- Three services rated lower on the positive satisfaction scale (SIS, DU, and Media)
- Five services had a greater percent of neutral responses (Media, student computing, DU, SIS, and BuckeyeBar)
- No services had a higher negative satisfaction rating
- All services, including the overall experience and OCIO leadership questions had higher N/A
Introduction

In February and March, 2011, the Statistical Team in the Office of the CIO conducted the web-based CIO Technology Poll, which contained a series of 14 questions plus an option for general comments (see Appendix C). This survey was commissioned by the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) at The Ohio State University. This annual omnibus satisfaction survey provides data that is used by departments within the OCIO for assessing programs and services.

Summary of Results

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with twelve different services and overall satisfaction on a 5-point scale (1-5) from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. In 2011, among all the university community respondents, percentages of satisfied users ranged from a low of 55% to a high of 76% for these services and support. Course Management System (Carmen) (76%, up from 71% in 2010), IT Support Service (8-HELP) (73%, up from 72%), and Campus Wired Network (OSUNet) (71%, up from 69% last year) are identified as the top three services and support areas within the OCIO with greater degree of satisfaction. Student Information System (55%, up from 46% in 2010), The Digital Union (55%, up from 49% last year) and Media Services (streaming, videotaping, equipment loan) (55%, up from 52%) are found to be the areas with low satisfaction ratings. Over two-third (68%, up from 65% last year) of the university community are satisfied with the overall IT services provided by the Office of the CIO. Satisfaction ratings of all but one service are trending positive this year compared with the results in 2010. Only 56% (significantly down from 68% in 2010) users are satisfied with the security of their electronic data. Results are reported in details in Appendix A and Appendix B.
**Faculty**

Percentages of satisfied among faculty ranged from a low of 42% to a high of 77% for the services and support provided by the Office of the CIO. Based on faculty ratings, IT Support Service (8-HELP) (77%, up from 72% last year), Campus Wired Network (OSUNet) (74%, up from 70% in 2011), and Course Management System (Carmen) (70%, up from 64%) are found to be the top three services and support areas within the organization. Like last year, Student Information System (42%, up from 36% in 2010) and Student Computing Centers (49%, up from 40%) are the bottom two areas with low satisfaction ratings. About two-third (64%, up from 57% last year) of our faculty are satisfied with the overall IT services provided by the Office of the CIO. Same as combined groups, among faculty, the ratings of all but one service are trending positive compared with the results in 2010. Only 55% (significantly down from 66% in 2010) faculty are satisfied with the security of their electronic data.

**Staff**

Among staff, percentages of satisfied respondents ranged from a low of 46% to a high of 75% for the services and support provided by the Office of the CIO. Campus Wired Network (OSUNet) (75%, up from 73% in 2011), IT Support Service (8-HELP) (72%, down from 73% last year) and E-mail Service (70%, up from 64%) are the top three services and support areas based on staff ratings. Student Computing Centers is in the bottom of all services with the lowest rating (46%, down from 48%) from staff. About
two-third (68%, no change from last year) of staff are satisfied with the overall IT services provided by the Office of the CIO. Based on staff responses, only three services are trending negative this year compared with the results in 2010. Like faculty, only 55% (significantly down from 69% in 2010) staff are satisfied with the security of their electronic data.

Graduate Students

Percentages of satisfied graduate students ranged from a low of 56% to a high of 80% for the services and support provided by the Office of the CIO. Carmen (80%, up from 74% in 2011), Buckeye Link (72%, significantly up from 61% last year) and IT Support Service (8-HELP) (71%, down from 75% last year) are topping the list of services and support areas. Like faculty and staff, over two-third (69%, up from 65% in 2010) of graduate students are satisfied with the overall IT services provided by the Office of the CIO. Based on the responses received from graduate students, only these four services are trending negative: OSU Wireless Network (63%, down from 72% last year), Security of Electronic Data (56%, down from 65% last year), 8-help (71%, down from 75% in 2010) and Buckeye Bar (67%, down from 70%).
Undergraduate Students

Percentages of satisfied undergraduate students ranged from a low of 46% to a high of 87% for the services and support provided by the Office of the CIO. Carmen (87%, up from 84% in 2010), Buckeye Link (75%, up from 73% last year) and E-mail Service (74%, up from 63% last year) are identified as the top three services within the organization. On the other hand, the Digital Union received the lowest rating (46%, up from 43% last year). About three-quarter (73%, up from 69% in 2010) of undergraduate students are satisfied with the overall IT services provided by the Office of the CIO. Same as faculty, the ratings of all but one service are trending positive this year compared with the results in 2010. Only 58% (significantly down from 73% in last year) undergraduate students are satisfied with the security of their electronic data.
In addition to these twelve services, respondents were also asked to rate the leadership provided by the Office of the Chief Information Officer on a 5-point scale (1-5) from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Less than half (48%, up from 44.5% last year) of all university community on Columbus campus either agreed or strongly agreed that they perceive the Office of the CIO as the IT leader on campus. The perception is trending positive for faculty (42%, up from 36% in 2010), staff (51%, up from 47%) and graduate students (45%, up from 41% last year).
Also provided in the poll, was room for our customers to provide comments and constructive feedback. The comments have been collated and aligned by service category (see Appendix D). The results reported above indicates that there are plenty of rooms for improvement in the services and support provided by the organization and the Office of the CIO has an opportunity to conduct deeper analysis of these findings, prioritize an action plan, and focus its efforts on the areas of greatest need.

Methodology of Conducting the Survey

This survey of OSU faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students on the Columbus campus is based on web questionnaires completed during Winter Quarter 2011. Completed questionnaires were collected from 411 faculty, 487 staff, 375 graduate students, and 312 undergraduate students. Faculty and staff were randomly selected from a Human Resources database, but excluded clinical house faculty and staff, for a total sample of 2,000 faculty and 2,000 staff. In addition, 2,500 graduate students and 2,500 undergraduate students from the Columbus campus were randomly selected from a database provided by the Office of the Registrar.

A notification e-mail was sent to all sampled individuals. This e-mail briefly informed the recipients of the survey, advised them that a subsequent e-mail would direct them to the survey web site, and specified the e-mail address and subject line of the message. Invitations were sent to each individual at his/her published OSU e-mail address explaining the survey and including a uniquely coded URL link to the web survey. This code made it possible to track responses and reduced the chance of un-sampled individuals completing a questionnaire. To increase the response rate across all groups (faculty, staff, graduate students, undergraduate students), a reminder e-mail was sent to all individuals who had not yet completed the questionnaire by the deadline. A summary of the questionnaire timeline is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date e-mail notification sent</th>
<th>2/18/2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date survey launched</td>
<td>2/22/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date reminder sent</td>
<td>3/01/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date survey closed</td>
<td>3/11/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Response Rate and Margin of Error**

The response rates and margins of sampling error are presented in the table below. The margins of error in the table show the +/- margins of difference between percentages estimated from the sample and those that would be obtained by interviewing all individuals in the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Margin of Sampling Error at 95% Confidence Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>411/1995 = 20.6%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>487/1992 = 24.5%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>375/2490 = 15.1%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>312/2484 = 12.6%</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The respondents who opted-out from taking the survey were removed from the denominator.*

In addition to sampling error, the survey is subject to other potential sources of imprecision and bias. These sources may include question wording, question ordering, and low response rate. The low response rate can be attributed to biasing factors such as timing of the survey, failure to recognize OCIO and over-surveying by previous requests. Non-participation in surveys is a growing concern. The goal of the notification e-mail sent to all sampled individuals was to increase participation by making the recipients aware that they would receive the e-mail survey invitation.

A major obstacle to increasing participation rates for web surveys may be associated with the mode itself. Many individuals have more than one e-mail address and may prefer an e-mail address that is not in the Human Resources database. Less preferred e-mail addresses may not be forwarded to preferred addresses and may be checked only occasionally or not at all. Software filters may identify e-mail survey invitations as spam, and individuals may be reluctant to open e-mails from sources unknown to them. Also, many faculty and staff e-mail addresses are over quota on their allotted storage space on the OSU mail server.

**Data Analysis**

After retrieving the data and performing basic exploratory analyses, bar charts (see Appendix A) and crosstabs (see Appendix B) were generated for each of the questions by
respondent groups. A significant number of respondents preferred Neutral and Not Applicable as their response when answering the survey questions.

A “Neutral” response can reflect any of these scenarios:
1. respondents feel ambivalent about the issue and do not feel strongly about either direction,
2. respondents do not want to express strong opinion if it is not considered socially desirable,
3. or they do not remember a particular experience related to the issue that is being rated.

In this study, Neutral responses were considered as valid opinion and used in the computation of percentages on the crosstabs and bar charts.

A “Not Applicable” or missing response can reflect either of the following two scenarios:
1. respondents do not have an opinion about the issue due to lack of knowledge or experience,
2. or they never developed an opinion about the issue because they find it irrelevant.

“Not Applicable” and missing responses were, therefore, not considered in the computation of percentages on the crosstabs and bar charts. Within the crosstabs, actual counts and percentages of the population answering “Not Applicable” or not answering the question were noted.

Survey Rationale

The CIO Technology Poll data are used for operational metrics to help achieve OCIO strategic goals. The data are also used for assessing customer satisfaction in order to improve services and support provided by the Office of the CIO.
Appendix A: Detailed Results

Services Related to Academics

Buckeye Link

More than two-third (69%, up from 60% in 2010) of the university community reported that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the Buckeye Link services. Less than a quarter (21%, down from 28%) were neutral and only 10% (12% in 2010) were dissatisfied. Looking at group level, we found undergraduate students expressed greater satisfaction (75%, slightly up from 73%) followed by 72% (significantly up from 61% last year) of the graduate students, 68% (significantly up from 56% last year) of the staff, and only 59% (but significantly up from 47% in 2010) of the faculty. This year, the percentages of neutral respondents were 29% for faculty (significantly down from 39% last year), 17% for grads (down from 25%); 14% for undergrads (down from 17%) and 28% for staff (down from 35% in 2010). Like last year, percentages of dissatisfied respondents remain low for all four groups.
More than one-half (55%, up from 46% last year) of the university community showed satisfaction with Student Information System. However, only 16% (significantly down from 26%) reported dissatisfaction with this service and about 29% (no change from 2010) remained neutral. Among the four groups, students showed greater satisfaction (61% grad, significantly up from 47% last year; 61% undergrad, up from 56%) followed by 54% of staff (up from 41%) and only 42% of faculty (up from 35%). Percentages of dissatisfied respondents were substantially down across all four groups and no substantial changes were observed in the percentages of neutral respondents for these groups compared to the results in 2010.
When asked to express their satisfaction with Course Management System (Carmen), three in four (76%) agreed that they are satisfied. Only 8% of the respondents were dissatisfied with this service. Eighty-seven percent of the undergraduates (up from 84% in 2010), 80% of graduates (up from 74%), over two-third of faculty (70%, up from 64% last year), and only 65% of the staff (up from 58%) reported satisfaction with this service. The percentages of neutral and dissatisfied respondents were slightly down for all four groups compared to the percentages reported in 2010.
Digital Union

Only 55% (up from 49% in 2010) of the campus community were satisfied with the Digital Union service. A huge 40% (down from 45%) of the respondents were neutral and only 5% (no change from last year) were dissatisfied. Staff members indicated greater satisfaction (62%, slightly up from 60%) for this service than the other three groups but notable changes in the percentages were observed for faculty (58%, up from 49% last year) and grads (56%, significantly up from 41%). This year, the percentages of neutral respondents were 34% for faculty (substantially down from 43% last year), 40% for grads (significantly down from 52%); 50% for undergrads (down from 54%) and 28% for staff (down from 35% in 2010). Like last year, percentages of dissatisfied respondents remain low for all four groups.
Student Computing Centers

Among all groups surveyed, about six in ten (58%, up from 54% last year) reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the Student Computing Centers. One-third (33%, down from 36% in 2010) were neutral and one in ten (9%, slightly down from 10%) was dissatisfied in expressing their opinions. Among the four groups, students showed greater satisfaction (60% grad, up from 58% last year; 64% undergrad, up from 58%) followed by 49% of faculty (up from 40%) and only 46% of staff (slightly down from 48%). Changes (down from last year) were observed in the percentages of neutral respondents for faculty (40%, down from 46%) and students (29% of grads, down from 33%; 28% of undergrads, down from 31%). Percentages of dissatisfied respondents were down for faculty, staff and undergrads, but slightly up for graduate students.
Media Services

In the staff and faculty community, only 55% (slightly up from 52% in 2010) of them agreed that they are satisfied with the Media Services (streaming, videotaping, equipment loan) compared to one-third (down from 37%) were neutral and only 12% (up from 11%) were dissatisfied in voicing their opinions. Faculty members indicated greater satisfaction (57%, up from 52%) for this service than the staff members (52%, up from 51%). This year, the percentages of neutral respondents were slightly down for both faculty (30%, down from 33% last year) and staff (37%, down from 42% in 2010). Like last year, percentages of dissatisfied respondents remain low for both groups (13% of faculty, down from 15%; 10% of staff, up from 7% last year).
Resources Related to Network and Infrastructure

OSU Wireless

With the OSU Wireless Network services, 65% (up from 63% in 2010) of the respondents reported that they are either satisfied or very satisfied; one in five (18%, down from 21%) were neutral and 17% (up from 16%) were dissatisfied. At group level, percentages of satisfied respondents were trending positive for faculty (64%, up from 57%), staff (68%, up from 62%) and undergrads (65%, up from 61% last year) but tending negative for graduate students (63%, substantially down from 72%). Percentages of neutral and dissatisfied respondents were trending down for faculty, staff and undergrads, but trending up for graduate students.
OSUNet

More than a seven in ten (71%, up from 69% in 2010) of the campus community showed satisfaction with OSU Wired Network. A quarter (24%, down from 25%) remained neutral and only 5% (down from 6% last year) reported dissatisfaction. Among the four groups, like last year, the staff members reported greater satisfaction (75%, up from 73%) followed by 73% (up from 70%) of the faculty, 70% (up from 68%) of the graduate students, and 62% (up from 61%) of the undergraduate students. The percentages of neutral were slightly down for all four groups compared to the percentages reported in 2010; and the percentages of dissatisfied respondents were slightly down for faculty, staff and undergrads, but only one percent up for graduate students.
E-mail Service

In the university community, about two-third (66%, up from 57% in 2010) of them agreed that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with e-mail services provided by the Office of the CIO. Eighteen percent (down from 24% last year) was dissatisfied and 17% (down from 19%) remained neutral. This year, undergrads was the most satisfied group (74%, significantly up from 63%) followed by 70% (up from 64%) of the staff, 61% (significantly up from 48%) of the graduate students, and only 58% (up from 53% last year) of the faculty. The percentages of neutral and dissatisfied respondents were down for all four groups compared to the percentages reported in 2010.
Security of Electronic Data

Among all groups surveyed, only 56% (significantly down from 68% last year) reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the security of their electronic data and communication. Twenty percent (significantly up from 7% in 2010) were dissatisfied in expressing their opinions. A similar response pattern was observed across all groups. In the percentages of neutral respondents, notable changes were observed only for the student groups and virtually, there were no changes for other groups.
Services Related to Support and Consultation

8-HELP

Among all respondents, about three-quarter (73%, up from 72% in 2010) were satisfied or very satisfied with the assistance and service they received from IT Service Desk (8-HELP) compared to one-fifth (19%, down from 20%) who were neutral and only 8% (up from 7%) were dissatisfied. Looking at group level, we found that faculty expressed greater satisfaction (77%, up from 75% last year), followed by 72% (up from 70%) of the undergraduate students, 72% (down from 73%) of the staff, and 71% (down from 75% in 2010) of the graduate students. In the percentages of neutral respondents, substantial change was observed only for faculty (14%, down from 20% last year) and virtually, there were no notable changes for other groups. Like last year, percentages of dissatisfied respondents remain low for all four groups (less than 10%).
About two-third (65%, up from 58% in 2010) of the campus community reported that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with services provided by walk-in technical consultation (Buckeye Bar). About one-third (32%, down from 39% last year) were neutral and merely 3% (down from 4%) were dissatisfied in expressing their opinions. This year, undergrads was the most satisfied group (72%, up from 64%) followed by 67% (down from 70%) of the grad students, 63% (significantly up from 51%) of the faculty, and only 51% (up from 44% last year) of the staff. The percentages of neutral respondents were down across all groups. Like last year, percentages of dissatisfied respondents remain very low for all four groups.
Overall experience with OCIO services

When the university community was asked to rate their overall experience with OCIO services, over two-thirds (68%, up from 65% in 2010) of the community reported satisfaction. A quarter (25%, down from 28%) were neutral and only 7% (virtually, no change) were dissatisfied. At group level, undergraduate students reported greater satisfaction (72%, up from 69%) followed by 69% (up from 65%) the grads, 68% (no change from last year) of the staff, and only 64% (substantially up from 57%) of the faculty. In the percentages of neutral respondents, slight changes were observed for faculty (26%, down from 31% last year), grads (25%, down from 30%) and undergrads (24%, down from 26%). Like last year, percentages of dissatisfied respondents remain low for all four groups.
Office of the CIO perceived as IT Leaders

Less than one-half of all the community respondents (48%, up from 45% in 2010) either agreed or strongly agreed that they perceive the Office of the CIO as the IT leader on campus. About four in ten (39%, no change from last year) of the respondents were neutral in expressing their perception. Fifty-five percent (down from 56%) of undergraduate students indicated a higher degree of agreement on this than staff with 51% (up from 47%), graduate students with 45% (up from 41%), and faculty with only 42% (up from 36%). As expected, in the percentages of dissatisfied respondents, slight changes were observed for faculty (18%, down from 22% last year), staff (13%, down from 17%) and undergrads (7%, down from 10%).
Appendix B: Questionnaire

2011 OCIO Poll Questionnaire

How satisfied are you with the following services and supports provided by the Office of the CIO?

1. Services Relating to Academics
   (Note: the first response on the scale at the far left is N/A for "Not Applicable")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Link - Ohio State’s online academic center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Information System (SIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen (course management system)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Digital Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Computing Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Media Services (streaming, videotaping, equipment loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Resources Relating to Network and Infrastructure
   (Note: the first response on the scale at the far left is N/A for "Not Applicable")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Wireless Network (OSU Wireless)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Wired Network (OSUNet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Webmail or Buckeye Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of your electronic data and communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Services Relating to Support and Consultation
   (Note: the first response on the scale at the far left is N/A for "Not Applicable")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-Help, IT Support Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye Bar - Walk-in Technical Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Overall Experience with Office of the CIO Services
   (Note: the first response on the scale at the far left is N/A for "Not Applicable")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with the overall service experience with services provided by the Offices of the CIO?</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. When I think about information technology on campus I perceive the Office of the CIO as information technology leaders.

   ( ) N/A - Not Applicable
   ( ) Strongly Disagree
   ( ) Disagree
   ( ) Neutral
   ( ) Agree
   ( ) Strongly Agree

6. Please us the space below to provide any additional feedback about services provided by the Office of the CIO.

____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________
____________________________________________

Thank You!

*This question was not available for students.
**Appendix C: Crosstabs by Respondent Groups**

*Buckeye Link - Ohio State's Online Academic Center*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 439 (27.7%) out of 1585

**Student Information System (SIS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 503 (31.7%) out of 1585

Did not respond: 2 (0.1%) out of 1585
### Carmen (Course Management System)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>353</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% within Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 302 (19.1%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 1 (< 0.1%) out of 1585

### The Digital Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% within Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 1021 (64.4%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 2 (0.1%) out of 1585

Office of the
Chief Information Officer
### Student Computing Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 909 (57.4%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 2 (0.1%) out of 1585

### Media Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 537 (59.8%) out of 898
Did not respond: 2 (0.1%) out of 898
### Campus Wireless Network (OSUWireless)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 305 (19.2%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 11 (0.7%) out of 1585

### Campus Wired Network (OSUNet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 610 (38.5%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 11 (0.7%) out of 1585
### E-mail Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 112 (7.1%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 7 (0.4%) out of 1585

### Security of Electronic Data and Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 81 (5.1%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 10 (0.6%) out of 1585
### 8-Help, IT Support Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 340 (21.5%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 2 (0.1%) out of 1585

### Buckeye Bar - Walk-in Technical Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 1104 (69.7%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 2 (0.1%) out of 1585
**Overall Service Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 141 (8.9%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 11 (0.7%) out of 1585

**OCIO as Technology Leader**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not applicable: 112 (7.1%) out of 1585
Did not respond: 7 (0.4%) out of 1585
Appendix D: Customer Comments

E-mail

- E-mail service needs to improve. Public free services like Gmail or yahoo are much efficient and their spam filter system is much more effective.

- Faculty e-mail capacity is a problem. 30mb makes it difficult to receive e-mail attachments from students.

- The ridiculous limitation on e-mail storage space does not allow me to do my job. I and many colleagues use free commercial e-mail accounts for our Ohio State tasks. Sad commentary on OSU's supposed commitment to being an eminent university.

- I wish the e-mail server were more conversant with Mac user needs -- for example, supporting MacMail.

- Student e-mail was recently expanded; it would be nice if faculty e-mail could be upgraded, too.

- Constantly running into problems with storage space.

- too much spam

- I have little interaction with Office of CIO, but I am extremely unsatisfied that the webmail account is limited to such a small size. This compels me to constantly switch between webmail account and Outlook. Because there is not one integrated e-mail system, sent material is lost and e-mail deleted. This is probably one of the most frustrating components of working here.

- webmail does not have enough storage

- Web Mail needs more "space"... it is important to keep back e-mails in my work and sometimes it fills up

- We should have a state of the art webmail system.

- E-mail storage capacity is inexcusably small. Every faculty member I know must forward all e-mail to Gmail, causing a confusion between two e-mail addresses. Inexcusable, even if this were a small time teaching college.
• There seem to be many glitches with the e-mail system that have been difficult to solve. Can't send e-mail from home without making major changes to settings. Webmail is not a good alternative, as the storage limit is so low-- I need to keep all my e-mail together and be able to search it. SIS is better, but still rather clunky. OSU technology often seems poorly designed for academic needs, e.g. the new course input system or assessment reporting system-- lots of money spent for a product that does not always work well.

• As faculty we really need more storage space for our OSU Webmail. It's crazy that students have buckeye-mail that provides a lot more storage than we have; we were told in my department we'd be getting Arts and Humanities e-mail addresses over a year ago, but as far as I'm aware that still hasn't happened.

• The archiving of e-mail is a huge inconvenience. If we had known, we could have prepared for it. Also, the archive is terrible for MAC users--it makes finding things difficult to impossible

• The E-mail service at OSU is a disgrace to the university.

• Faculty need greater storage capacity in their e-mail accounts

• Better e-mail system with more storage. Right now the e-mail storage is very limited

• e-mail is a joke here at OSU. My account receives 5-10 spams an hour during working times. software licensing programs are tedious and hard to use

• We either need more storage space for e-mail or we need to be able to, unencumbered, forward to third-party services, such as Gmail. The storage allowance is the worst of any institution I've taught at, public or private.

• OSU webmail has a terrible interface and inadequate storage.

• I wish there was a better way to block spam mail from getting into my mailbox.

• Buckeye-mail increased spam volume by 10 times, while simultaneously spam binning OSU communications. According to the EULA provided by Microsoft, it is not secure and is possibly a violation of FERPA when I communicate with my students. The modifications to Buckeyelink and the SIS seem buggy. Overall, I feel the quality has declined in my five years at the University.

• Buckeye-mail lost my e-mails sometimes.
• Very unhappy with the e-mail archive system. I have several ongoing projects including graduate level courses and research that require the frequent review of older e-mails. Previously those e-mails were organized in my inbox and now I have difficulty searching for the desired information through the archive system and it is no longer organized. This has been very frustrating.

• Buckeye-mail using outlook web is not really a good idea. The interface is horrible, and why use a third party software? Accessing wireless on campus should be easier. Why can't we use the same account name and password as everything else? Also, you need to go ONLINE to activate your account... yet, you can't access the web if you don't have a password. This is such a huge contradiction.

• The e-mail system is not user friendly and would prefer instead of Outlook a gmail setup instead. I find them easier to use/navigate/access information than the current one employed by OSU.

• The .buckeye-mail.osu.edu is too long and looks unprofessional.

• Ever since the system was switched to Buckeye-mail, I am getting a lot of spam mail. Even if I choose to mark these messages as spam, they seem to never end. I don't have this problem with my other e-mail address, and it would be great if better filters could be used.

• I am not sure whether you handled webmail through our college, or it is accessed through our server; each time I attempt to access off-campus I have problems.

• Centralized e-mail system. Centralized support for web services (i.e., design, etc.)

• It's been ridiculous to try and get remote access to my outlook. I absolutely thing the OSU webmail is archaic and inconvenient with little options. I have been trying to get the IT people to set up my outlook so I can retrieve remotely but come to find we aren't even on an exchange server. How archaic is that? And the e-mail capacity is worse. Then I am told to start using my gmail account. Shouldn't have to do that... it's my personal account. A place like OSU should absolutely have top notch IT, and I have experienced anything but. It's more than frustrating!

• Can the webmail@osu.edu be made to stay up longer without needing to resign in?

• Before I was importing my e-mail into Eudora, I had a lot of trouble staying under my Webmail quota and still keeping records of my communication.

• I do not like hotmail.
• Webmail has very little storage room and I keep getting bogus e-mails from people asking for my password. I wish there were some way to block them. Many people don't know their fake and will send information. I've had many residents that had that issue.

• When I first saw that buckeye-mail was to be transferred to Outlook, I couldn't believe that you would make such a transition. Outlook is unintuitive, the controls are sloppy and I frankly preferred the older system, which at least didn't throw half my mail into the spam box. I would have been okay with any other client, and am honestly surprised and shocked you didn't chose gmail.

• Also, with today's high-volume information traffic, I think that university-assigned e-mail accounts should be allowed more than 30 MB of storage space. How about 60 or 100?

• Need more storage space in university e-mail system for faculty

• I always get really good service until we have tried to solve an issue of why I cannot send from my home e-mail to any osu.edu e-mail address for the past few months. IT-Help is working with me but we have not determined the source of the issue. Otherwise, you people are great!

• Buckeye-mail is just another layer of e-mail services, which is annoying. I want to have everything in my dot osu.edu account. In addition the separate systems for each college mean that we have additional e-mails and layers. Unify and simplify!!!

• The system is outdated and has been fraught with security risk. Arizona State University's system used Google as their e-mail provider. It was just a better experience. I love OSU, we can do better.

• It is unprofessional to have "buckeye-mail" including in student e-mail addresses - weakens legitimacy of student inquiries and communications with people inside and outside of the university. I would like all faculty, staff, and students to be in the same Outlook address book, as promised

• As for e-mail, I have never been able to log into my e-mail account despite the fact that I can log into Carmen and Buckeye Link. Thank goodness I have all my mail forwarded to my aol account.

• Also, some people have the extension @buckeye-mail, and Outlook kicks this back every time. It doesn't recognize that extension.

• There has to be a better e-mail service than buckeye-mail. I always have problems with it not loading and freezing; a school as big as OSU should be able to find a more reliable system for their students.
• I'd like to see the e-mail and Web mail accommodate larger files and larger file storage - for those of us who routinely need to send many large 3MB - 5MB graphic files. Maybe capacity can be increased based on specific job requirements?

• A campus-wide calendaring system and the use of exchange for e-mail would be extremely helpful.

• My OSU outlook App seems to be missing a lot of features of the regular outlook, however it might be I haven't upgraded my browser or selected the right one.

• It would be great if webmail had higher storage capacity.

• I wish there was more support for e-mail on my mobile device. I use it to check work e-mail when traveling.

• Being at other universities prior I have a different view point. It would be extremely helpful if the Outlook address book was linked by university rather than department. My previous university was comparable in size and possible larger (enrollment) and the capability was available. Also there are a number of passwords needed. It seems there should be an easier way.

• E-mail service dissatisfactory due to inability to use Outlook to see all OSU schedules of all invitees. Not having everyone on one mail server is a decade behind private industry.

• The issue with spam & important faculty/staff e-mails going into student spam is a problem that continues.

• Webmail accounts need more storage space- osu needs to get more/bigger servers.

• hotmail is not a great e-mail client.

• Also, if you could embed the buckeye-mail software into osu.edu or carmen that would take away from opening a whole new window or tab just to check that. But once again, long term upgrades I understand.

• My biggest problem is not being able to "kill" a previous name in the osu system. Because of this, I am unable to block much of the spam I receive. i think that this should be an option when one changes one's name... that the old one should completely disappear.

• E-mail access from off-site - and no access to standard materials on office machine - is very frustrating.
• the frequency with which buckeye-mail is down is unbelievably frustrating—particularly because the university provided access to all student e-mail communications to microsoft to "improve" our experience.

• I would like if the mail i have forwarded from my OSU account would show up to my gmail in a timely manner.

• I've never actively used the Office of the CIO and really don't know much about it. I feel that buckeye link and webmail are both fairly cumbersome and challenging to navigate, and the e-mail crashes far too often.

• too much down time. horrible mail service. e-mails with a dot followed by a number? who does that other than you?

• Finally - buckeye-mail is unreliable. E-mails from OSU professors who I communicate with regularly somehow end up in junk mail on a fairly regular basis.

• I started as a graduate student in 2006 and have seen changes to both Buckeye Link and the webmail systems. Both are less intuitive to use than the original systems (especially class registration, which now requires many additional pages to click through before registering). While I know these changes were probably made for good reasons (and I do appreciate the additional mail space in buckeye-mail), I feel there could have been more information provided about the systems when they were phased in. Problems that I and other student have had with things such as registration were often handled at the local administrative level (e.g. telling us how to register in the new system). I would have preferred to have such instruction from CIO directly rather than second hand after other students had already struggled with the system.

• I can only comment on technology as it relates to our department, and our department is HORRIBLE. We still use Eudora e-mail. The same e-mail system as in 1970!!!! We get IT support if your computer crashes or E-mail goes down. That's the only time you see or hear from IT people.

• Buckeyelink and Buckeye-mail are both inconvenient.

• Buckeye-mail is better than the old osu.edu e-mail, but it is still not as user friendly as my other free e-mails (such as gmail, or even aol).

**Buckeye Link**

• Buckeye link is super slow, times out, takes me to an inappropriate login page frequently. It only functions properly half the time. It is very frustrating.
• I routinely experience problems with the activation of SEI forms online on Buckeyelink and where I have my office.

• Buckeye Link and SIS are very helpful.

• The new buckeyelink system (student center etc) gives me a hundred more steps to get to what I need. For example, to check if the class is full or not, there is a lot of things I have to click on to get to the right screen; it is just not efficient!

• I find Buckeyelink and SIS incredibly hard to navigate. I think the current system is not really a step forward from where we were before.

• Overall I'm satisfied. During this particular school year, I've been frustrated by the connectivity/reliability issues with BuckeyeLink and Carmen.

• I don't know the difference between SIS and Buckeyelink; until this survey, I thought they were the same.

• I really dislike BuckeyeLink, it's awkward, cumbersome, and a waste of my time

• If you have any influence over SEIs, I think this would be a great space to use technology to get better assessments

• I've never actively used the Office of the CIO and really don't know much about it. I feel that buckeye link and webmail are both fairly cumbersome and challenging to navigate, and the e-mail crashes far too often.

• Buckeyelink and My Student Center are cumbersome and inefficient (and that's being generous). Searching for classes is a chore and registering is a pain. The Student Center help is a joke (there's nothing useful there) and everything takes about six clicks more than is necessary. Overall the internet works well on campus, but it regularly happens that I can't logon for a period of time (in different parts of campus). When I'm by the medical center, I use the OSUMC free wireless because that is overall more consistent than the OSU wireless. In the computer labs I use, some of the computers are switching to Windows 7 and that's great. I really struggle to understand why any lab is still running XP. One lab, which I haven't been to in the past few months (so it may have changed), had lower screen resolutions than the screen is optimized for and only internet explorer with no ability to change any settings (including the resolution). That was ridiculous. If you're worried about users playing with settings, just install Deep Freeze rather than locking the settings. Once I'm in a lab with good machines or I have a good connection to the wireless, the internet here is phenomenal. I've also been pretty impressed with the speed that tech support gets back to you.

• BuckeyeLink and SIS are extremely difficult to navigate. The online course catalog is particularly un-user friendly, as is the student financial aid section.
• Buckeye Link as it is is cumbersome and can be difficult to find out info.

• Buckeyelink serves its purpose, but the interface is overly complicated.

• I started as a graduate student in 2006 and have seen changes to both Buckeye Link and the webmail systems. Both are less intuitive to use than the original systems (especially class registration, which now requires many additional pages to click through before registering). While I know these changes were probably made for good reasons (and I do appreciate the additional mail space in buckeye-mail), I feel there could have been more information provided about the systems when they were phased in. Problems that I and other student have had with things such as registration were often handled at the local administrative level (e.g. telling us how to register in the new system). I would have preferred to have such instruction from CIO directly rather than second hand after other students had already struggled with the system.

• I believe OSU is in need of integrated systems, where students can go to one location, perhaps something that combines Carmen, Buckeye Link and SIS capabilities. It is very confusing to have multiple places to go for these needs and I believe a university of OSU's caliber should have these services integrated.

• There is occasional freezing of SIS and Buckeye Link, which can be very problematic when meeting with a student. No blaming, just wish it was less frequent.

• Buckeyelink rarely works efficiently and when it does work, it takes on average 20 minutes to load. This is a huge problem especially around scheduling time.

• Please make buckeyelink and the student center more user-friendly. It takes forever to find anything

• Buckeyelink and Buckeye-mail are both inconvenient.

• Buckeye link is just not a well engineered system cognitively - the old system pre 08-09 was much more intuitive and the new SIS system should mimic that more.

• Please, for the love of God, change everything about BuckeyeLink. It is terrible, it was "ok" two years ago before you changed it but now it's just a mess. 1) You can't have it open in two tabs. This is crucial because when scheduling classes multiple tabs HAVE to be open in order to compare information when registering. 2) There needs to be a more streamlined way of adding a class. I should not have to confirm FOUR TIMES that yes, I do want to sign up for a class. It should just be click and done. 3) There should be more than one button on Carmen that takes us back to our personal Carmen home pages. Just having the one button in the upper right tool bar is annoying. Also, why in the world would you make an e-mail button on Carmen that isn't even attached to our BuckeyMail service? IT DOESN'T WORK SO WE DON'T NEED IT.
• My dissatisfaction with SIS and buckeyelink is related to the inability to use those services after 1:00 a.m., which is usually when I need them.

• It would be really nice if BuckeyeLink didn't shut down between the hours of 1:30 and 6:30. I need it during that time sometimes.

• I work nights so the time to access Buckeyelink is very inconvenient. I would prefer if it was down for a shorter period of time so I would be able to access it more often. I know many of my coworkers feel the same.

• Keep the carmen and buckeyelink updates away from midterm and finals times.

• Buckeye link SUCKS! hard to navigate, pain to sign up for classes. old system was better, less clutter.

• Buckeyelink should not go down every night.

• Resources like Carmen and Buckeye Link are extremely helpful, but I remember as a new user they were very confusing to navigate. In general, I think there is too much on a page. Maybe making bigger/more noticeable links to the important things would be helpful. Overall, though, I have been pleased with the functionality.

• Buckeyelink is frustrating because it doesn't conform to our semester schedule.

OSU Wireless

• OSU wireless is generally okay but it often drops my user status for no reason; this may be a Mac-related problem.

• Wireless coverage isn't particularly good along 12th avenue corridor.

• I think students should be able to access wireless throughout campus with their ID name and password.

• I don't know what it's like in other areas, but the wireless network in Kottman building is terrible with weak signals that drop repeatedly regardless of where in the building one is located. This makes working on projects and coursework almost impossible during the normal day, and really needs to be improved.

• OSUWireless should be covered in every corner of the campus.

• Would like to see Linux / Ubuntu support for osuwireless...
• No OSU Wireless within the OSU College of Dentistry

• I would like consistent wireless in every building on campus.

• can't wireless logon/password be automating synced with name.n logon/password?

• there should be wifi at the rpac.

• Wireless access needs to be made available to the entire campus, not just part of campus. I work at a research center that has frequent speakers and conferences. People who come expect wireless access and are mystified that they can't get it. It makes Ohio State look very backwards compared to other universities.

• The instructions for resetting your Ohio State wireless account (access internet on campus from laptop) are very confusing and do not really help. However, when I e-mailed the office of the CIO they were extremely helpful and made sure that I resolved my problem quickly and efficiently.

• In classrooms, OSU wireless makes you sign in every 20 minutes. It's extremely annoying for teachers to have to sign in all the time when they're showing a movie or something online.

• OSU wireless is horrible on the fisher campus. I know many people who get kicked off repeatedly. It is quite annoying, and sometimes forces me to go to different libraries/ not be able to access information I need during class.

• It doesn't make sense to me that I have to sign in to ResNet almost every time I get on the internet even if my computer hasn't been idle for 24 hours. It is a hassle. But I understand that there might not be anything to help it that wouldn't take down the amount of security I have. I am very satisfied with the connection I recieve, but it gets very slow and backed up during the hours of the night when most students are working. I figure there can't be much done to help that without changing networks or making multiple networks.

• many times my internet service is disrupted and i have re-login the network or osuwireless – annoying

• BETTER OSUWIRELESS!

• More wireless points need to be installed in the science buildings and around the medical center... lots of dead-zones, even for my phone!

• OSU wireless is severely spotty in the Fisher College of Business. Some days I can not connect and others i have no problem. Something to look into.
• The wireless in my dorm goes in and out all day... sometimes for hours at a time I cannot use the internet for more than 10 minutes before losing the connection. Fix this please!

• I especially like the reliability and availability of the OSU Wireless access AND the digital union--workshops, staff, and facilities are phenomenal. Thank you!

• The wireless system is a mess and the Carmen system is disappointing to say the least.

• I would like to see more wireless access. I don't get wireless in my office on campus, but do get it in the basement of our building, frustrating.

• Sometimes the wireless connection is unreliable. I am in Arps a lot and have experienced some bad connections.

• My one complaint is regarding the OSU wireless network and ease of use with mobile devices.

• Wireless internet in outdoor spaces needs to be stronger so people can easily work outside(oval, outdoor seating, walkways, etc.)

• Connecting a computer to the wireless network is too difficult, and it doesn't have to be. I go places all the time and log on with ease, even when I have to input a password. I have never had such difficulty like I have connecting to osuwireless, and having to go to the library to get it set up is a pain in the butt.

• Your wireless network is extremely challenging to figure out how to use - I have heard from multiple grad students that they have never been able to figure it out despite repeated attempts and requests for help. I am usually a little more tech savvy than my peers and even I had to struggle for 30+ minutes with aid and FAQ notes online to get connected. This should be easier - connection to information is essential to sound education.

• I had a lot of trouble initially connecting to the osuwireless account. I needed an internet connection in order to get connected to the account, which seems ironic. Also, it took at least 4 calls to the helpdesk before someone was able to fix my 5-second problem. On a good note, even though it was a frustrating experience, it was nice to actually talk to a human being each time I called.

• OSU is very college centric and too many dollars are being spent on the various infrastructures, people, and standards are all over the board. Get rid of wireless networks run by colleges/departments and all should be on OSU wireless.

• I think some of the science buildings could use more reliable wireless access.
- osuwireless has gotten slower!

- I think you guys do a great job but there is so much traffic on the osuwireless network that is it often painful to use. I understand that comes as a long term upgrade, however, so keep up the good work until then.

- ResNet's continuous login requirement is incredibly annoying, and as I see it, completely useless. Surely there is a better way to determine who is accessing the Internet from where than requiring logins all the time. Next, the Internet in the dorms is rather unstable and at times is slow, and others just plain broken.

- I find really questionable that OSU still does not provide a decent wireless signal for the 4th floor at University Hall.

- My dissatisfaction with OSU Wireless has to do with the fact that for some reason it is continuously dropped from my Droid, though it works fine with my laptop and my Droid doesn't drop my home wireless system. I haven't yet seriously attempted to diagnose the problem or to fix it. So it may well not be a problem with OSU Wireless itself.

- I've never been able to successfully get onto the campus wireless system.

- The wireless in the law school could definitely be improved.

- Also, OSU Wireless constantly requires me to reenter my information, even though I've reset the connection (and cleared it from my connections list) several times. It's quite frustrating.

- I thought connecting to the Fisher wireless was very hard too (I am a fairly tech savvy person too)

- With OSUNet, I wish that you could sign up for the service via laptop. Rather than notifying students that they cannot connect to the service without having sign up, please offer an option to do so at the time that the message is displayed.

- Wireless coverage is very good, but not great.

- Also, OSUWireless, particularly ResNet, is tedious to log into every hour whenever it feels like PMSing. I would like it if I could set up OSUWireless on my Kindle. I know the university supports going paperless and it would be very convenient if OSUWireless could support this goal of our university and work on Kindles and other E-readers.

- Hard to get help when I have osuwireless issues

- Also the osu wireless should be more continuous. It cuts out when moving.
• OSU wireless never seems to work,

• wireless/wired internet services are abysmal and overly complex to set up.

**Buckeye Bar**

• I brought my laptop to the buckeye bar and it had a virus on it. I could not use it at all, and the guys there installed windows 7, office, and made my laptop run better than ever and it was set up the way I wanted it. Over the top service provided for students. Excellent and keep it up!!

• Another BuckeyeBar station at the Union or Central Classroom Building would be nice.

• The only problem I have is with the Buckeye bar. Especially at the beginning of the quarter, there is always such a long line that I never have time to wait in it. I'm not sure how you would fix this so I didn't let it affect my ratings, but I'm just putting it out there as a problem.

• Never enough support for wireless at buckeye bar, though when you do get to them they're great.

• The walk in help should offer some evening hours for the working professional students.

• I do like Buckeye Bar and find the people there very helpful.

• Atari at the Buckeye Bar is good.

**Student Computing Centers**

• The only problem I have with the CIO is that the computer labs don't offer free printing anymore...but I'm not even sure if this is a CIO problem or a university problem.

• I don't know if this is your area, but I was really unhappy when our 50 pages of free printing was taken away. I think we pay enough in tuition to get those free pages and I know a lot of people probably didn't use them because you had to go to specific labs.

• Computer labs/printers malfunctioning is frustrating but I haven't utilized many of the other services provided.
• The student computing center in Gerlach for graduate business students often has printing problems. I would suggest that any printed documents get watermarked (or at least have that option easier) when printing, because oftentimes multiple copies of the same document must be printed because other students take them (everyone is printing the same material).

• Not sure if this is the right place to bring this up, however I feel that OSU should offer double sided printing in the student computing centers. Going green elsewhere, lets go green in this aspect.

• ECE general purpose labs are far better than computer labs. Computer Labs are too crowded and noisy.

• I dont know if this is the CIO's job, but the computer lab in the law school is awful.

• The only other problems I have experienced are unreliable printers in student computer labs.

• The printers in all the web labs on vet campus are terrible! they need to be updated! sometimes it took >30minutes to print a pdf lecture...

• Many times, campus computer centers are full beyond capacity, but I understand that this is an expected problem.

• The computing center are great, when they are overflowed. I also feel like you should be able to figure out how to let people use their college's printing quota across the campus and in the libraries instead of in their college's specific computer lab.

• computers in Stillman lab are really slow when I use them for assignments as simple as typing my resume up

• There should be a campus map off all of the computer labs around campus (which building, room, and capacity).

Security of Electronic Data and Communications

• Your security protocols are self-defeating and get in the way of faculty productivity.

• #2, data security: OSU's handling of administrative/personnel data is just FINE. The concern and systems in place of security on faculty personal computers is OVERKILL, and preventing us from using many valuable web resources. This should be rethought, and relaxed very slightly –
I generally find the attention to security a hindrance more than a help. I can't even download to my work computer the most basic software or updates, which is enormously frustrating, and I am told I can't change the sleep function on the computer either -- also frustrating, and beyond me how it makes me or OSU more secure. Similar problems apply to classroom computers, which go to sleep and/or require reentry of passwords at inopportune moments. Clearly, my needs as researcher and teacher are not a top priority at OSU.

I was disheartened to read about the recent security breach in which social security numbers and other sensitive information may have been compromised. Several years ago, faculty members were lectured about not keeping sensitive information on their computers, and told that they would be liable if any data breaches occurred (when the university had been responsible for listing students' social security numbers on course rolls in the first place!). But when private data were exposed via a university-controlled server, the main emphasis seemed to be on downplaying the potential risks--and not accepting culpability.

I have no idea how I'm supposed to assess the "Security of (my) electronic data and communications." Shouldn't you really be the ones who are keeping an eye on that?

I am amazed at the things we have to go through with security but the ball still keeps getting dropped centrally.

Changing passwords? Are you completely out of touch? This forces people to write it on a post it stuck to the monitor. How is that secure???

The main problem I have with IT at OSU is the proliferation of passwords and security features that make everyday activities unnecessarily complicated. Let me give two examples. (1) We have to remember so many different usernames and passwords (some that change every few months, some that don't) that I for one simply can't keep up with them all and end up either posting my password on a sticky note or forgetting it and simply avoiding certain technologies because I can't remember the password. OIT has helped a lot by combining many things under the "dot number" rubric and one password (which has served me for 22 years), but other campus activities still ask for a different password that has to change periodically. I know passwords are important for security, but it would be much easier to combine *all* of them into one username and password *for everything*. (2) The library requires that you log in to your OSU account ***just to look up a book in the catalog***! I was absolutely flabbergasted to realize this a few weeks ago, and I'm still trying to figure out what in the world we are trying to protect ourselves from by making it so hard to just find a book on the shelf. Even in the lobby, you can't just quickly log in to the catalog to see if a book is available. And if you are up on, say, the 8th floor and want to move back and forth between the computer and the shelves, you have to log in and out every time you go to the catalog. My experience at the Westerville Public Library is much less frustrating, since I can go directly to that library's home page and look up

Office of the Chief Information Officer
a title without all the sign-in and sign-out and carrying on. Might you be able to look into this? Thanks!

- The focus on security has overwhelmed usability. I generally avoid or circumvent CIO services when I can.

- Concern about protection of information on campus.

- The approach to security is, IMHO, insane. I am among many faculty who resent being treated as infants when it comes to controlling our own desktop.

- Please give users more flexibility in terms of managing computer security. The MCSS requirements are too intrusive, and take up too much computing time/memory from a relatively old machine.

- I continue to be concerned that the encryption software unduly slows computing time. I understand that this is a line that has to be walked appropriately, but it imposes a cost in that older machines become obsolete before their useful time expires based on the computing needs for which they are used.

- I don't like the fact that I have to change my network password every quarter. It should be changed to every year. This does not make us more safe.

- The server that was hacked that had all of my student information is a large concern for me. I consider this a fundamental failing of the CIO and I now have concerns about their stewardship of my information.

- Concerned about the confidential document hacking.

- I am upset that my personal information was hacked.

- security of data and communications should have been separate questions since e-mail is inherently insecure, and OCIO can't control e-mail misuse. So, I'm neutral about security of communications, weakly satisfied about data.

- I would like to see a more proactive communication with regard to security breaches, and a visible commit to lessening these.

- I perceive the OCIO as a hindrance to accomplishing any given task. They are unresponsive and uncooperative. How can you have SO MANY FIREWALLS in place and STILL get broken into? I'll probably have better luck getting business data from the hackers than I would from the OCIO.

- Also, the fact that all of that information about students got stolen this year prevents me from giving a high ranking for security.
• This past year and in once a couple of years ago, my personal information was breached and I was offered the free usage of credit watch dogs for a year. Can the office of the CIO try to prevent identity theft from happening in the future?

• If we are a research institute with leaders in the field, why can't we keep constituents' personal information secure? I AM NOT HAPPY MY SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER WAS SUBJECT TO BREACH and I know of coworkers whose identity was stolen as possibly the result of MULTIPLE data breaches. How can we "teach" students to become competent IT professionals if the faculty can't even keep our systems secure? We should have the best in the field TEACHING. Maybe we need to employ/find people who CAN keep the systems secure so they CAN lead the way in research on how to keep systems secure AND teach others how-to... In the meantime, I have to wait and worry when the next breach will be and how much impact it will have on my life.

• Data security is over complicated, and still it seems to get breached all the time.

• My personal information has also been stolen from the university twice. The first time I received one free year of Equifax. But I had to pay after that. The second time, the university hired a different monitoring company. But I was already a client of Equifax, so I didn't want to change. In short, I have been paying for some heavy-duty identity theft security for at least four years now, all because the university's security was breached. And then it was breached again!

• finally, i don't mind all of the free credit monitoring that osu has provided, but i'm tired of finding out that institutional information has been hacked over and over again.

• Obviously, the best case for IT is to remain unnoticed. However, with the recent data breach, that is not the case.

• The different passwords are confusing at having to log in every time I get on the computer in my dorm is annoying. I have had to reset my passwords a few times because my computer will sometimes require me to log on with my wireless name and password and sometimes with just my osu name and password. This may be a feature of my computer but still a frustrating feature.

• My dissatisfaction with security of my data is related to someone stealing my social security number during this academic school year.

• The timing system thing on the computers on campus tend to be a pain. I was on it a few times where I had to redo the login and password every 5-8 minutes.

• I was displeased with the recent security breach of student information. It affected most of my family.
Media Services

• It would be helpful if On Line Media Services integrated even more seemlessly with Carmen. I would like to work with them to provide more meaningful reports of who is using our streaming videos and how they use them.

• It seems to me there are a lot of advances to be made in terms of streaming video, archiving it online, and also having some pool of equipment available for long-term projects that may take place outside of the classroom.

• For my classes I hugely rely on networked audivisual materials, especially movie streaming from the OSU Media Services, and I find the quality of the service disastrous; streaming is slow and software crashes all the time.

Digital Union

• The Digital Union concept is good, but actual execution is lacking. It seems like a bunch of people are employed to play with some technology every now and then.

• I especially like the reliability and availability of the OSU Wireless access AND the digital union--workshops, staff, and facilities are phenomenal. Thank you!

• I feel that there is a lot of good information on the office of the CIO website, but the navigation on the Learning Technology page is confusing. At first I thought I made a mistake and just typed in the address for the digital union. It took me forever to find how to schedule a video conference. I ended up just using the search tab.

• The Digital Union is a good resource and I feel that sometimes people just go in there to use the internet then students who actually need help using a special program cannot get that help. I'm not saying that student's shouldn't be able to use the internet to do homework, etc, but priority should be given to people using special programs or people who have question.

Student Information Systems

• I'm not particularly tech-oriented, but the Faculty Center and SIS seem rather user-unfriendly. The icons don't seem to be very helpful in terms of identifying their function. In addition, I didn't realize that there were at least three different things I had to click on in order to have my grades submitted properly this past time (I don't recall that being an issue in earlier versions).

• Buckeye Link and SIS are very helpful.
• SIS makes it very difficult to go back far enough into previous quarters to find grades for students who ask for letters of recommendation. I often have a student as a freshman who comes back as a junior or senior asking for a letter. I need to be able quickly to verify courses and grades. SIS only lets me see the grade roster back less than one year.

• SIS is a disaster and has made things much worse.

• The SIS system is incredibly cumbersome and counter-intuitive to use, and I say this as a fairly tech-savvy person.

• I find the Faculty Center part of the SIS to be extremely annoying.

• I have never heard of the Office of the CIO. The SIS is terrible. We have to change our processes to match what the SIS can do, rather than making the SIS software meet our needs. STUPID!!! Computers are supposed to make out lives easier -- not run our lives. In addition, we have to do things earlier and earlier -- select textbooks, schedule classrooms, etc. -- since we became computerized. Again, computers are supposed to speed things up, so why does it take longer to use them?

• Neither Carmen nor SIS are intuitive (user-friendly). It takes a lot of effort to learn these systems, when effort should be placed on research and teaching.

• The new buckeyelink system (student center etc) gives me a hundred more steps to get to what I need. For example, to check if the class is full or not, there is a lot of things I have to click on to get to the right screen; it is just not efficient!

• I find Buckeyelink and SIS incredibly hard to navigate. I think the current system is not really a step forward from where we were before.

• additionally, SIS is still difficult to navigate and the account statements are ridiculously difficult to read.

• The only computing problem I have had is with SIS, where course registration is cumbersome. When appropriate prerequisites are not entered into the system, a SIS override would be preferred to paper forms.

• The worst system on campus is the course selection system in my student centre. It is not used by all the departments efficiently, it is difficult to really find out about real course content (could link to a PDF or word document for ex.) and again, adds another layer for the user, who has to contact the professor and department to find out about the courses, what the number is, so that it can be located in the system. Very cumbersome!!

• I don't know the difference between SIS and Buckeyelink; until this survey, I thought they were the same.
• The implementation of the SIS was horrible, specifically the billing. Your disorganization caused me, and many of my friends, a lot of headaches. Did any of you actually try using the software before you unleashed the terrible thing on thousands of students? There is no recourse for the students in this matter. The students get hosed, the CIO administrative folks get awards and stuff to put on their resumes. The Mechanical Engineering department recently got all the ME students into the MSDN Academic Alliance. This is a very nice feature and I appreciate this. Thank you! I rated OSUNet as "very poor" because the computer folks in my building have turned off all of the OSUNet ports. Now when I want to connect multiple computers to one printer in my lab, I have to string ethernet cable around the lab and setup my own router. It is really fortunate that the hundreds of miles of ethernet cable installed in the walls is completely useless. The computer folks say that they turned off the ports for "safety." This is like buying a car, then welding the doors shut to make sure no one drives it. You wouldn't want anyone to drive the car, because it is unsafe. Great logic! The BuckeyeBar Walk-in help desk is really great. The folks there are helpful, cheerful, and patient. Thank you for that! My wife gets OSU mail, including tax forms and until recently, paychecks, delivered to multiple incorrect addresses. She has changed her mailing address online and has spoken to HR folks in our department, but you folks can't manage to coordinate information transfer on your own systems across departments. The Software to Go is a nice feature, thank you for that! I think you folks are delirious if you would consider yourselves "information technology leaders." You provide too many roadblocks to progress that I have to work around for my academic progress and manage around for my research work.

• The SIS interface is terrible. Someone needs to sit down and perform typical task a student would perform and see how ridiculous the interface is. Some examples: Searching for a class results in 20+ results which must be paged through 3 at a time! Similar results when looking at account activity. Links that have the similar name but lead to different places. And a lot of link that lead nowhere!

• SIS is such a pain. The interface is so unintuitive.

• SIS should be updated. too few functions and options. very convenient to register classes. consultant needed from CWRU

• SIS sucks. not-user friendly. slow. as a general rule, if you can't use the back-button the website SUCKS! The back-button is there because it is needed. When you debilitate it, you are at fault not the back-button

• SIS has one of the worst interfaces I have seen. It's hard to get around and looks like something from the early days of web design. The old system was so much nicer, cleaner, and intuitive. While I understand the back end value of SIS, the front end is a huge, and embarrassing step backwards.
• Buckeyelink and My Student Center are cumbersome and inefficient (and that's being generous). Searching for classes is a chore and registering is a pain. The Student Center help is a joke (there's nothing useful there) and everything takes about six clicks more than is necessary. Overall the internet works well on campus, but it regularly happens that I can't logon for a period of time (in different parts of campus). When I'm by the medical center, I use the OSUMC free wireless because that is overall more consistent than the OSU wireless. In the computer labs I use, some of the computers are switching to Windows 7 and that's great. I really struggle to understand why any lab is still running XP. One lab, which I haven't been to in the past few months (so it may have changed), had lower screen resolutions than the screen is optimized for and only internet explorer with no ability to change any settings (including the resolution). That was ridiculous. If you're worried about users playing with settings, just install Deep Freeze rather than locking the settings. Once I'm in a lab with good machines or I have a good connection to the wireless, the internet here is phenomenal. I've also been pretty impressed with the speed that tech support gets back to you.

• BuckeyeLink and SIS are extremely difficult to navigate. The online course catalog is particularly un-user friendly, as is the student financial aid section.

• Any time you want to do away with SIS would be great for me. That system is taken years off of my life and literally cost some of my friends hundreds of dollars.

• Reporting support for SIS system has been poor -- SFB020 (Receivables Detail) report still does not work after it was released nearly two years ago. This is unacceptable considering how much was time and money has been invested in the SIS system.

• While I find SIS to be a good system in lots of ways, I wish it could be a little more flexible to the needs of its users and I wish there was a place where my "wish list"/concerns were heard and responded to.

• I believe OSU is in need of integrated systems, where students can go to one location, perhaps something that combines Carmen, Buckeye Link and SIS capabilities. It is very confusing to have multiple places to go for these needs and I believe a university of OSU's caliber should have these services integrated.

• SIS is the only service you have on this survey that I use, and it is horrible as well. We had a lot of confused unhappy grad students last year.

• There is occasional freezing of SIS and Buckeye Link, which can be very problematic when meeting with a student. No blaming, just wish it was less frequent.

• SIS -- this system has been operational for several years and the current quarter still doesn't populate in the basic search criteria??
• There are a lot of quirks in SIS that should have been addressed before it was implemented. Some things are better and the interface is superior, but it took some key functionalities that are not acceptable. Waiting-list management is terrible; MARX was much more basic, but more useful. The fact that a student could schedule free time was wonderful. Also, the fact that a student can only get on a waiting list for one section of a specific class makes a very unpractical bottle neck for the process, not to mention that if a student is on two waiting lists and he rolls off one, he's never taken off the other one. This is probably the worst failure of SIS, and we cope with it because we have no other option, but it's clear that whoever was involved in the design didn't have that much experience with enrollment.

• student center is annoying to use. can't open existing schedule in one window and view potential classes in another. requires twice the navigation necessary to get to basic functions like checking class schedule, signing up for classes etc.

• Please make buckeyelink and the student center more user-friendly. It takes forever to find anything.

• student center is a great asset to help plan out future classes, create and view degree audits, and more. very useful!

• My dissatisfaction with SIS and buckeyelink is related to the inability to use those services after 1:00 a.m., which is usually when I need them.

• SIS evaluations should have room for open-ended responses for the teachers (unless this has already been updated).

• The SIS is an aggravating waste of time. Oracle Peoplesoft was a terrible choice, the previous methods of scheduling (circa 2008 or earlier) were much more user friendly.

• Personally I believe the online class scheduling could be a bit more user friendly. At my past community college (Saddleback College in Mission Viejo, CA) the class registration was simple and easy. One could put classes in a shopping cart and once the person's time bracket opened, all they would have to do is simply hit the Check Out button.

• Also, SIS has a section for assignments and exam dates but no one ever uploads anything to it. If we have carmen then why are those tabs still in SIS?

• buckeye link SUCKS! hard to navigate, pain to sign up for classes. old system was better, less clutter.

• Accessing the SIS center is either unavailable or takes too long to upload on a Mac. My roommates with a Mac experience the same problem, thus scheduling for classes was difficult. Even during random days and times I have this issue.
• I hate Buckeyelink. It is so hard to schedule classes. When a lot of people are on it, it becomes very slow. For a huge college there needed to be a better website to schedule classes.

• looking for classes can sometime be tedious in search (but it IS an efficient system)

• The online course scheduling system is very difficult to work with.

• Please consider a new interface for class searching and scheduling.

• Is it is often hard to get in the student center a.nd an error occurs before 00:00

• Similarly in the SIS, keeping the site's organizational hierarchy clear in my head has sometimes caused problems --like when posting grades or moving back and forth between quarters.

**General**

• Outsource infrastructure; focus on teaching and learning- the unique resource of OSU

• Wheneverf I needed help received in a relatively timely, curteous and professional manner. Have always appreciated the job they are doin

• Much of this survey is not that relevant as I use the MedCenter IT services more than central OSU IT resources.

• Most of my services are done locally in the College of Education and Human Ecology. They are quite good (OTEL).

• I am a new faculty member so have limited experiecd with the Office of the CIO.

• I am in the College of Optometry and don't interact with these service much.

• This is the most reactionary and backward institution at which I have worked in terms of information and instructional technology. It is astonishing to me that in 2011 I am still struggling with issues of software functionality, network access, instructional resources for all kinds of media, and a general sense that faculty are not entitled to manage and use their own technology for research and instruction. OSU is far behind the resources--hardware, software, and support--provided by smaller institutions a decade and more ago.

• I am not currently involved with any courses, faculty, or students at OSU.
• Most of my contact is not directly with CIO but rather with Humanities, and now, Arts & Humanities technology services. What contact I have with CIO (e.g., streaming films) has been very satisfactory.

• I'm rather surprised that this survey is necessary. I don't think many people have major issues with the desktop support/customer service aspect of the Office of the CIO. The real issues involve support for advanced computing, software purchasing and installation/related security issues and network permissions. There are lots of places that get the desktop services right and there's lots of good templates to follow, but there are few that get the underlying networking infrastructure right to make a university a "Research 2.0" institution. That's what we should be striving for.

• I would also like to see innovative uses of instructional technology being rewarded in terms of Tenure & Promotion in Units.

• The quality of services provided by the CIO has declined steadily over the past 2-3 years. The CIO's office does not effectively meet the needs of the campus community.

• I appreciate the professionalism of the people in the Office of the CIO.

• CIO services and Tech services of EHE college often seem to conflict. Surprisingly hard to find out who's in charge of what space or service.

• I primarily work at Nationwide Children's Hospital and have limited interaction with OSU Office of CIO.

• I don't directly use services provided by CIO. As far as I am concerned, this office is just another Admin unit.

• In general, I think the CIO does a very good job.

• Great service always!

• I very rarely use any of this stuff.

• From my experience, actual and perceived, Athletics IT is the technology leader on campus.

• Keep up the good work! Anthonia

• services are split between departments and CIO and sometimes it's confusing trying to figure out who to call to get help.

• Our (Anthropology) service has been enormously benefitted by David Sweasey.
• IT support is slow and inefficient.

• I am an adjunct faculty so I have had little interaction with CIO.

• We have an IT support staff in our College that is excellent and pretty much cutting edge for all our IT support needs for classroom and distance ed, as well as data security etc.

• The quality of IT support from OCIO seems to have become less and less relevant to academic concerns and more and more "corporate". Is there anyone in the management who understands universities and academic needs anymore?

• Overall, I think the Office is doing a very good job of providing services to a broad and diverse set of users with greatly differing needs - it's a very challenging situation but one that also great opportunities. Keep up the efforts.

• Good work. I do not use all services. I am very happy with those I use.

• I don't know if it is considered part of the Office of CIO, but the departmental IT people I have worked with leave much to be desired. Not willing to help, unable to help, or just unavailable. And when they do try to help it is an intrusion in their day. Also, the implementation of LANdesk seems to be a mandate from above without adequate discussion and attention to concerns.

• System seems to be very slow.

• The IT infrastructure on campus is inadequate to the needs of a large research university. Digital storage space, desktop computing, applications such as webmail, and pretty much all other infrastructure components are a source of much frustration for me. To an extent, I have managed to work around them by providing my own laptop and forwarding my osu e-mail to Gmail. I know this is against university policy, but it is the only way I can effectively get my job done.

• I have no complaints about the Office of the CIO. IT services within the College of Law are, however, a very mixed bag.

• It's hard to separate CIO services from College and Departmental computer support.

• As faculty member, I appreciate CIO services, but also cherish the excellent IT support in our own department. Merging and saving resources, while at the same time maintaining local services, will need thoughtful implementation.

• I see OIT primarily as maintaining the status quo, dealing with minor emergencies. I don't see OIT helping us to more more productive and efficient, helping us to be at the leading edge, visionary. The think the emphasis on Microsoft Windows is misguided, but it may be too late to do much about it.
• I don't know anything about most of the above services. I am retired and use mostly the library services, with which I am very satisfied.

• OSU IT is among the best, while OSU Med Center IT is among the worst. How do we translate efficiency and excellence from the former to the latter?

• While the OCIO's responsibility clearly lies with "enterprise" needs, I would like to see those needs include the need for one-off, experimental, exploratory projects—the core of a research university's mission and strength. Every "enterprise" application began as an experiment.

• I rarely interact with this office. I go through ARTs and Sciences and don't understand how they interface.

• Overall, while I've given you a bunch of "neutrals", that's exactly what you should want. Your job should be to facilitate what users need, and otherwise stay the <bleep> out of the way. You do that more effectively than the vast, vast majority of other places with similar IT infrastructures. The few "dissatisfieds" I've provided, are primarily because, as an instructor teaching courses, these resources really are opaque. I could learn something about them if I wanted to spend the day or two wandering around the University's web resources trying to find the right links, but right now no-one's doing anything to put the primary tools necessary to use the course-related resources at the fingertips of the people who need them. "Well, they're attached to every *** e-mail we send out!!!!" (or some similar reply). That's all well and good. Since we get so much random junk e-mail from the university, pretty much everything goes in the "look at it later" pile. Send out a single (or maybe 2 or 3) before-the-quarter messages with significant titles: OSU Faculty - AU Quarter Quicklinks - PLEASE SAVE, or something like that. Embed 2 sentence descriptions, and links to Carmen, grading forms, SEIs, a web-page listing the important dates - holidays, deadlines, etc for the quarter, e-mail addresses for the registrar, scheduling, classroom services. Phone numbers for classroom AV services, etc... We'd save those somewhere important, and be able to get to and use the resources available, much more easily.

• In general I've been happy with the services. I'm not sure how involved CIO is in our digital x-ray's in the technology clinic or recorded lectures, but these areas have been very slow to adapt.

• There are a large number of problems with this service. It is to be expected however lowering expectations is no way to improve.

• I think there can be better overall organization of everything- to make it all easier to access and use- but the individual compartments seem to function as intended

• I never heard of the Office of the CIO before today. 3rd year grad student.
• Entire service network is poorly organized and most of the time I do not know where to ask about various problems.

• I am only taking 1 class as a continuing ed students and it is not even meeting on Campus. I do not have much interaction with the CIO.

• I have no problems or concerns at this time

• The system at OSU is a breeze compared to the cumbersome and problematic system at .... let's just say .... a certain campus across town where I am teaching. I have had to make a number of trips to their office to solve connectivity and e-mail problems there, but absolutely no trips to OSU's IT office.

• My experience is only based on the service provided at the Glenn School--please take note.

• Very satisfied with the reliability of access and user-friendliness of websites.

• OCIO should take lead in overall IT issues and interface with GL and also other "Shared Services".

• I don't use much of the resources offered by CIO office.

• This was a lock and key issue none of these questions apply

• My roll is clinical and I do not use the majority of links/services in this questionnaire.

• The staff who I have worked with at the Office of CIO are very dedicated and professional. However, I dont feel they are staffed appropriately for providing campus wide resources especially network and security infrastructure

• keep up the good work

• other than a few announcements, i do not interact with the CIO often. therefore most of the questions do not apply. There is not a clear discription of who you are talking about the CIO for the hospitals, etc. although i feel that a survey is a good idea and a way to get a good deal of feedback, i hope i answered in a good and precise way for the questions you were asking.

• The office of CIO in a support role has done it's job... However, as far as an innovator it is being driven by the environment....

• My contact is limited but I have always been more than satisfied with end results.
• As a staff member, I think there is way too much red tape to get anything done quickly and/or efficiently. I dont know who anyone is there anymore and I am not allowed to call anyone for a quick answer when I have a questions regarding one of my process (I am in Systems). I am disappointed by this new "leadership"

• Decentralized Department and Unit level Tech Support staff are critical. Office title 'CIO' is confusing for user level, compared to the former OIT Security experts and administrators are among the best in the country and should be recognized as such.

• If your office had anything to do with the way the Medical Center and CVM websites are NOT working, please consider sticking to phone and computer services.

• Have not used Office of the CIO extensively.

• Office of Student Life secures my network and servers.

• Some systems here seem old fashion. No uniformity across colleges.

• we have not used these services through the alumni association

• My main job at OSU is to support the students/faculty/staff of this amazing university but I strongly feel that my ability to do this is hampered by the bureaucratic process that OCIO has set in place. There are many needless steps, phone calls, forms, lists, processes that are pushed in front of us before any work can happen and with the ultimate result being that it can't be done in a timely manner. There are fixes that take a few moments to do (entering data in a set up table) but we are forced to wait two weeks before it goes through the cumbersome and elaborate maze that OCIO has created. President Gee's messages of "one university" and "removing silos" and "making processes simpler" have not seemed to read the airport.

• I see the Office of the CIO as being uncoordinated and understaffed.

• I do not deal with the Technology Services.

• Because CIO's get more blame for things going wrong than praise for things going right, they are necessarily focused on guarding and protecting and are very reluctant to try new things or change for any reason. For this reason, almost by definition, a CIO office in a large organization is the last place to find technology leadership.

• Know your customer groups and their needs before determining and developing enterprise "solutions". Information Technology landscape changes rapidly, so an institution must be able to analyze, anticipate, and respond accordingly. This institution has some exceptional talent that is not understood, underutilized, or ignored at the university level. Communicating with the university community is a service that is paramount. Is two-way communication (through all levels) really occurring?
• I feel very disconnected from this office. I have no idea how to begin to utilize services or if I should.

• My experience with the information technology services has been mostly unsatisfactory. I feel the people I speak with are out of touch or don't fully understand the work or the potential issues I run into in my department/job. I think a lot of this has to do with working for a big university and medical center, but I sometimes wish I could communicate directly with someone I know and/or can see about the problems I am having.

• I believe CIO is doing their job well. Frustrated with College of Nursing view of an on-line course.

• There is lack of clear definition as to what groups in OCIO are responsible for what services. Or for that matter, what services (and service levels) OCIO offers.

• I don't utilize OCIO very often.

• Too much beauracracy in my opinion.

• It's sometimes difficult to distinguish the services offered by the Office of the CIO from those offered by local tech services and difficult to know who to contact with questions or specific requests. However, I've always been well-served when I had a need. Thank you.

• I'll be content to know that you have at least settled on a name. Now someday you will have consistent services (??) Hopefully!

• Our department IT staff is the best I've ever worked with. We could not function without them.

• On the infrequent occasions I have had a problem, I have always found the CIO response to be prompt, efficient, and pleasant. Great group of folks! Thanks to all.

• The are good people who have a lot of knowledge, but sometimes it take way too long to hear back from their staff when information, a response or an answer is needed.

• I receive better customer service from other IT departments on campus

• Staff and student employees in every area very helpful.

• Everyone has always been very helpful when I have asked for assistance but I don't know that I would consider us technology leaders.
• I would like more IT support—the quality is currently very good and the people are
great. It just seems like there are not enough people to support the number of end
users. I would especially like to see more integration between local IT staffs and
OCIO staffs.

• I'm not a student anymore, this survey was sent to my work OSUMC e-mail. I don't
use any student computing services but I do check the IT website for system statuses
which are sometimes helpful.

• The office staff are always helpful

• The office of the CIO has a long history (25+ years) of coming up with good ideas
and implementing them so badly nobody really can or wants to use them. Their
products are either so under resourced that they work very poorly or so expensive as
to be unaffordable. The organization seems remarkably out of touch with various
campus needs.

• The OCIO claims to be a high performance organization, but that seems to be nothing
but talk. There are numerous missed deadlines, no sense of urgency, and a general
lack of follow through and accountability. Overall, the campus needs results not talk.

• Don't you do voice too?

• A good portion of distributed IT units provide better services without high service
costs.

• It seems like OSU is behind the curve when it comes to Technology and it hamper
our ability to do the Job.

• Our office has inhouse technical support so for the most part we, other than the
inhouse tech folks, do not use the services mentioned.

• I like that I know I find help from the CIO office when I need it. I have always been
able to search the website and find solutions to my problems quickly and easily.

• I don't have any idea why i keep getting these e-mails.

• You guys are good!

• I don't know what the CIO is.

• I've been very pleased with the services I have utilized.

• I have nothing to compare Ohio State's CIO to... just a heads up
• You are doing a great job. Keep up the good work.

• If its not broke, don't fix it. Otherwise, get on it ASAP.

• I have not used these services much, as I am a commuter who rarely uses anything other than Webmail, Carmen, and Buckeyelink.

• Thank you for your hard work. Keep it up!

• This survey helped me to know that I really need to know more about the office and what services I should be connected to. I am very pleased with the technological services I receive in my office from tech services and their assistance with interfacing my services.

• Those working on CIO projects need to consider all different users and audiences when making decisions - I have been the end user on numerous CIO initiatives that have been incredibly disappointing because the office clearly did not understand the end user needs from the beginning.

• I think the internet, webmail, and computer facilities could be greatly improved.

• I'm not too sure exactly what the Office of the CIO does. I know it provides online services.

• I think that there is still a LOT of work to be done to create a functional main OSU website. It is very poorly done and I personally know that (especially in the application process for university admissions) this "first glance" at OSU has turned MANY people away from the university. It needs to be more friendly.

• people are good. Computers are outdated, wireless sucks and networking problems galore,

• I think it would be beneficial to the Office of the CIO to better inform students of what the office is, and the services it offers.

• system goes down way too often, difficult with all the firewalls to stay online for more than 5 minutes.. have to reload and retype passwords ALL THE TIME

• The technology in classrooms is basically minimal. Both classroom pool and department classrooms have a long way to go to catch up with other Ohio universities!

• I've had a lot of trouble with classroom computers (flaky internet for streaming video, broken computers) for teaching, and for the computer/projector hookup in non-computer rooms.
• My immediate experiences with IT are with OTEL. I have found OTEL to be incompetent with even routine IT needs, less than honest about OCIO policies, and diffident to faculty. Further, in an e-mail OTEL’s administrator acknowledged that it was one of OTEL’s goals to have access to faculty e-mail communications (a policy that is not tolerable in a community dedicated to academic freedom). Consequently, I now pay for IT services from private vendors (outside the university) in order to obtain the IT services I need and the security and privacy I should otherwise have found at OSU.

• In my albeit limited experience, the Office of the CIO has spent more time "branding" itself than in providing useful services to faculty. Two examples: it is exceedingly difficult and frustrating to find any tech support on campus - no one to help you with your office computer (I had a colleague told simply that she should use her own laptop in her office since no one would fix the one in her office!), and when one does try to call on the IT services, the buck generally gets passed from office to office. Of which there apparently many, and yet none tasked with solving any faculty problems. A second peeve: try working on the computers in the library. You will discover that the "home pages" are all set to the CIO site (see above: branding). You have to struggle mightily even to find a link to the "library" on this site. I have spoken with a number of librarians about this - they all acknowledge the problem and then roll their eyes at the impossibility of fixing it. Perhaps less time spent advertising yourself and more time spent helping faculty do their work.

• Did not have any tech equipment for Campbell Hall #243 all quarter--not sure what office does that. Also, like to have doc camera at each classroom, but have to get set up each time

• the support of IHIS/Epic has been very suspect. Trying to get help after hours is very challenging. trying to find things (search engine) on One Source is poor.

• Information technology services at The Ohio State University are out-of-date, personnel at the help desk are rude and deliberately unhelpful, and I find the IT environment overall to be a strongly negative force constraining and working against my research program.

• Classroom equipment consistently problematic over both teaching quarters this year, including internet connections in classroom.

• The OCIO office seems to be well behind the curve and trends related to cloud computing services and emerging technology. The OCIO needs to become much more agile in response to the changing IT needs of a diverse and evolving technology landscape. Otherwise, the rouge computing services may continue to grow in response to a perceived complete lack of support for such services.

• It would be helpful to send out a brief review of all the services offered to faculty, with the link to the web site for more information.
• Electronic Reserve have been making lots of mistakes lately, some computers will not stream videos from the OSU library due to lack of software, my wireless works on my iPhone but not my Apple all the time, impossible to change grade before end of grading period. Used to be able to. I do appreciate that which does work. Thank you

• There is too much reliance of digital data bases, especially replacing academic libraries. The technology is immature. It is easily jeopardized by hacking, careless maintenance and power failures. Information is easily changed and lost. The digital library is not private. Your government, another government, corporations or a nosy neighbor can watch what you read. Until the system becomes more robust we have rely on the old, reliable paper information system

• Also it seems that you have to go so many different places if you need assistance with some type of technology, would be easier if it was all in one spot.

• services are slow, often do not work and overly costly via internal billing. Our team would prefer to contract with an outside vendor to provide our IT services, especially phone which is still antiquated service and equipment based upon the 19th century

• We need to get the successor to Course/Student/Faculty Analytics up and running. It's a year after the announced date for this to be up and running. Lack of access severely compromises my ability to do the analysis I need to do as Chair of my department.

• During our recent move from hopkins hall to pomerene hall, my computer was dropped by the designated IT person and I have been with a meaningful office computer and it (unfortunately) dedicated raid drive (which was backed up at my own expense) for some time in september until the present. Because, I was forced by the "rules" (I would have been glad to set it up myself) to let an incompetent person mess with my equipment I have been with out anything but a deeply outdated computer that will not even run the current programs we are using! With this event I am totally displeased !!!!!!!!

• This comment is in regard to this survey, and might not be relevant to CIO. But, headings and radial buttons toward the right (which seem more important for CIO) tend to get truncated unless I use a very small font. Please fix this next time around when I'm likely to have less than an ideal vision.

• We in Hagerty Hall are particularly well-served by the IT Service Desk on the 4th floor. They are very quick to respond, easy to work with, and almost always resolve our IT problems. Same goes for the hypermedia studio on the 1st floor.

• It is difficult to plan for courses using SPSS because the status of the license agreement is not know until the end of December. The SPSS license is a great asset for students, but it would be helpful to have more stability in its availability.
• You still seem to think you're living in 1990. Many many faculty use Apple products and Firefox or Chrome.... yet you INSIST on forcing us to use outdated, poorly designed software from Microsoft. There's simply no excuse for this. Nor is there ANY possible excuse for OSU buying a piece of software as bad as SIS.

• I find the OSU web page very hard to navigate and HATE the people search link. You have to know the exact first and last name for this to work. That can be tricky when someone is known by a different name than that given him by his parents or when the spelling of her name is tricky.

• What I need is a system that allows for data sharing, data management, and collaboration on proposals and papers. I am using an outside wiki-farm for collaborations and have to develop my own data management system for each of my projects. I suspect that many researchers across campus are dealing with similar concerns and are re-inventing the wheel independently over and over. I think the CIO should show some leadership here.

• CIO policies are often in conflict with the functions and services expected from faculty and staff. The faculty/staff e-mail service is woefully inadequate, connectivity and support across modern mobile technology gadgets is abysmal, tools available for sharing large data files across campus and beyond OSU campus for research collaborations is non-existent. In many respects, CIO is several years behind on data management and communication technology.

• Consider updating licensed software more frequently (e.g. Maple 13).

• The IT services provided by the IT office associated with the College of Humanities have been consistently inadequate. The office polices faculty access to software, but provides next to no support for most anything else. I know this is not just my opinion, but that view is shared by other faculty members.

• I confidently recommend to my students to contact the technology services department when they have problems and I know they will not be ignored.

• also, sometimes there are problems with classroom technology. This is my 4th year as an OSU faculty member and I've been surprised at the low quality of IT services in general at OSU.

• Direct services and problem handled thru college unit are prompt and helpful on technical side. When system is "down," I presume that is university CIO and responses are prompt.

• OSU:Pro (I assume this is an Office of the CIO project) is a disaster.

• Where I marked satisfied instead of very satisfied, I think of a sense of being cumbersome. E.g., navigation from one screen to another can be time consuming.
• I am disappointed that on a couple occasions, when I sent e-mail to the CIO about policy issues (e.g., the impending requirement for frequent password changes), I did not get even an acknowledgment -- let alone a response -- to my arguments. It's a shame that expertise about such things right here on campus is completely ignored in favor of cliches about "standard practices" that have been adopted by other (mostly commercial) institutions, often without much thinking about whether they are good ideas. Not telling you anything new here, but the user interface for BuckeyeLink is simply horrible. SIS is not much better.

• It would be nice to get alerts about technology innovations that might enhance our work.

• I am a law student. My only exposure to OSU technology is some SIS, Buckeyelink, Buckeye-mail, and the law school's wireless network.

• I have had several very frustrating interactions. As an instructor, when I attempted to get a laptop for a classroom that did not have one, I was told that I could have the laptop but not the cords used to connect to the digital projector - that I would have to buy those. When I had problems with Buckeye-mail, I was told that 8-help could not help me, and I would have to take it up with Microsoft (who, naturally, never responded). From my experiences with CIO and OIT, what I have learned is never to utilize these resources and to always go to my departmental IT professionals instead, as they are inevitably more polite and helpful.

• I've never heard of the CIO until this survey, so I don't think of them as the 'information technology leaders.' I tend to think of our department's administrative wizard Erica Kallis as the person who sorts out all of that stuff. She seems to know everything about it.

• I feel there needs to be an orientation to all CIO has to offer on campus. It felt like all of this was just assumed and I had to figure it out myself.

• Not sure that I am actually familiar with the services of the CIO. I am a law student with limited access to internet services (i.e., internet access and computer access is limited to Drinko Hall), and thus have not had the opportunity to use internet on the main campus. Therefore, I have never had a need or opportunity to visit the Office of the CIO, other than through SIS and BuckeyeLink, and do not know how useful my opinion in this survey will be.

• in-person help (at Mason Hall) is astonishingly sub-par. OSU is one university, having different systems for different colleges/programs/departments is unnecessarily complicated and a terrible user experience. attending a top-ranked business school in 2011 and paying nearly $30k annually, I am extremely disappointed in the technology services at OSU. shameful.
• I teach in the Denney Hall DMP classrooms (currently in 308), and they are constantly dysfunctional—whether it be a monitor malfunctioning, the internet going out, a board being broken, chairs being broken, etc.

• I had never heard of the Office of that CIO before this survey. As a law student we have poor internet services in the law school

• I think you're doing a great job communicating and emphasizing customer service.

• I am very dissatisfactioned with the cost model for storing data on the enterprise disk array(s). Charging 5.50/GB/month is ridiculous. At that price point, it's more cost effective because of budget models to bring the storage in-house (which has been done throughout campus). Calling IT-help usually results in frustration as well as differing answers for repeated questions.

• More serious requests for business Requirements of other departments within the university are backlogged for 4-6 months. Aligned with the old government adage, certainly not moving toward eminence.

• navigation of the osu website is difficult. i feel as though an individual must already know where to find information on osu.edu and its related pages.

• I deeply appreciate the assistance provided by Mary Ann Leshy and Suresh Pudhota on the testing, troubleshooting and enablement of the eStores catalogs.

• From where I sit, ITIL and maturing service delivery models is the key to moving from Neutral to Strongly Agree in overall experience w/ OCIO services.

• I have always had great experience with the Office of the CIO, especially the assistance I get from Mike Belair regarding the data warehouse. I have more confidence in this central office than I do in my own college's computing staff.

• If our accounts payable people would join the 21st century the services your office provides would be even more valuable.

• I came from 30 years in the industry and OSU is operating in the 1980's. To schedule a meeting using doodle polls and to process approvals using excel forms and PDF forms is really not very efficient. OSU need to bite the bullet and get everyone on one system and tell everyone to compile. Outlook Exchange is the world standard. People Soft has work flows built into it for hiring and HR needs. Expense reports using paper forms are not efficient. At my last job, everyone had company credit cards that automatically feed into a reporting system. Once the receipts were matched up with the expenses, the report went off for an electronic approval. NO PAPER! I would love to talk to being on a committee to help turn OSU around. Please call me if you want my help. Thanks for asking and hopefully thanks for listening. Let's all work together to make OSU great!! Sincerely, David Emerling emerling.4 248-877-4718
• Why are there no questions about the land lines? We are a forgotten service even if it used by much of the campus admin.

• Overall, I'm very satisfied with all the IT areas that I interface with at OSU.

• Departments have no money to keep up with technology, the University should provide IT support to academic units.

• Ohio State needs to invest in technology streamlining and implementation of more PeopleSoft modules that can assist business units/colleges with efficiencies.

• As an OCIO employee, I think it's great that we work with other university departments to develop our services (e.g. e-mail-Student Life and ITSM-OSUMC) but to me this suggests that our customers are doing better at our jobs than we are. The fact that "Distcons" exists is another suggestion that we are not doing very well at supporting our customers. To me, our customers should never think to "go it alone" on technology.

• We still have a lot of home grown applications which are siloed. The mail servers should at least be synched enough to enable every dept to view calendars when scheduling and responding meeting invites. Technology should be involved earlier on while/prior to making business decisions.

• I am also amazed that OSU does not make use of an intranet like Cleveland Clinic Foundation uses - this intranet was so helpful to researchers across campus!! Why can't we do similar?!

• It would be beneficial for your office to come to a FDC meeting to review your duties and functions, how you run your projects and what your expectations are for an FDC Project Manager.

• Neutral on many of the services in the survey because I haven't even heard of them. As a new employee (one year) I am dissappointed that the CIO has not prepared an introductory services package that is given our de facto upon entering service. Help services have been above average. Personnel are friendly and helpful.

• sometimes when they give instructions on how to do something it is very confusing as to how to get to the starting point and how to continue with the procedure.

• As a member of the academic advising community at OSU who regularly uses Buckeyelink and SIS daily, I am not sure that the CIO asks for feedback on those systems and any enhancements/upgrades suggestions, but I'm not sure if that is something the Office of the CIO has to do as part of the business plan.
• I work in Athletics and the Help Staff is top notch. My only complaint is when on the road the vpn is slow when used on a wireless network.

• I also had a high school recruiting presentation scheduled over December "break" in room 002 of Psych building & computer was being updated so I had to contact bldg IT as I had a room of parents & students waiting for a presentation on a "down" computer. IT needs to verify calendar & not assume just because classes are out that staff are out & do not have classroom needs during this time. Also, constantly have issues with new or returning students activating their buckeye e-mail accounts. I direct them to 688-HELP but not sure if this is best number for these customers. Also, there doesn't seem to be any consistency when OSU e-mails are shutdown (graduated, withdrawn students, etc.). Would be nice to have a definitive answer for grads, leave of absence students.

• Can we get the Cloud? I would like to access my work documents while not at work. Thanks.

• A lot of times it's very unclear where to go for IT services... in addition, as an instructor I refer my students to utilize the services (i.e. equipment check out, etc.), but it's not very streamlined and user friendly for the students, which makes it challenging as an instructor. I hear a number of complaints from students about some of the services through OCIO.

• Seems to me Library computers should default to the Libraries home page, not the CIO home page. And a departmental library's computers -- Geology, or Music/Dance, or Science and Engineering -- should default to that library's home page.

• (1) I don't like going through my SFO for security access since it is too slow. My SFO is mostly unavailable. (2) Trouble with OSU Wireless. Most people I have talked to can't get it to work and have given up.

• I think that digital services seem to be too expensive and my experience has been that they do not anticipate or prepare well for events.

• As a newly hired IT Professional in the university I am constantly having to deal with issues that OCIO has created and fails to adress. Publishing cloud computing guidelines and then providing instructions via 8 help on how to violate them does not help me complete the mission of our college and the university. Additionally, the recent "dropping" of the google docs initiative by OCIO once again presents us with a huge challenge as we already have staff and faculty using it. We really do want to work with OCIO but it is incredibly difficult to do so. Help us do our jobs by supporting, advising and following the policies you put in place. I realize and understand that there are HUGE challenges that OCIO is facing. Just work with the colleges. We are looking for leadership, guidance and backing, not mandates.
• Also, the programs used need to be more user-friendly and less complicated in its structure. The people creating the programs should try to use them as a user to see how difficult it is to achieve a particular task.

• McAfee needs replaced by something I can trust. Where is Windows 7? How come everything is still on XP?

• Poor service to students. Lack of essential core services/applications - left to departments to provide and support.

• I work on ODS applications and collaborate frequently with OCIO personnel in that regard. The personnel are, to a person, very capable and very helpful. However, working with OCIO in general has become less efficient in recent years due to what I perceive as increased bureaucracy, project management requirements on the OCIO side.

• I think my biggest complaint is just that I have to pay for my landline telephone now. It's not too expensive, but I can't afford Caller ID, voice-mail, etc. I work nights, so it's frustrating that Buckeyelink is closed every single night. Carmen has a lot of great features but hardly anybody ever uses them. At least it functions well and doesn't need to be closed for hours at a time every night. I know this is not the fault of the CIO, but I'm sick of the computer lab in my dorm always being full of housekeeping staff. I like that Buckeye-mail doesn't have a limit like Webmail did, but I still get a ton of spam. The initial switch was poorly handled too.

• They may need to speak up about their services. Make it known what they are all about, and where and when and why you can be contacted.

END