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Section 1: Interviews and Focus Group Discussions

Introduction

This document summarizes observations from the focus groups and interviews held with a variety of stakeholder groups at Kansas State University (K-State) to gain their perspective on information technology.

The information is the result of 16 University leadership interviews and 19 focus group sessions with 211 participants representing faculty, students, staff and administration. The leadership interview participants are listed later in this document.

This document is accompanied by a workbook with detailed comments from the interviews and focus groups.

Importance of K-State’s Information Technology Capability

Summarized responses from the following questions

How important is K-State’s information technology capability to your success in your role (faculty, student, administration, etc.), using a scale of 1 to 5:

- a. Not at all important (1)
- b. Somewhat important
- c. Important (3)
- d. Very Important, but not essential
- e. Very Important and essential (5)

Nearly all (202 out of 211) respondents described information technology as “very important and essential” to their success in their role. Less than ten of the 211 respondents described it as “very important, but not essential.” Those individual selecting this lower rating, said they did so because of the work they performed on a daily basis, not necessarily due to their role in the organization. For example, one respondent said technology was important, but not essential to managing the relationships they were directly accountable for; however, in that broader context of their role, information technology was essential.

No participants rated K-State’s information technology capability as “important,” “somewhat important,” or “not at all important.”
### Information Technology Services Working Well

#### Summarized responses from the following questions

For this question, participants referred to a handout, and the list of information technology services. (Provide brief overview of services). Given the scope of information technology services provided, what are the key things that are working well?

How well are the physical security capabilities working for you? For this question, consider things like our blue light camera network, door access cards, and the campus video camera network.

- In general, interviewees and focus group participants felt that the IT staff is very helpful, want to work with customers, and provide good service directly.
- Overall, the most consistently positive responses across all groups were in regard to the communications and collaborations tools, including email, Office 365, Zoom, and Listserv. These capabilities were described as working well in every group.
- The Qualtrics survey tool is something that was highly thought of.
- Several groups identified hardware and software support as a capability that worked well. They appreciated the fact that equipment was available to be loaned out if needed.
- Faculty and students noted that support for the technology in the classrooms is very high. Several mentioned that if there was a problem, someone was able to come to the classroom quickly, and help resolve the issue.
- Other areas that received a mostly positive response were account passwords and security, with the exception of weeding out email scams or phishing.
- All groups mentioned that the information technology team members were very helpful individually.

### Information Technology Services To Be Improved

#### Summarized responses from the following questions

For this question, participants referred to a handout, and the list of information technology services. (Provide brief overview of services). Let me know if you have any questions. Given the scope of information technology services provided, what is not working? Provide brief examples only.

How well are the physical security capabilities working for you? For this question, consider things like our blue light camera network, door access cards, and the campus video camera network.

- Information technology is essential to all the work being done at the University. Participants expressed frustration that it is not managed as an essential commodity (e.g., electricity, water, etc.),
and that adequate IT support is not available to all. Some focus group participants mentioned budget and IT funding as barriers to information technology being treated as a strategic asset:

- Budget cuts have really hit IT hard, in terms of staff, maintenance, support and training, and service delivery capabilities. These are areas that were substantially reduced due to budget cuts, and which negatively impacted services.
- There are departments that have more funding for IT, and can afford additional support and can purchase information technology solutions independently. In some cases, the units with funding can purchase a needed solution, but those that do not have the funding but who may equally need that solution, are unable to purchase the solution. An example may be the learning management system.

- IT Chargeback – How ITS charges for their services does not seem to provide the insight needed. Several groups identified an inability to relate the charges in their IT bill to the specific services they receive in a measurable way.
  - One example frequently cited was telephones – almost every group mentioned that they are cutting out the phone system as a way to reduce their IT costs.
  - The perception is that end users are being charged “piecemeal” for all components of IT services, rather than treating it as a utility.
  - Others mentioned internet wall jacks and Wi-Fi ports as items that they are being charged an itemized price for, but did not think they were the only beneficiary of that service.
  - Still, others mentioned there was a point in time where department IT staff was reallocated to ITS. Those departments felt they were still paying 100% for those staff members, even though they did not exclusively support their department.

- Redundant Solutions – People expressed frustration at the number of solutions that are used for common or enterprise needs, but where there may be some functionality gaps driving some groups to adopt a different solution. Some of this may be a communications issue – e.g., the rumor mill, or the lack of a centralized source of information on enterprise agreements.
  - Email management is cited as a need by multiple departments, with the following solutions: Constant Contact, EMMA PulseSend and Listserv. However, not all solutions meet the needs for tracking, list management, monitoring email effectiveness.
  - Learning management has potential for both academic and administrative customers; some potential administrative users do not feel they have an LMS to help track courses taken, and ensure compliance where needed. In Research, there is an active project to try to consolidate information to a single LMS, so they can track mandatory training requirements.
  - CRM – there are a number of departments who are reaching out externally, and who would like a singular view of those contacts. They are not able to do this now. This includes prospective students, alumni, donors – CollegeNet vs. Talisma
  - HR – Research, administration and college of engineering each have their own HR system; Global campus has EIS.
o Time clock – several different time clock solutions in use, however, most employees don’t have an automated solution
o Physical security systems – door access, video cameras
o Room scheduling
  o This increases the complexity and cost of training and support. Students and faculty, in particular, mentioned that it is difficult to learn when there are both competing solutions and inconsistent usage.
  o They also mentioned the inability to leverage the size and scale of Kansas State to achieve economies of scale. In various departments, the vendors are the ones who can provide information on whether there is an enterprise license agreement that can be leveraged. The inability to leverage the University-wide usage to negotiate better pricing or licensing configuration.
  o The inability to have solutions that meet the range of needs, from larger programs that may need a robust solution for more complex environments, and who can afford to pay for robust functionality, to smaller programs with simpler requirements and lower budgets.
  o Students who have courses in multiple departments expressed confusion and difficulty learning multiple solutions for a common need.

• Lack of Effective Standards and Compliance – Inability to define and adhere to enterprise standards, facilitate integration and a consistent user experience. Some groups noted the following examples, which may be impacted by inconsistent hardware or software configuration:
  o Syncing passwords – the passwords may not readily synch across all solutions an individual may use.
  o TrendMicro for Windows or Mac OS platforms – works better for the windows environment.

• Wi-Fi is spotty around the campus. If you are in an older building, it is definitely problematic. Even in the newer buildings, it could be intermittent, and cause operating issues. Bandwidth is projected to become even more of an issue, given that most individuals have 2+ devices to access Wi-Fi.

• Inconsistent service delivery across the campus. There are those organizations that have funding and that can provide for some of their own information technology support, and those that do not have funding cannot provide information technology support. This leads to a tremendous amount of unevenness across several areas: training and support, incident management, hardware/software configuration, network access, applications, and project management.

• There seem to be four types of IT groups providing information technology services to the K-State community. An effective approach to governances needs to take these into account. These can be loosely described using the following categories:
  o Affiliated IT – K-State Foundation and Alumni are organizationally separate, but affiliated entities of the University, they have their own IT staff.
  o Centralized IT –This is the ITS group, which has responsibility for enterprise information technology capabilities and processes.
Distributed IT – This is a smaller IT group, typically providing a broader range of mission-specific information technology services for their unit; they may leverage the University's network infrastructure (e.g., IT function in Residential living, Student Health, Bio Research Institute, campus IT). Distributed IT units may operate fairly autonomously, but work with the centralized IT staff on projects as needed.

Small Department/College-specific IT Support

- These IT support teams are typically composed of few (<3?) staff; they support department or college-specific IT solutions, provide incident management and problem resolution for same, and ad hoc support for enterprise IT solutions; these groups appear work in conjunction and coordination with the centralized IT group.

IT Support (Help Desk) – In general, people felt that the best way to get IT support was to know someone who can possibly help you. The individual may not be the point of contact for the specific issue at hand, but they may be able to identify who to call. This ad hoc method of getting support appears to create several issues including:

- Long problem resolution times
- Ineffective handoff between decentralized IT and centralized IT – this should be a Tier 2 handoff; but instead, issues are logged as Tier 1, and move to the back of the queue. This results in a lack of confidence in ServiceNow, by the decentralized IT teams. One description was that ServiceNow is “where problems go to die”
- Lack of documentation, FAQs, ineffective/inconsistent categorization, and inability to search the knowledgebase for incident resolution further erodes the confidence in IT support, and extends the incident resolution time.

Maintenance of legacy solutions – All groups (some more so than others) seemed to believe that the ongoing budget cuts have led to reduction of maintenance on legacy applications, and that they had fallen behind. These comments were also extended to hardware, and many felt that the personal computing infrastructure was too old. In the meetings with information technology staff, this was classified as having high technology debt.

- Some customers felt that major solutions have only one person who is knowledgeable about the legacy system, and this impacted the ability to effectively support and maintain it. Examples include DARS; ERP, which as gaps in functionality and integration;
- FIS is not viewed as reliable and stable – crashes regularly. One user reported 26 days as the longest time without a crash over the past year
- ERP – there is a lot of customization, which increases the cost of maintenance, and makes its more time consuming to make changes

Information technology governance – Almost all groups expressed a need to improve information technology governance. Some expressly agreed with a proposed approach to establish a robust governance structure.

---

1 While 'Small Department/College-specific IT support' teams can also be called “distributed,” this distinction recognizes that the scale and breadth of IT support may be an important factor in aligning responsibilities and reducing redundant services.
governance structure for the University. Topical areas describing a need to improve governance included:

- Roles & responsibilities, within IT, and between the IT providers – removing redundancies, clarifying overlaps, clarifying specific points of contact
- Prioritization and application portfolio management – a transparent process for identifying what projects information technology staff should work on
- Enterprise architecture and standards – guidelines and standards to help facilitate integration and interoperability, reduces the complexity of the environment, and provides an objective approach for agreement on enterprise solution and options
- Ongoing strategic alignment – transparent process for ensuring that information technology resources are focused on the University’s highest value IT opportunities
- Budgeting and investment approval – an explicit process that provides approval for information technology initiatives and programs, and which takes into account initial and on-going costs to ensure sustainability
- Information technology service delivery/process management – a need to provide uniform information technology services across the University; an ability to relate the IT service received to the IT costs they incur; improvements in incident management and problem resolution

Most groups felt that ineffective governance impacted the University’s ability to achieve broader goals (e.g., K-state Vision 2025) using information technology.

- Phone system – many departments are eliminating the phone system due to budget constraints. However, most mentioned how limited the phone system was, and discussed the need for more unified communications or VoIP solutions.
- Access to information via the K-State website – Information needs to be easier to find, and more accurate, in terms of the content and the links, when found. Most groups expressed dissatisfaction with:
  - Navigation experience, and several expressed that Google is a better search tool for accurate, relevant information, even though the Google results point to a location to the K-State website
  - Performance metrics and web statistics – information on who is accessing the website and their engagement, most popular pages, etc.

**Desired Information Technology Capabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarized responses from the following questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What additional information technology services do you think should be provided? Can be technology or services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For this next question, participants referred to the priorities defined in the 2025 Visionary Plan (handout). In your opinion, do we have sufficient information technology capability to support this direction and vision? What are the top opportunities and priorities for applying information technology in support of Institution mission/vision/values (probe, interaction with what specific units, at what level in the Institutions specifically)?

Crystal Ball: Thinking out over the next three to five years, what are your anticipated information and technology needs? Is the University likely to be able to support those needs? Why or why not?

In response to questions about additional information technology services, most participants felt there were significant gaps in the information technology capabilities needed to move the University forward (these were documented in the previous section on “Information Technology Services Needing Improvement.” Several suggested that the need to improve existing technology management capabilities should outweigh the desire to add new information technology solutions. Still others thought addressing these technology management capabilities was critical to being well positioned for the future.

Most participants expressed a level of frustration for having a technology solution without the expertise and enabling processes needed to make it effective (we would distinguish this combination as a ‘capability’).

In addition, most participants were concerned that the investments needed to support the newer capabilities would be significant. They also noted that the University continues to face budget declines, increasing the competition for fewer dollars.

With respect to specific technology capabilities needed, to support the Visionary 2025 plan, and anticipated needs, participants identified the following areas:

- Enterprise-wide accessibility solutions that are easy to use and deploy – This was identified as a potential compliance risk where significant fines could be incurred. One participant referenced Wichita State University, which faced civil rights violations due to not complying with ADA requirements.
  - Remediation services for existing content and an enterprise-wide, proactive execution strategy are needed.
  - Closed captioning and text to vice needed for enterprise systems – CMS, Canvas, etc.
- Enterprise program and tools for data analytics – This was identified for the organization, and for the curriculum. Students expressed a desire for a degree program.
- Improved internet capabilities, increased bandwidth, address the dead spots across the University, etc.

2 In this context, we would define “capability” as a combination of an established and adopted process, the enabling tools or technology solutions, and the experienced individuals to leverage these.
• Data storage and access solutions – This was expressed regarding very large data sets, support to research, and the need to collaborate across the University and with other institutions and organizations.

• Solutions supporting the research lifecycle, from funding identification & application through grant management and compliance Enterprise digital asset management.

• IP Phone/IP TV, other unified communications capabilities.

• Communications and collaboration – tools and solutions that enable global communication and collaboration.

• Emergency Alerts – the ability to tailor alert messages to different audiences, and to send out via text and emails with more flexibility on the content.

• Automated password reset.

• Improved solutions to prevent phishing attempts and email scams.

• Enterprise solutions for shared and common needs (in some cases, it may be more than one) – this was expressed across the board – almost every group had one or two examples where multiple redundant solutions created issues. Candidate examples included:
  – Document content management (ImageNow)
  – Policy library
  – Workflow and process automation
  – Forms management
  – Mobile payment solutions
  – Plug-in tools for Canvas

• Email tracking solutions to help determine effective reach.

• Improved website analytics.

• Cloud-based solutions

The focus group participants also identified potential IT solutions that might be candidates for similar needs across the university. These are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnitin</td>
<td><a href="http://www.turnitin.com">www.turnitin.com</a></td>
<td>Solution to help prevent plagiarism, provide feedback to writer and assist with grading papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda.com/LinkedIn Learning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.linkedin.com/learning">www.linkedin.com/learning</a></td>
<td>Online source for professional development training/education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNow</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hyland.com">www.hyland.com</a></td>
<td>A content management software system that uploads, organizes, and stores documents and content. Now called Perceptive Content since being acquired by Hyland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculog</td>
<td><a href="https://www.digarc.com/">https://www.digarc.com/</a></td>
<td>Curriculum management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bomgar</td>
<td><a href="http://www.Bomgar.com">www.Bomgar.com</a></td>
<td>Bomgar is a remote support solution that allows support technicians to remotely connect to end-user systems through firewalls from their computer or mobile device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendeley</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mendeley.com">www.mendeley.com</a></td>
<td>Mendeley is a desktop and web program produced by Elsevier for managing and sharing Research papers, discovering research data and collaborating online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Sync</td>
<td><a href="http://www.OrgSync.com">www.OrgSync.com</a></td>
<td>Campus engagement network that connects your students to organizations, programs, and departments on campus in a private online community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PointClickCare</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pointclickcare.com">www.pointclickcare.com</a></td>
<td>Cloud-based electronic health records solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procare</td>
<td><a href="http://www.procaresoftware.com">www.procaresoftware.com</a></td>
<td>Child care management software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxient</td>
<td><a href="http://www.maxient.com">www.maxient.com</a></td>
<td>Student conduct incident case management software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid planner</td>
<td><a href="http://www.liquidplanner.com">www.liquidplanner.com</a></td>
<td>Online project management software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wufoo forms</td>
<td><a href="https://secure.wufoo.com/">https://secure.wufoo.com/</a></td>
<td>Online forms creator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CrashPlan</td>
<td><a href="http://www.code42.com">www.code42.com</a></td>
<td>Online backup software suite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papercut</td>
<td><a href="http://www.papercut.com">www.papercut.com</a></td>
<td>Print management software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PageUp</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pageuppeople.com">www.pageuppeople.com</a></td>
<td>HR talent management solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godot</td>
<td><a href="http://www.godotengine.org">www.godotengine.org</a></td>
<td>Cross platform game engine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handshake</td>
<td><a href="http://www.joinhandshake.com">www.joinhandshake.com</a></td>
<td>Recruiting solutions, including internships and career interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slack</td>
<td><a href="http://www.slack.com">www.slack.com</a></td>
<td>Cloud-based team collaboration environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Hat</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tophat.com">www.tophat.com</a></td>
<td>Service to enable instructors to engage students in classroom and learning activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment with Vision 2025 Plan

**Summarized responses from the following questions**

For this question, participants referred to the priorities defined in the 2025 Visionary Plan (handout). In your opinion, do we have sufficient information technology capability to support this direction and vision? What are the top opportunities and priorities for applying information technology in support of Institution mission/vision/values (probe, interaction with what specific units, at what level in the Institutions specifically)?

Crystal Ball: Thinking out over the next three to five years, what are your anticipated information and technology needs? Is the University likely to be able to support those needs? Why or why not?

- Most interview participants felt that the University leadership was very supportive of information technology as a strategic asset.
- Nearly all (202 out of 211) interview and focus group participants felt that information technology is essential and important to their jobs.
- Instead of citing technology capabilities, most participants cited improvements in technology management and leadership as key factors to achieve Vision 2025 strategic goals. They expressed support in the individuals providing information technology services, and the new ITS leadership, but did not believe the University was well situated for success in effectively leveraging IT unless key technology management areas were also addressed, such as:
  - Prioritization, especially enterprise wide decision making
  - Allocation of resources for information technology, and overall budget; reduction in IT sustainability costs
  - Coordination and agreement on solutions and approaches to meet enterprise-wide needs
  - Vision and leadership on information technology
  - Redundancy of IT services, service providers
  - Enterprise architecture and standards to facilitate integration, interoperability, ease of use, sustainability
  - Cost reduction, reducing redundancy and overlapping solutions and information technology services, improved leverage of the University’s size and scale to achieve better pricing
  - Improved information technology support and training
- Other examples are included in the section "Information Technology Services Needing Improvement."
- Specific technology capabilities needed to support the Visionary 2025 plan are identified in the section "Desired Information Technology Capabilities."
Observations Based on Stakeholder Group

This section covers the input received based on the different stakeholder groups – students, faculty, staff & administration, research, and other campus locations. The intent is to provide a high level understanding of the needs from each group that may be taken into account as part of the strategic planning effort.

A. Staff, Administrative Departments & Leadership

This category includes all administrative departments and interview participants – Human Capital, Finance & Administrative, Marketing & Communications, IT, University Support Staff Senate. Overall these groups felt that the security solutions, communications, collaboration capabilities, and the core applications portfolio worked well. In addition, they were very appreciative of the IT staff.

In terms of information technology services needing improvement, this group cited Wi-Fi and networking capabilities, information technology training, support and delivery, and reduction in redundant IT solutions among potential improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology Services Working Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Account set-up and eID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Antivirus, safety and security; online training for antivirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication and collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Calendar and email capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Digital signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working relationship with IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stability of the IT staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amazing IT staff – really want things to work and do the right thing for the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1:1 assistance from Office of Mediated Education (OME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes being made in IT service delivery – configuration management, ITIL processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Campus systems administrators group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core enterprise applications are working well, including the following specific applications:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Electronic theses, dissertations, and reports (ETDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o K-State online LMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cooperative arrangement with University of Kansas for back up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology Services to be Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing files – large file transfer, collaboration among teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2-factor authentication is too complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business intelligence/data analytics tools &amp; capabilities, data governance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Email and list management solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved networking and Wi-Fi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information Technology Services to be Improved

- KSIS can be unstable, either due to the solution itself, or Wi-Fi
- Information technology training, support and service delivery
  - Need to know someone in IT to get effective support
  - Improved IT service delivery – who to go to, where to look, increased staffing stability (i.e., mix of students vs. staff)
  - Increased IT subject matter expertise – frequently, there is only one person who is the resident SME
  - Ongoing training for staff and IT
  - Improved governance and transparency in IT prioritization and decision making; ability to ensure IT is focusing on KSU’s highest priorities
- Extended equipment lifecycles add to the complexity of the infrastructure environment, and the complexity of support.
- Employee onboarding is time-consuming and inefficient; it can take several weeks after starting for employees to get fully set up
- IT budget does not effectively support the ongoing operational costs AND provide new capabilities to support University goals
- Fewer redundant solutions
- Blurring of the lines between K-State owned technology and personal technology may require new policies

### Desired Information Technology Capabilities

- Improved integration among core systems
- Workflow and automation tools
- Improved transparency, project management, IT strategy, enterprise architecture
- Media asset management/enterprise digital asset management
- Accessibility features in core systems ASAP, CMS, Canvas, etc.
- Mobile payment solutions
- Improve compliance with data security and privacy regulation – GDPR, PCI, FERPA
- Enterprise CRM solution
- University standard for card key/door access and other physical security capabilities
- Unified communications capabilities to provide next generation communications

### B. Faculty & Academic Leadership

This group included Faculty, Faculty Senate, Dean’s Council, Polytechnic, and Global Campus. This group identified security solutions, communications and collaboration, IT support for the classroom, and some selected core solutions as working well.

They cited improvements needed in some of these same areas, echoing feedback hear from other groups regarding Wi-Fi, lack of integration between support solutions, improved support for less commonly used
solutions, and the need to get the most out of the solutions already in place. In addition, they identified having a single set of solutions for accessibility needs would be helpful.

**IT Services Working Well**

- Antivirus
- eID and passwords
- Single password for signing on
- Communications and collaboration
- Zoom
- Equipment checkout
- IT support for classroom
- ETDR
- Canvas – Move to the enterprise systems
- Microsoft Office solutions
- K-State online
- Content Management System (CMS)

**Information Technology Services to be Improved**

- Frequency of changing passwords
- Accessibility – single set of accessibility solutions; should be streamlined
- EAB student success collaborative is underutilized
- Using the full set of capabilities for Talisma
- Lack of integration between some of the frequently used core systems – Talisma, EIS, HR; KSIS/DARS
- Current/real time financial information
- Improved Wi-Fi and network support, especially in older buildings
- PageUp, which may contain private information, seems to have no oversight by IT; some concern that the information is not securely protected
- Information technology support and service delivery
  - More consistent level of service across the campus
  - Improved support for faculty to be able to leverage the technology solutions they have – TEVAL, classroom scheduling tablets
  - Support for Linux applications
  - Need to know who to go to for IT support
  - Training could be better focused on the unique needs of faculty, help faculty to really leverage the technology solutions they have access to (e.g., Lecture Capture, KSIS)
  - Ability to accommodate specialized solutions that are not standard
  - Improved/increased involvement by user community prior to changing core applications

**Desired Information Technology Capabilities**

- Plagiarism solution – turn it in
Desired Information Technology Capabilities

- Move commonly used solution to enterprise wide for more cost effective – ImageNow, Linda.com/LinkedIn, Turnitin
- Encryption – AES or ad hoc file encryption solution
- Data analytics – should lead to understanding of students; a lot of data is available, but there are still significant gaps
- Ability to be able to share data easily – large data sets, network bandwidth
- Building access controls
- Ability to more effectively screen and detect fraudulent emails and phishing schemes
- Curriculum management solution (Curriculog does not work)
- Website analytics
- Inventory of popularly used solutions

C. Research

This group included a cross-section of individuals whose roles are primarily research, and support of information technology for research. They identified a few capabilities they felt were working well, but the overall message was that information technology needs for the research community were not well supported. This included data analytics and reporting to accommodate the reporting and compliance needs, data storage, and support for researchers in the field.

IT Services Working Well

- Qualtrics
- Calendar, email etc.
- eID and passwords
- Zoom
- Content management and Google analytics
- K-State online directory

Information Technology Services to be Improved

- Tracking factors that affect our eligibility for Research funding
- Research protocol and compliance
- Electronic research administration
- Reporting and analytics – this changes all the time, but funders and entities providing oversight request lots of reports
- Coordinated solution for common needs, such as learning management system (internal); HR
- Support and capabilities for data analysis needs - researchers have a lot of database needs
- Support for individual and large scale data needs - research may be at risk because of inadequate support
**Desired Information Technology Capabilities**

- Improved security
- Improved K-State mobile app – interface is difficult
- Research administration – submitting proposals, proving support information, monitoring grants
- Research support in the field/lab
- Agile approaches to information technology, to enable the organization to quickly respond to changing federal requirements
- Central IT support of research IT needs
- Workflow solution

**D. Students**

This group included students and representatives from the student government association. Overall, the students were pleased with the technology services that were available to them, but did not feel that they used the technology to its fullest extent. In terms of improvement, they were almost unique in identifying the user interface as not being appealing, and wanted a much easier and consistent way of scheduling time with faculty. They also cited the need for more consistency with the physical security systems across campus, and to replace outdated equipment.

**IT Services Working Well**

- Communication & collaboration
- Computer repair & maintenance, including equipment checkout
- Office 365
- Email
- University computing labs
- Media development center
- K-State alerts

**Information Technology Services to be Improved**

- Canvas – would be good if faculty used the solution more fully
- KSIS/DARS user interface is unappealing
- Assisting faculty in their use and adoption of the technology that is available to them
- K-State mobile app (KSIS, Canvas, Parking, etc.) underutilized
- Link course and class schedule with outlook calendar
- Trend Micro solution does not work across all platforms well
- Safety solutions – some lights do not work, video system is outdated; this is a high priority for students; not all buildings have card key access
- Website is not optimized for mobile devices
- Would like more mobile apps in general
- Six months is too frequent to change passwords
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Information Technology Capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Creating access to other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inventory of solutions and tools available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• System to be able to sign up online for advisor appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reference citation tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Distributed IT Groups**

These groups included Student life, Residence & Dining, Facilities, Athletics, each of which provide IT services more directly to their stakeholders. As a result, their focus was more on additional IT solutions they would like to see from the central IT organization, in the form of enterprise solutions for enterprise needs, for example, in security, CRM, and coordinated purchasing and cooperative contracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Services Working Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Technology Services to be Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Information Technology Capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• University-wide CRM Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secure texting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PCI compliant form builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinated contracting that enables us to take advantage of the university scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data governance and privacy – requires student input to have effective policies and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Virtual desktop capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wireless upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IP TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IP Phones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Other Campus Locations**

This group included representatives from other campus locations and the Global Campus. In general, these participants had some local IT support to meet their needs, and felt that day to day operations went well. They cited the lack of a university wide CRM solution as an area to be improved, as well as governance, and a need to update financial systems for more real time access to information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Services Working Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Microsoft office suite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IT Services Working Well

- Network, security, internet access, and VPN
- Day to day operations go well
- eID and passwords
- Content management system
- K-State online

## Information Technology Services to be Improved

- Telephone connectivity
- Lack of university-wide CRM
- Talisma works well for larger organizations, but not as well for smaller entities like our campuses
- Financial systems are old, and do not have real time information
- Accessibility solutions to ensure compliance
- One Drive – difficult to share and clunky
- Some entities have their own active directory implementation (Vet school), and this creates some complexity and synch issues
- Governance – project prioritization, project portfolio, planning
- Instructional design

## Desired Information Technology Capabilities

- Encryption, especially ad hoc file encryption
- Unified communications – Arts & Science has started using Google voice
Section 2: Information Technology Satisfaction Survey

Introduction

As a part of the information technology strategic planning effort, the team conducted a survey of students, faculty, staff, and administration from April 27 through May 18, 2018. This report summarizes the survey demographics and observations.

Respondent Demographics (Q1 thru Q8)

- A total of **1,290 persons** responded to the survey from a wide range of respondents, including undergraduate and graduate students (42% of responses), support staff and unclassified professionals (35%), full-time and part-time faculty (16%), University administrators (4%), and others (3%). Counts of respondents by group can be found in the table below. [Question 1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Group</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Support Staff</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Professional</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administrator (including department heads, assistant Deans, Associate Deans, Vice Presidents)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, please specify</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Students at all four campuses, and from all colleges participated in the survey. The majority of student respondents were from the Manhattan (88%) and global (11%) campuses. The top colleges in the percentage of student responses were Engineering (25%), Arts and Sciences (20%), Business Administration (20%), and Agriculture (15%). [Questions 2 and 3]

- Unclassified professionals and university support staff from a variety of business units and departments participated in the survey. All unclassified professional and support staff respondents were from the Manhattan campus. The top business units in terms of the percentage of administration responses were Others (20.3%), Academic/Instructional Departments (20%), Student Services (16%), Information Technology Services (16%), and Research (7.7%). [Questions 4 and 5]

- University administrators from a variety of business units and departments participated in the survey. All administrator respondents were from the Manhattan campus. The top business units in terms of the percentage of administration responses were Academic/Instructional Departments (50%), Student Services (16%), and Others (14%). [Questions 4 and 5]

- Faculty at all four campuses, and from all colleges participated in the survey. The majority of faculty respondents were from the Manhattan campus (94%). The top colleges in percentage of faculty
responses were Arts and Sciences (39%), Agriculture (17%), Engineering (10%), and Human Ecology (9%). 45% of responding faculty indicated that their role was primarily instructional, and 30% indicated that their role was primarily research-based. [Questions 6, 7, and 8]  

Direction and Vision (Q9 thru Q15)  

- Students had mostly positive or neutral views of the University leadership’s direction and vision for Information Technology. [Question 9]  
- Faculty had generally negative or divided responses regarding University leadership’s direction and vision for Information Technology, and had significantly higher percentages of negative responses and comments than did students in this area. [Question 13]  
- University Administrators had generally negative responses regarding University leadership’s direction and vision for Information Technology. Among all groups surveyed, Administrators had the highest percentage of negative responses in this area. [Question 13]  
- Other Staff (university support staff and unclassified professional staff) had mixed responses regarding University leadership’s direction and vision for Information Technology. Other Staff had generally had more negative responses than Students and Faculty, but more positive responses than Administration. [Question 13]  

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction / Vision - University Leadership</th>
<th>Students (Q9), 376 respondents</th>
<th>Faculty (Q13), 165 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University leadership has a clear vision for technology.</td>
<td>56% Positive</td>
<td>28% Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University appears to be proactive to changing technology to better meet academic and administrative needs.</td>
<td>63% Positive</td>
<td>39% Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-State's 2025 Visionary Plan has a clear vision for technology.</td>
<td>37% Neutral/Positive</td>
<td>28% Neutral/Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction / Vision - University Leadership</th>
<th>Administrators (Q13), 45 respondents</th>
<th>Other Staff (Q13), 367 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University leadership has a clear vision for technology.</td>
<td>20% Neutral/Negative</td>
<td>25% Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University appears to be proactive to changing technology to better meet academic and administrative needs.

K-State's 2025 Visionary Plan has a clear vision for technology.

- Students had mostly positive or neutral views of overall IT leadership at K-State. [Question 11]
- Faculty had generally positive or neutral views of overall IT leadership at K-State, but had higher percentages of negative responses than students in this area. [Question 15]
- University Administrators had mostly positive views of overall IT leadership at K-State, but had negative responses regarding two questions related to IT leadership’s vision and goals. For most questions regarding IT leadership at K-State, either Administration or Other Staff had the highest percentage of negative responses among groups surveyed. [Question 15]
- Other Staff (including university support staff and unclassified professionals) had generally positive or neutral views of overall IT leadership at K-State. For most questions regarding IT leadership at K-State, either Administration or Other Staff had the highest percentage of negative responses among groups surveyed. [Question 15]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction / Vision - Information Technology</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT services are well-aligned with the University's overall vision and goals.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT staff listen to my needs and provide an action plan to resolve requests (when feasible).</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT is customer service oriented.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New technology equipment/projects are effectively managed by IT.</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction / Vision - Information Technology</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support academics.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Neutral/Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support administration.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Neutral/Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT helps the University achieve positive results.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction / Vision - Information Technology</td>
<td>Administrators (Q15), 44 respondents</td>
<td>Other Staff (Q15), 360 respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT services are well-aligned with the University's overall vision and goals.</td>
<td>24% 48% 29% Neutral/Negative</td>
<td>36% 42% 22% Neutral/Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT staff listen to my needs and provide an action plan to resolve requests (when feasible).</td>
<td>76% 17% 7% Positive</td>
<td>65% 20% 15% Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT is customer service oriented.</td>
<td>73% 14% 14% Positive</td>
<td>62% 21% 17% Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New technology equipment/projects are effectively managed by IT.</td>
<td>61% 30% 9% Positive</td>
<td>44% 30% 27% Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student and Administrative Systems (Q17 thru Q18)**

- Students had very positive responses regarding the University's student information system (KSIS).
  
  **[Question 17]**
  
  - Over 85% of students agreed that they have access to the screens and information they need to support their learning, assessments, and classroom responsibilities, as well as to systems needed for enrollment, tuition, financial aid, student nutrition, and other administrative purposes.
  
  - Over 75% of students said that they trust the data in the University’s student information system.

**Students, 351 respondents**

17. Please answer the following questions regarding the University's student information system (KSIS)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the screens and information that I need to support my learning.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the screens and information that I need to complete assignments, assessments, and other classroom responsibilities.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students, 351 respondents

17. Please answer the following questions regarding the University's student information system (KSIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the screens and information that I need for enrollment, tuition, financial aid, student nutrition, and other administrative purposes.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's student information systems.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Faculty, University Administrators, and Other Staff (including university support staff and unclassified professionals) had generally positive responses regarding the University’s administrative systems, although each of these groups indicated deficiencies or difficulties with reporting and dashboards. Additionally, University administrators indicated deficiencies or difficulties with accessing and querying data within financial and human resources systems. [Question 18]

Faculty, 157 respondents

18. University Administrative Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the screens that I need to complete my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the data that I need for my role (data-driven decision-making).</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's financial information system (FIS).</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's human resources information system (HRIS).</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's student information system (KSIS).</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to run my own queries in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to write my own reports in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use finance, HR, or payroll system dashboards for analysis, monitoring, or alerts related to my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators, 44 respondents

18. University Administrative Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the screens that I need to complete my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the data that I need for my role (data-driven decision-making).</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's financial information system (FIS).</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators, 44 respondents</td>
<td>18. University Administrative Systems</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's human resources information system (HRIS).</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's student information system (KSIS).</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to run my own queries in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to write my own reports in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use finance, HR, or payroll system dashboards for analysis, monitoring, or alerts related to my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Staff, 366 respondents</th>
<th>18. University Administrative Systems</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the screens that I need to complete my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have access to the data that I need for my role (data-driven decision-making).</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's financial information system (FIS).</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's human resources information system (HRIS).</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust the data in the University's student information system (KSIS).</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to run my own queries in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to write my own reports in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use finance, HR, or payroll system dashboards for analysis, monitoring, or alerts related to my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Centralized Information Technology Support (Q20 thru Q24)**

- Respondents indicated positive experiences and interactions with centralized Information Technology Services (ITS) for technology support. [Question 20]
- Only 40% of respondents felt that ITS had sufficient staff to ensure that technology is functioning appropriately. This is notable because it is significantly lower (>20%) that the positive responses for other questions in this area.
20. Please answer the following questions regarding your interaction with centralized Information Technology Services (ITS) for technology support. (833 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS resolves technology problems in an appropriate timeframe.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS personnel are adequately trained to provide the level of service required.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS personnel communicate the nature of the problem and how to avoid it in the future.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS communicates the status of outstanding requests to the requesting student/staff.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS personnel take the time to understand the nature of the problem.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication from ITS is appropriate in terms of frequency/content of message.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that ITS has sufficient staff to ensure that technology is functioning appropriately.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Neutral/Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Respondents indicated that 67% of their technology service requests to ITS are resolved the same day of the request or within 1-2 days, which 80% of respondents indicated was an acceptable turnaround time for resolution. Respondents indicated that 30% of their technology requests to ITS are resolved the same day as reported. Respondents indicated that 11% of requests to ITS take greater than 1 week to resolve. [Question 21]
- Overall, respondents indicated that decentralized IT typically resolves incidents in a more timely manner than ITS. [Questions 21 and 26]

21. Incident Resolution - Centralized IT (831 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Same Day</th>
<th>1-2 Days</th>
<th>3-4 Days</th>
<th>5-6 Days</th>
<th>1-2 Weeks</th>
<th>2-4 Weeks</th>
<th>4+ Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of my technology service requests are usually resolved in:</td>
<td>30%³</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An acceptable turnaround time for resolution is:</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Respondents indicated generally positive or neutral experiences and interactions with centralized Information Technology Services (ITS) for technology training. [Question 22]

---

³ This is far below the help desk cross-industry average of 68.1% of incidents resolved during the first call for 2016, according to Gartner, “IT Key Metrics Data 2017: Key Infrastructure Measures: IT Service Desk Analysis: Multiyear”, published December 12, 2016.
22. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements in regards to technology training and staff development provided by central Information Technology Services (ITS). (833 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate technology-related staff development opportunities are being offered to staff throughout the University.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of technology-related training classes is pertinent to end users.</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training classes are offered at times that I can attend.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Neutral/Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trainers communicate class material effectively.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Neutral/Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer online or self-paced training over face-to-face classes.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-related staff development helps me integrate technology into my work.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-related training materials are easy to use and effective training tools.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Neutral/Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decentralized Information Technology Support (Q25 thru Q27)

- Respondents indicated positive experiences and interactions with decentralized information technology services for technology support. [Question 25]
- Only 53% of respondents felt that decentralized IT units had sufficient information technology support staff within their department to support teaching and learning. This is notable because it is significantly lower (>20%) than the positive responses for other questions in this area.

25. Please answer the following questions regarding your interaction with decentralized information technology for technology support. (815 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized technology support personnel resolve problems in an appropriate timeframe.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized technology support personnel are adequately trained to provide the level of service required.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized technology support personnel communicate the nature of the issue and how to avoid it in the future.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized technology support personnel communicate the status of outstanding requests to the requesting student/staff.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized technology support personnel take the time to understand the nature of the problem.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Please answer the following questions regarding your interaction with decentralized information technology for technology support. (815 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication from decentralized technology support personnel is appropriate in terms of frequency/content of message.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe we have sufficient decentralized technology support staff within my department to support teaching and research.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Respondents indicated that 78% of their technology service requests to decentralized IT are resolved the same day of the request or within 1-2 days, which 82% of respondents indicated was an acceptable turnaround time for resolution. Respondents indicated that 42% of their technology service requests are resolved the same day as reported. Respondents indicated that 8% of requests to decentralized IT units take greater than 1 week to resolve. [Question 26]
- Overall, respondents indicated that decentralized IT units resolve incidents in a more timely manner than ITS (42% resolved on the same day, vs. 30% same day resolution for ITS) – however both are substantially lower than the helpdesk average of 68% (see footnote 3, page 21). [Questions 21 and 26]

26. Incident Resolution - Decentralized IT (646 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to Resolution</th>
<th>Same Day</th>
<th>1-2 Days</th>
<th>3-4 Days</th>
<th>5-6 Days</th>
<th>1-2 Weeks</th>
<th>2-4 Weeks</th>
<th>4+ Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of my technology service requests are usually resolved in:</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An acceptable turnaround time for resolution is:</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Respondents indicated generally positive experiences and interactions with decentralized information technology for technology training. [Question 27]

27. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements in regards to technology training and staff development provided by decentralized information technology (615 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate technology-related staff development opportunities are being offered to staff throughout the University.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of technology-related training classes is pertinent to end users.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training classes are offered at times that I can attend.</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trainers communicate class material effectively.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer online or self-paced training over face-to-face classes.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements in regards to technology training and staff development provided by decentralized information technology (615 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology-related staff development helps me integrate technology into my work.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-related training materials are easy to use and effective training tools.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Division of Responsibilities (Q30 thru Q31)

- Respondents generally had positive responses regarding their understanding of the division of responsibilities between ITS and decentralized IT for technology support. [Question 30]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q30. Please answer the following questions regarding technology support. (663 respondents)</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand the respective roles and responsibilities of central Information Technology Services (ITS) and decentralized information technology support.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know who to call for information technology support.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For several categories of incidents/requests (notably the following categories: system access, new technology requests, questions regarding productivity software, support for classroom technology, technology-related support for research activities, network-related issues, and questions regarding enhancing productivity or services through the use of technology), comparable percentages of respondents indicated that they would contact ITS and decentralized IT for support. [Question 31]

- On average across all categories of incidents/requests, 25% of respondents indicated that they do not know who to contact for a given issue. [Question 31]. More than 30% indicated they did not know who to contact for questions/requests regarding the financial information system, HR information systems, technology-related support for research activities, voice system related issues and questions regarding enhancing productivity or services through the use of technology.

- The above points would seem to contradict the generally positive responses regarding understanding of division of responsibilities from Question 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q31. Please indicate who you would typically contact for the issues and requests listed. Please mark all that apply. (677 respondents)</th>
<th>Centralized ITS</th>
<th>Decentralized IT Support</th>
<th>I Don't Know Who to Contact for this Issue</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions / requests regarding the financial information system (FIS).</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions / requests regarding the human resources information system (HRIS).</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions / requests regarding the student information system (KSIS).</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Password resets.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Please indicate who you would typically contact for the issues and requests listed. Please mark all that apply. (677 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Centralized ITS</th>
<th>Decentralized IT Support</th>
<th>I Don't Know Who to Contact for this Issue</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System access including network and software access.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New technology requests including hardware, software, services.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions regarding productivity software.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for classroom technology including workstation and presentation.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-related support for research activities.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network-related issues (both wired and wireless).</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice system related issues.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions regarding enhancing productivity or services through the use of technology.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technology Effectiveness and Adequacy (Q33 thru Q40)

- Respondents had generally positive responses regarding overall effectiveness of technology to support teaching, learning, and research. [Question 33]

33. Please respond to the following statements from your perspective (678 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively use technology to support teaching and learning.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University provides sufficient and appropriate technology resources and support to support teaching and learning.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to effectively use technology to support my research activities.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University provides sufficient and appropriate technology support for my research activities.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Respondents had generally positive responses regarding the adequacy of K-State’s technology applications for their current needs. [Question 36]
- Respondents had generally positive responses regarding the adequacy of K-State’s technology applications for their anticipated future needs. [Question 39]
- For all categories of technology applications listed in the survey, respondents displayed lower percentages of agreement and higher percentages of disagreement with the statement “This technology solution, as it exists today, is adequate for my anticipated future needs” compared to the statement “This technology solution, as it exists today, is adequate for my anticipated current needs.”
- 72% of respondents agreed that the overall portfolio of technology applications available to them today meets their current needs, whereas 15% disagreed. [Question 37]
• 51% of respondents agreed that the overall portfolio of technology applications available to them today meets their anticipated future needs, whereas 27% disagreed. [Question 40]

• The differences in agreement observed when comparing current technology adequacy with future technology adequacy could be understood as an indicator that students and staff expect K-State’s technology applications and environment to grow in the future and keep pace with technology trends and advancement in higher education. [Questions 36–40]

• 49% of respondents felt that web creation tools and capabilities met their current needs and 46% felt this would be sufficient to meet their future needs. This is significantly lower (15–39%) than positive responses in all other capability areas.

<p>| For each of the following technology solutions you use, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: This technology solution, as it exists today, is adequate for my [current/future] needs. | Current (Q36), 645 respondents | Future (Q39), 644 respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accounts eID and passwords, eProfile, Connect, ID Cards | Positive | Neutral | Negative | Opinion | Positive | Neutral | Negative | Opinion |
| 89% | 7% | 5% | Positive | 75% | 14% | 11% | Positive |
| Safety &amp; Security Passwords, Antivirus, Scams blog, K-State Alerts | Positive | 66% | 17% | 17% | Positive |
| 82% | 8% | 10% | Positive | 66% | 17% | 17% | Positive |
| Web Creating web pages, Domain names (DNS), Content management system (CMS), Tools for web publishing, Website consulting | Positive | 46% | 26% | 28% | Positive/Neutral |
| 49% | 25% | 26% | Positive | 46% | 26% | 28% | Positive/Neutral |
| Labs and Printing University computing labs, K-State InfoCommons (Hale Library), Printing | Positive | 58% | 28% | 14% | Positive |
| 68% | 22% | 10% | Positive | 58% | 28% | 14% | Positive |
| Teaching &amp; Research Technology classrooms, Instructional design, K-State Online (Canvas), TEVAL, Electronic Theses, Dissertations &amp; Reports (ETDR), K-State Survey (Qualtrics) | Positive | 56% | 24% | 20% | Positive |
| 67% | 19% | 14% | Positive | 56% | 24% | 20% | Positive |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current (Q36), 645 respondents</th>
<th>Future (Q39), 644 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For each of the following technology solutions you use,</strong> <strong>please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: This technology solution, as it exists today, is adequate for my [current/future] needs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone &amp; TV</strong> K-State specific programming, Cable TV service, Telephone services, Voicemail</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication &amp; Collaboration</strong> Calendar, Email/webmail, Office 365, Mailing lists (LISTSERV), Audio/Video Conferencing, Digital Signage</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hardware &amp; Software</strong> Antivirus, Computer repair and maintenance, Software, Equipment checkout, Virtualization</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multimedia &amp; Video</strong> Equipment checkout, Media development center, Multimedia, Video production, Webcasting/podcasting, Lecture Capture</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet &amp; Network</strong> Internet access, Wi-Fi, K-State VPN, Network access, ResNet</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training &amp; Support</strong> KSIS, K-State Online, Security, Technology, Technology classrooms, Help Desk, Desktop Support</td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of the following technology solutions you use, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

This technology solution, as it exists today, is adequate for my [current/future] needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Current (Q36), 645 respondents</th>
<th>Future (Q39), 644 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications Connect, Talisma, Business</td>
<td>Positive 53%</td>
<td>Neutral 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence/Analytics, Image Now, FIS/MIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuickBooks, HRIS, KSIS/DARS, Custom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

The overall portfolio of technology applications available to me today meets my [current/future] needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Current (Q37), 627 respondents</th>
<th>Future (Q40), 622 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The overall portfolio of technology applications available to me today</td>
<td>Positive 72%</td>
<td>Neutral 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meets my [current/future] needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Technology Maturity (Q42)

- 21% of respondents amongst all groups rated K-State as above average or significantly above average in comparison to other public research universities they are familiar with, whereas 24% rated K-State as below average or significantly below average. [Question 42]
- Among the groups surveyed, Students had the highest percentage of positive responses in regards to overall technology adequacy and maturity at K-State in comparison to other public research universities, followed by Faculty, Other Staff, and University Administrators (in that order). [Question 42]
- Among the groups surveyed, University Administrators had the highest percentage of negative responses in regards to overall technology adequacy and maturity at K-State in comparison to other public research universities, followed by Faculty, Other Staff, and Students (in that order). [Question 42]
- Faculty had the highest percentage of respondents who considered K-State to be significantly below average compared to other public research universities in regards to overall technology adequacy and maturity. [Question 42]

42. I would consider K-State to be ____________ in comparison to other public research universities that I am familiar with, in regards to selection and adequacy of IT solutions and information technology maturity and effectiveness.
### Respondent Group Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Group</th>
<th>Significantly Above Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Significantly Below Average</th>
<th>I Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondent Groups (618 respondents)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (200 resp.)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (119 resp.)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administrators (36 resp.)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff (263 resp.)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment – K-State IT Survey Data

Q 9: Direction/Vision - University Leadership
Students Only (n=376)

- University leadership has a clear vision for technology.
  - Strongly Agree: 16%
  - Somewhat Agree: 40%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 29%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 12%
  - Strongly Disagree: 3%

- The University appears to be proactive to changing technology to better meet academic and administrative needs.
  - Strongly Agree: 22%
  - Somewhat Agree: 42%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 18%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 15%
  - Strongly Disagree: 5%

- K-State's 2025 Visionary Plan has a clear vision for technology.
  - Strongly Agree: 16%
  - Somewhat Agree: 21%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 51%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 7%
  - Strongly Disagree: 4%
IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support academics.

- Strongly Agree: 18%
- Somewhat Agree: 40%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 31%
- Somewhat Disagree: 9%
- Strongly Disagree: 2%

IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support administration.

- Strongly Agree: 19%
- Somewhat Agree: 35%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 35%
- Somewhat Disagree: 8%
- Strongly Disagree: 2%

IT helps the University achieve positive results.

- Strongly Agree: 34%
- Somewhat Agree: 42%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 16%
- Somewhat Disagree: 4%
- Strongly Disagree: 3%

IT services are well-aligned with the University’s overall vision and goals.

- Strongly Agree: 23%
- Somewhat Agree: 39%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 30%
- Somewhat Disagree: 5%
- Strongly Disagree: 3%

IT staff listen to my needs and provide an action plan to resolve requests (when feasible).

- Strongly Agree: 30%
- Somewhat Agree: 34%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 24%
- Somewhat Disagree: 9%
- Strongly Disagree: 3%

IT is customer service oriented.

- Strongly Agree: 29%
- Somewhat Agree: 38%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 25%
- Somewhat Disagree: 6%
- Strongly Disagree: 3%

New technology equipment/projects are effectively managed by IT.

- Strongly Agree: 22%
- Somewhat Agree: 39%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 30%
- Somewhat Disagree: 8%
- Strongly Disagree: 2%
Q13: Direction/Vision – University Leadership Support Staff and Unclassified Professionals (n=367)

University leadership has a clear vision for technology.
- Strongly Agree: 4%
- Somewhat Agree: 21%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 37%
- Somewhat Disagree: 28%
- Strongly Disagree: 11%

The University appears to be proactive to changing technology to better meet academic and administrative needs.
- Strongly Agree: 7%
- Somewhat Agree: 31%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 28%
- Somewhat Disagree: 25%
- Strongly Disagree: 10%

K-State's 2025 Visionary Plan has a clear vision for technology.
- Strongly Agree: 3%
- Somewhat Agree: 24%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 47%
- Somewhat Disagree: 19%
- Strongly Disagree: 7%
Q15: Direction/Vision - Information Technology
Faculty Only (n = 164)

- IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support academics.
  - Strongly Agree: 10%
  - Somewhat Agree: 31%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 34%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 18%
  - Strongly Disagree: 7%

- IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support administration.
  - Strongly Agree: 5%
  - Somewhat Agree: 44%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 18%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 27%
  - Strongly Disagree: 6%

- IT helps the University achieve positive results.
  - Strongly Agree: 5%
  - Somewhat Agree: 16%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 13%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 37%
  - Strongly Disagree: 29%

- IT services are well-aligned with the University’s overall vision and goals.
  - Strongly Agree: 8%
  - Somewhat Agree: 32%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 37%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 32%
  - Strongly Disagree: 9%

- IT staff listen to my needs and provide an action plan to resolve requests (when feasible).
  - Strongly Agree: 9%
  - Somewhat Agree: 35%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 32%
  - Strongly Disagree: 9%

- IT is customer service oriented.
  - Strongly Agree: 6%
  - Somewhat Agree: 37%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 12%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 28%
  - Strongly Disagree: 16%

- New technology equipment/projects are effectively managed by IT.
  - Strongly Agree: 8%
  - Somewhat Agree: 31%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 30%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 13%
  - Strongly Disagree: 13%
Q15: Direction/Vision - Information Technology
Support Staff and Unclassified Professionals (n=360)

- IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support academics.
  - Strongly Agree: 7%
  - Somewhat Agree: 27%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 42%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 18%
  - Strongly Disagree: 7%

- IT leadership has a clear vision for the future of technology to support administration.
  - Strongly Agree: 5%
  - Somewhat Agree: 28%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 37%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 20%
  - Strongly Disagree: 10%

- IT helps the University achieve positive results.
  - Strongly Agree: 23%
  - Somewhat Agree: 46%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 21%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 6%
  - Strongly Disagree: 4%

- IT services are well-aligned with the University’s overall vision and goals.
  - Strongly Agree: 7%
  - Somewhat Agree: 29%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 42%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 17%
  - Strongly Disagree: 5%

- IT staff listen to my needs and provide an action plan to resolve requests (when feasible).
  - Strongly Agree: 24%
  - Somewhat Agree: 41%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 20%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 11%
  - Strongly Disagree: 4%

- IT is customer service oriented.
  - Strongly Agree: 25%
  - Somewhat Agree: 37%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 21%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 13%
  - Strongly Disagree: 4%

- New technology equipment/projects are effectively managed by IT.
  - Strongly Agree: 12%
  - Somewhat Agree: 31%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 34%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 14%
  - Strongly Disagree: 8%
I have access to the screens and information that I need to support my learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have access to the screens and information that I need to complete assignments, assessments, and other classroom responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have access to the screens and information that I need for enrollment, tuition, financial aid, student nutrition, and other administrative purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I trust the data in the University's student information systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17: University's Student Information System (KSIS)  
Students Only (n = 351)
Q18: Access to Data - University Administrative Systems
Faculty Only (n = 157)

- I have access to the screens that I need to complete my job responsibilities.
  - Strongly Agree: 36%
  - Somewhat Agree: 30%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 13%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 16%
  - Strongly Disagree: 5%

- I have access to the data that I need for my role (data-driven decision-making).
  - Strongly Agree: 24%
  - Somewhat Agree: 29%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 18%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 21%
  - Strongly Disagree: 7%

- I trust the data in the University's financial information system (FIS).
  - Strongly Agree: 29%
  - Somewhat Agree: 25%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 30%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 10%
  - Strongly Disagree: 5%

- I trust the data in the University's human resources information system (HRIS).
  - Strongly Agree: 35%
  - Somewhat Agree: 39%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 7%
  - Strongly Disagree: 4%

- I trust the data in the University's student information system (SIS).
  - Strongly Agree: 36%
  - Somewhat Agree: 39%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 14%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 8%
  - Strongly Disagree: 3%

- I am able to run my own queries in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.
  - Strongly Agree: 14%
  - Somewhat Agree: 33%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 22%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 12%
  - Strongly Disagree: 18%

- I am able to write my own reports in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.
  - Strongly Agree: 11%
  - Somewhat Agree: 8%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 31%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 24%
  - Strongly Disagree: 26%

- I use finance, HR, or payroll system dashboards for analysis, monitoring, or alerts related to my job responsibilities.
  - Strongly Agree: 12%
  - Somewhat Agree: 18%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 24%
  - Somewhat Disagree: 16%
  - Strongly Disagree: 30%
Q18: Access to Data - University Administrative Systems

Administrators Only (n = 44)

1. I have access to the screens that I need to complete my job responsibilities.
   - Strongly Agree: 32%
   - Somewhat Agree: 48%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 9%
   - Strongly Disagree: 5%

2. I have access to the data that I need for my role (data-driven decision-making).
   - Strongly Agree: 7%
   - Somewhat Agree: 16%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 23%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 41%
   - Strongly Disagree: 14%

3. I trust the data in the University's financial information system (FIS).
   - Strongly Agree: 21%
   - Somewhat Agree: 34%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 13%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 21%
   - Strongly Disagree: 11%

4. I trust the data in the University's human resources information system (HRIS).
   - Strongly Agree: 19%
   - Somewhat Agree: 45%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 12%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 19%
   - Strongly Disagree: 5%

5. I trust the data in the University's student information system (KSIS).
   - Strongly Agree: 18%
   - Somewhat Agree: 62%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 10%
   - Strongly Disagree: 5%

6. I am able to run my own queries in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.
   - Strongly Agree: 8%
   - Somewhat Agree: 8%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 25%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 21%
   - Strongly Disagree: 38%

7. I am able to write my own reports in the University's finance, payroll and HR systems.
   - Strongly Agree: 0%
   - Somewhat Agree: 9%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 18%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 18%
   - Strongly Disagree: 55%

8. I use finance, HR, or payroll system dashboards for analysis, monitoring, or alerts related to my job responsibilities.
   - Strongly Agree: 5%
   - Somewhat Agree: 14%
   - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 14%
   - Somewhat Disagree: 19%
   - Strongly Disagree: 48%
ITS resolves technology problems in an appropriate timeframe.

- Strongly Agree: 26%
- Somewhat Agree: 43%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15%
- Somewhat Disagree: 12%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

ITS personnel are adequately trained to provide the level of service required.

- Strongly Agree: 26%
- Somewhat Agree: 39%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 19%
- Somewhat Disagree: 12%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

ITS personnel communicate the nature of the problem and how to avoid it in the future.

- Strongly Agree: 22%
- Somewhat Agree: 38%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 24%
- Somewhat Disagree: 12%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

ITS communicates the status of outstanding requests to the requesting student/staff.

- Strongly Agree: 26%
- Somewhat Agree: 36%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 24%
- Somewhat Disagree: 10%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

ITS personnel take the time to understand the nature of the problem.

- Strongly Agree: 29%
- Somewhat Agree: 37%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 22%
- Somewhat Disagree: 8%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

Communication from ITS is appropriate in terms of frequency/content of message.

- Strongly Agree: 27%
- Somewhat Agree: 34%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 26%
- Somewhat Disagree: 9%
- Strongly Disagree: 3%

I believe that ITS has sufficient staff to ensure that technology is functioning appropriately.

- Strongly Agree: 16%
- Somewhat Agree: 23%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 28%
- Somewhat Disagree: 17%
- Strongly Disagree: 15%
The majority of my technology service requests are usually resolved in:

- 30% in the same day
- 37% in 1-2 days
- 17% in 3-4 days
- 5% in 5-6 days
- 5% in 1-2 weeks
- 2% in 2-4 weeks
- 4% in 4+ weeks

An acceptable turnaround time for resolution is:

- 25% in the same day
- 56% in 1-2 days
- 13% in 3-4 days
- 3% in 5-6 days
- 3% in 1-2 weeks
- 3% in 2-4 weeks
- 3% in 4+ weeks
Emerging Observations – Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q22: Technology Training</th>
<th>All Respondents (n = 833)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate technology-related staff development opportunities are being offered to staff throughout the University.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree: 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of technology-related training classes is pertinent to end users.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree: 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training classes are offered at times that I can attend.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trainers communicate class material effectively.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree: 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer online or self-paced training over face-to-face classes.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree: 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-related staff development helps me integrate technology into my work.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree: 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-related training materials are easy to use and effective training tools.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree: 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decentralized technology support personnel resolve problems in an appropriate timeframe.

Decentralized technology support personnel are adequately trained to provide the level of service required.

Decentralized technology support personnel communicate the nature of the issue and how to avoid it in the future.

Decentralized technology support personnel communicate the status of outstanding requests to the requesting student/staff.

Decentralized technology support personnel take the time to understand the nature of the problem.

Communication from decentralized technology support personnel is appropriate in terms of frequency/content of message.

I believe we have sufficient decentralized technology support staff within my department to support teaching and research.
The majority of my technology service requests are usually resolved in

An acceptable turnaround time for resolution is

Q26: Incident Resolution - Decentralized IT
All Respondents (n = 646)

- 42% resolved Same Day
- 37% resolved 1-2 Days
- 10% resolved 3-4 Days
- 4% resolved 5-6 Days
- 2% resolved 1-2 Weeks
- 2% resolved 2-4 Weeks
- 2% resolved 4+ Weeks
Q30: Division of Responsibilities
All Respondents (n = 663)

I understand the respective roles and responsibilities of central Information Technology Services (ITS) and decentralized information technology support.

- Strongly Agree: 15%
- Somewhat Agree: 35%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 18%
- Somewhat Disagree: 18%
- Strongly Disagree: 14%

I know who to call for information technology support.

- Strongly Agree: 31%
- Somewhat Agree: 37%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11%
- Somewhat Disagree: 14%
- Strongly Disagree: 7%
Q31: Please indicate who you would typically contact for the issues and requests listed

All Respondents (n = 677)

- Questions / requests regarding the financial information system...
- Questions / requests regarding the human resources...
- Questions / requests regarding the student information system...
- Password resets
- System access including network and software access
- New technology requests including hardware, software...
- Questions regarding productivity software
- Support for classroom technology including...
- Technology-related support for research activities
- Network-related issues (both wired and wireless)
- Voice system related issues
- Questions regarding enhancing productivity or services through...

Central Information Technology Services
Decentralized Information Technology Support, if Available
I Don't Know Who to Contact for this Issue
Other
Q33: Technology - Teaching, Learning, and Research
All Respondents (n = 678)

I am able to effectively use technology to support teaching and learning.
- Strongly Agree: 30%
- Somewhat Agree: 46%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 13%
- Somewhat Disagree: 7%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

The University provides sufficient and appropriate technology resources and support to support teaching and learning.
- Strongly Agree: 18%
- Somewhat Agree: 37%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 21%
- Somewhat Disagree: 15%
- Strongly Disagree: 8%

I am able to effectively use technology to support my research activities.
- Strongly Agree: 30%
- Somewhat Agree: 39%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 19%
- Somewhat Disagree: 7%
- Strongly Disagree: 4%

The University provides sufficient and appropriate technology support for my research activities.
- Strongly Agree: 25%
- Somewhat Agree: 33%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 22%
- Somewhat Disagree: 12%
- Strongly Disagree: 8%
Q36: Technology Adequacy - Current
All Respondents (n = 645)

- Accounts eID and passwords, eProfile, Connect, ID Cards: 50% Agree, 39% Somewhat Agree, 7% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3% Somewhat Disagree, 5% Strongly Disagree
- Safety & Security Passwords, Antivirus, Scams blog, K-State Alerts: 40% Agree, 42% Somewhat Agree, 8% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 7% Somewhat Disagree, 3% Strongly Disagree
- Web Creating web pages, Domain names (DNS), Content management system: 19% Agree, 30% Somewhat Agree, 25% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 17% Somewhat Disagree, 9% Strongly Disagree
- Labs and Printing University computing labs, K-State InfoCommons (Hale): 30% Agree, 38% Somewhat Agree, 22% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 7% Somewhat Disagree, 3% Strongly Disagree
- Teaching & Research Technology classrooms, Instructional design, K-...: 25% Agree, 42% Somewhat Agree, 19% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 9% Somewhat Disagree, 5% Strongly Disagree
- Phone & TV K-State specific programming, Cable TV service: 22% Agree, 38% Somewhat Agree, 21% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 12% Somewhat Disagree, 7% Strongly Disagree
- Communication & Collaboration Calendar, Email/webmail, Office 365: 30% Agree, 45% Somewhat Agree, 13% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 9% Somewhat Disagree, 3% Strongly Disagree
- Hardware & Software Antivirus, Computer repair and maintenance: 26% Agree, 40% Somewhat Agree, 19% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 11% Somewhat Disagree, 4% Strongly Disagree
- Multimedia & Video Equipment checkout, Media development center: 23% Agree, 38% Somewhat Agree, 26% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 9% Somewhat Disagree, 4% Strongly Disagree
- Internet & Network Internet access, Wi-Fi, K-State VPN, Network access, ResNet: 28% Agree, 39% Somewhat Agree, 13% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 11% Somewhat Disagree, 8% Strongly Disagree
- Training & Support KSIS, K-State Online, Security, Technology: 23% Agree, 38% Somewhat Agree, 23% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 11% Somewhat Disagree, 5% Strongly Disagree
- Applications Connect, Talisma, Business Intelligence/Analytics, Image Now: 19% Agree, 34% Somewhat Agree, 27% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 13% Somewhat Disagree, 6% Strongly Disagree
The overall portfolio of technology applications available to me today meets my current needs.

Q37: Portfolio of Technology Applications Meet my Current Needs
All Respondents (n = 627)

- **Strongly Agree**
- **Somewhat Agree**
- **Neither Agree nor Disagree**
- **Somewhat Disagree**
- **Strongly Disagree**
### Q39: This technology solution, as it exists today, is adequate for my anticipated future needs

All Respondents (n = 644)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts eID and passwords, eProfile, Connect, ID Cards</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security Passwords, Antivirus, Scams, blog, K-State Alerts</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Creating web pages, Domain names (DNS), Content management system (CMS), Tools for...</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labs and Printing University computing labs, K-State InfoCommons (Hale Library), Printing</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research Technology classrooms, Instructional design, K-State Online (Canvas),...</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone &amp; TV K-State specific programming, Cable TV service, Telephone services, Voicemail</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Collaboration Calendar, Email/webmail, Office 365, Mailing lists...</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware &amp; Software Antivirus, Computer repair and maintenance, Software, Equipment...</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia &amp; Video Equipment checkout, Media development center, Multimedia, Video...</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet &amp; Network Internet access, Wi-fi, K-State VPN, Network access, ResNet</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Support KSIS, K-State Online, Security, Technology, Technology classrooms,...</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Connect, Talisma, Business Intelligence/Analytics, Image Now,...</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q40: The overall portfolio of technology applications available to me today meets my anticipated future needs.

All Respondents (n = 622)
Q42: I would consider K-State __________ in comparison to other public research universities that I am familiar with, in regards to selection and adequacy of IT solutions and information technology maturity and effectiveness.

Students (n = 200)
Q42: I would consider K-State _________ in comparison to other public research universities that I am familiar with, in regards to selection and adequacy of IT solutions and information technology maturity and effectiveness.

Faculty (n = 119)
Q42: I would consider K-State _________ in comparison to other public research universities that I am familiar with, in regards to selection and adequacy of IT solutions and information technology maturity and effectiveness.

Administrators (n = 36)
Q42: I would consider K-State ___________ in comparison to other public research universities that I am familiar with, in regards to selection and adequacy of IT solutions and information technology maturity and effectiveness.

Other Staff (n=263)
Attachment – List of Participants

List of Focus Groups

- Administration and Finance Leadership
- Communications and Marketing Leadership
- Dean’s Council
- Faculty Senate
- Human Capital Services Leadership
- IT Leadership
- IT Staff
- Manhattan Campus Faculty 1
- Manhattan Campus Faculty 2
- Manhattan Campus Staff
- Manhattan Campus Students 1
- Manhattan Campus Students 2
- Olathe/Polytechnic/Global Campus Staff & Faculty
- Olathe/Polytechnic/Global Campus Students
- Research Leadership
- Student Government
- Student Life Leadership
- System Administrators
- University Support Staff Senate

Interview Participants

- President – General Richard B. Myers
- Provost/Sr. VP – Dr. April Mason
- VP Research – Dr. Peter Dorhout
- VP Administration and Finance/CFO – Ms. Cindy Bontrager
- VP Student Life/Dean of Students – Dr. Pat Bosco
- VP Human Capital Services – Mr. Jay Stephens
- VP Communications and Marketing – Mr. Jeff Morris
- Chief of Staff – Ms. Linda Cook
- Chief Government Relations Officer – Dr. Sue Peterson
- General Counsel – Ms. Cheryl Strecker
- Athletic Department IT Team – Mr. Andrew Shimon
- President/CEO Foundation – Mr. Chris Mills
- President Alumni Association – Ms. Amy Button Renz and IT Staff
- Student Government President (Past) – Mr. Jack Ayers
- Student Government President (New) – Ms. Jordan Kiehl
Thank you.