

## Introduction

This report provides a summary of the purposes, the methodology and the results of the client satisfaction survey sponsored by IS&T in April 2007. The survey is one means through which IS&T can give a voice to their clients. It is a systematic way to identify what is working and what needs to be improved from the clients' vantage point. This survey was undertaken for the following purposes all of which helped guide the construct and design of the survey.

- To document where clients are satisfied along with where they are dissatisfied and to identify what gaps cause any disappointment in the client experience.
- To find out what improvements are important to clients.
- To use this data to prioritize the continuous improvement initiatives that will make it easier for MIT clients to do their work.

The ultimate goal is to provide an excellent client IT experience that supports the teaching, learning, research and business needs of the MITT community. In the near term the goal is to improve the clients' ability to use IT to get their work done. The survey findings on the following pages provide a sound basis for determining how IS&T can focus efforts to enhance the quality of the client experience at MIT.

Brian McDonald  
President  
MOR Associates

# Methodology

## Survey Population

The survey solicited feedback from three client communities: faculty, students, and administrators.

### Selection Criteria - Faculty and Research Academic

- Tenured and tenure track faculty are included.
- Part-time faculty are not included.

### Selection Criteria - Students

- Includes undergraduates and graduates.

### Selection Criteria - Administrative

- IS&T staff are excluded.
- Bargaining units are included.

## IS&T Sample Size Estimates

The following table presents a summary of the population and sample size estimates that resulted from applying the above criteria and served as the guide to sampling strategy.

| Population Breakdown |  | Major Cohort Counts | Target Sample Size (Returned surveys) | Anticipated Response Rate | Initial Sample Size | Final Sample Size | Actual Response Rate | Final Weighted Representation |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Faculty</b>       |  |                     | <b>100</b>                            | <b>22%</b>                | <b>450</b>          | <b>105</b>        | <b>23%</b>           | <b>15%</b>                    |
| <b>Researchers</b>   |  |                     | <b>100</b>                            | <b>28%</b>                | <b>350</b>          | <b>147</b>        | <b>42%</b>           | <b>21%</b>                    |
| <b>Students</b>      |  |                     | <b>200</b>                            | <b>33%</b>                | <b>600</b>          | <b>245</b>        | <b>41%</b>           | <b>36%</b>                    |
| Graduate             |  |                     | 100                                   | 33%                       | 300                 | 143               | 48%                  |                               |
| Undergraduate        |  |                     | 100                                   | 33%                       | 300                 | 102               | 34%                  |                               |
| <b>Staff</b>         |  |                     | <b>100</b>                            | <b>25%</b>                | <b>400</b>          | <b>189</b>        | <b>47%</b>           | <b>28%</b>                    |
| <b>TOTAL</b>         |  |                     | <b>500</b>                            | <b>28%</b>                | <b>1,800</b>        | <b>686</b>        | <b>38%</b>           | <b>100%</b>                   |

**Notes:**

- The Target Sample Size was derived assuming a Confidence Interval of .20 and a minimum Confidence Level of 95%.
- Each major cohort (faculty, students, staff) was intended to represent approximately 33% of the total. This would result in relative over weighing of the faculty and staff, but under weighting of students.

**Demographic Data**

Some demographic data for faculty and staff including department and campus was also captured.