California Department of Technology

2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
2014 Survey Overview
Methodology/Demographics

- Ratings were based on the following 1 – 5 scale:
  - (1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Excellent)
- Surveys were tailored to which services departments subscribed to last year.
- Services were rated on the following performance categories:
  1. Reliability of Service
  2. Knowledge/Expertise of Staff
  3. Responsiveness of Staff
  4. Communications
- The following categories are new to the 2014 survey:
  1. Billing System/Staff
  2. Project Oversight Services
  3. Information Security Office
  4. Statewide Technology Procurement
  5. Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
  6. Mobile Device Management (MDM)
- 1,810 customer surveys sent (235 departments).
- 383 customers from 123 departments responded to at least a portion of the survey (21% response rate).
  - Industry standard response rate* is 15-30%.
- 226 completed the survey in its entirety (12% completion rate).

*Source: PeoplePulse.com
2014 Survey Overview
Ratings Summary

- Overall “service and performance” report card grade: 3.44
  - Compared to 3.75 in 2013 (an 8.3% decrease)
- Highest-rated Business Area: Account Management, 3.96
  - AMB was also highest-rated in 2013 at 3.85
- Lowest-rated Business Area: ITPOC, 2.98
  - Customer Service System was lowest-rated in 2013 at 3.04
- Highest rated Service Area: Middleware, 3.77
  - Mainframe was highest-rated in 2013 at 3.82
- Lowest-rated Service Area: SBCS, 2.64
  - CA.Mail was lowest-rated in 2013 at 3.15
- The Online Service Catalog is the most improved business area (+3.5%)
  - Account Management was the 2nd most improved business area (+2.7%)
- Middleware is the most improved service area (+7.7%)
  - DB2 Support is the 2nd most improved service area (+6.9%)
## 2014 Survey Overview

### Responses by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Services, Department of</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Affairs, Department of</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller's Office, State</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Department of</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Development Department</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services, Department of</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Department of</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Compensation &amp; Government Claims Board, CA</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control, Department of</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalization, Board of</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Services, Department of</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations, Department of</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health, Department of</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Teachers Retirement System</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Department of</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2014 Survey Overview

Responses by Organization continued . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles, Department of</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation, Department of</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sacramento</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Integration, Office of</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Fresno</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services, Governor's Office of</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI$CAL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources, California Department of</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Agency</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Officers Standards &amp; Training, Commission on</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Community Corrections, Board of</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer, State</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Oversight, Department of</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Shasta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Department of - Special Schools Division</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Commission, CA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Office of</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry &amp; Fire Protection, CA Department of</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services Agency, CA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2014 Survey Overview
Responses by Organization continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labor Relations Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services &amp; Development, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections &amp; Rehabilitation, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disabilities, State Council on</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Services, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services Authority</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Employment &amp; Housing, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Wildlife, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Tax Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Benefit Exchange</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Patrol, Department of the CA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Council of CA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Health Care, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide Regulation, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014 Survey Overview
Responses by Organization Continued . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Employees Retirement System</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Recycling &amp; Recovery, Department of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Agency, State of California</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd District Agricultural Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32nd District Agricultural Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging, Department of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Resources Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Council, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audits, Bureau of State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar of CA, State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Consumer Services &amp; Housing Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children &amp; Families First Commission, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy, State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, Department of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium C-IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Contra Costa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Humboldt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2014 Survey Overview
Responses by Organization continued . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Madera</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Merced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey Superior Court</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Napa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Placer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Mateo Superior Court</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Stanislaus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Information Integrity, CA Office of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Racing Board, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development, Department of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector General, Office of the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Performance, Commission on</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery Commission, CA State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services Oversight &amp; Accountability Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Research, Governor's Office of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2014 Survey Overview

Responses by Organization continued . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender, Office of the State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Conservation &amp; Development Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Center, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Hospitals, Department of</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lands Commission, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid Commission, CA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Credentialing, Commission on</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - Chancellor's Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - Fresno</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - San Bernardino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - San Jose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - Sonoma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University - Stanislaus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL** 383
Overall Survey Results
by Surveyed Groups

AVERAGE RATING BY SURVEY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Support</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Services</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Survey Results
by Business Area

Average Rating 3.39 - down 2.2% from 2013 (3.46)
Overall Survey Results

by Service Area

Average Rating: 3.39 - down 2.4% from 2013 (3.48)

Average Rating by Technology Service
### Overall Survey Results

#### Top 10 Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Account Management</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Account Management</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middleware</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>App - Mainframe</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Web - SFT</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Web - SFT</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Web – Misc.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DB - SQL Server Support</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DB2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Midrange</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CISO</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Billing Staff</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Web – Misc.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>App - Middleware</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Rating by Performance Category

Reliability of Service: 3.24
Knowledge/Expertise: 3.54
Responsiveness/Timeliness: 3.447
Communications: 3.446

CalTech as Strategic Partner
by Surveyee Job Level

*Overall Rating 3.43 - down 7.2% from 2013 (3.69)*

2012: 97 respondents
2013: 274 respondents
2014: 230 respondents
CalTech Report Card Grade for Service and Performance

OVERALL SERVICE AND PERFORMANCE GRADE PERCENTAGES

2012: 97 respondents
2013: 274 respondents
2014: 230 respondents
CalTech Report Card Grade
for Service and Performance
*Overall Rating 3.44 - down 8.4% from 2013 (3.75)*

OVERALL SERVICE AND PERFORMANCE BY JOB LEVEL

- **Executive**
  - 2012: 3.21
  - 2013: 3.57
  - 2014: 3.32

- **Manager**
  - 2012: 3.33
  - 2013: 3.58
  - 2014: 3.29

- **Staff**
  - 2012: 3.44
  - 2013: 3.91
  - 2014: 3.62

2012: 98 respondents
2013: 273 respondents
2014: 230 respondents
CalTech Report Card Grade
for Service and Performance
Overall Rating 3.44 - down 8.4% from 2013 (3.75)

OVERALL SERVICE PERFORMANCE BY FREQUENCY OF INTERACTION

2012: 98 respondents
2013: 273 respondents
2014: 230 respondents
CalTech Report Card Grade
for Service and Performance

Overall Rating 3.44 - down 8.4% from 2013 (3.75)

Overall Service and Performance by 2014 Account Tier Categorizations

2012: 98 respondents
2013: 273 respondents
2014: 230 respondents
## New and Potential Services by Interest Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW SERVICE</th>
<th>TOTAL INTERESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CalCloud</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mobile Device Management</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Storage as a Service</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Remedy on Demand</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Project Portfolio Management</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mainframe University Training</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Database as a Service</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Salesforce Product Suite</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Linux on Mainframe</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes total responses indicating ‘Likely’ or ‘Very Likely’
New and Potential Services
by Departments with the Greatest Interest Level *

- **CALCLOUD**
  - DCSS/9, DSS/6, SCO/5, High Speed Rail/5

- **MOBILE DEVICE MANAGEMENT**
  - DCSS/5, DCA/4, ABC/3, County of Sacramento/3, High Speed Rail/3, DSS/3

- **STORAGE AS A SERVICE**
  - High Speed Rail/4, DCSS/3, DMV/3, CDPH/3

- **REMEDY ON DEMAND**
  - DCSS/6, DCA/3, County of Sacramento/3, Fiscal/3

- **PROJECT PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT**
  - High Speed Rail/4, DPH/4, ABC/2, CHP/2

- **MAINFRAME UNIVERSITY**
  - SCO/7, EDD/4

* Answered ‘Likely’ or ‘Very Likely’
New and Potential Services
by Departments with the Greatest Interest Level * continued . . .

- DATABASE AS A SERVICE
  - SCO/3, HIGH SPEED RAIL/3

- SALESFORCE PRODUCT SUITE
  - CDPH/3, HIGH SPEED RAIL/2

- LINUX ON MAINFRAME
  - DMV/2, DOT/2

* Answered ‘Likely’ or ‘Very Likely’
Requested Services
Written Responses

- **SHAREPOINT (3)**
  - Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control
  - Department of Finance
  - High Speed Rail Authority

- **SOFTWARE AS A SERVICE (2)**
  - Natural Resources Agency
  - Department of Water Resources

- **DR AS A SERVICE**
  - Secretary of State

- **PRIVATE CLOUD SOLUTIONS**
  - Emergency Medical Services Authority

- **VOIP SOLUTION**
  - Department of Social Services
Requested Services
Written Responses Continued . . .

- **API Management**
  - Department of Healthcare Services

- **Instant Message**
  - Department of Healthcare Services

- **Office 365 G3 on both Email Services**
  - Office of Statewide Health Planning & Development
Take-Aways / Next Steps

- Customer Account Leads will:
  - Meet with their customers to discuss their department’s survey results
  - Get in-depth feedback from customers on services receiving a notable decrease in the rating
  - Share feedback with the service area
  - Coordinate discussions between the service area and the customer, as needed

- Results are presented to all CalTech Divisions and managers
  - Each division will review their ratings and look for opportunities to improve

- Survey Result Highlights are presented to Customer Advisory Council, Information Technology Executive Council and Chief Information Officers

- Survey results summary is provided in the Customer Connection Newsletter

- Detailed survey results will be published on CalTech’s website

- Improvements made by specific areas, as a result of the survey ratings, will be published in a future Customer Connection Newsletter edition
The following slides provides a detailed view for the survey results of each service area and business area.
Billing System  New 2014 Category!
Overall Rating: 3.17

Average Rating by Performance Category

- Ease of Use: 3.26
- Meaningful Reports: 3.20
- Online Help/Training: 3.03

2014: 160 Respondents

Combined Overall Responses*
- Excellent: 8%
- Above Average: 20%
- Average: 57%
- Below Average: 10%
- Poor: 5%

* Combined responses of 3 performance categories
Billing Staff  
**New 2014 Category!**

Overall Rating: 3.45

**Average Rating by Performance Category**

- Communications: 3.52
- Professionalism/Attitude: 3.62
- Knowledge/Expertise: 3.50
- Timely Resolution (Billing): 3.30
- Thorough Resolution (Billing): 3.29

**Combined Overall Responses** *

- Above Average: 27%
- Average: 45%
- Below Average: 8%
- Poor: 4%

* Combined responses of 5 performance categories

2014: 106 Respondents
Statewide Technology Procurements

Overall Rating: 3.03

Average Rating by Performance Category

- Professionalism/Attitude: 3.22
- Knowledge/Expertise: 3.16
- Timeliness of Service: 2.84
- Successful Procurement: 2.89

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 10%
- Above Average: 23%
- Average: 40%
- Below Average: 12%
- Poor: 15%

2014: 19 Respondents

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories
Account Management
Overall Rating 3.96 - up 2.7% from 2013 (3.85)

Average Rating by Performance Category

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

* Combined responses of 6 performance categories

2012: 99 respondents
2013: 146 respondents
2014: 223 respondents
Value of Account Management

Overall Rating 3.78 - down 2.8% from 2013 (3.84)

2012: 98 respondents
2013: 143 respondents
2014: 218 respondents
Communication/Notification Efforts
Overall Rating 3.30 - down 1.0% from 2013 (3.34)

Average Rating by Performance Category

Change Management: 2012 - 3.00, 2013 - 3.27, 2014 - 3.27

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 2.98
- 2013: 3.34
- 2014: 3.30

Combined Overall Responses *
- Excellent: 15%
- Above Average: 26%
- Average: 41%
- Below Average: 12%
- Poor: 6%

2012: 95 respondents
2013: 145 respondents
2014: 236 respondents

* Combined responses of 6 performance categories.
CSS Service Request Process

Overall Rating 2.99 - down 1.7% from 2013 (3.04)

By Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use (CSS)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS Training</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Status Updates</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Service Provision</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 2.86
- 2013: 3.04
- 2014: 2.99

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 10%
- Above Average: 16%
- Average: 48%
- Below Average: 15%
- Poor: 11%

2012: 87 respondents
2013: 154 respondents
2014: 198 respondents

*Combined responses of 4 performance categories.
Incident Management
Overall Rating 3.27 - down 4.5% from 2013 (3.42)

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

2012: 91 respondents
2013: 141 respondents
2014: 214 respondents

* Combined responses of 3 performance categories.
Internet Site
Overall Rating 3.32 - down 2.6% from 2013 (3.41)

By Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date Information</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 3.06
- 2013: 3.41
- 2014: 3.32

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 11%
- Above Average: 25%
- Average: 51%
- Below Average: 9%
- Poor: 4%

* Combined responses of 3 performance categories.

2012: 97 respondents
2013: 100 respondents
2014: 200 respondents
Online Service Catalog
Overall Rating 3.32 - up 3.6% from 2013 (3.21)

By Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date Information</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 2.98
- 2013: 3.21
- 2014: 3.32

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 9%
- Above Average: 26%
- Average: 55%
- Below Average: 7%
- Poor: 3%

* Combined responses of 3 performance categories

2012: 90 respondents
2013: 92 respondents
2014: 173 respondents
Service Desk
Overall Rating 3.39 - down 2.9% from 2013 (3.49)

By Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Expertise</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Resolution</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorough Resolution</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Calls Timely</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Overall Responses

- Excellent: 13%
- Above Average: 33%
- Average: 37%
- Below Average: 12%
- Poor: 5%

* Combined responses of 5 performance categories.

2012: 89 respondents
2013: 159 respondents
2014: 184 respondents
Training Center
Overall Rating 3.40 - down 1.4% from 2013 (3.45)

By Performance Category

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

2012: 79 respondents
2013: 92 respondents
2014: 151 respondents

*Combined responses of 5 performance categories.
Stage 1 Business Analysis (S1BA)

Overall Rating: 2.86

by Performance Category

- Ease of Use: 2.97
- Clarity of Submission Criteria/Instructions: 2.78
- Simplification of Process: 2.84

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 1%
- Above Average: 25%
- Average: 41%
- Below Average: 21%
- Poor: 12%

2014: 37 respondents

*Combined responses of 3 performance categories.
New 2014 Category!

Value of Stage 1 Business Analysis (S1BA) Process
Overall Rating: 2.78

Responses

- Excellent: 3%
- Above Average: 25%
- Average: 36%
- Below Average: 19%
- Poor: 17%

2014: 36 respondents
New 2014 Category!

ITPOC Staff for FSR Review

Overall Rating 2.85

by Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely Feedback</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful Feedback</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of Overall Project Effort</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Project Risks/Issues</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 6%
- Above Average: 17%
- Average: 47%
- Below Average: 16%
- Poor: 14%

2014: 25 respondents

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories
New 2014 Category!

ITPOC Staff for Project Consulting
Overall Rating 3.08

**by Performance Category**

- Provision of Useful Feedback: 3.07
- Assessment of Project Risks/Issues: 3.13
- Enhancement of Overall Project Effort: 3.03

**Combined Overall Responses** *

- Excellent: 14%
- Above Average: 23%
- Average: 36%
- Below Average: 11%
- Poor: 16%

2014: 31 respondents

* Combined responses of 3 performance categories
New 2014 Category!

ITPOC Manager
Overall Rating 3.09

by Performance Category

Combined Overall Responses *

2014: 32 respondents

* Combined responses of 5 performance categories
Project Management

Overall Rating 3.32 - down 8.7% from 2013 (3.61)

By Performance Category

Overall Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

2012: 66 respondents
2013: 95 respondents
2014: 29 respondents

* Combined responses of 5 performance categories.
New 2014 Category!

CISO
Overall Rating 3.51

by Performance Category

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 16%
- Above Average: 34%
- Average: 39%
- Below Average: 6%
- Poor: 5%

*Combined responses of 6 performance categories.

2014: 128 respondents
Security Management Services
Overall Rating 3.45 - down 5.0% from 2013 (3.63)

by Performance Category

Reliability 2012: 3.21 2013: 3.73 2014: 3.45
Knowledge 2012: 3.45 2013: 3.66 2014: 3.50
Responsiveness 2012: 3.19 2013: 3.60 2014: 3.45
Communications 2012: 3.23 2013: 3.52 2014: 3.40

Average Rating by Year

2012: 3.22 2013: 3.63 2014: 3.45

Combined Overall Responses *

Excellent 14%
Above Average 37%
Average 36%
Below Average 7%
Poor 6%

*Combined responses of 4 performance categories.

2012: 61 respondents
2013: 87 respondents
2014: 102 respondents
App Hosting - Mainframe
Overall Rating 3.65 - down 4.5% from 2013 (3.82)

by Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 66 respondents
- 2013: 104 respondents
- 2014: 82 respondents

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 24%
- Above Average: 29%
- Average: 39%
- Below Average: 4%
- Poor: 4%

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories
App Hosting – Middleware *

Overall Rating 3.77 - up 7.6% from 2013 (3.50)

* IBM WebSphere, IBM WebSphere MQ, IBM HTTP Server, IBM Tivoli Access Manager WebSEAL Server, IBM Tivoli Access Manager Policy Server, IBM Tivoli Access Manager Authorization Server, IBM Tivoli Directory Server

by Performance Category

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

Below Average 4%
Average 39%
Above Average 33%
Excellent 24%

2013: 63 respondents
2014: 34 respondents

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories.
App Hosting - Midrange
Overall Rating 3.51 - up 5.5% from 2013 (3.32)

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

*Combined responses of 4 performance categories.

2012: 47 respondents
2013: 61 respondents
2014: 33 respondents
App Hosting - Windows
Overall Rating 3.21 - down 7.8% from 2013 (3.48)

by Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 3.25
- 2013: 3.48
- 2014: 3.21

2014 Responses - Overall

- Excellent: 12%
- Above Average: 29%
- Average: 39%
- Below Average: 9%
- Poor: 11%
- Below Average: 9%

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories.

2012: 53 respondents
2013: 76 respondents
2014: 58 respondents
Database Support – DB2-LUW
Overall Rating 3.63 - up 6.9% from 2013 (3.40)

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

Below Average 4%
Average 42%
Above Average 40%
Excellent 14%

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories

2012: 36 respondents
2013: 60 respondents
2014: 26 respondents
Database Support – Oracle
Overall Rating 2.84 - down 18.7% from 2013 (3.49)

2012: 35 respondents
2013: 50 respondents
2014: 14 respondents

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories.
Database Support – SQL
Overall Rating 3.41 - down 6.4% from 2013 (3.64)

by Performance Category

2012: 34 respondents
2013: 51 respondents
2014: 35 respondents

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories
Disaster Recovery

Overall Rating 3.34 - down 2.0% from 2013 (3.41)

By Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 3.13
- 2013: 3.41
- 2014: 3.34

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 24%
- Above Average: 20%
- Average: 31%
- Below Average: 16%
- Poor: 9%

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories

2012: 54 respondents
2013: 67 respondents
2014: 51 respondents
Email – CA.Mail
Overall Rating 3.16 - up 0.3% from 2013 (3.15)

by Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012: 53 respondents
2013: 92 respondents
2014: 45 respondents

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 12%
- Above Average: 23%
- Average: 41%
- Below Average: 18%
- Poor: 6%

*Combined responses of 4 performance categories.

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 3.10
- 2013: 3.15
- 2014: 3.16

55
Email – CES
Overall Rating 3.20 - up 1.2% from 2013 (3.16)

by Performance Category

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

2012: 9 respondents
2013: 79 respondents
2014: 75 respondents

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories
New 2014 Category!

Geographic Information System
Overall Rating: 3.41

By Performance Category

Combined Overall Responses *

2014: 8 respondents

*Combined responses of 4 performance categories.
New 2014 Category!

Mobile Data Management
Overall Rating 3.09

by Performance Category

Combined Overall Responses *

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories.

2014: 19 respondents
**Network Services**

Overall Rating 3.35 - down 5.6% from 2013 (3.55)

---

**Combined Overall Responses**

- Excellent: 19%
- Above Average: 15%
- Average: 37%
- Below Average: 16%
- Poor: 13%

---

**Average Rating by Year**

- 2012: 3.43
- 2013: 3.55
- 2014: 3.35

---

**by Performance Category**

- Communications: 2012: 3.46, 2013: 3.27, 2014: 3.40

---

2012: 73 respondents
2013: 128 respondents
2014: 134 respondents

*Combined responses of 4 performance categories.*
Server Based Computing
Overall Rating 2.64 - down 20.86% from 2013 (3.33)

by Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 3.14
- 2013: 3.33
- 2014: 2.64

Combined Overall Responses *

- Average 68%
- Above Average 4%
- Below Average 14%
- Poor 14%

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories

2012: 43 respondents
2013: 43 respondents
2014: 11 respondents
Tenant Managed Services
Overall Rating 3.41 - down 5.2% from 2012 (3.60)

by Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of Service</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Expertise</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness/Timeliness</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 3.20
- 2013: 3.60
- 2014: 3.41

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent 8%
- Above Average 36%
- Average 48%
- Below Average 4%
- Poor 4%

*Combined responses of 4 performance categories.

2012: 61 respondents
2013: 70 respondents
2014: 51 respondents
Website Hosting
Overall Rating 3.31 - down 4.4% from 2013 (3.46)

by Performance Category

- Responsiveness: 2012: 3.29, 2013: 3.34, 2014: 3.43
- Communications: 2012: 3.12, 2013: 3.35, 2014: 3.21

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 3.25
- 2013: 3.46
- 2014: 3.31

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent: 15%
- Above Average: 27%
- Average: 41%
- Below Average: 9%
- Poor: 8%

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories

2012: 53 respondents
2013: 54 respondents
2014: 58 respondents
Web Services - Secure File Transfer

Overall Rating 3.70 - down 0.6% from 2013 (3.72)

by Performance Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Rating by Year

- 2012: 58 respondents
- 2013: 68 respondents
- 2014: 55 respondents

Combined Overall Responses *

- Excellent 23%
- Above Average 33%
- Average 38%
- Below Average 5%
- Poor 1%

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories
Web Services – Ursus CMS

Overall Rating 2.82 - down 17.6% from 2013 (3.42)

**By Performance Category**


**Average Rating by Year**

- 2012: 3.24
- 2013: 3.42
- 2014: 2.82

**Combined Overall Responses** *

- Above Average: 41%
- Average: 27%
- Below Average: 5%
- Poor: 27%

2012: 43 respondents
2013: 36 respondents
2014: 6 respondents

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories
Web Services – Other
Overall Rating 3.66 - up 4.2% from 2013 (3.51)

By Performance Category

Average Rating by Year

Combined Overall Responses *

2012: 45 respondents
2013: 41 respondents
2014: 45 respondents

* Combined responses of 4 performance categories