

MISO 2026

Information and Library Services conducted the MISO (Measuring Information Service Outcomes) Survey in March 2026 with Bates students, staff and faculty. Bates conducts this survey every three years, with data collected since 2002, when the MISO survey began. The survey results provide important data for ILS, affording us the opportunity to identify issues with services, gain insight into our campus' use of library resources and technology, and compare our efforts to our peers at other similar institutions.

As in previous years, Bates students, faculty and staff have high ratings (generally a 3+ out of 4) of satisfaction for the ILS services and resources measured by the survey. We are pleased with these findings, however our results also have highlighted areas where we have improved, as well as those we can address to improve our users' experiences.

It should be noted that each group's survey has a different set of questions, and that each time we run the survey, we add and remove questions from the previous survey based on what we are hoping to learn. A consistent criticism of our MISO survey is its length, so each time we implement it we seek ways to streamline it, while gathering the data that will help us improve our services. The full 2026 results for each group (faculty, staff, students) are available for review at bates.edu/ils/miso-2026

Specific Findings

- 1. Computing Help Desk Satisfaction.** Faculty ratings for help desk services showed improvement from 2023. Specifically the reliability, responsiveness and knowledge ratings for the help desk were higher this cycle. However, faculty use of the help desk declined (down to 2.59 in 2026 from 3.10 in 2023), and some comments were critical of the capacity, training, and availability of help desk staff. Staff also reported higher satisfaction levels in 2026 (3.82) than in 2023 (3.69), while students did not have strong opinions in this area.
- 2. Library and Software Resource Availability.** Faculty comments included requests for expanded or maintained access to specialized digital resources, including specific academic journals, international content, print and e-books, and streaming platforms for classroom instruction. They also stressed the critical importance of academic software, and computational tools, and emphasised that access to these resources should be expanded, not reduced.
- 3. Printer improvements.** Continuing improvements to printer reliability were noteworthy. Faculty satisfaction ratings rose from 3.20 in 2023 to 3.44 in 2026. Student satisfaction ratings for printers remained positive at 3.47 (previously 3.46 in 2023) and there was a notable upward trend in student use of printers (from 3.73 in 2023 to 4.06 in 2026)

4. **Lecture Capture.** Since the end of the Covid-19 pandemic, faculty members have reported a decrease in the use of lecture capture technology, and rated its importance lower than in 2023.
5. **Online Identity and Reputation.** Reflecting greater awareness of online threats, both faculty and staff assessed their own skill level at protecting their identity and reputation online lower in 2026 than in 2023, and both groups indicated that they have increased interest in additional training to improve this skill area.
6. **Artificial intelligence usage and perceptions.** In this cycle we added new open-ended questions for each survey group about their use of generative AI tools. Many participants used this opportunity to share their viewpoints of AI and its place at Bates.
 - a. **Students** were split into two major groups: Some are ideologically opposed to the use, and shared strong feelings in their personal objection to any AI tools. 23% of students reported that they never use generative AI for academic purposes. Other students use AI as a tool in completing their coursework, with 47% reporting that they use an AI tool at least 1 day a week or more for academic work. Students who do use AI shared that they use it as a study and learning tool, as a part of their writing process, and as a research aid.
 - b. **Faculty** respondents shared a lower rate of Generative AI use. 42% never use generative AI tools, while 27% use it 1 day a week or more for academic or work purposes. The faculty responses detail a broad range of practices and techniques adopted in response to Generative AI, largely centered on increasing in-person, process-based, and personalized assessments. A number of faculty expressed strong opposition to Generative AI, citing beliefs that it is "fundamentally at odds with healthy civic institutions", is "harmful to learning", and avoid it due to ethical and environmentally damaging concerns. Some faculty are waiting for the college's official response to AI before adapting their language and policies, while others urge the college to do more for thoughtful conversations and guidance.
 - c. **Staff** usage was also mixed. 38% never use AI tools for work, while 29% use these tools 1 day a week or more for work purposes. Those who do use Generative AI tools shared that they use them in the areas of communication and writing support, data Analysis and technical work, and content generation and research. A significant number express opposition to AI tools or a need for guidance from the college.