FY 2015 Survey Results

UAF Facilities Services
The Process

- 488 Surveys sent out
- Survey sent to Employees who submitted an EWORF
- 142 Responses
- 29% Response Rate (considered above average)
- Response rate reflects 95% confidence level that these responses represent the whole population
- Employees had two weeks to respond to the survey
Who Participated

• Responses from employees from 46 different buildings on campus
Expectations vs. Satisfaction

Facilities meeting high expectations of campus

Expectations

- High expectations: 50%
- Very high expectations: 11%
- Very low expectations: 1%
- Low expectations: 5%
- Moderate expectations: 33%

Satisfaction

- Meets expectations: 62%
- Far exceeds expectations: 3%
- Exceeds expectations: 20%
- Below expectations: 15%
Survey Make Up

- The survey is composed of 5 categories
- Knowledge of Process: measurement of how well customers feel that they understand the process for requesting work from facilities
- Understand Service Levels: A measure of how effectively customers feel service levels or schedules have been communicated to them
- Work meets expectations: a measure of whether the work performed meets the expectations of customers
- Feedback Mechanism: a measure of how appropriate customers feel the level of feedback to and from facilities is
- General satisfaction: a measure of how satisfied customers generally are with services provided by the facilities management function at the institution
- All were rated on a scale of 1-5, 5 being Strongly Agree
What Impacts Overall Satisfaction?

• An analysis was completed to determine which scores impact the Overall Satisfaction
• Ranked in order from biggest impact to lower impact:
  – Feedback Mechanism - by far the largest impact
  – Knowledge of Process - large impact
  – General satisfaction - medium impact
  – Work Meets Expectations - lower impact
  – Understands Service Levels - low impact
• To increase Overall Satisfaction, the area of feedback needs to be addressed
• Comments from customers show they want better communication regarding their work order, when it’s assigned, who it is assigned to, when work will start and when work will be completed, any delays in the schedule
Benchmarks

• The survey results were compared to Benchmarks for each category
• Peer Benchmark was determined by the top peer responses in the annual Sightlines survey

* The peer group is composed of other universities that have similar programs to UAF, a similar mix of research vs. classrooms, and to the extent possible, climate issues. There are 13 universities in this group which was chosen by UAF and Sightlines. The group includes universities such as Montana State University, University of Maine, University of New Hampshire, University of Vermont, UAA and others.
Overall Benchmarking Metrics

Service Request Process & Physical Plant Performance
Overall Benchmarking Metrics

“Do users understand the work order process?”

“I use the web system for simple repair requests. For more complicated issues I rely on our facilities coordinator to discuss them with Facilities Services. That seems to be effective and she gets timely and clear response.”

“I’m not always sure if my issue warrants a work order, so I call first to ask and usually the person on the phone places the order for me. The form is easy to use though.”

“The request process is fine. The cost is outrageous.”

“Submit EWORFs mostly for projects, phone for urgent building issues or supporting infrastructure issues.”

Knowledge of Process

![Knowledge of Process Chart]

- FY09: 4.26
- FY10: 4.08
- FY11: 4.31
- FY12: 4.30
- FY13: 4.20
- FY14: 4.27
- FY15: 4.20

- Knowledge of Process
- Peer Average
- Peer High
“Some requests are completed faster than others. The process is confusing for someone who doesn’t use the system often.”

“Work seems to take a long time to occur. People disappear from projects with no explanation.”

“What is this work schedule that always appears on the survey? I don’t think I have ever received one.”

“I’ve not had many positive experiences with the painting WOs. The finished product has been fine. It seems to always take much longer than we were told and they seem to take a lot of breaks throughout the day.”

“I’m not sure we are even on a schedule. The only way we get the lawn mowed is to call and request. Same with snow removal.”
Overall Benchmarking Metrics

“Always ask for Rocky and crew. Never disappoint.”

“Excellent responsiveness, and excellent work performance.”

“Locksmith is very reliable and helpful--works well with our department.”

“I’m not sure where the ‘office signs’ department is but the man who created my sign and installed it was very courteous and extremely prompt. I really appreciated his work.”
“Encourage younger staff to reach out to customers during work progress for status or questions.”

“Again, most of the time I’m informed that work has started by me showing up and finding a Facilities employee doing the work. Unless they can’t access the room...then I know when work commences!”

“Where can you check the progress of a work request without having to call?”

“Most online work requests are never responded to. Work may or may not happen. Facilities almost never communicates about submitted work order. Scheduling is arbitrary and not well coordinated.”

Feedback has the largest impact to the overall satisfaction score.
Overall Benchmarking Metrics

General Satisfaction

Users general satisfaction with facilities

FY09 FY10 FY11 FY12 FY13 FY14 FY15
3.55 3.48 3.31 3.28 3.10 3.11 3.10

General Satisfaction
Peer Average
Peer High
Results Trend

Comparison of Maintenance, Grounds & Custodial
Schedule & Service Trend
Work Meets Expectations Trend
Feedback Trend

![Feedback Trend Graph]

- **Mechanical Trades – HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical**
- **Structural Trades – Carpentry, Painting, Locksmith**
Customer Satisfaction Index
Customer Satisfaction Index

• The Customer Satisfaction Index is a composite score of the five categories
• Each category score is scaled to 100%
• The average of these scores make up the Customer Satisfaction Index
Customer Satisfaction Index

General Satisfaction Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Blue: Customer Satisfaction Index
- Red: Peer Average
- Grey: Peer High