FY 2016 Survey Results
UAF Facilities Services
The Process

- 452 Surveys sent out
- Survey sent to Employees who submitted an EWORF and to Building Managers
- 116 Responses
- 27% 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
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:
  – Understands Service Levels - the largest impact
  – Feedback Mechanism - close to the largest impact
  – Knowledge of Process - large impact
  – General satisfaction - medium impact
  – Work Meets Expectations - lower impact
• To increase Overall Satisfaction, the area of communication needs to be addressed including setting expectations around service levels and the process and providing an opportunity for customer feedback
• 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
I'm mostly interested in getting the work order into the system quickly and efficiently so that I can get on with the rest of my work. I would like, though, to be able to get feedback on status. When I call I'm told they'll get to us as soon as possible.

I place requests via website when possible, but no one ever comes until our director calls. We've waited more than 2 months before to get help installing air conditioners, but the time someone came, we had brought someone in from outside UAF to do it.
Overall Benchmarking Metrics

- Concerns with lower staffing issues - some items are not being addressed as quickly as they should be.

- The communication of work request schedule could be improved. There are times that the request is urgent and this is indicated in the work order but it does not seem to be prioritized as needed.

- Electronic Work Orders have been great these past few years.

- Understanding Service Levels has the largest impact to the overall satisfaction score.
Overall Benchmarking Metrics

Are users’ expectations met?

Sometimes our grass is cut all the way down our hill to our building, and other times it’s mowed just a couple feet. But not consistent and it looks better for our guests who visit when it’s mowed all the way. It looks more finished.

Again, HVAC, electrical, alarm shop all EXCELLENT!. Plumbing and maintenance after plumbing falls short so it brings the ratings down

My experiences with this department (structural trades) have been overwhelmingly positive.
It took a rather long time after reporting wasp nests to get them taken care of, and I had zero follow up on my request to trim back obstructing vegetation. The work was completed and the ticket closed, but at no point was anything scheduled or feedback involved.

I never have any idea where a work order stands. It doesn't seem that there's a good mechanism in place for communication back to me on the status of my work order.

Again, just better communication from ALL shops when work has been assigned, would be useful.
Overall Benchmarking Metrics

- **Users general satisfaction with facilities**

- **General Satisfaction**

  - FY09: 3.55
  - FY10: 3.48
  - FY11: 3.31
  - FY12: 3.28
  - FY13: 3.10
  - FY14: 3.11
  - FY15: 3.10
  - FY16: 3.10

All methods of submitting work just fine. I have a lot of experience working with facilities and every instance and each person I have encountered has been excellent.

Many areas of FS exceed expectations. For example, alarm shop, HVAC, freezer techs, but it falls short in cleaning and the company we have hired. Also, incomplete work after ceiling leak in lab...left mess, didn't replace tiles, still have bucket hanging from leak.

Overall in my interactions with staff, they have been courteous, professional and helpful.
Results Trend

Comparison of Maintenance, Grounds & Custodial
Schedule & Service Trend

Schedule & Service

- Mechanical Trades – HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical
- Structural Trades – Carpentry, Painting, Locksmith
Work Meets Expectations Trend
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

- Customer Satisfaction Index
- Peer Average
- Peer High