

# **Facilities and Plant Operations**

Office of Facilities and Plant Operations

## Performance Objective 1 To improve and maintain the appearance and ease of navigating the campus.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: To maintain visual appeal of the Quadrangle, John McNeese Park, the Entrance Plaza, and other areas along Ryan Street.

#### 1.1 Data

2016-2017:

Visual assessment of Ryan Street (the areas under contract) is overall very good. The Quadrangle and John McNeese Park, however, are not being sufficiently kept according to our survey comments.

2017-2018:

Visual assessment and Spring 2018 survey questions and comments specific to the Grounds Dept. McNeese bid and awarded a contract with Rotolo Consultants for landscape management services across the entire campus, which includes the key areas of the Quadrangle, John McNeese Park, and Ryan Street.

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Landscape management service contract has been renewed and is a recurring renewal now. For the Quad and Park, we are considering an additional landscape management contract to cover these areas because our manpower is limited.

2017-2018:

This will be a recurring contract. It increases the workforce necessary to keep all of the university grounds well maintained. That goal was met.

[contract Rotolo 1819](#) [PDF 2,779 KB 7/10/18]

### 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an overall average score of 4.0 (out of 5) on the Grounds section of the Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was to make sure that the general opinion of the campus staff is that appearance of the grounds are satisfactory.

[Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey](#) [PDF 1,574 KB 4/5/18]

#### 2.1 Data

2016-2017:

Survey results were not setup to group results by building; the responses were mixed. Specificity is needed in order to focus on the staff's areas of concern.

Semester	Overall Average Score
Spring 2018	4.03

#### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

We will inaugurate a separate survey or a separate area in the existing survey design to specifically target grounds areas and their associated buildings.

2017-2018:

With the Spring 2018 survey, newly revised questions were used specifically to evaluate the Grounds operation. Responses were grouped by building. Result is that the Grounds superintendent now has the ability to focus on particular areas that need attention. As the assessment has changed, this result provides us with a new benchmark.

### 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an overall average score of 3.75 (out of 5) on the Navigating Campus section of the Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey.

**3.1 Data**

Semester	Overall Average Score
Spring 2018	3.86

**3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2017-2018:

A score of 3.86 is a good result considering that this was the initial evaluation of appearance and access. Survey comments were varied, but the constructive comments have been used to prioritize work orders (e.g., getting night lighting back up to safe levels, installing additional bike racks, repaving sidewalks, etc.). This result sets the benchmark.

**Performance Objective 2 To ensure timely and sufficient maintenance of campus facilities and improve customer satisfaction.****1 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: Earn an overall average score of 4.0 (out of 5) on the Maintenance section of the Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was to maintain or exceed a minimum average score of 3.0 on a 5-point Likert scale on the department's satisfaction survey.

**1.1 Data**

Year	Satisfaction Score
2015-2016	3.8
2016-2017	3.43

Semester	Average Score
Spring 2018	3.69

[Maintenance\\_-\\_Facilities\\_&\\_Plant\\_Operations\\_Satisfaction\\_Survey\\_Sp18](#) [PDF 53 KB 7/30/18]

**1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:

Goal was met. It is recognized, however that there is always room for improvement. Our goal is not just to achieve mediocrity; on the other hand, we cannot set the goal so high that results are not reasonable or achievable. As stated before, there are genuine issues with some work orders; and no matter what, some building occupants will never be satisfied.

2017-2018:

Goal of 4.0 was not met. At 3.69, though, it is a better-than-expected result. This was the first return with the new survey; to make it statistically meaningful, a couple more results will be needed in order to see any trends. The survey was being redesigned during Fall 2017, so there are no survey results logged. The survey is currently setup to be released twice per academic year, once per regular semester.

**2 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: To keep campus personnel informed with notifications about their work order requests.

**2.1 Data**

2016-2017:

There were no results to report in the 2016-2017 academic year.

2017-2018:

Maintenance personnel were instructed to leave a door tag that was especially designed. In lieu of the tag, personnel could also make face-to-face contact with the requester at the time the repair was initiated. With either method, personnel

were instructed to regularly update the requester as long as the work order remained open.

[door tag](#) [PDF 133 KB 7/30/18]

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Analysis so far: In the absence of a software package running on an Internet server and automatically generating notifications, using an old school approach may be a fix- leaving a door tag at the location where the work was performed.

2017-2018:

The effort undertaken to improve notifications with the campus population has not been entirely successful. Two questions in the survey in the Maintenance section specifically reference notification. According to the results, the campus opinion sits in the middle, only marginally more positive than negative. Maintenance will reassess the use of the door tags.

## Performance Objective 3 To improve campus cleanliness and to improve staff management in Custodial Services.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an overall average score of 4.0 (out of 5) on the Custodial Services section of the Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey. Campus cleanliness is largely a perceived ideal, so the campus response is crucial to determining cleanliness.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was reaching or exceeding a minimum average score of 3.0 on a 5-point Likert scale on the Facilities satisfaction survey. Ensure that the campus community is satisfied with the cleanliness of facilities.

[Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey](#) [PDF 1,574 KB 4/5/18]

#### 1.1 Data

Year	Satisfaction Score
2015-2016	3.85
2016-2017	3.58

Semester	Average Score
Spring 2018	3.88

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

- While the results do show that the goal was met, it is recognized that there is always the need for improvement. The comment section of the survey showed a wide range of opinions. All comments regarding custodial service were given to GCA.
- Representatives from GCA and MSU Facilities met in June and discussed key points based on results from the most recent satisfaction survey done by Facilities and GCA. Discussion points have provided direction for GCA response. Survey is to be revised to ask more location-specific questions.

2017-2018:

- Results from the Spring 2018 survey do show a higher score from the year before. It is also a different survey. The benchmark was reset to 4.0 for the 2017-18 period. At 3.88, the result is close. The changes to the survey helped focus the participants attention to specific areas instead of an overall opinion.
- GCA and MSU Facilities met on March 7, 2018 to discuss the results of the Spring 2018 survey. Several key points were made and minuted; these provide the performance areas for supervisors and managers to focus on. Continued attention in these areas should effect a change in the score and get it closer to the benchmark.
- Two surveys are now being planned per year, one in each semester. However, only one was accomplished in this reporting period because we did not take the proper time needed to redesign our survey.

[Custodial Satisfaction Survey Discussion March 2018](#) [PDF 172 KB 7/24/18]

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: To ensure quality work and work ethic.

### 2.1 Data

2016-2017:

A Joint Review Committee is formed on an as-needed basis in order to review the effectiveness of the services as contracted. Representatives from GCA Services (which provide general management and oversight of both civil service and contract employees) and MSU form this committee. GCA prepares a report and presents it to MSU.

2017-2018:

Meetings between MSU and GCA that result from the survey responses are sufficient to address work quality as well as the satisfaction by the campus community. Issues to focus on are identified.

[Custodial Satisfaction Survey Discussion March 2018](#) [PDF 172 KB 7/26/18]

#### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Turnover of employees has been reduced. The continuing job analysis gives GCA a better knowledge for evaluating employee performance, and complaints by the campus population appear to be decreasing.

2017-2018:

One of the main issues that drove the university to seek a contracted custodial service was the low quality of work being performed by in-house staff. Since the initial contract, work quality has become less of an issue because GCA sets professional standards that must be met by the employees under its supervision. Work quality continues to improve.

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: To continue the service contract with a custodial service company.

### 3.1 Data

2016-2017:

Over the period of the first contract with GCA Services, the general opinion is that cleanliness has improved overall; the campus looks better with a contracted company than managing it with our own office.

2017-2018:

General opinion is that campus cleanliness continues to improve. GCA's scope of work as seen in its contract with the university is a sound approach to managing custodial operations. Responsibilities of each party are clearly defined.

[GCA contract 10012017\\_09302020](#) [PDF 1,127 KB 7/26/18]

#### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

MSU plans to continue with a contracted custodial service and will solicit proposals in Fall 2017. Based on the experience gained, MSU will be modifying and refining its specifications for the next contract.

2017-2018:

- For the foreseeable future, the university will maintain a contract with a custodial service. The reasoning for this is competition. When the university managed its own custodial staff, the lack of competition enabled complacency and lower-than-expected work ethic. With outside custodial services now pursuing service contracts, the ethos of that work ethic is completely different. Evaluation of the work performed needs to rate highly in order to keep the contract. Competition is what makes the difference and is what yields a better overall result.
- The benchmark has been met for two reporting cycles. Effective 2018-2019, this benchmark will be discontinued.

## Performance Objective 4 To design a long range capital improvements plan for the maintenance and growth of MSU's physical facilities with input from the Master Plan Committee.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: To continue the development of the capital improvement master plan.

## 1.1 Data

2016-2017:

A contract with Architects Southwest was initiated; the planning process has started.

2017-2018:

Several meetings with Architects Southwest have produced a plan for a week long series of workshops with different areas of the campus for deans, directors, and department heads seeking their thoughts about space needs regarding their programs.

### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

- Based on observations, the current plan needs to be expanded from its narrowly-defined plan that focuses on a specific area to one that encompasses the entire University campus.
- As a result of the conversations taking place, the master planning has brought attention to the need for additional assets beyond buildings and land holdings.

2017-2018:

- This plan now addresses the entire university instead of just one portion of it. Development of a long-range plan with a focus on capital operation. The question survey identifies programs' needs and desires which is the first step that has been accomplished.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: To continue garnering funds from both public and private sources in order to adequately implement the five-year capital plan.

### 2.1 Data

2015-2016:

- An analysis of the past five years of capital outlay requests, which also tracks private source funds, shows that the University received \$115,811,202 for major construction and renovation.
- Legislative appropriations and self-generated University funding has resulted in meeting \$79,943,600 of that total.

2016-2017:

- Capital Outlay requests with new and continuing projects were submitted for the next fiscal year to Division of Administration and Finance as part of our five-year Capital Outlay Request.
- Currently, the Health & Human Performance building is under construction and ADA modifications are underway in multiple areas.

2017-2018:

- Capital Outlay requests with new and continuing projects were submitted to Division of Administration Office of Facilities as part of our five-year Capital Outlay Request.
- Health & Human Performance continues and will finish in 2019 fiscal year.

[5Yr\\_CO\\_Plan\\_McNeese\\_FY2018-19](#) [XLSX 21 KB 7/30/18]

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Based on results of legislative funding, projects that receive approval of funding may not necessarily receive a cash line item for the fiscal year in which what is expected to be expended in the course of the fiscal year. The five-year request is adjusted accordingly to reflect the amount of funding re-requested every year until they are complete).

2017-2018:

This process does not change from year to year. Facilities consistently submits the annual Capital Outlay Request per the requirements of the legislature which vary according to economy and will which are things we are responsive to but certainly beyond our control. Effective 2018-19, this assessment will be discontinued due to the continuous nature of the item.

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: To maintain an inventory of facilities and land holdings.

### 3.1 Data

2016-2017:

The Facilities Inventory and Space Utilization Report which is turned in every November to the Board of Regents is the best available information and is audited/edited/updated on a yearly basis.

2017-2018:

The Facilities Inventory and Space Utilization Report was submitted in November 2017 to the Board of Regents and was available online at the URL below. Three data files specific to McNeese are attached.

<https://regents.la.gov/divisions/finance-facilities/facilities/facilities-inventory-and-utilization-system/2017-facilities-inventory-sp>

[BL1417](#) [PDF 12 KB 7/26/18]

[CL1417](#) [PDF 47 KB 7/26/18]

[RM1417](#) [PDF 101 KB 7/26/18]

### **3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:

- This report is a collaborative effort between Facilities and IRE and was successfully submitted before its due date
- Additional physical assets should be included in the main collection of data which lists only buildings at present. Needs to accommodate and hold this data (as mentioned above).

2017-2018:

- Additional structures not defined as buildings have been added to the data collection. Utility infrastructure, improved lighting, etc.), and non-movables (shades, spectator seating, etc.) have not been added to the database because they are already recorded on maps and other schematics.
- Effective 2018-2019, this assessment will be discontinued from our plan because of its routine nature. Even though the Board of Regents will not change in the foreseeable future, it is not necessary to report that we continue to update database information and adding data periodically to maintain its comprehensiveness when it's necessary. Needs to be included here.