



Facilities and Plant Operations

#5 Plan cycle - 5
Plan cycle 2020/2021
7/1/20 - 6/30/21

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.

2018-2019:

The university entered into a contract with Rotolo Consultants, Inc. to maintain the grounds of the entire campus, not just the keys areas of the Quadrangle, John McNeese Park and the frontage on Ryan Street. Additional landscape projects to repair the sod in the Quad was undertaken by university personnel. In addition, various sidewalks across campus have been repaired, particularly in front of Kirkman, Cafeteria, Drew, Kaufman and Fine Arts.

2019-2020:

Contracts in place are proving to be successful from visual surveys by the Facilities and Grounds offices.

2020-2021:

Now that the contract is established and has proven successful and the process for monitoring has now become routine, we wish to remove this assessment

[contract rotolo 1819](#) [PDF 2,779 KB 6/17/20]

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.

2018-2019:

The first contract with RCI was a 15-month commitment. Overall, the services provided were satisfactory, but was rebid for Fiscal Year 20 with certain changes made to the specification to make the good results we got even better. The positive feedback leads us to want to do more improvements to the landscaping across campus.

2019-2020:

Contracts established in 2018-19 have proven successful and we continue to monitor for acceptability. Surveys shown in the Grounds section of the survey indicate a high approval rating by the campus community.

2020-2021:

With the existing contracts continuing to show high levels of satisfaction and monitoring of the contract routine, we feel this assessment is no longer necessary. It is to be removed for the 2021-22 assessment report.

[Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey](#) [PDF 1,539 KB 6/17/20]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB 7/29/21]

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an overall average score of 4.00 (out of 5.00) 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.

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
Fall 2018	4.2
Spring 2019	4.21
Fall 2019	4.4
Spring 2020	4.35
Fall 2020	no data*
Spring 2021	no data*

* Hurricane recovery projects interrupted normal operations

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB 7/26/21]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB 7/26/21]

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.

2018-2019:

Goal was met.

2019-2020:

Goal was met in the Spring semester; survey was not issued for the Fall semester due to the direct impact of Hurricane Laura, and then Hurricane Delta.

2020-2021:

Hurricane recovery phase meant that most buildings were off-line forcing online delivery of most instruction. Without a significant population present, a survey would not provide meaningful data. The campus was still being repaired. We intend to reimplement our survey in the Fall semester of 2021.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an overall average score of 3.75 (out of 5.00) on the Navigating Campus section of the Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey.

[Facilities and Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey](#) [PDF 1,539 KB 6/17/20]

3.1 Data

Semester	Overall Average Score
Spring 2018	3.86
Fall 2018	3.9
Spring 2019	3.92
Fall 2019	3.96
Spring 2020	4.03
Fall 2020	no data*
Spring 2021	no data*

* Hurricane recovery projects interrupted normal operations

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB 7/26/21]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB 7/26/21]

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.

2018-2019:

Survey numbers showed improvement by way of a higher score. Lighting in some areas was replaced as part of normal upkeep. The same is true for sidewalks that were repaved.

2019-2020:

Numbers showed slight improvement this time around, but still an improvement all the same. More "branded" type signage has been installed on building facades which makes navigation easier.

2020-2021:

In the aftermath of the hurricanes, most of our signage is missing, damaged, or otherwise unsuitable. Paths

are clear after much cleanup and disposal. Signage will be one of the last things to be reinstalled, so we expect satisfaction numbers to drop in the next survey, which is planned for Fall 2021.

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 4.00 (out of 5.00) 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 3.00 on a 5-point Likert scale on the department's satisfaction survey.

[Maintenance - Facilities & Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey Sp18](#) [PDF 63 KB 6/17/20]

1.1 Data

Year	Satisfaction Score
2015-2016	3.80
2016-2017	3.43
2017-2018	NA*

*survey was being redesigned in 2017

Semester	Average Score
Spring 2018	3.69
Fall 2018	3.76
Spring 2019	3.92
Fall 2019	3.91
Spring 2020	3.92
Fall 2020	no data*
Spring 2021	no data*

* Hurricane recovery projects interrupted normal operations

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB 7/26/21]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB 7/26/21]

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 4.00 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.

2018-2019:

Goal not met, but we have seen improvement since 2018. We will continue to emphasize with the maintenance staff that their aptitude and professionalism reflect on the community's perception of them and the university.

2019-2020:

Goal not met, but there has been marginal improvement since 2019-20. We will continue to emphasize with the maintenance staff that their aptitude and professionalism reflect on the community's perception of them and the university. Some personnel have left the university. It remains to be seen how this will affect the next survey.

2020-2021:

No data to report.

Soon after opening the school year with social distancing in place, Hurricane Laura hit SWLA on August 27, 2020, then Hurricane Delta hit on October 9. The university switched to online instruction. The survey was suspended as there was not a significant population to sample. We plan to restart the survey cycle in the Fall 2021 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.

2018-2019:

In our surveys of that academic year, satisfaction ratings relating to this assessment goal were 3.22 in the Fall survey and improved to 3.49 in the Spring survey.

2019-2020:

Door tags have been used but not to the fullest extent that the department would like to see. As a new process, it's not fully embraced by all personnel and its use will continue to be emphasized by management.

2020-2021:

Door tag method temporarily suspended due to COVID-19 pandemic and the hurricanes disrupting the normal routine of the Physical Plant personnel. Looking for new affordable software that might provide another means to keep campus employees informed about the repair work they've requested.

[Door tag](#) [PDF 133 KB 6/17/20]

[Facilities & Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey Fall18](#) [PDF 130 KB 7/29/21]

[Facilities & Plant Operations Satisfaction Survey Spring 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB 7/29/21]

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.

2018-2019:

While the door tags have some success, we aren't seeing the results that we were anticipating. We continue to look for better ways to improve the process.

2019-2020:

Looking at the data, we feel other methods for informing our campus community of the status of work orders may be better accomplished by means of a more automated work order system.

2020-2021:

Because of the pandemic and the natural disasters that we've endured this year, our focus has shifted to campus recovery versus satisfaction of a campus community that hasn't been on campus.

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 4.00 (out of 5.00) 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 3.00 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 1,539 KB 6/17/20]

1.1 Data

Year	Satisfaction Score
2015-2016	3.85
2016-2017	3.58
2017-2018	NA*

*survey was being redesigned in 2017

Semester	Average Score
Spring 2018	3.96
Fall 2018	3.96
Spring 2019	4.01
Fall 2019	4.12
Spring 2020	4.13
Fall 2020	no data**
Spring 2021	no data**

**Hurricanes Laura and Delta interrupted the normal survey cycle.

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB 7/26/21]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB 7/26/21]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB 7/26/21]

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 McNeese State University 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 4.00 for the 2017-2018 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 McNeese State University 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.

2018-2019:

The Spring Semester survey shows that we met our benchmark.

2019-2020:

Satisfaction survey results showed additional increases in this academic year.

2020-2021:

The direct impact of two hurricanes, Laura and Delta, meant that the campus switched to mainly online instruction and displacement of faculty and staff. Office space utilized by the custodial service was lost. The combination of the natural disasters and the pandemic have resulted in loss of workforce in this service. Also, with the lack of population on campus, the satisfaction surveys were interrupted. We are not sure what to expect when the surveys are restarted with the Fall 2021 semester. The custodial service is having problems finding enough staff.

[Custodial Satisfaction Survey Discussion 2018](#) [PDF 170 KB 6/17/20]

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 McNeese State University form this committee. GCA prepares a

report and presents it to McNeese State University.

2017-2018:

Meetings between McNeese State University 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.

2018-2019:

In the Fall of 2018, GCA met with McNeese for a Joint Review Committee meeting. Much the same as previous meetings, work was assessed and comments from the last survey were discussed.

2019-2020:

As the contracted cleaning service for the university, ABM sets goals that are closely related to our benchmark of quality work and work ethic. They release their data each November to MSU Facilities. Their improvements in the 2019 report were: hiring an inspector to identify deficiencies, filling the vacant supervisor positions, and equipping each area within their service area with a maintenance cart and full stock of supplies for proper service. ABM also set a fixed buffing schedule and a fixed stripping and waxing schedule for floors. They also implemented Safety Training which happens each Friday.

2020-2021:

By ABM's reporting cycle in November 2020, SWLA had endured two hurricanes. ABM's action items changed significantly due to being in "recovery mode"--many contractors were on campus repairing damages in occupiable campus facilities, the football schedule had been rerouted to Spring, and a few buildings did not and would not come back on line. In response, ABM concentrated primarily on floor maintenance after the contractors left, preparing for many more Spring Sports than usual, and filling staff vacancies as possible. Many ABM employees did not return after the storms which has put a strain on ABM. ABM continues with its scheduled training and safety programs.

[Custodial Satisfaction Survey Discussion 2018](#) [PDF 170 KB 6/17/20]

[McNeese ABM QRC 20 Nov 2019](#) [PPTX 3,037 KB 8/4/21]

[McNeese ABM QRC Nov 2020](#) [PPTX 3,090 KB 8/4/21]

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.

2018-2019:

Survey questions were redesigned because response results seem to be contradictory. Supervisors need assistance with follow-up to reduce the repeat problems. Stairways and restrooms seem to have particular repeating issues. The new contract coming up will address these concerns more directly with new requirements which should improve service.

2019-2020: (new contract with ABM in place)

ABM's overall mission is to make a difference, every person, every day. While there are always additional improvements that can be made, the effort so far has received recognition of satisfaction, namely in feedback from Library staff who state, "custodians doing a beautiful job," and from residents in Collette Hall who gave thank you and gift cards to their custodians. We will continue to support ABM's improvement efforts.

2020-2021:

Given the disruption that the hurricanes caused, ABM has managed to keep accidents and incidents to zero and to keep the functioning areas of the campus clean. Last recorded accident still holds at May 2016. Last recorded incident still holds at August 2014.

All departments were affected adversely by the two hurricanes and subsequent freeze and an unusual record-breaking flood in May; in spite of that, the Custodial personnel stepped up and worked with the repair contractors to clean buildings and make them ready for the university to occupy.

We will continue to support ABM's improvement efforts.

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 University and a question survey for deans, directors, and department heads seeking their thoughts about space needs regarding their programs.

2018-2019:

Architect Southwest delivered the Master Plan in 2019. A complete plan exists and provides the referential basis for future expansion of the campus.

2019-2020:

On March 22, 2020, Gov. Edwards issued the Stay-at-Home Order due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

2020-2021:

With Hurricane Laura hitting SWLA on August 27, 2020, and then Hurricane Delta on October 9 which followed almost the exact same path, the university switched into a recovery mode. In the aftermath of the storms, our needs have changed and the development of the master plan is being altered to include entire facility replacements. At this time, that vision is still being cultivated.

[MSU Appendix](#) [PDF 31,496 KB 7/29/21]

[MSU Design Code](#) [PDF 201,646 KB 7/29/21]

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 student life programs to a plan that fully encompasses the entire University campus.

As a result of the conversations taking place, the master planning has brought attention to the need for additional collection of data of other physical 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 this sort of scope is a more complex operation. The question survey identifies programs' needs and desires which is the first step that has been accomplished.

2018-2019:

Architect Southwest delivered the Master Plan in 2019. A complete plan exists and provides the referential basis for future expansion of the campus.

We are evaluating the recommendations of Architects Southwest deliverables.

2019-2020:

Plans are being developed based on information in the master plan for developing a new student union which is a starting point to the overall implementation of the master plan.

2020-2021:

A student-assessed fee for the planning and construction of a new student union was passed by popular student vote in the Spring of 2020. However, movement on the planning was delayed due to COVID-19 pandemic and Hurricanes Laura and Delta.

Results of the hurricanes have shown that our Master Plan has to be altered to reflect a new reality that has provided opportunities to improve the physical campus.