



Introduction

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

1 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.

1.1 Data

Overall Indicators for Grounds:

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*	—
Spring 2021*	—
Fall 2021	4.16
Spring 2022	4.14

*Hurricane recovery projects interrupted normal operations.

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB]

[FL 2021](#) [PDF 112 KB]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB]

[SP 2022](#) [PDF 108 KB]

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

For Grounds Services, the goal was met in both semesters that the survey was done. Looking at the individual

questions for both Fall and Spring, the data show that each scored above the benchmark. It's a solid result given that the university is still in a post-hurricane recovery period.

2 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]

2.1 Data

Overall Indicators for Navigating Campus:

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*	—
Spring 2021*	—
Fall 2021	3.85
Spring 2022	3.94

*Hurricane recovery projects interrupted normal operations

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB]

[FL 2021](#) [PDF 112 KB]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB]

[SP 2022](#) [PDF 108 KB]

2.1.1 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.

2021-2022:

For Campus Navigation, the goal was met in both semesters that the survey was done. In terms of specific items, there were 2 in the Fall survey, signs/markers & adequate parking, that individually fell below the benchmark. Looking at the same 2 items in the Spring survey, those data have improved. The university is still in post-hurricane recovery.

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]

1.1 Data

Maintenance Services:

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

*Survey was being redesigned in 2017.

Overall Indicators for Maintenance Services:

Semester	Overall Average Score
Spring 2018	3.69
Fall 2018	3.76
Spring 2019	3.92
Fall 2019	3.91
Spring 2020	3.92
Fall 2020*	—
Spring 2021*	—
Fall 2021	3.7
Spring 2022	3.73

*Hurricane recovery projects interrupted normal operations.

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB]

[FL 2021](#) [PDF 112 KB]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB]

[SP 2022](#) [PDF 108 KB]

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:
Goal was not met. We are basically back where we were in 2017-18. The maintenance shop is reduced in terms of personnel. Also, the department head changes on July 1, 2022. More and more, maintenance items are being contracted out to local vendors to improve the accuracy of repair work. The department is still planning on implementing a new work order system when funding becomes available.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

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

2.1 Data

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.

2021-2022:
Door tag system has been abandoned due to being ineffective.

[Door tag](#) [PDF 133 KB]

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB]

[FL 2021](#) [PDF 112 KB]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB]

[SP 2022](#) [PDF 108 KB]

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

Two questions in our satisfaction survey specifically refer to notification: "when a repair is going to take longer than expected" and "when repair work is complete." In the Fall survey, these got ratings of 3.34 & 3.28, respectively. In the Spring survey, the ratings were 3.28 & 3.31. As stated in the analysis on the above assessment, changes within the maintenance department have made/will make an impact in the coming months. Specific comments are driving the efforts to make improvements.

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]

1.1 Data

Custodial Services:

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

*Survey was being redesigned in 2017.

Overall Indicators for Custodial Services:

Semester	Overall Average Score
Spring 2018	3.96
Fall 2018	3.96
Spring 2019	4.01
Fall 2019	4.12
Spring 2020	4.13
Fall 2020*	—
Spring 2021*	—
Fall 2021	3.99
Spring 2022	3.97

*Hurricanes Laura and Delta interrupted the normal survey cycle.

[FL 2018](#) [PDF 130 KB]

[FL 2019](#) [PDF 115 KB]

[FL 2021](#) [PDF 112 KB]

[SP 2018](#) [PDF 97 KB]

[SP 2019](#) [PDF 119 KB]

[SP 2020](#) [PDF 102 KB]

[SP 2022](#) [PDF 108 KB]

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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 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.

2021-2022:

Unfortunately, the staffing situation has not improved significantly since last fiscal year. ABM, our custodial service, is still understaffed. Lack of people makes it harder to keep campus buildings clean. Some campus buildings are vacated due to hurricane damage which does ease the workforce issue. In spite of that, the Fall data shows a 3.99 average score, and the Spring data shows a 3.97 average score for Custodial Services. The scores very nearly reach goal. In the current situation, that's a respectable result.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: To ensure quality work and work ethic.

2.1 Data

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.

2021-2022:

ABM continues with its scheduled training and safety programs. ABM's quarterly review also gives information on achievements and serves as a self-evaluation for McNeese to review.

[Custodial Satisfaction Survey Discussion 2018](#) [PDF 170 KB]

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

[McNeese ABM QRC Feb 2022](#) [PPTX 3,225 KB]

[McNeese ABM QRC Nov 2020](#) [PPTX 3,090 KB]

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2021-2022:

With the current staffing shortage and only slight indications that the availability of this particular labor force is growing, ABM is managing to get new hires trained in cleaning procedures and use of equipment. Supervisors play a large role in this. The impact of the labor shortage is still affecting the operation. However, the training programs remain on schedule and ABM continues to provide work statistics as seen in the latest Power Point presentation. (see data above)

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.

2021-2022:

The master plan is now an extant document. This objective is met and can be dropped from future evaluations. [final entry]

[MSU Appendix](#) [PDF 31,496 KB]

[MSU Design Code](#) [PDF 201,646 KB]

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.

2021-2022:

The master plan is an agile and systematic approach to the enhancement and growth of the McNeese campuses. As funds are garnered, this plan provides a blueprint on how and when to proceed with expansion. If needs change, the document is agile enough to be realigned. The master plan is vision, and our current president is certainly making it his mission to see it come to fruition. As an objective, the goal is now met and can be dropped from future evaluations. [final entry]