



Spring 2017 Facilities Satisfaction Survey Results

Prepared by Diana Pineda

Purpose of Brief

The purpose of this brief is to analyze the results of the facilities survey completed by 38 respondents in spring 2017.

Summary of Findings

- 29% of respondents primary work location was at the Crafton Center (CCR) and 13% primarily worked in the Learning and Resource Center (LRC).
- 100% of respondents were satisfied with event setups by custodial personnel.
- 100% respondents were satisfied with the following Grounds service components:
 - Access to walkways and buildings without interference from irrigation schedule
 - Appearance of grounds (shrubbery, lawns, walkways)
 - Quantity and diversity of flowerbeds, trees, and shrubs
 - Attitude, appearance, and productivity of grounds department personnel
 - Overall satisfaction with grounds services
 - Performance of grounds supervisors
 - Timely response to reported grounds related requests
- 92% of respondents indicated satisfaction with the performance of maintenance supervisors.
- 58% of respondents specified access to parking as the most negative way construction affected them.
- 42% of respondents indicated a positive experience in relocating to a new location for their office or program.

Overview

The Director of Facilities in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning (OIERP) developed a satisfaction survey to evaluate the services provided by the Custodial, Grounds, and Maintenance departments. The survey also included questions to evaluate the perception of impact, if any, that construction projects at Crafton Hills College (CHC) had on respondents. CHC managers, faculty, and staff were invited through email to complete an online survey from March 3 to March 21, 2017. The purpose of this brief is to analyze the results of the facilities survey completed by 38 respondents in spring 2017.

Methodology

The survey was administered online, respondents were provided with a survey link through email. First, the survey consisted of a multiple-choice question to determine respondent's primary work location at CHC. Then, respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with thirty-one statements regarding Custodial, Grounds, and Maintenance services. The following 5-point Likert scale was utilized: 5=Very Satisfied, 4=Somewhat Satisfied, 3= Somewhat Dissatisfied, 2= Very Dissatisfied and 1= No Opinion/Not Applicable. Analysis of the data excluded "No Opinion/ Not Applicable" responses. Follow up open-ended questions allowed for respondents to provide comments regarding Custodial, Grounds, and Maintenance services. The last part of the survey asked respondents to rate the degree to which they perceived the impact of the ongoing construction projects at CHC with five statements. The following 5-point Likert scale was utilized: 5= Very Positive, 4=Somewhat Positive, 3=No Impact, 2=Somewhat Negative, 1=Very Negative. Finally, respondents were asked to specify in which way the construction affected them the most negatively, as a multiple-choice question. To anonymize responses, individual names mentioned in the comments/suggestions were replaced with "[Name]". Additionally, to organize feedback received, comments/suggestions were categorized by topic. A limitation to grouping any open-ended responses into categories is that other researchers may group them differently.

Findings

Tables 1 through 10 illustrate the results of the findings from the facilities survey in spring 2017.

Table 1 lists respondent's self-reported primary work locations on campus. Twenty-nine percent of respondent's primary work location was at the Crafton Center (CCR) and 13% primarily worked at the Learning and Resource Center (LRC).

Table 1. Respondent's primary work locations.

Primary Work Location	#	N	%
CCR	11	38	28.9
LRC	5	38	13.2
CNTL	4	38	10.5
KHA	4	38	10.5
PSAH	3	38	7.9
WEST	3	38	7.9
ARTS	2	38	5.3
CHL	2	38	5.3
CYN	2	38	5.3
CDC	1	38	2.6
M&O	1	38	2.6

Table 2 illustrates respondent's level of satisfaction with various services provided by the Custodial department. One hundred percent of respondents were satisfied with event setups. Over 91% of respondents expressed satisfaction with delivery of equipment or supplies from the warehouse. Respondents were least likely (62%) to be satisfied with the cleanliness of the rest room areas.

Table 2. Respondent's level of satisfaction regarding Custodial services.

Statement	Very Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Cleanliness of hallways and stairwells	18	47.4	12	31.6	5	13.2	3	7.9	38
Attitude, appearance, and productivity of custodial personnel	24	72.7	5	15.2	2	6.1	2	6.1	33
Overall satisfaction with custodial services	21	56.8	8	21.6	5	13.5	3	8.1	37
Cleanliness of office areas	17	47.2	12	33.3	6	16.7	1	2.8	36
Timely response to cleanliness concerns	19	65.5	7	24.1	2	6.9	1	3.4	29
Cleanliness of rest room areas	11	29.7	12	32.4	6	16.2	8	21.6	37
Performance of custodial supervisors	15	60	7	28	1	4	2	8	25
Delivery of equipment or supplies from the warehouse	17	73.9	4	17.4	1	4.3	1	4.3	23
Event setups (tables, chairs, etc. are set up for events on time and as requested)	16	76.2	5	23.8	0	0	0	0	21
Mail collection and delivery	14	53.8	7	26.9	2	7.7	3	11.5	26
Cleanliness of classrooms	8	30.8	11	42.3	5	19.2	2	7.7	26

Note: "No Opinion/Not Applicable" responses were excluded from this table.

Table 3 includes open-ended responses provided by 14 (37%) respondents, regarding services provided by the Custodial department. Feedback received was organized in the following three themes: compliments/praise, issues with restrooms, and suggestions. As an illustration of compliments provided, one respondent made the following comment: “The custodial services do a fantastic job. I think too many faculty members underestimate the work that is put in to our buildings. I wish I could thank each member individually.”

Table 3. Open-ended responses regarding Custodial services.

Compliments/Praise (n=6)
Everyone in this building is always happy to help when we have events or last-minute "situations" arise. Definitely a "team" environment here!
I am fully satisfied with the cleanliness of the facilities, the problem is that the facility itself is antiquated. The Women's bathroom in Arts building has 3 stall, no ventilation, bad lighting, no lighting in the last stall. The bathroom and the art rooms look like they came out of the 70's. There are still cigarette ashtrays in the stall in the women's bathroom. This is NOT the message I want to send students or their parents when they come to visit.
The custodial services do a fantastic job. I think too many faculty members underestimate the work that is put in to our buildings. I wish I could thank each member individually.
The restroom on the second floor is usually dirtier, maybe because there is higher student traffic. Richard is the best! Richard, Kelly, and Ed are always so friendly. Thank you all for your hard work!
Vanessa is a great worker and Edward Chavez always has a smile when he delivers packages.
Vanessa is a pleasure to work with. Always helpful and attentive to our needs.
Issues with Restrooms (n=5)
The bathrooms can be a disaster, but I think this is more a function of the students and not so much the custodians. Perhaps it's a scheduling item. The custodians clean in the late afternoon, so the restrooms are in their worse condition midday after lunch.
The cleanliness of the rest room on the 1st floor of CYN is not maintained, and supplies are not always replenished in a timely manner.
The staff bathroom on the first floor is often dirty by the toilet area (the toilet is the handicap stall) might be broken.
The toilet in the staff office area doesn't appear to be cleaned on a regular basis.
We simply have to ask every day for paper towels and soap. Even when asked directly for these supplies, there is no follow through.
Suggestions (n=3)
Chalkboards in CNTL-132 & CNTL-245 should be vacuumed more frequently.
I have mentioned my frustration more than once of the custodial staff that maintains the PSAH building. Even with the support of the Fire Technology, Fire Academy, Paramedic and EMT programs that maintain their rooms, (dumping trash, cleaning white board, cleaning sinks, wiping down tables and desks and for the foremost picking up paper towels that did not make the bucket) minimizing the work load for the custodian, they still neglect to see that the paper towel holders are full, hall ways and bathroom floors are cleaned, window in doors are cleaned and carpeted areas vacuumed regularly. Oh well no sense to go on :(
It would be nice if the delivery person would not complain when delivering!

Grounds Department

Table 4 demonstrates respondent’s level of satisfaction with various services provided through the Grounds department. One hundred percent of respondents were satisfied with the following service components:

- Access to walkways and buildings without interference from irrigation schedule
- Appearance of grounds (shrubbery, lawns, walkways)
- Quantity and diversity of flowerbeds, trees, and shrubs
- Attitude, appearance, and productivity of grounds department personnel
- Overall satisfaction with grounds services
- Performance of grounds supervisors
- Timely response to reported grounds related requests

Table 4. Respondent’s level of satisfaction regarding Grounds services.

Statement	Very Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Access to walkways and buildings without interference from irrigation schedule	33	86.8	5	13.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	38
Appearance of grounds (shrubbery, lawns, walkways)	30	78.9	8	21.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	38
Quantity and diversity of flowerbeds, trees, and shrubs	30	81.1	7	18.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	37
Attitude, appearance, and productivity of grounds department personnel	30	81.1	7	18.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	37
Overall satisfaction with grounds services	30	81.1	7	18.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	37
Trash removal / cleanliness of grounds and parking lots	29	76.3	5	13.2	3	7.9	1	2.6	38
Adequacy of irrigation (under/over watering)	27	75.0	7	19.4	2	5.6	0	0.0	36
Performance of grounds supervisors	21	80.8	5	19.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	26
Timely response to reported grounds related requests	18	78.3	5	21.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	23

Note: “No Opinion/Not Applicable” responses were excluded from this table.

Table 5 includes open-ended responses provided by 10 (26%) respondents, regarding services provided by the Grounds department. Feedback received was organized in the following three themes: compliments/praise, comments, and suggestions. Respondents were most likely to provide compliments/praise regarding Ground services. As an illustration of compliments provided, one respondents made the following comment: “Beautiful as always - and always appreciated!”

Table 5. Open-ended responses regarding Grounds services.

Compliments/Praise (n=6)
Beautiful as always - and always appreciated!
Beautiful grounds.
I feel that our ground crews deserve recognition for a job well done. With the area needed to be maintained and the amount of ground personnel accomplishing this task is amazing. Thank you keeping our grounds beautiful.
I informed the staff that the trail stairs between the tennis courts and soccer field were unsafe. This was taken care of immediately. Thank you.
Otherwise, great performance by the grounds team.
Most beautiful campus ever. What would it take to become an arboretum? I think that would be a feather in the cap of the wonderful grounds folks who make this campus an absolute joy to walk.
They all work so hard thank you keeping our college beautiful
Comments (n=1)
Worried about trees in central quad.
Suggestions (n=3)
I use the soccer field for the 6-7:30am fire cadet classes and the field is often very wet making it hard and sometimes unsafe to perform drills with the cadets. Also, the mower is often being run during class making the air quality undesirable. We are usually only out there Tuesday and Thursday mornings so it would be much appreciated if mowing could be scheduled on another day.
I wish the exterior trashcans were emptied more regularly.
you really need trash cans around the ccr building

Maintenance Department

Table 6 illustrates respondent’s level of satisfaction with various services provided through the Maintenance department. Ninety-two percent of respondents indicated satisfaction with the performance of maintenance supervisors and over 90% of respondents were satisfied with the attitude, appearance, and productivity of maintenance personnel. On the other hand, only 59% of respondents were satisfied with the following services provided:

- Adequacy of building temperature (summer and winter)
- Condition of plumbing fixtures (toilets, faucets, water fountains)

Table 6. Respondent’s level of satisfaction regarding Maintenance services.

Statement	Very Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Function of doors and hardware	21	55.3	13	34.2	3	7.9	1	2.6	38
Condition of furniture, fixtures, and equipment	18	47.4	14	36.8	4	10.5	2	5.3	38
Overall satisfaction with maintenance services	17	45.9	14	37.8	4	10.8	2	5.4	37
Condition of interior surfaces (walls, ceilings, floors)	16	42.1	14	36.8	3	7.9	5	13.2	38
Attitude, appearance, and productivity of maintenance personnel	19	61.3	9	29	2	6.5	1	3.2	31
Adequacy of building ventilation system	18	50	10	27.8	4	11.1	4	11.1	36
Professionalism and expertise of maintenance personnel	18	58.1	8	25.8	4	12.9	1	3.2	31
Performance of maintenance supervisors	18	69.2	6	23.1	0	0	2	7.7	26
Timeliness of repairs	14	46.7	9	30	2	6.7	5	16.7	30
Condition of plumbing fixtures (toilets, faucets, water fountains)	11	29.7	11	29.7	9	24.3	6	16.2	37
Adequacy of building temperature (summer and winter)	11	29.7	11	29.7	7	18.9	8	21.6	37

Note: “No Opinion/Not Applicable” responses were excluded from this table.

Table 7 includes open-ended responses provided by 13 (34%) respondents, regarding services provided by the Maintenance department. Feedback received was organized in the following three themes: dissatisfaction, suggestions, and compliments/praise. As an illustration of dissatisfaction expressed by respondents, one respondent made the following comment: “The library is too cold in winter. Staff has to wear heavy coats.”

Table 7. Open-ended responses regarding Maintenance services.

Dissatisfaction (n=6)
Despite popular opinion, the interior temperature is just fine, in my opinion. But response to repair requests is very slow, and [Name] (I think) and [Name] usually appear to be unhappy with responding to the requests. I would go so far as to say they have a negative attitude toward their work. The toilets in this building are running or leaking almost daily.
Regarding Maintenance, when I have requested assistance from them I have been treated like I don't know what I am talking about or they just can't do anything about the issues. One semester it was 73 outside and the heater was on in the classroom making my room 83 on one of the days. I and my students where sweating. This is not a positive learning environment for students. Productivity went down and when Maintenance came out to look into it after I had been leaving messages for a week (7 to 8 days) they stood in the hallway speaking loudly and disrupting my class.
Requested a wall to be repainted in my office four years ago, and was told no. Still looks like crap to this day. Thanks! Light ballasts go unrepaired. My door still jams. Bathroom facets either dribble or power wash the first layer of skin from my hands. The maintenance personnel do what they can. It seems the maintenance of our facilities are deferred until the buildings are dilapidated.
Temperature of the WC buildings is awful, especially on hot days. It often gets to be over 100 degrees which makes it impossible to teach and for students to focus. Also the computer furniture is outdated and difficult to navigate around. They are bulky and do not lend themselves well to instructor movement.
The library is too cold in winter. Staff has to wear heavy coats.
Too much complaining when called to fix things
Suggestions (n=5)
Men's bathroom in West needs updating and is sometimes messy
Pantry in 226 gets a lot of use lately and it shows. We could definitely use more of a team mentality when cleaning up after ourselves. I find that I have to pick up and wipe down before I can start prepping for an event/meeting. Not sure what the solution is since the space is used by various campus staff. Also, the last stall in ladies restroom downstairs has issues staying latched.
The fire cadets use the fitness center on Tuesday and/or Thursday mornings between 6-7:30am. It would be nice if the air conditioning came on a little before 6a so the room is cooled down for their workout. Thanks.
Usually pretty cold in the building if it's cold outside. So maybe turn on heater when it is cooler, if possible.
We need to look at having larger chairs for larger students in classes.
Compliments/Praise (n=2)
Keep up the great service
Thank you for fixing the water pressures on the faucets in the restrooms - MUCH better!

Table 8 illustrates respondent’s perceived impact of ongoing construction projects on campus. One hundred percent of respondents had the perception that once construction is complete the overall impact on them personally and on their program and/or department to be positive or to have no impact.

Table 8. Respondent’s perceived impact of construction projects.

Statement	Very Positive		Somewhat Positive		No Impact		Somewhat Negative		Very Negative		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Once the construction is complete, what do you believe the overall impact will be on you personally?	16	42.1	10	26.3	12	31.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	38
Once the construction is complete, what do you believe the overall impact will be on your program and/or department?	15	40.5	9	24.3	13	35.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	37
How would you describe the impact of the current construction on you personally?	8	21.1	7	18.4	13	34.2	9	23.7	1	2.6	38
How would you describe the impact of the current construction on your program and/or department?	8	21.1	6	15.8	17	44.7	6	15.8	1	2.6	38

Note: Any missing responses were excluded from this table.

Table 9 illustrates the most negative ways construction affected respondents. Fifty-eight percent of respondents specified access to parking as the most negative way construction affected them, followed by access to facilities (37%).

Table 9. Most negative ways construction affected respondents.

Different disruptions	#	N	%
Access to parking	22	38	58.0
Access to facilities	14	38	37.0
Noise	8	38	21.0
Dislocation of programs	6	38	16.0
Dust	5	38	13.0
Construction traffic/deliveries	5	38	13.0
Other	3	38	8.0

Note: Any missing responses were excluded from this table.

If a respondent selected “other”, they had the opportunity to elaborate further. Below is a list of other ways construction affected respondents:

- Complaints when there are smelly operations
- Construction makes Honors office difficult to find by those who haven't been there. However, we will be moving in summer.
- I occasionally use the quad area for fire cadet workouts, most importantly the large staircase to the LADM building. While those stairs are unavailable I have had to change my workout. This is a minor inconvenience thought.

Table 10 illustrates respondent's perceived impact of the moves (Churn) on campus. Fifty percent of respondents indicated no impact in rating their experience for relocating to a new location for their office or program. Forty-two percent of respondents indicated a positive experience in relocating to a new location for their office or program.

Table 10. Respondent's perceived impact of the moves (Churn) on campus.

Statement	Very Positive		Somewhat Positive		No Impact		Somewhat Negative		Very Negative		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Please rate your experience for relocating to new location for your office or program.	11	30.6	4	11.1	18	50.0	3	8.3	0	0.0	36

Note: Any missing responses were excluded from this table.