

**HAWAI‘I COMMUNITY COLLEGE
UNIT ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT**

Planning, Operations and Maintenance

March 16, 2017

**Review Period
July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016**

Initiator: Ken Kaleiwahea
Writer(s): Ken Kaleiwahea

Program/Unit Review at Hawai‘i Community College is a shared governance responsibility related to strategic planning and quality assurance. Annual and 3-year Comprehensive Reviews are important planning tools for the College’s budget process. This ongoing systematic assessment process supports achievement of Program/Unit and Institutional Outcomes. Evaluated through a college-wide procedure, all completed Program/Unit Reviews are available to the College and community at large to enhance communication and public accountability. Please see <http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/files/program-unit-review/>

Please remember that this review should be written in a professional manner. Mahalo.

UNIT DESCRIPTION

Describe the Unit	
Provide the short description as listed in the current catalog.	<p>The Unit does not have a section in the current catalog.</p> <p>The Planning, Operations and Maintenance (POM) department manages and maintains 27 buildings on the 20.7 acre Manono campus, as well as 5 buildings on approximately 2.6 acres at the University of Hawaii at Hilo campus. We are responsible for the daily maintenance of the buildings and grounds to ensure a safe, sustainable, and accessible environment for our Kauhale. In addition, we handle daily operations for the campus such as mail services, room reservations, key requests, move requests, event setup and other operational support.</p> <p>POM is also responsible for Capital Improvement Planning, fire protection systems, security systems, routine inspections related to health and safety issues, pest control, energy management, waste management, and recycling.</p>
Provide and discuss the unit's mission (or goals and objectives if no unit mission statement is available).	The mission of the Planning, Operations and Maintenance is to provide expeditious and quality services and products to our internal and external customers, on time and within agreed upon standards and agreements.

Comprehensive Review information

Provide the year and URL for the location of this unit's last Comprehensive Review on the HawCC Program/Unit Review website: http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/files/program-unit-review/	
Year	
URL	
Provide a short summary regarding the last Comprehensive Review for this unit. Discuss any significant changes to the unit since the last Comprehensive Review that are not discussed elsewhere in this review.	The Unit has not completed a Comprehensive Review to date. The first Comprehensive Review will be for the period of July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2016.

--	--

QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS

ARPD Data

IF ARPD data is available for the unit, please attach a copy of the ARPD data and submit with the Unit Review document.

If no ARPD data is available for the unit, please provide and discuss relevant and/or comparable data as available from the unit’s records.

- a) If you will be submitting the Unit Review document in hard copy, print and staple a copy of the ARPD data tables, if available, or other unit data as applicable, to the submission; the icon to print the ARPD data tables is on the upper right side, just above the data tables.

OR

- b) If you will be submitting the Unit Review document in digital form, attach a PDF copy of the ARPD data tables, if available, or other unit data as applicable, along with the digital submission; the icon to download the ARPD data tables as a PDF is in the upper right side, just above the data tables.

Unit ARPD data, if available, can be found on the ARPD website:
<http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/arpd/>

ANALYSIS OF THE UNIT’S DATA

Describe, discuss, analyze, and provide context for the unit’s data.	
Discuss, analyze, and provide context for the unit’s ARPD health scores in the Demand, Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Overall Health categories as applicable.	ARPD data is not collected or reported by the UH System for this Unit.
Describe, discuss, analyze, and provide context for unit data that was collected based on its specific operations and functions. Examples could include, but are not limited to, work logs and	The following data represents the new Key Performance Indicators (KPI) collected for the 2015-2016 Unit Review period. A description of each metric can be found on the attached Definitions for Key Performance Indicators.

activities records, meeting and session records, and any other relevant internal or external data, as appropriate.

A Key Performance Indicator (KPI) is a measurable value that helps the Unit gauge performance over time. These metrics are used to determine the Unit's progress in achieving strategic and operational goals, as well as compare the Unit's performance against other educational institutions.

Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained = 234,399

Maintenance Backlog = \$11,530,000*

Current Replacement Value (CRV) = \$111,378,000**

Facilities Condition Index (FCI) = 0.10 or 10%

Average Age of Buildings = 43.7

* 6 Year Plans for CRDM, Minor CIP and Major CIP projects.

** Sightlines, March 2016

Kilowatt Hours (KWH) per GSF = 8.06

Gallons (GAL) per GSF = 14.71

BTU per GSF = 3028

Total Energy Cost per GSF = \$2.40

Grounds Cost per Acre = \$6816

Acres per Grounds FTE = 5.8

Janitor Cost per GSF = \$1.86

GSF per Janitor FTE = 21,309

Maintenance Cost per GSF = \$0.80

GSF per Maintenance FTE = 117,200

Total Maintenance Cost per GSF = \$5.73

Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) = No data

A Customer Satisfaction Survey was not developed in time for this review period. Therefore, no data was collected for the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI). The goal is to use this KPI to establish a baseline for year over year comparison of the Unit's effectiveness on overall customer satisfaction.

The *2013-2014 Facilities Performance Indicators Report* published by APPA provides data from over 300 educational institutions. This report allows for extensive comparisons over average costs

and performance levels for custodial, grounds, maintenance and other functional areas.

In 2014, the national average cost for Energy per GSF was \$2.46 compared to our \$2.40. Although we are close to the national average, energy costs vary by geographic location and climate. The goal is to use this KPI to establish a baseline for year over year comparison of the Unit's Total Energy Cost per GSF to gauge our energy management strategy.

The national average Facilities Condition Index (FCI) is 0.11 compared to our 0.10. The FCI is a relative indicator of condition that changes over time as the facilities are re-assessed to reflect ongoing deterioration. The FCI provides a snapshot of the "catch-up" costs for the current condition relative to the Current Replacement Value (CRV) of the buildings. The FCI will increase as capital renewal decreases.

The national Average Age of Buildings is 33.3 years compared to our 43.7 years. Nearly one-third of the buildings on the Manono campus were built in the 1950s.

The national average cost for Grounds services was \$5,488/Acre compared to our \$6816/Acre. The average Grounds FTE worker covered 17.3 acres compared to our 5.8 acres. Our higher Grounds Cost per Acre and lower Acres per Grounds FTE suggests that the Unit is over-staffed in this area.

Similarly, the national average cost for Janitor (Custodial) services was \$1.43 per GSF compared to our \$1.86 per GSF. The average Janitor FTE worker covered 35,049 GSF compared to our 21,309 GSF. Our higher Janitor Cost per GSF and lower GSF per Janitor FTE suggests that we are over-staffed in this area.

By contrast, the national average cost for Maintenance services was \$1.70 per GSF compared to our \$0.80 per GSF. The average Maintenance FTE worker covered 72,929 GSF compared to our 117,200 GSF. Our lower Maintenance Cost per GSF and higher GSF per Maintenance FTE suggests that the Unit is under-staffed in this area.

	<p>According to the Federal Facilities Council, aging facilities require more maintenance and repair to keep them operating effectively. Reallocating one FTE to Maintenance would bring the Unit closer to the national average at 78,133 GSF per Maintenance FTE. This would enable management to maintain current service levels while implementing a Preventive Maintenance (PM) program to help extend the useful life of equipment and avoid costly breakdowns.</p>
<p>Describe any trends, and any internal and/or external factors that are relevant to understanding the unit's activities during the review period.</p>	<p>The number of capital renewal projects completed decreased from previous years as a result of the reduction in capital improvement funding by the State legislature. Two projects that were started in previous review periods were completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace campus walk way roofs, campus rain gutters, raise walk way roof. • Campus Lock & Key Replacement. <p>Two new projects were started and completed during the current review period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building 390 – Upgrade electrical. • PB15 and PB16 – Termite damage repair. <p>The project to repaint Building 378 was not completed due to contractor delay.</p> <p>According to the <i>State of Facilities in Higher Education 2015 Benchmarks, Best Practices & Trends</i> report by Sightlines, enrollment and financial pressures require facilities leaders to find new ways to address the following challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources on most campuses remain constrained as net tuition revenue growth is limited by tuition discounting and the need to provide more financial aid to students. • Continued financial constraints on State governments mean public institutions can expect no growth or reduced capital funding, flat operating budgets and in some cases freezes on tuition increases. • Capital needs for facilities continue to grow as buildings constructed in the 1960s and 1970s have passed key age thresholds and need to be renewed. Deferred maintenance

	backlogs continue to grow at most campuses, despite evidence that leadership is making sound decisions regarding project selection.
Discuss other strengths and challenges of the unit that are relevant to understanding the unit's activities during the review period.	One strength is the overall ability of the Unit. All Employees have the knowledge, experience and skill within their respective core functions to get the job done. The challenge is not all Employees have the willingness to do their work more efficiently by performing or functioning in the best possible manner. This requires more staff development opportunities with a focus on continuous improvement.

Report and discuss all major/meaningful actions and activities that occurred in the unit during the review period. For example:

Changes to the unit's services, functions, and/or operations.	<p>The Unit began preparations to open the new Mailroom for the Manono campus during the review period. The new Mailroom opened on July 1, 2016. Prior to this, the College shared mail services with the University of Hawaii at Hilo for nearly 30 years. Bringing the Mailroom operation in-house is more efficient for the College and provides an opportunity to tailor services to meet customer needs.</p> <p>A casual hire position helped with the transition, which involved several months of resource planning, coordination and training. This position was responsible for establishing the new Mailroom layout based on training with the University of Hawaii at Hilo Mail Services. This position also shadowed their Student Assistants to learn the delivery route.</p> <p>The casual hire then trained our Office Assistant III and first Student Assistant on the daily operations of the Mailroom. One additional Student Assistant position was hired to provide daily coverage on the delivery route. The Office Assistant III position has taken on the responsibility of supervising the Student Assistants and has been instrumental in streamlining the daily operations of the Mailroom to ensure customer satisfaction.</p>
Changes to the clients it serves (students, faculty, staff, community, UH System etc.).	The Unit will continue to provide core functions in the areas of janitorial, building maintenance, grounds keeping, and operational support services.

<p>Personnel and position additions and/or losses.</p>	<p>In March 2016, one Office Assistant III position was vacated. The responsibilities for this position was split between the other Office Assistant III position and the Auxiliary & Facilities Services Manager (Unit Manager).</p>
<p>Other major/meaningful activities, including responses to previous CERC feedback, if applicable.</p>	<p>The Unit provided support services during the transition from the leased facilities at Kealakekua to the new campus at Palamanui. The leases at Kealakekua were set to expire on June 30, 2016.</p> <p>Once the buildings were vacated, the property owners required that the facilities be restored to their original configuration. This required the demolition of the Biology lab space in Building 1. A contractor was secured through competitive bid to perform the demolition work involving water, gas and electrical lines.</p> <p>Building 3 required the demolition of several walls that were added by the College. The demolition and finish work was completed as a Summer Project by the College’s Carpentry program.</p> <p>Our Grounds crew provided logistical support to move the remaining furniture and equipment from Kealakekua to Palamanui. Our Building Maintenance Workers provided minor repairs and painting of Buildings 3 and 4. Our Janitorial crews provided cleaning services to Buildings 1, 3 and 4. The Unit Manager provided project management and procurement support.</p> <p>Doing this work in-house saved the College over \$30,000.00.</p>

<p>Describe, analyze, and celebrate the unit’s successes and accomplishments. (For example, more students were served OR the unit successfully integrated new strategies/technologies.)</p>	
<p>Discuss what the unit has been doing well that needs to be maintained and strengthened.</p>	<p>The Unit is successful at providing support services for annual events such as HawaiiCC Day, Career and Job Fair, Student Recognition Ceremony, Commencement, and HLS Ho’ike. These events require the coordination of the different core functions of the Unit and provides an opportunity for team building. Teamwork is one area that needs to be strengthened.</p>

	<p>The Unit successfully launched the new Mailroom for the Manono campus and the transition was relatively seamless. Customer service has been a central focus and needs to be maintained as we make continuous improvements to meet the needs of our stakeholders.</p>
<p>Validate these successes by discussing positive improvements in the unit.</p> <p>Please provide evidence if applicable (ex: unit data reports, relevant URL links, etc.).</p>	<p>Improvements in the Unit were most evident in the Commencement setup. During the previous review period, the Unit met as a department to discuss a strategy to divide tasks and work together as a team to accomplish the setup with the least amount of time and effort per each person. Employees within the Unit reported less exertion, less conflict, and smoother operations over previous years. The strategy was repeated again successfully in the current review period.</p>

Describe, analyze, and discuss any challenges and/or obstacles the unit has faced.	
<p>Identify and discuss the unit's challenges/obstacles.</p>	<p>One challenge has been the implementation of a Preventive Maintenance (PM) program to help extend the useful life of equipment and avoid costly breakdowns.</p> <p>Scheduling the PM work for hundreds or thousands of pieces of equipment is critical to an effective Preventive Maintenance program. An advanced Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) can be used to automatically generate PM Work Orders based on the task and frequency for that type of equipment. However, this requires someone to gather information for each piece of equipment and input the data into the system.</p> <p>The main obstacle with the current CMMS (AiM) is that the Preventive Maintenance module is complicated to setup. Furthermore, the reporting component does not provide a comprehensive set of reports to analyze trends and make informed decisions. In short, the cost of labor required for data entry outweighs the benefits. This is not feasible with the current workload.</p>

	<p>A second challenge is the daily operations of the Unit. Workload has increased for the Office Assistant III and Auxiliary & Facilities Services Manager positions who are providing coverage for the vacant Office Assistant III position. Processing times for room reservations, key requests, and other operational support have increased with the additional responsibilities of the Mailroom, procurement, and personnel.</p> <p>A third challenge is balancing the competing priorities of the daily operations of the Unit with the overall management of campus facilities, oversight of contractor repairs, and coordination of Capital Improvement projects with the system offices.</p>
<p>Discuss changes and actions taken to address those challenges.</p>	<p>A spreadsheet of PM tasks and frequencies was created to help the Unit Manager track annual inspections and schedule Preventive Maintenance for major equipment.</p> <p>The vacant Office Assistant III position was converted to an Office Assistant IV with the addition of the Mailroom operation and supervisory duties. This position will be responsible for supervising the Office Assistant III and Student Assistant positions to provide clerical support to the Unit as well as operational support to the campus.</p> <p>An Auxiliary & Facilities Services Officer position was also created to support the Unit Manager. This position will be responsible for supervising the daily operations of the Unit in providing auxiliary and facilities support services.</p>
<p>Describe and explain the results of these actions.</p>	<p>The manual effort that is required to schedule Preventive Maintenance work using a spreadsheet remains a challenge.</p> <p>The creation of the Office Assistant IV and Auxiliary & Facilities Services Officer positions addresses the workload issues by allocating proper resources to increase capacity.</p>
<p>Discuss what still needs to be done in order to successfully meet and overcome these challenges.</p>	<p>The Unit requires an advanced CMMS to enable the development of an effective Preventive Maintenance program. The Unit Manager recommends the UH System explore the option of switching to an alternative CMMS that provides advanced functionality and reporting capabilities.</p>

	<p>The Unit Manager has prior experience with an advanced CMMS that provides a robust Preventive Maintenance module. This advanced CMMS also includes other integrated modules required by the Unit such as Key Management, Facilities Use Reservations, Inventory Management, Energy Management and Capital Planning.</p> <p>The Office Assistant IV and Auxiliary & Facilities Services Officer positions are currently being reviewed and pending approval before recruitment can begin.</p>
--	---

UNIT ACTION PLAN

Discuss the unit's prior year's (AY14-15) action plan and results.	
<p>Describe the unit's action plan from the prior review period and discuss how it was implemented in AY15-16.</p>	<p>The following Action Plan was created during the 2014-2015 Unit Review for the current review period.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refocus POM's mission to enhance the learning environment. The current mission of the Unit needs to align with the mission of the College. Changes were not made during the current review period and will be implemented in the next review period. 2. Implement a Preventive Maintenance plan for Janitorial, Building Maintenance, and Grounds and schedule routine tasks on a daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, semi-annual, and annual basis to help increase efficiency and reduce repair costs for the College. The current CMMS used by the UH System lacks the functionality the Unit needs to implement an effective Preventive Maintenance program. The Unit Manager recommends replacing the current CMMS with an advanced CMMS. 3. Implement an Inspection Program for Janitorial, Building Maintenance, and Grounds areas to help increase effectiveness and maintain customer satisfaction. An Inspection Program was implemented for the Janitorial

function during the current review period. The Unit Manager recognized the need to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) first in order to set the expectation for performance standards to help Employees understand how their performance will be measured. The Unit will continue to implement this action goal in the next review period as it develops new Standard Operating Procedures.

4. Create a set of standards and expectations for POM staff to help increase operational performance. The Unit began developing Standard Operating Procedures for each core function during the current review period but did not complete them. The Unit will continue to implement this action goal in the next review period.

5. Align with Hawaii Community College Strategic Directions 2015-2021 goal for 21st Century Facilities (21CF) – Modern Teaching and Learning Environments. The Unit was successful in developing productivity and efficiency measures for this goal by developing new Key Performance Indicators such as Kilowatt Hours (KWH) per Gross Square Foot (GSF), Gallons (GAL) per GSF, and Total Energy Cost per GSF to implement cost saving strategies and sustainable practices. The Unit will continue to work with the UH System to advocate for facility needs in support of this goal.

6. Develop rubrics and benchmarks to enhance Unit Outcomes. The Unit was successful in developing new Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to help measure performance and identify areas for Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) to enhance Unit Outcomes.

The previous assessment strategy provided a collection of statistical data to quantify the output that took place during the review period. This strategy served the purpose of measuring output for year over year comparison, however, did not provide a way to measure performance.

	The new assessment strategy provides measurable data through Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to enhance decision-making on performance improvement goals. Furthermore, it provides a way to measure organizational efficiency by comparison against industry standards.
Discuss the results of the action plan and the unit's success in achieving its goals.	The Unit did not complete action goals 1 and 2. The Unit made significant progress on action goals 3 and 4. The Unit was successful in achieving action goals 5 and 6.
Discuss any challenges the unit had in implementing that action plan or achieving its goals.	The primary challenge for the Unit was the time required to develop and implement action goals 2, 3 and 4. Pulling data from the current CMMS was not possible in developing additional Key Performance Indicators (KPI) related to Work Order Management. Many of the pre-packaged reports were broken during the system upgrade to AiM 8.0 in January 2016. Therefore, the Unit was not able to pull data related to Average Response Time, Work Order Type, Backlog of Deferred Work, and Percent of Reactive Work.

- Did the unit review its website during AY15-16? Please check the box below that applies.

Reviewed website, no changes needed.

Reviewed website and submitted change request to webmaster on June 30, 2016.

Reviewed website and will submit change request to webmaster.

Unit does not have a website.

Please note that requests for revisions to unit websites must be submitted directly to the College's webmaster at

<http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/web-developer>

Discuss the unit's overall action plan for AY16-17, based on analysis of the unit's data and the overall results of unit outcomes assessments conducted during AY15-16.	Benchmarks and Timelines for
--	-------------------------------------

	implementation and achievement of goals.
Action Goal 1: Change the Unit’s mission to align with the mission of the College.	Benchmarks/Timelines: Complete by end of next review period.
<p>How can this Action Goal lead to improvements in unit services, functions, or operations, and support attainment of the unit’s outcomes (UOs)?</p> <p>This will help Employees within the Unit understand the connection between their core function and the mission of the College. A vision statement will describe what the Unit will look like in the future to help align Employees and provide direction in achieving a common purpose.</p>	
Action Goal 2: Create a set of standards and expectations for the Unit to help increase operational performance.	Benchmarks/Timelines: Complete by end of next review period.
<p>How can this Action Goal lead to improvements in unit services, functions, or operations, and support attainment of the unit’s outcomes (UOs)?</p> <p>Standard Operating Procedures for each core function will set the expectation for performance standards and help Employees carry out routine tasks in achieving Unit Outcomes.</p>	
Action Goal 3: Develop and implement a Customer Satisfaction Survey to measure overall satisfaction, identify problems, and improve processes.	Benchmarks/Timelines: Complete by end of next review period.
<p>How can this Action Goal lead to improvements in unit services, functions, or operations, and support attainment of the unit’s outcomes (UOs)?</p> <p>A Customer Satisfaction Survey will allow the Unit to develop a Key Performance Indicator for year over year comparison of the Unit’s effectiveness on overall customer satisfaction. The results of the survey will help the Unit to understand customers’ needs and identify areas for improvement to provide a better experience.</p>	

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

NOTE: General budget asks are included in the 3-year Comprehensive Review. Budget asks for the following categories only may be included in the Annual review: health and safety needs, emergency needs, and/or necessary needs to become compliant with Federal/State laws/regulations.

Please provide a brief statement about any implications of or challenges with the unit’s current operating resources.

N/A

For budget asks in the allowed categories (see above):	
Describe the needed item(s) in detail.	
Include estimated cost(s) and timeline(s) for procurement.	
Explain how the item(s) aligns with one or more of the strategic initiatives of <u>2015-2021 Strategic Directions</u> .	

<http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/sites/default/files/docs/strategic-plan/hawcc-strategic-directions-2015-2021.pdf>

UNIT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

For all parts of this section, please provide information based on unit outcomes (UO) assessments conducted in AY 2015-16.

Unit Outcomes Assessed

- List all unit outcomes assessed during AY 2015-16.

Assessed Unit Outcome #	Unit Outcome Text
1	Comparable Measures
2	Customer Satisfaction
3	Cost per Unit Area

Assessment Strategies

<p>For each UO assessed in AY 2015-16 listed above, provide a brief description of the assessment strategy, including:</p>	
<p>a description of the type of <u>unit work or activity assessed</u>, including unit service records, client satisfaction surveys, and other types of assessment instruments.</p>	<p>1. Comparable Measures <i>Work Requests</i> – Collect data on number of work orders created, closed, cancelled, and average age. <i>Key Requests</i> – Collect data on number processed and average turn-around time. <i>Facility Use Requests</i> – Collect data on number processed and average turn-around time. These metrics will help determine the Unit’s effectiveness in achieving operational goals.</p> <p>2. Customer Satisfaction A Customer Satisfaction Survey will allow the Unit to develop a Key Performance Indicator to help understand customers’ needs and identify areas for improvement. The results will help to determine the Unit’s effectiveness in achieving customer satisfaction goals.</p> <p>3. Cost per Unit Area Key Performance Indicators such as Total Energy Cost per GSF and Total Maintenance Cost per GSF will help determine the Unit’s effectiveness in achieving strategic goals.</p>
<p>a description of <u>who conducted the assessment</u>, (e.g., an individual unit faculty/staff member, <u>OR</u> a group of unit faculty/staff).</p>	<p>The Unit Manager conducted the assessment of the Unit Outcomes.</p>
<p>a discussion of the <u>assessment rubric/scoring guide</u> that identifies</p>	<p>Comparable Measures for the number of work orders created, closed, cancelled and average age was not assessed. The reporting component in the current CMMS is broken and this data could not be generated. The Unit Manager chose not to use a manual system</p>

<p>criteria/categories and standards used in the assessment.</p>	<p>of compiling the data to determine the average turn-around time for Key Requests and Facility Use Requests. An advanced CMMS with modules for Key Management and Facilities Use Reservations would enable the Unit to manage these workflows and easily produce reports for these Comparable Measures.</p> <p>A Customer Satisfaction Survey was not developed in time for this review period. Therefore, no data was collected for the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI). The Unit Manager will implement this as an action goal for the next review period.</p> <p>The Unit was successful in developing new Key Performance Indicators (KPI) to help measure Cost per Unit Area. These metrics were assessed through comparison against national averages of other educational institutions. The current review period establishes a baseline for year over year comparison against future review periods.</p>
--	--

Expected Levels of Achievement

- For each unit outcome (UO) assessed in AY 2015-16, indicate the benchmark goal for unit success.
 - example 1: “85% of students surveyed will rate the unit’s services as meeting or exceeding their expectation”;
 - example 2: “95% of service requests will be completed on time and to the satisfaction of the requester.”

Assessed UO#	Benchmark Goal for Unit Success for Each UO Assessed
1	85% of Work Orders, Key Requests, and Facility Use Requests will have been completed within the original estimated completion time.
2	75% of artifacts from the Customer Satisfaction survey will demonstrate a Satisfactory level or better.
3	75% of artifacts from the Cost per Unit Area will Meet or Exceed Expectations when compared to service industry standards.

Results of Unit Assessments

For each UO assessed in AY 2015-16:
--

<p>provide a <u>description of the assessment results</u> in terms of unit's attainment of the UOs.</p>	<p>The Unit was not able to provide assessment results for Unit Outcome 1 and 2 due to lack of data.</p> <p>25% of the artifacts from the Cost per Unit Area meets expectations. The Total Energy Cost per GSF is close to the national average. We are over the national average on Grounds Cost per Acre and Janitor Cost per GSF. We are below the national average on Maintenance Cost per GSF.</p>
---	---

Other Comments

<p>Include any additional information that will help clarify the unit's UO assessment results.</p>																
<p>Include comparisons to any applicable College or related UH-System service-unit standards, or to any national standards from industry, professional organizations, or accrediting associations, as applicable.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="407 825 1427 1031"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="407 825 862 867">Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th> <th data-bbox="862 825 1094 867">Unit 2015</th> <th data-bbox="1094 825 1427 867">National Average 2014*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 867 862 909">Total Energy Cost per GSF</td> <td data-bbox="862 867 1094 909">\$ 2.40</td> <td data-bbox="1094 867 1427 909">\$ 2.46</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 909 862 951">Grounds Cost per Acre</td> <td data-bbox="862 909 1094 951">\$ 6,816</td> <td data-bbox="1094 909 1427 951">\$ 5,488</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 951 862 993">Janitor Cost per GSF</td> <td data-bbox="862 951 1094 993">\$ 1.86</td> <td data-bbox="1094 951 1427 993">\$ 1.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 993 862 1035">Maintenance Cost per GSF</td> <td data-bbox="862 993 1094 1035">\$ 0.80</td> <td data-bbox="1094 993 1427 1035">\$ 1.70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="407 1073 1427 1108">* 2013-2014 Facilities Performance Indicators Report published by APPA</p>	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Unit 2015	National Average 2014*	Total Energy Cost per GSF	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.46	Grounds Cost per Acre	\$ 6,816	\$ 5,488	Janitor Cost per GSF	\$ 1.86	\$ 1.43	Maintenance Cost per GSF	\$ 0.80	\$ 1.70
Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Unit 2015	National Average 2014*														
Total Energy Cost per GSF	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.46														
Grounds Cost per Acre	\$ 6,816	\$ 5,488														
Janitor Cost per GSF	\$ 1.86	\$ 1.43														
Maintenance Cost per GSF	\$ 0.80	\$ 1.70														

Next Steps – Assessment Action Plan

<p>Describe the unit's intended next steps to improve assessment of the UOs based on the unit's overall AY 2015-16 assessment results. Include any specific strategies, tactics,</p>

activities, or plans for revisions to assessment practices, and/or service or operational change, or increased student support:

<p>Changes to assessment practices, activities, or projects.</p>	<p>The Unit Manager will request the reporting component on the current CMMS be fixed. This will allow the Unit to pull reports for assessment of Comparable Measures.</p> <p>The Unit Manager will develop and implement a Customer Satisfaction Survey. This will allow the Unit to collect data for assessment.</p>
<p>Modifications to the unit's services, functions, operations, client relations, and/or faculty/staff professional development activities over the next 3 years.</p>	<p>Action Goal 2: Create a set of standards and expectations for the Unit to help increase operational performance.</p> <p>Action Goal 3: Develop and implement a Customer Satisfaction Survey to measure overall satisfaction, identify problems, and improve processes.</p>
<p>Increases or changes in student support activities and services to support student learning and achievement.</p>	<p>Action Goal 1: Change the Unit's mission to align with the mission of the College.</p>

Definitions for Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained

The sum of all areas on all floors of a building included within the outside faces of its exterior walls, including all vertical penetration areas, for circulation and shaft areas that connect one floor to another. Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences, Postsecondary Education Facilities Inventory and Classification Manual (FICM).

Maintenance Backlog

The total cost of all CRDM, Minor CIP and Major CIP projects based on the 6 Year CIP Plans.

Current Replacement Value (CRV)

The current cost to replace a building based on current acceptable standards of construction and compliance with regulatory requirements using current market prices for materials and labor. The construction cost is based on GSF maintained and does not include infrastructure costs. Source: Sightlines.

Facilities Condition Index (FCI)

The ratio of deferred maintenance backlog to Current Replacement Value (CRV) (the equation is deferred maintenance backlog divided by current replacement value, expressed as an index or percentage). The FCI calculation is useful as a benchmark for comparison to an institution's baseline conditions or to other institution's, and as a tool to determine objectives and strategies to address backlogs of deferred maintenance. Higher FCIs mean that a higher proportion of the campus is in need of repair. Typically, older buildings will have higher FCIs. Source: Sightlines.

$FCI = \text{Maintenance Backlog} / \text{Current Replacement Value}$

Kilowatt Hour (KWH) per GSF

The ratio of total annual consumption of electricity expressed in Kilowatt-Hours (KWH) to Gross Square Feet Maintained (GSF). Source: HELCO bill.

KWH / GSF

Gallons (GAL) per GSF

The ratio of total annual consumption of water expressed in Gallons (GAL) to Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained. Source: Department of Water Supply bill.

GAL / GSF

BTU per GSF

The ratio of total annual consumption of gas expressed in British Thermal Units (BTU) to Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained. Our gas bill measures usage in Therms. A Therm is equal to 100,000 BTU. Source: Hawaii Gas bill.

BTU / GSF

Total Energy Cost per GSF

The ratio of the total annual cost of electricity, water and gas to Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained.

Total Energy Cost / GSF

Grounds Cost per Acre

The ratio of total annual cost of Grounds supplies, equipment, employee benefits/wages, and contract labor to Gross Acres maintained. Source: Kualu Financial System.

Grounds Cost / Gross Acres

Acres per Grounds FTE

The ratio of Gross Acres maintained to Grounds full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.

Gross Acres / Grounds FTE

Janitor Cost per GSF

The ratio of total annual cost of Janitorial supplies, equipment, employee benefits/wages, and contract labor to Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained. Source: Kualu Financial System.

Janitor Cost / GSF

GSF per Janitor FTE

The ratio of the Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained to Janitor full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.

GSF / Janitor FTE

Maintenance Cost per GSF

The ratio of total annual cost of Maintenance supplies, equipment, employee benefits/wages, and contract labor to Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained. Source: Kualu Financial System.

Maintenance Cost / GSF

GSF per Maintenance FTE

The ratio of the Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained to Maintenance full-time equivalent (FTE) employees.

GSF / Maintenance FTE

Total Maintenance Cost per GSF

The ratio of the total annual cost of Utilities, Grounds, Janitorial, and Maintenance to Gross Square Feet (GSF) Maintained. The Grounds, Janitorial and Maintenance costs include supplies, equipment, employee benefits/wages, and contract labor.

Total Maintenance Cost / GSF

Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI)

Performance metric based upon a 5 point rating system administered by the Customer Satisfaction Survey.

5 = Very Satisfied

4 = Satisfied

3 = Neutral

2 = Dissatisfied

1 = Very Dissatisfied