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Overview

Founded by the Texas Legislature in June 1969, The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) has evolved from 670 students in 1973 to offering access and opportunity for nearly 31,000 graduate and undergraduate students today. UTSA has come a long way in just 43 years. Administrative offices for the first UTSA president, Arleigh B. Templeton, were set up in 1970 in Hemisfair Park, and architects Ford, Powell, and Carson Inc. began developing a conceptual master plan for the campus.

In 1973, Peter T. Flawn was appointed UTSA’s second president. By this time, more than 670 students had enrolled in graduate level courses taught by 52 faculty members.

UTSA’s earliest students attended college at the Koger Center, an office park. Master’s degrees were offered in business administration, education, bicultural-bilingual studies, English as a second language, environmental management, Spanish, biology, mathematics and systems design. Thirty-eight degree programs were approved for the school.

In 1973, construction began on UTSA’s original campus, now known as the Main Campus, on a 600-acre tract in the rolling foothills of San Antonio’s northwest side.

In September 1975, the UTSA Main Campus began holding classes for students enrolled in five colleges: Business, Fine and Applied Arts, Sciences and Mathematics, Humanities and Social Sciences, and Multidisciplinary Studies. Enrollment was 4,433 with 2,247 undergraduates. In 1976, the John Peace Library Building opened, and also served as the new administration building.

James W. Wagener was named UTSA president in 1978. In the 1980s, four new colleges were put in place and new undergraduate programs were offered in civil, mechanical, and electrical engineering. Later in the decade, the College of Sciences and Mathematics was reorganized to form the College of Sciences and Engineering. Also, UTSA’s athletics teams began competing as San Antonio’s only NCAA Division I sports program.

More than 12,000 students enrolled at UTSA in this era. A recital hall, university center, and the first on-campus residence, Chisholm Hall opened. In 1986, University of Texas System designated The Institute of Texan Cultures as a campus of UTSA. Samuel A. Kirkpatrick became the fourth UTSA president in 1990.

UTSA began offering classes downtown in the Institute of Texan Cultures, and as enrollment increased, the university began looking for a new location. The Texas Legislature allocated $71.5 million to UTSA, with $20 million stipulated for the Downtown Campus.

---

1 The University of Texas at San Antonio website, History, October 2012.
In 1997, UTSA opened the 11-acre Downtown Campus, which now has four academic buildings. A growing number of undergraduate and graduate degrees can be completed onsite at the Downtown Campus. Other facilities constructed or opened during the 1990s included the Engineering-Biosciences Building, Business Building, a campus visitor center, and a computer lab. The student-centered University Center has tripled its original size.

Ricardo Romo became UTSA’s fifth president in 1999 and was the first Hispanic president in the university’s 30-year history. Academic reorganization the following year included a move to six colleges: Business, Education and Human Development, Engineering, Liberal and Fine Arts, Sciences, and Public Policy. A college of Architecture, Honors College, and the Graduate School were subsequently developed.

In 2004, as UTSA celebrated its 35th anniversary, two important new facilities opened at the Main Campus: the $52 million Main Building, which provides the university with more classroom, laboratory, and administrative office space; and Chaparral Village at UTSA, a $45 million, 1,000-bed student housing complex that brings the number of students living on campus to 3,000. Also in 2004, the university reached a land swap agreement with the city of San Antonio to increase the size of the Downtown Campus.

The university continues to grow. In February 2006, UTSA dedicated its new Biotechnology, Sciences, and Engineering Building, which is one of the largest and most sophisticated science facilities at any institution of higher education in Texas. The $84 million complex will figure prominently in the university’s transformation into the state’s next premier research institution. In November 2006, UTSA purchased an additional 125 acres of land on Hausman Road to build a future athletic complex.

In spring 2007, UTSA opened Phase I of Laurel Village, a $40 million, 680-bed facility for UTSA students. Phase II opened up summer 2008. Additional major capital projects completed or scheduled to be completed since 2008 total more than $354 million and include the following:

- University Center
- South Thermal Energy Plant
- Ximenes Avenue Garage
- Applied Engineering and Technology
- Science Research Laboratories
- Sculpture and Ceramics Graduate Studio
- Plaza Norte
- Bauerle Road Garage
- San Saba Hall
- Athletics Phase I
- John Peace Library Renovation
- North Paseo Building
UTSA has a goal to become a doctoral/research-extensive institution (at least 50 doctoral degrees a year in at least 15 disciplines) by 2015. As the premier doctoral/research university of South Texas and as a Hispanic-serving institution, UTSA will continue to provide educational opportunities for the underrepresented population of the region at the highest level of excellence.

**Mission**
The University of Texas at San Antonio is dedicated to the advancement of knowledge through research and discovery, teaching and learning, community engagement, and public service. As an institution of access and excellence, UTSA embraces multicultural traditions and serves as a center for intellectual and creative resources, as well as a catalyst for socioeconomic development and the commercialization of intellectual property for Texas, the nation, and the world.

**Vision**
UTSA’s vision is to be a premier public research university, providing access to educational excellence and preparing citizen leaders for the global environment.

**The Office of Facilities Management**
The Office of Facilities Management (FM) reports to the vice president for Business Affairs. FM is organized to serve three campus locations: Main Campus, Downtown Campus, and the Institute of Texan Cultures. The Institute of Texan Cultures, through its research, collections, exhibits, and programs, serves as the forum for the understanding and appreciation of Texas and Texans.

The Office of Facilities Management serves a broad spectrum of customers, including faculty, staff, and students. Key customers include the academic deans, the executive managers of various administrative departments, and key management personnel in the Student Services organization. In addition to academic and student support, FM responds to needs in the growing research community at UTSA.

The Facilities Management Department, since September 1, 2012, employs a workforce of 328.

**Campus Physical Plant**
The UTSA Main Campus is comprised of approximately 5 million gross square feet of E&G and auxiliary space on 600 acres. The first buildings were built on the Main Campus in 1975, and the newest building was completed in 2012. Two buildings are currently under construction on the Main Campus, San Saba Hall, and North Paseo Building.

An additional 125 acres purchased in 2006 is currently being developed as Park West Athletics Complex on Hausman Road. UTSA athletics is the only NCAA Division I institution in San Antonio.

The Downtown Campus has four buildings along with the Institute of Texan Cultures.
The University of Texas at San Antonio was established in 1969 as a “university of the first class” by the Texas State Legislature. In 2009, UTSA was designated an emerging Tier One research university by the Texas Legislature. The University of Texas at San Antonio ranks 4th in the nation in the number of undergraduate degrees awarded to Hispanics, according to 2011 Diverse Issues in Higher Education magazine ratings.
Introduction

This report reflects the observations and recommendations of a team of senior university facility administrators who visited The University of Texas at San Antonio from October 14 through October 18, 2012. The major focus of this report is the evaluation and assessment of the Office of Facilities Management (FM). The review was patterned after APPA’s Facilities Management Evaluation Program.

The review was conducted at the request of David Riker, associate vice president Office of Facilities.

The judgment and recommendations included in this report are based on the review team members’ many years of experience in college and university facilities management combined with extensive interviews, detailed document reviews, and studied comparisons.

Members of the review team were selected to comprise higher education facility managers who are experienced in managing complex institutions. Members of the review team include the following individuals:

Jack Hug, Team Leader
Assistant Vice Chancellor, University of California, San Diego-Retired
APPA Past President, APPA Fellow

Viron Lynch, MBA, EFP
Director Plant Operations
Weber State University

Richard Robben, PE, MBA, EFP
Executive Director of Plant Operations
University of Michigan

Daniel Costello, M.Sc.Eng, CEM, EFP
Associate Director Facilities Services
University of Texas Austin

Steve Thweatt
Executive Director Facilities Management
University of Colorado, Boulder

The review team conducted extensive interviews within the Office of Facilities Management and with numerous principal administrators, academic and research department heads, and faculty and staff external to FM who constitute the major campus stakeholders and client constituency for the FM services.
Those members of the campus administration and community who participated in the interview process include:

- Dr. Ricardo Romo, University President
- Julius Gribou, Executive Vice Provost
- Dr. Marianne Woods, Senior Vice President, Research
- Aaron Parks, Chief Operating Officer, Institute of Texan Cultures (ITC)
- Ken Pierce, Vice Provost, IT
- Dr. John Frederick, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Kerry L. Kennedy, Vice President for Business Affairs
- Pam Bacon, Associate Vice President, Administration (Business Affairs)
- Dr. John Frederick, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Julio Haverland, Director, Business Auxiliary Services
- Dr. Jude Valdez, Vice President of Community Services (Downtown Campus)
- Dave Dixon, Executive Director, Program Management, Office of Planning & Construction, UT System
- David Diaz, Director of Employee Relations, Human Resources
- Richard De Leon, Program Manager, Office of Planning & Construction, UT System
- Dr. Amanda Read, HI Containment Lab Manager, Office of Research Integrity
- Lenora Chapman, Acting Associate Vice President for Financial Affairs (Business Affairs)
- Capt. Doug Sonego, UTSA Police Department
- Sam Gonzales, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs
- Robert Dickens, Director of Purchasing and Distribution Services (Business Affairs)
- Frank Salazar, Director of Extended Education (Downtown Campus)
- Steve Barrera, Chief of Police, UTSA
- Ray Teske, Lecturer, Lecturer & Assistant Director of Academic Development Program – (Teach Facilities Management Courses)

Office of University Advancement Staff
- Jim Mickey, Associate Vice President, Alumni Program Marketing
- Laura Murray, Associate Vice President, Strategic Initiatives/Endowment

Student Affairs Group I
- John Kaulfus, Associate Dean of Students
- Tony Daniels, Associate Director/Campus Recreation Center
- Mark Munguia, Senior Associate Director/Campus Recreation Center
- Dr. Pat Graham, Executive Director/Special Events Center
- Michelle Montanio, Assistant Director/Student Activities, Downtown Campus

Student Affairs Group II
- Laura Munroe, Director, Campus Recreation Center
- Ross Cob, Senior Associate Ad Bus & FCLT Intercollegiate Athletics
- Patrick Grant, Assistant Athletics Director-Intercollegiate Athletics
- Herbert Ganey, University Center Business Manager
- Zenia Trevino, Administrative Services Officer III – Admissions Office

Members of the Facilities Management Department who participated in the interview process:
- Dave Riker, Associate Vice President for Facilities
- Doug Lipscomb, Facilities Director of Planning & Development/University Architect
- Paul Goodman, Assistant Vice President for Facilities/Engineering & Project Management
- David Oliver, Assistant Vice President for Facilities/Operations & Maintenance
- Fred Weiss, Director of Business Operations
- Rene Colunga, Facilities, Utilities/Project Management Engineer
- Dagoberto Rodriguez, Facilities Energy Manager
- Christopher Miller, Facilities Interim Director, Operations & Maintenance
- Ron Woltersdorf, Facilities Director of Downtown Campuses
- Joe Rubio, Facilities Director of Customer Services/HK & Events Management
- Robert Espinoza, Facilities Assistant Director of Engineering & Project Management (Capital Projects)
- Kathryn Pearson, Facilities Assistant Director of Engineering & Project Management (Institutional Projects)
- Michael Merada, Facilities Plant Engineer
- Joseph Stilwill, Facilities Fleet Manager
- James Jinks, Facilities, Utilities Superintendent
- Belinda Dovalina, Budget Performance Project Analyst
- Susan Whitley, Fiscal Manager

Members of the Facilities Management Department participating in the group meetings:
Facilities Senior Project Managers
- Roy Garza
- Edward Rodriguez
- Jimmie Hearn
- Jonathan Jarrell

Housekeeping Managers
- Sonia Saenz
- Josephine Izbinski

Facilities Business Operations Staff
- Kim Norton, Work Control Manager
- Moses Gomez, Information Tech Associate II
- Felix Hernandez, Resource Management Supervisor
Facilities Project Coordinators – Capital Projects
- Richard Zamora
- Robert Peek

Facilities Administrative Staff
- Margaret Ibarra, Senior Administrative Associate (P&D)
- Carmen Ortegon, Senior Administrative Associate (Business Operations)
- Sylvia Ruiz, Administrative Associate II (O&M)
- Blanch Torres, Administrative Associate II (Business Operations)
- Sharon Pawlik, Administrative Associate I (Customer Services/HK)

Facilities Housekeeping & Event Services Staff
- Gilberto Guadamuz, Building Attendant III
- Cruz Lara, Building Attendant III
- Evangelina Rivera, Building Attendant II
- Henrietta Vasquez, Building Attendant II
- Robert Martinez, Physical Plant Services Worker II

Deferred Maintenance Facilities Staff
- Jimmie Hearn, Facilities Senior Project Manager (E&PM)
- Johnny Flores, Senior Facilities Planning Analyst (P&D)
- Belinda Dovalina, Budget Perf. Proj Analyst (Business Operations)

Facilities Project Coordinators – Institutional Projects
- James Council
- George Herrera
- Vladimir Andzic
- Andrew Goodenough

Facilities Zonal Workers
- Matt May, Electrician III
- Michael Cole, Carpenter
- Carlos Morales, Refrig. Mechanic
- Brian Silver, Plumber III
- George Martinez, Irrigatino Tech.
- Adrian Buitron, Facilities Control Tech II (Operations)
- Paul Macdonald, Utilities Station Oper II

Facilities Zonal Maintenance Supervisors
- John Saldana, E&G Zone Supervisor
- Justin Lowe, Research Zone Supervisor
- Ramon Rios, Auxiliary Zone Supervisor
- Robert Baldassari, PM Supervisor
Facilities Grounds Staff

- Della Reyes, Grounds Maintenance Supervisor
- Fred Wiedner, Grounds Maintenance Supervisor

At the conclusion of the site visit, the APPA review team presented a verbal report to the Facilities Management expanded executive leadership team.
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Executive Summary

APPA: Leadership in Educational Facilities conducted a complete facilities management evaluation for the Office of Facilities Management. Using eight objective criteria developed as part of APPA’s Facilities Management Evaluation Program (FMEP), a team assembled by APPA examined The University of Texas at San Antonio’s Office of Facilities Management Department (FM) with respect to its performance. The criteria utilized to guide this review are:

- Leadership
- Facilities Strategic and Operational Planning
- Customer Focus
- Assessment and Information Analysis
- Development and Management of Human Resources
- Process Management
- Performance Results
- Other Considerations

The use of this topical framework provides an interrelated and complementary tool for performing a critical examination of the organization. These FMEP criteria were also the basis for conducting the FM self-assessment that was provided to the review team in advance of the campus visit and interview process. This self-assessment was very well written, giving accurate representation of institutional context, practices, and conditions.

The review team members’ knowledge and experience as successful practitioners of college and university facilities management and college and university administration form the judgment and recommendations of this report. The judgments and recommendations included in this report are given not by way of criticism, but rather as a means to assist FM in its effort to continuously improve current its levels of service and to better meet the needs of UTSA.

The executive summary that follows captures the highlights of this review. The “Evaluation Report and Recommendations” section of this report describes in detail the review team findings and recommendations.

1.0 LEADERSHIP

Setting Direction

Facilities Management leaders have done a good job of taking the foundational steps for setting direction of the organization. They have articulated the FM organizational mission, vision, and core values. However, a shared understanding of the FM organization’s mission, vision, and values throughout the organization has not yet been achieved. FM staff has difficulty describing what the FM mission and vision means to them and how the work...
that they do each day supports the mission and vision. This implies that there is more work that needs to be done to achieve a shared understanding and commitment to the stated mission, vision, and values.

The review team did not find the FM mission, vision, and values displayed in the various FM workspaces.

**Ethical Behavior**

Facilities Management leaders and managers receive formal training in business and leadership skills. They are required to complete the *Fundamentals of Supervision for Facilities Supervisors* curriculum, which was developed in coordination with the HR Department. Additional formal ethics training is provided to individuals in specific job functions when requirements are identified.

The review team observed no indication of any concern about ethical behavior within FM.

**FM Organization Structure**

The FM organization consists of components that are structured in a typical hierarchical alignment to form one facilities management organization (One FM).

Most leadership roles and responsibilities for the FM organization are clearly defined except for the director of Customer Services. This is a relatively new position and the role and responsibilities of this position have not been effectively communicated to the campus.

The APPA review team found that FM leadership may want to consider a realignment of the functions and service provided by Business Operations. The rationale for this consideration and other organizational structure recommendations are contained in Section 8.0: Other Considerations.

**Leaders’ Role in Customer Focus**

The FM leadership team emphasizes excellence through the development and application of a number of tools and guiding principles that are intended to maintain quality services. FM has struggled to execute these principles and now needs to couple this to a rigorous and disciplined customer focus strategy with specific implementation actions. Section 3.0: Customer Focus of this report focuses on the FM customer services area and provides a number of recommendations for action.

**Communications of FM Services**

The review team noted that there was a significant misperception of duties, procedures, and performance expectations to warrant concern about how well FM has communicated its role and services. During the interview process, there were a number of instances in which customers who do not have regular interactions with FM staff were not clear about the FM department’s roles and responsibilities.
There is sufficient confusion and misunderstanding among the campus constituencies in the following areas: customer services, zone maintenance, recharge rates, and billing processes.

**Workplace Environment**

Facilities Management leaders have done a good job of creating a workplace environment that is conducive to employees coming to work each day and doing their best.

FM leaders rely heavily on a biennial Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) conducted under the direction of the vice president for Business Affairs. They report that the survey results have improved for each of the 3 surveys conducted over the past six years and that these results are in an appropriate range.

The SEE provides an assessment of overall organizational climate. Since this survey carries so much importance in the workplace, FM leaders are encouraged to continue with their practice of following with a survey response plan. Communication to all levels of the organization about actions that management is taking to address workplace climate improvements is especially important.

The FM Department has presented several excellent programs to enhance employee performance. These programs are listed in criterion 2.13 and opportunities for improvement are addressed in Section 5.0: Development & Management of Human Resources.

### 2.0 FACILITIES STRATEGIC AND OPERATIONAL PLANNING

Facilities Management has a fully developed and aligned strategic plan. The plan was developed as a subset to both the institutional plan A Shared Vision UTSA 2016 and the Vice President for Business Affairs Plan 2007-2016. The FM plan is a 10-year plan originating in 2006 and contains all the standard elements of mission, vision, core values, and strategic goals. All components are defined in excellent detail with each component in close alignment with both parent plans.

The FM strategic plan is tracked so that progress toward the stated goals is recorded. Strategic goals are specific, measurable, assigned, reportable, and time sensitive. The goals match with the institution’s higher level goals and are endorsed by the campus administration. The plan demonstrates best practices from an alignment and tracking perspective.

The process used in development of the FM strategic plan was highly inclusive and involved various employee committees and was the result of a HR Department-facilitated employee retreat. Some of the goals may not be the most strategic for FM and could benefit by including some of the high-level initiatives that FM is currently pursuing. Some examples of this are: a customer focus strategy, worker training and needs assessments,
initiatives from the employee survey feedback, and carefully chosen recommendations included in this report.

It is also recommended that FM consider approaching future strategic plan development from a “balanced scorecard”\(^2\) approach. Utilizing this type of approach can focus attention in the four focus areas (perspectives) of people, customers, process, and financials and thereby better round out the goals and objectives and give a context for how they fit together. This approach can also help when rolling out strategic plan information to stakeholders.

**Other Strategic Plans**

Facilities Management has a number of other plans that can also be considered strategic for the organization that include: the campus master plan that has the complementary plans of the utilities master plan and deferred maintenance plan. There is also a five-year capital plan that is reviewed and updated annually. FM also has an element of its strategic plan that supports institutional *energy conservation and environmental sustainability.*

The university has three overarching plans that govern the basic parameters by which projects have to be developed and implemented. The evaluation team has determined that these plans, campus master plan, institutional strategic plan, and the capital improvement plan, are comprehensive and complete. Facilities Management has recognized the need for developing a program, with funding, to identify and address the facility renewal and deferred maintenance needs of the university, and we encourage settlement of this issue. The campus should consider the merits of a dedicated sustainability officer to maintain the appropriate focus on sustainability issues on a campus wide basis.

FM is working on the development of a business continuity plan and also has an emergency plan in place since 2009.

### 3.0 Customer Focus

The APPA review team recognizes and applauds the “Brand Promise” and the “Celebrating Facilities Excellence” program initiatives. However, based on our customer and FM staff interviews, there is more work to be done before FM realizes this initiatives’ goal of achieving an organization culture of excellence.

In fairness to FM, a lot of work has been done in developing a stronger customer service orientation for the organization. A number of customer-focused initiatives help align the organization with the needs of the customers; however, the execution and measurement of effectiveness of these initiatives have not produced the desired outcomes.

The recommendations contained in Section 3.0: Customer Focus represent examples of the work that needs to be done to further the improvement necessary to establish an FM

---

workforce culture of excellence. The review team considers these recommendations substantial opportunities for improvement worthy of FM senior leadership attention and commitment.

4.0 ASSESSMENT AND INFORMATION ANALYSIS

Facilities Management, for the most part, has the information that it needs to support analysis and decision making, and they use the information effectively.

The department is involved in both internal and external data collection and reporting and benchmarking activities.

Internally, FM has established a program it calls “Operations Review Meeting” to track performance measures. Under this program, the information is assembled monthly using data from the CMMS and other campus information systems. The data presented is then reviewed by the department’s extended senior executive team.

To remain current with technology Facilities Management has developed an extensive computer replacement plan that seeks to ensure regular upgrades to computer hardware and software systems. Also, Facilities Management has plans and is actively working to upgrade the CMMS software and hardware.

5.0 DEVELOPMENT & MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Management theories, elegant organizational charts, and well-crafted strategic plans do not guarantee a successful organization. Only people doing their best work led by the best leaders guarantees success.

The accomplishment of group purpose and, in turn, the “organizational effectiveness and performance” is effective to the extent that individual energy is successfully directed toward organizational goals. The Great Workplace Institute, www.greatplacetowork.com, drawing on decades of research, has found that a great workplace is one where employees trust the people they work for, take pride in what they do, and enjoy the people they work with, i.e., camaraderie.

Thus, the criteria utilized for this section of the report are focused on the workplace and the workforce.

The review team found that FM Human Resources practices and initiatives are in line with the university’s HR practices, policies, and procedures, and furthermore, have taken steps to be aligned with the initiatives and priorities prescribed by the vice president for Business Affairs.

---

3 The Great Workplace, How to build it, How to keep it, and Why it Matters-Michael Burchell, Jennifer Robins. Copyright 2011, The Great Place to Work Institute Inc.
The overall menu of HR functions, including processes and procedures for job descriptions, performance evaluations, hiring practices, employee orientation, and a safe workplace are well done for the most part. The review team noted several substantial HR initiatives that if done well, and carried to a more refined and higher level of implementation, can set FM apart from its peers. Although FM states that employee communications is paramount in most of their initiatives, the review team recommends further management review of employee understanding and participation of some of these initiatives that include:

- Employee Recognition
- Employee Career Pathway
- Staffing Analysis
- Employee Communication

Section 3.0: Customer Focus describes a number of findings and recommendations that support a need for FM to examine closely the effectiveness and outcomes of these important initiatives.

It is also noted that FM is a large organization with over 300 employees. There are substantial on-going needs for a strong professional HR capability, and it may be appropriate for FM to elevate the HR functions for a more strategic status. Consideration should be given to providing an HR professional as a member of the FM leadership team.

**6.0 PROCESS MANAGEMENT**

The FM core-processes that have been put into place ensure that the department takes a unified approach to process management and customer service. The numerous processes that are necessary for the daily conduct of the many different facility responsibilities are performed very well. As gaps in service levels are discovered, metrics for these deficiencies are developed and monitored for improvement.

**Budget Processes**

There are two principal budgets that are influenced or controlled by FM. These are the capital budget and the operating budget. Both have important process elements.

The campus Financial Affairs Department and vice president for Business Affairs have established formal budget processes for the development of operating budgets that allow for input on permanent and one-time budgeted needs from the various departments.

The FM annual budget development includes input from all staffing levels that are vetted within each department and ultimately submitted for consideration by the senior executive team.
The process used by FM to develop budgets for capital projects includes needs analyses, input from multiple levels of staff, and historic expenditures and also encourages innovative measures to leverage resources.

The review team believes the process for capital project budget development has a solid foundation; however, some comments received from end users suggest that even with their involvement in the process, they may not fully appreciate how budgets and project scope relate.

Section 6.0: Process Management describes a number of important findings and recommendations relating to capital project processes and customer understanding and perception of the capital processes, including: How capital project budgets are tracked and communicated, benchmarking of project costs, professional services errors and omissions, customer advocacy by project managers, and the 4 percent management fee that applies to institutionally managed projects.

7.0 PERFORMANCE RESULTS

Appearance of Campus Buildings and Grounds

The UTSA campus buildings and grounds are intensely utilized; UTSA leads the University of Texas System campuses in space utilization and is among the highest in students per building gross square foot measures. Additionally, it is noted that the average age of campus buildings have increased to the point where many building components have reached or exceeded their useful life expectancy.

Facilities Management has some excellent guiding documents to help with its effort to achieve a high level of campus appearance as stated in the campus master plan that includes architectural elements for new construction and landscape design. It is recognized that the campus has been evolving from a commuter campus to a more urbanized environment and that campus standards must be revised to support new goals and aspirations. Efforts to solidify these standards and maintain a current set of design guidelines is crucial for the development of the campus to remain on track with institutional and strategic goals.

The above noted, it remains incumbent upon the facilities organization to provide the best possible physical conditions that approved budgets can support.

The APPA FMEP team commends FM staff and its leadership team for all the hard work they are doing to achieve the desired image of the campus physical plant. Our findings and recommendations specific to campus appearance as described in Section 7.0: Performance Results indicate that there are a number of opportunities for improvement in campus appearance.
Facilities Management appears to have a competent workforce and is building workforce capability and capacity to succeed. The FMEP team recognizes that FM is achieving good results in light of a challenging and aging infrastructure, campus growth and change, and tough economic times. Overall, the campus community has acknowledged and appreciated the continued facilities improvements.
Evaluation Report and Recommendations

1.0 LEADERSHIP

Senior leaders in an effective facilities organization set direction and establish customer focus, clear and visible values, and high expectations in line with institutional mission, vision, and core values. Effective facilities leaders facilitate the dialogue around larger leadership issues such as total cost of ownership (TCO), sustainability, recapitalization requirements, and facilities reinvestment. Leaders inspire the people in the organization and create an environment that stimulates personal growth. They encourage involvement, development and learning, innovation, and creativity. Leaders act as both educators and change agents.

1.1 Describe how leadership roles and responsibilities and the decision-making structure are defined by the facilities department and generally understood by internal and external stakeholders.

Most leadership roles and responsibilities for the FM organization are clearly defined in written job descriptions and sufficiently understood throughout the FM organization, the campus administration, and among many of the academic departments except for the director of Customer Services. This is a relatively new position and the role and responsibilities of this position have not been effectively communicated to the campus.

The review team found that the associate vice president for FM is afforded clear recognition of trust by members of the campus administration and the members of the FM senior executive team. This high level of trust allows for open communication, respect for individuals, and enhances the organization’s ability to gain support for important facility management initiatives.

The FM organization consists of organizational components that are structured in a typical hierarchical alignment to form one facilities management organization (OneFM). The associate vice president for Facilities reports directly to the vice president for Business Affairs who reports to the president of the university.

Facilities Management is organized by functional area: Facilities Planning and Development and University Architect; Engineering and Project Management; Facilities Operations & Maintenance; and Customer Services. Each department is led by a senior leader who reports to the associate vice president for Facilities Management. This alignment of senior managers also reinforces the department’s decision-making process to all internal and external stakeholders. As previously noted, the review team has recommendations for organizational realignment of the Business Operations functions.
The FM website is available to all internal and external stakeholders, as well as a published strategic plan that includes vision, mission, and core values statements. The FM website does a very good job of portraying leadership and reporting relationships of all staff. However, during the interview process, there were a number of instances where customers who do not have regular interactions with FM staff were not clear about the FM department’s roles and responsibilities.

**Recommendation 1A**

FM leaders are reminded that the organizational design is the formal system of accountability that defines key positions in the organization and legitimatizes rights to set goals, receive information, and influence the work of others. As such, clear roles and responsibilities and sensible organizational structure at all levels is an important determinate of success. For FM, the quality of coordination among the various functional areas, and how well these functional areas work together, is often the single most important determinate of organizational success.

It is recommended that FM take the necessary steps to clearly and effectively communicate the role and responsibilities of the director of Customer Services both internally to FM and externally to all campus customer constituents.

It is also recommended that consideration be given for realignment of the director of Business Operations. The specific details of this recommendation are contained in Section 8.0: Other Considerations.

1.2 Describe how the leadership system includes mechanisms for the leaders to conduct self-examination, receive feedback, and make improvements.

FM leaders rely heavily on a biennial Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) conducted by the vice president for Business Affairs. The survey is intended to provide feedback from the department’s employees on a wide range of topics including supervision, fairness, team effectiveness, diversity, pay, physical environment, benefits, employee development, quality, information systems, internal and external communications, employee engagement, and job satisfaction.

Facilities Management leaders report that the survey results have improved for each of the three surveys conducted over the past six years and that the results are in an appropriate range.

All departments conduct regularly scheduled staff meetings and FM leaders receive some feedback on performance during these meetings. All employees receive regular evaluations from their supervisors and have the opportunity to provide feedback as a part of this process.
Recommendation 1B
The SEE provides an assessment of overall organizational climate, and although FM leaders receive an annual performance evaluation from their supervisor, they do not have an effective mechanism to conduct self-examination and to receive personal feedback for making self-improvements for developing personal proficiency.

“Feedback is the breakfast of champions.” Only by completing the loop from outward action to understanding of the action’s impact can anyone hope to understand his or her effect: what works, what doesn’t, and what needs to improve.

It is recommended that for those members of the senior executive team, an annual 360-degree type of leadership performance evaluation be conducted in order to provide a mechanism to receive feedback from colleagues, other than solely from direct supervisors.

1.3 Describe how the organization aligns its missions, vision, and value statements with those of the institution.

FM has articulated a mission, vision, and core values for the organization that are congruent and in alignment with the university’s business affairs and the mission, vision, and core values statements. FM has demonstrated through a rigorous and documented process that the goals and objectives of the FM strategic plan are tightly aligned with the institution’s various levels of planning. Furthermore, the plan is reviewed each year for progress and continued alignment; yet, some additional work is needed within FM to more effectively disseminate the plan to larger numbers of the FM staff.

The FM mission statement, “promoting learning and discovery through teamwork and excellence in facility management,” does not describe clearly and succinctly for FM staff an understood purpose of the organization. The vision statement is quite lengthy, as are the core values and guiding principles. The review team found that FM staff has difficulty describing what the FM mission and vision means to them and how the work that they do supports the mission and vision.

Facilities Management core values coupled with business affairs core values and guiding principles are well done and collectively constitute the principles and values for which the FM organization prescribes.

The review team did not find the FM mission, vision, and core values displayed in various FM workspaces.

Recommendation 1C
Mission and value statements are the raw materials that leaders use to help set direction, to structure and align the organization, and to inspire and motivate people to achieve group purpose. That’s why every organization needs a mission and value
statement. These statements serve as guides and accountabilities along the long road to success.

There is a need to develop and communicate these statements for achieving a shared understanding beyond the leadership levels of the organization. It is recommended that the mission and core value statements be displayed at various FM work sites and break areas. The display of mission and value statements will serve as an additional reminder to the workforce and will reinforce the organization’s purpose and workplace values. Displaying the mission and value statements doesn’t just add voice to these documents; it endorses them as facility management policy and guiding principles. In future efforts, more involvement of the staff in the planning process will help assure staff buy-in and ownership of goals and will improve feedback on accomplishment of goals.

1.4 Describe how effective the senior leadership of the department has been in establishing and sustaining internal and external communications plans that (a) educate the campus community on the facilities department’s role in institution success, (b) promote customer and stakeholder feedback; and (c) reinforce the role of front-line staff in creating a positive public impression of the quality of the organization’s services.

The review team found through extensive interviews with campus administrative stakeholders, customers, and staff that FM leaders have done a fair job overall of communicating the FM role through its campus website, service publications, and through meetings with customer groups and personal contact by FM leadership team members who they come into contact with on a day-to-day basis. However, the review team noted that there was a significant misperception of duties, procedures, and performance expectations that concern was warranted. During the interview process, there were a number of instances in which customers who do not have regular interactions with FM staff were not clear about the FM department’s roles and responsibilities. This is an area where there are substantial opportunities for improvement.

Facilities Management has a process in place to promote customer and stakeholder feedback. The FM leadership team attends standing meetings with selected customer groups on a monthly basis, conducts monthly customer satisfaction surveys on 10 percent of completed work orders (albeit, a relatively small sample), and surveys customers at the end of all institutional projects. FM also has initiated a director of Customer Services representative who maintains a log of customer concerns and who meets with customers to resolve their concerns.

FM has developed “Standards of Customer Service” to help reinforce the role of front-line staff in creating a positive public image.

**Recommendation 1D**

There is a need to make the most of opportunities that will allow FM to effectively communicate its roles and responsibilities to the broader campus community.
There is sufficient confusion and misunderstanding among the campus constituencies about customer services, zone maintenance, recharge rates, and billing processes that warrant FM leaders take the time to address these topics with the campus constituencies most affected by current policy and practices governing these topics.

FM would be well served if it developed a guide to facility services—a kind of owner’s manual primarily used by campus customers and stakeholders. This could also be of substantial assistance to staff within the FM&P organization. This manual should make up a substantial framework for the FM&P department website. It can also facilitate with the orientation of new employees to the facilities department and can be used by supervisors and managers to reinforce the organization’s roles and responsibilities.

Because of the nature of the department’s services, regular contact with customers occurs in the form of meetings, consultation and discussions of service work, or actual project work. Section 3.0: Customer Focus contains specific recommendations for FM leaders to sharpen understanding of customer needs, to nurture stronger customer relationships, and to encourage senior leaders to continue to impress upon managers and supervisors at all levels of the organization the notion of “listening to the voice of the customer.”

These topics are addressed in further detail in other sections of this report including Section 3.0: Customer Focus and Section 6.0: Process Management.

1.5 Describe how representatives of the facility department engage with key communities, both on and off campus (e.g., town and gown, agencies having jurisdiction) and contribute to the enhancement of their various communities—both personal and professional.

The UTSA campus is used for many civic and community activities, including but not limited to, high school graduation ceremonies, summer camps, U.S. naturalization programs, and local government town hall meetings.

Facilities Management meets frequently with agencies having jurisdiction and neighborhoods adjacent to the campus to inform and discuss construction concerns. The associate vice president for FM and other members of the SET attend meetings of various community and campus committees as needed. The associate vice president for FM also makes presentations to community and professional groups and participates with his peers from other institutions.

The review team found that FM leaders and staff are engaged where appropriate with their various communities.
Recommendation 1E
A review of procedures used on projects and certain categories of maintenance work orders should be undertaken to ensure proper reviews are being conducted and are built into the normal processes.

1.6 Describe the leadership development and succession plans presently in place to ensure continuity of leadership.

The review team found that consideration has been given to the importance of developing people in the organization so that no critical position relies exclusively on a single individual. Members of the FM leadership team are keenly aware of the importance of continued development of multiple leaders throughout the organization. However, FM does not have a formal leadership development and succession plan, nor have they identified a realistic and achievable way to provide backup and depth for those positions identified as critical and that represent a one-deep situation.

Recommendation 1F
Success requires having the right people in the right place at the right time, with the right skills. In accordance with university policy, FM is encouraged to map the workforce, i.e., develop a workforce plan that will identify these critical positions and help build an approach for sourcing, securing, and developing the right individuals into those key positions. This is a strategic need for the FM organization.

A practical approach is recommended that allows for an assessment of the total needs of the organization and for meeting the training and development needs of individuals already in the organization and/or for acquiring the necessary position depth through hiring. The APPA Institute for Facilities Management and the APPA Leadership Academy are two appropriate programs for consideration to develop people and to address succession for critical roles and for FM leadership roles.

1.7 Describe how the leadership of the facilities department emphasizes the importance of, and engages in excellence.

The FM leadership team emphasizes excellence through the development and application of a number of tools that help maintain quality services. For example, FM leaders are striving to establish a culture of excellence. To achieve this cultural excellence, the Business Affairs organization, of which FM is a part, established a guiding principles program with mandatory training for all staff.

The guiding principles are:
- We respect and care for each other.
- We partner to deliver excellent service.
- We value and empower people.
- We create positive change.
- We do the right thing.
The FM Brand Promise is: “a commitment to achieving goals through excellence and service – every person, every day, every job.”

The Office of Facilities provides monthly and quarterly employee awards as part of its Celebrating Facility Excellence program. This program has been in effect for several years and compliments the Business Affairs program. The Celebrating Facility Excellence program recognizes staff accomplishments based on kudos and recommendations from customers, co-workers, and others. Generally, individual staff is recognized, but teams are also eligible.

**Recommendation 1G**
The APPA review team recognizes and applauds the Brand Promise and the Celebrating Facilities Excellence Program initiatives. However, based on our customer interviews, there is more work to be done before FM achieves the initiatives goal of achieving an organizational culture of excellence.

Many of the recommendations contained in this report represent examples of the work that needs to be done to further the improvement necessary to establish an FM workforce culture of excellence.

1.8 **Describe how the leadership of the facilities department promotes and ensures ethical behavior in all interactions.**

All applicable staff members complete an annual compliance and conflict of interest training that provides and reviews institutional policies and procedures. Ethical behavior is also a topic included in the FM customer service training, supervisory training, discrimination/sexual harassment training, and a number of other training programs.

Facilities Management leaders and managers receive formal training in business and leadership skills. They are required to complete the Facilities Fundamental Supervisory curriculum, which was developed in coordination with the HR Department. Additional formal ethics training is provided to individuals in specific job functions when requirements are identified.

The review team observed no indication of any concern about ethical behavior within FM.

**Recommendation 1H**
Facilities management leaders are encouraged to continue to nurture the ethical leadership practices that have served the organization so well.

When considering factors that influence the department’s success, organizational design, leadership philosophy, and visibly practiced ethical behavior and organizational professed values impact the performance of every individual.
2.0 FACILITIES STRATEGIC AND OPERATIONAL PLANNING

Strategic and operational planning consists of the overall planning process, the identification of goals and actions necessary to achieve success, and the deployment of those actions to align the work of the organization. The successful facilities organization anticipates many factors in its strategic planning efforts: changing customer expectations, business and partnering opportunities, technological developments, institutional master plans, programmatic needs, evolving regulatory requirements, building organizational capacity, and societal expectations, among other criteria.

2.1 Describe the strategic plan that was developed for the facilities organization that includes the goals and objectives of the department.

The Facilities Department has a fully developed and aligned strategic plan. The plan was developed as a subset to both the institutional A Shared Vision UTSA 2016 plan and the Vice President of Business Affairs Plan 2007-2016. The FM plan is a 10-year plan originating in 2006 and contains all the standard elements of mission, vision, core values, and strategic goals. All components are defined in excellent detail with each component in close alignment with the parent plans. The FM strategic plan is positioned to track and record progress and therefore demonstrates a best practice approach.

Strategic goals are specific, measurable, assigned, reportable, and time sensitive. The goals match with the institution’s higher level goals very well and are approved by upper campus administration.

2.2 Describe the process used to develop the strategic plan, and how participation from internal and external stakeholders was sought out, the process used to gain approval of the plan by the administration, and how it was communicated to internal and external stakeholders.

The process used in development of the facilities strategic plan is top-down from the perspective that institutional themes and areas of collaboration are considered with subsequent business goals used to drive the direction of the FM goal development. The overarching themes are: diversity, globalization, and transformative leadership. Areas of collaborative excellence are: health, security, energy and the environment, human and social development, and sustainability. Facilities utilized senior leadership experience coupled with key stakeholder meetings to develop input for the plan. There was no evidence to indicate that input from lower levels within the FM Department was obtained during plan development.

A notable feature of the plan’s structure includes annual action plans for each goal within each plan year. This measures progress and keeps objectives on target, illustrating yet another excellent example of plan management.
Recommendation 2A
Develop a method for amending the strategic plan to include high-level initiatives that the facilities department is currently pursuing for inclusion in the annual action plans. Some examples are worker training and needs assessments, feedback from the employee survey, and other carefully chosen recommendations contained in this report.

Consider approaching future strategic plan development from a “balanced scorecard” approach. Using this type of approach can focus attention in the following four focus areas: people, customers, process, and financials to reinforce goals and objectives and give context for how they integrate. This can also help in rolling out plan information to stakeholders.

2.3 Describe the processes defined to ensure that strategic goals and key performance measures are understood by all, and the extent to which those goals and measures are periodically reviewed.

Facilities Management has made a concerted effort to develop key performance metrics that are tracked and reviewed by senior management. The prime vehicle for this review is a Monthly Operations Review Meeting. The metrics used in the meeting are specifically designed to measure performance in support of the strategic plan. It is evident that these performance measures are well understood by those attending the operations review meeting, but it is less evident that the measures are rolled out and understood at lower levels of the organization. Interviews with some of the workforce suggests that a “disconnect” exists between those working at the front lines with those that are attending the monthly reviews. Specifically, the middle and front-line staff members of the department are not focused on the goals and may not be aware of how their activities fit into the larger picture.

Recommendation 2B
Develop a series of meetings and/or newsletters to give feedback to the workforce and other stakeholders on how well the implementation of the plan is progressing. Providing a forum for involvement in the future by all levels of the workforce in the determination of strategic objectives will serve to improve a stronger staff connection to the plan.

2.4 Describe how the institution’s and the facilities’ master plans incorporate and reflect principles of sustainability, Total Cost of Ownership (TCO), and overall facilities renewal.

Goal number four of the facilities strategic plan calls for support of institutional energy conservation and environmental sustainability. The campus master plan recognizes that the UTSA Main Campus was developed primarily as a commuter campus and has recommended several strategies to migrate away from the traditional suburban type of campus development. The campus has taken a much stronger interest in the area of

---

sustainability through an increased focus on the development of on-campus student residence halls, sensitivity to the elimination of non-pervious paving materials, building renovations and remodeling, transportation management strategies for students commuting between campuses, and energy conservation measures. A broad range of energy conservation strategies have been deployed as a result of the master plan recommendations and led to the adoption of a university policy statement (9.43) in support of sustainability initiatives and the formulation of an UTSA Sustainability Council. The principles of TCO are included in the processes for the approval of projects by the Board of Regents and are supported by the campus master plan. Facility renewal costs are addressed for new construction through the TCO elements of project approval; however, a comprehensive program of facility renewal needs and funding does not exist. The Facilities Department management has recognized the need for identifying a program to address this important area.

**Recommendation 2C**  
Facilities Management has recognized the need for developing a program with funding to identify and address the facility renewal needs of the university. We encourage settlement of this issue. The campus should consider the merits of a dedicated sustainability officer to maintain the appropriate focus on sustainability issues on a campus-wide basis.

2.5 Describe the current strategies and processes defined to ensure continuity of functions in the event of staff turnover, contractor failure, or other unanticipated disruptions.

The Facilities Department has developed several programs to address some aspects of business continuity planning. These include the ability to hire temporary workers, cross training of critical positions, and performance bonding of contractors. Management recognizes that this is not a substitute for the development of a complete business continuity plan and, as such, is in the process of developing such a plan.

**Recommendation 2D**  
Complete the process of developing a business continuity plan.

2.6 Describe the emergency response plans that are currently in place, and how they are communicated to facility employees and the campus community as required.

The Office of Facilities Management has an emergency plan in place since 2009. This plan is the forerunner of the business continuity plan that is in development. The plan was developed under the guidance of the university’s Department of Public Safety in conjunction with the Department of Environmental Safety and Risk Management. The plan is comprehensive in nature and includes periodic drills and training for first responders and key management positions. The department’s plan includes such features as calling trees, an automated messaging system, and campus alert website.
Recommendation 2E
Complete the current development process for business continuity plans and integrate it with existing emergency plan.

2.7 Describe the process and timing for a regular, periodic review of the facilities strategic plan.

The Facilities Management strategic plan, as mentioned earlier, is reviewed annually and is updated when necessary to remain consistent with the institutional and business affairs plans.

2.8 Describe the process used to develop the capital plan, addressing needs for renovation, major repairs and/or upgrades.

Facilities Management has a number of strategic-level master planning documents including the campus master plan, utilities master plan, and deferred maintenance project plan, all of which are used as a basis for capital planning and development.

The university updates the five-year capital plan (MP1) annually and provides it to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) for funding and priority considerations. Specific projects are initiated in one of two ways. Academic projects are initiated from the Office of Space Management under the purview of the provost while non-academic projects are generally initiated through the Office of Facilities Planning and Development. The Office of Space Management also develops the campus space standards that are followed by all projects.

As individual projects are identified to move forward, they are presented to the president’s cabinet for preliminary consideration. If approved to move ahead, projects are then presented to the University Facilities Planning & Development Department for the development of a complete scope and budget. A project definition phase is then used to develop the financial plan, scope, and programmatic needs and schedule, while working with the institutional Master Plan Management Council (MPMC), Facilities Engineering Project & Management (FP&M) and Facilities Operation & Maintenance (FM&O) to identify necessary infrastructure improvements and the appropriate building location.

The UTSA Master Plan Management Council functions as the “Building Advisory Committee” and reviews proposed facility changes that could impact the civic structure of the university as described in the 2009 campus master plan. These may include new construction, facility additions and renovations, landscaping or infrastructure projects, and site development projects. The council also reviews possible projects beginning at the conceptual stage and provides advice regarding the project’s impact on the campus’ goals and policies adopted with the campus master plan.

The Office of Facilities Planning and Development does not typically charge for their services. This approach is a generally accepted practice that benefits the university community and encourages the engagement of the campus with the appropriate
professionals to develop their project ideas. It has the unintended consequence, however, of using staff resources and time exploring project initiatives that have no real chance for execution. This is a particular problem with some individual customers who initiate far too many projects that never become reality.

The decision-making process for the major repair and renovation process uses the University of Texas System FRRM program to forecast facility renewal requirements and utilizes its objective deferred maintenance priority system to establish annual deferred maintenance projects. The deferred maintenance priority methodology is based upon data from a comprehensive preventive maintenance program and CMMS (TMA) equipment list and associated historical data.

The Office of Facility Planning and Construction (OEPC) assists the campus with the development and construction of major capital projects (> $4 million). The system office (OFPC) and the campus decide on the best project delivery methodology and the project team composition, but the OFPC expressed some degree of frustration in not becoming involved in project decisions until too late in the process. Even considering the very good relationship that has been forged between the campus and system offices, it is the OFPC’s desire to be brought into the project process at the earliest possible stage, particularly at the development of the conceptual scope and budget.

Recommendation 2F
The review team views the capital planning process as comprehensive and complete while other sections of this report may comment on individual elements of the design and construction process. It is recommended that the Office of Facilities in partnership with the campus administration examine methods that would provide mechanisms to ensure that only projects with a reasonable degree of success are pursued without additional resources to support them. The best method for assisting with this issue is to have the university establish a capital governance structure that requires the engagement and approval of upper level administration in capital ideas before they are allowed to proceed. A good deal of what is needed is in place with the current structure and could simply add one level of review and approvals for capital project ideas before clients engage the planning office in pursuing their dreams. By way of example, if the physics department may be thinking that they want to consider a building addition, the dean, provost, and other appropriate administrators should sign off on the idea before planning is asked to spend time on developing it.

It is further recommended that UTSA and OFPC continue to explore and negotiate a complete agreement on the overall project development process focused on the specific level and timing of involvement by OFPC. The OFPC representative is calling attention to the development of specific project criteria without engaging OFPC in the very beginning of scope determination and budgeting.
The problem is rooted in a historical relationship that was admittedly a shared responsibility. OFPC and UTSA agreed that things are much better than ever before. They hold UTSA as a model for other institutions to follow in many respects, but they also pointed out that UTSA was guilty of working on projects and not involving OFPC until the scope and budget were firmly established. When OFPC tries to adjust budgets (upward), they are met with resistance, and UTSA believes that OSPB adds too much contingency. OFPC and UTSA must recognize that there is still work to do on the relationship.

2.9 Describe the processes utilized to ensure a budget is developed with input from multiple levels of staff utilizing historic expenditures, needs analyses, and with effective allocation of available resources to support the organization’s goals and objectives, while seeking new and innovative measures to leverage resources.

There are two principal budgets that are influenced or controlled by FM—the capital budget and the operating budget.

The process used to develop budgets for capital projects includes needs analyses, input from multiple levels of staff, and historic expenditures and also encourages innovative measures to leverage resources. While the self-report made this sound like a rigorous and formal process, the review team found very little evidence that this was actually being done.

In addition to the end user, other university departments are provided an opportunity for plan review regarding their needs in order to determine project scope and budget. These departments include: Environmental Health and Safety and Risk Management; Campus Police; Office of Information Technology; Transportation; and Facilities O&M, including housekeeping, grounds, and utilities. Similarly proposed projects are reviewed by the university environmental planner to determine water quality and storm water upgrades that will be required by the project and the related costs that should be included in the project budget.

Capital project budgets are typically developed based upon historical expenditures using three sources for this information: 1) University of Texas System Office of Facilities Planning and Construction; 2) Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board; and 3) the University of Texas at San Antonio historical construction cost database. There have been project budget issues when this prescribed process is not followed. For example, there are times when project budgets and schedules are determined by others outside the FP&D organization without due consideration for historical costs or academic scheduling needs. In other instances, OFPC imposes multiple layers of contingencies onto projects that displace programmatic needs within a predetermined budget amount. The last area of concern related to project budgets is associated with scope creep and scope control. Many project coordinators and senior project managers expressed frustration at their inability to
control scope creep by some project stakeholders, whether that is the customer or other university departments with an interest in the project.

There was some concern expressed by campus customers that their involvement in the development and execution of project budgets was too limited. This held particularly true for institutional projects in which the job order contract (JOC) process was utilized. Customers felt that the JOC contractors were not “sharpening their pencils” adequately until they were threatened with bidding the project. This leads to mistrust and project delays.

The Financial Affairs Department and vice president for Business Affairs have established formal budget processes that allow for input on permanent and one-time budgeted needs from the various departments. FM closely tracks annual budget expenditures and has a process to reinvest forecast budget savings to provide for necessary unbudgeted items such as computer replacement, vehicle replacement, and additional supplies and equipment.

Facilities budgets are generally flat from year to year, except that there is typically a request for a limited number of additional permanent and one-time funding items. These include operational, maintenance, and to a lesser extent, capital line items. The FM annual budget development includes input from all staffing levels that are vetted within each department and ultimately submitted for consideration by the senior executive team. Budgets typically carry over from year to year with opportunities provided to request additional permanent and one-time funding based on institutional growth and departmental needs.

**Recommendation 2G**

*The review team believes the capital process for budget development has a solid foundation, however, some comments received from end users suggest that even with their involvement in the process, they may not fully appreciate how budgets and project scope relate to one another. This is especially pronounced when value engineering requires scope reductions while project surpluses are sometimes realized at project end. It is incumbent on the campus to allow the professionals in the Facilities Department to develop project budgets and schedules that are realistic. It is equally important that the campus empower the project team, primarily through the project coordinators and senior project managers, to manage and control scope creep throughout the life of the project. Another area to investigate is how budgets are tracked and how well this information is shared with end users during the course of the project. Sharing this information would also provide a better understanding of construction costs and nurture trust between users and FM.*

*Examine the current JOC process to ensure that time is afforded by the project coordinators to sufficiently represent their customers and hold contractors accountable for their cost estimates and quality.*
The process for determining the operating budget again would benefit from a more rigid budgeting system that builds and tracks the program elements more closely. Although this might entail more effort, the capabilities of the TMA system can provide greater granularity to budget expenditures and thereby give greater data for determining resource levels for different programs. This may not have to be as rigid as a zero-based budget system but some variation would be useful. In this way, budgets could be built up from specific program requirements tracked at the program level and changes made in close coordination with changes in scope.

2.10 Describe the process used to ensure that the capital planning process aligns itself with the campus master plan and the institution’s strategic plan, in terms of preferences and current and future priorities/initiatives. Provide your institution’s definition for each of these plans.

The university has three overarching plans that govern the basic parameters by which projects have to be developed and implemented. The evaluation team has determined that these plans, the campus master plan, institutional strategic plan, and the capital improvement plan, are comprehensive and complete. Strong evidence of the governing nature of these plans was observed, and they are being closely followed.

2.11 Describe the process used to ensure that representatives from operational units participate in the development of construction program planning and are active participants in the acceptance of completed projects and documents.

As discussed in recommendation 2I, adequate participation of operating units exists in the process for units to comment and provide input into the program development. This review process continues during the development of design and construction documents. Construction sites are also open to operating units to review for their areas of responsibility. The process appears to provide adequate representation for the knowledge transfer to the operating units.

2.12 Describe how leadership is building and expanding organizational capacity and capabilities.

During the peer review, it became apparent that UTSA is heading toward a period of more restrained growth due to shrinking resources at the state level. It is likely that FM will be asked to reduce its budget. If reduced resources are the expectation, then the department must develop an improvement plan for the efficient use of the current resources, or the scope of services provided by FM will be forced to decrease with budget reductions and the erosion caused by inflation. The department has offered several items as examples for increasing organizational capacity. These include: better hiring practices, APPA staffing analysis, the development of shop rates for auxiliary unit charges, new fees for construction projects, and training program enhancements. Although these examples are useful and appropriate, FM may find that they will not adequately support the expansion of services
in a time of resource scarcity, and some may in fact be at risk during budget cutting exercises.

**Recommendation 2H**  
Facilities Management should begin to explore process redesign and continuous improvement programs for streamlining efforts to reduce inefficient activities and improve means and methods of providing service. Additionally, benchmark with other universities that use sophisticated computerized maintenance management systems for ways that the CMMS functionality could also be leveraged to improve efficiency.

Allowing budget reductions to drive scope reductions will lead to a descending cycle of customer and employee satisfaction. Our changing times require extraordinary responses to remain successful.

2.13 Describe the practice used to ensure the workplace environment optimizes staff performance.

The FM Department has presented several excellent programs to enhance employee performance. These programs are described below.

- All facilities supervisors are required to complete the *Fundamentals of Supervision for Facilities Supervisors* curriculum.
- Human Resources and the Office of Information Technology provide business skills training.
- Formal training is provided to individuals in specific job functions when requirements are identified.
- The FM organization has key performance indicators (KPIs) that track the general performance of specific functional areas.
- Individual development plans are incorporated into annual performance plans and are evaluated during the annual performance evaluation period.
- Job/position descriptions are developed by FM and periodically reviewed in coordination with HR.
- Commitment to ensuring that staff members obtain and maintain professional credentials to allow them to effectively perform their jobs.
- Facilities staff members are actively involved in several major professional associations, including attendance at IFMA, APPA, ASHRAE, TSPE, AIA, and other facility management trade organizations to acquire technical training.
- Staff members in each functional area have been intimately involved in the development of career progression plans and job families/career paths.
- Each department is provided funding for training as part of their overall maintenance and operations budget.
Recommendation 2I
The review team strongly supports the efforts described above but refers to the recommendations in Section 6.0: Process Management that are particularly important in this area as well. A highly trained workforce working with a collaborative and cooperative mindset will help ensure the organization’s productive capabilities of FM service staff.

3.0 CUSTOMER FOCUS

Customer focus is a key component of effective facilities management. All stakeholders must feel their needs are heard, understood, and acted upon. Various tools must be in place to assure customer communication, to assimilate what is said, and implement procedures to act on expressed needs. To be successful, a facility department must ensure that its customers have an understanding of standards, tasks, roles, frequencies of services, etc.

3.1 Describe the process you use to identify your customers.

FM has defined customers as “anyone that utilizes UTSA campus facilities.” This includes faculty, staff, students, on-campus residents, researchers, suppliers/vendors, others that are assigned space on the campus, and visitors. This traditional definition provides a broad listing of customers but it is not a process. Customer levels of interaction, segmentation by service type, and priority of customer function being serviced, are all critical to determining how to define a customer from a practical perspective. It is impractical to assume that FM can be all things to all customers. This is particularly true during times of limited resources.

The review team found that the concept of segmenting the broad customer constituency that FM serves is not widely understood. Different customers and customer groups have different requirements for service, and these different service requirements, preferences, and priorities among customers are important to understand when developing service processes.

A more practical and focused process of determining differences in customer requirements and decisions on how resources are deployed is needed.

Recommendation 3A
Focus attention on customers that are in regular and close contact. Those that are in regular contact with the department, as is the case with routine meetings and originators of service requests, should receive focus. Using the work-order management system to analyze work requests and identify the different customers is a good place to start.

The different customer groups as represented by the zone maintenance approach to organizational alignment also provide additional clues. Most noted are the differences
in requirements and satisfaction with services between the E&G funded customers and those representing auxiliary enterprise customers.

3.2 Describe how you identify the needs and expectations of both your internal and external customers and how you measure your success in meeting those expectations.

Facilities Management reports that several means of meeting with customers for the purpose of obtaining feedback are conducted. These include standing monthly meetings with major customer groups, individual department meetings on capital projects, and meetings with customers who are primary reimbursable customers that have service level agreements (SLAs) in place. Additional customer needs and expectations are obtained through service work-order follow-up and customer satisfaction surveys for those customers who have capital projects.

Success is reported and measured via periodic customer satisfaction surveys and through review of KPIs at operations review meetings.

The review team recognizes that obtaining customer satisfaction is a difficult and complex goal to achieve. In practice, the methods described above provide a variety of customer interaction and opportunities for communication and feedback on service quality and satisfaction. However, in the many interviews that were conducted with customers, there seems to be a disconnection between FM representatives and customers on understanding customer expectations and service satisfaction. The review team believes there are several possible explanations for this.

- The work-order survey system is taking too small of a sample size for reporting customer satisfaction, and this is the only customer KPI in regular use.
- Meetings with customers are not effective.
- No mechanism exists for taking customer comments at meetings and acting on them in a proactive way. Specifically, if correction of a miss-step is the only action taken without a change to the process to prevent future occurrences of the miss-step, then it is likely to be repeated.
- Direct customer interaction through personal visits or follow up phone calls would provide another avenue for customer feedback.

Recommendation 3B

Making certain that customer concerns are registered in a process that is designed to correct deficiencies is critically important. Simply meeting and or surveying is not enough unless there are mechanisms in place to act on the data collected and then to provide feedback to customers of actions taken to correct deficiencies.

Toward this end, the following recommendations are made:

- Make customer focus a strategic initiative and develop an action plan to address this need. There is an especially important need to improve relationships with a
number of student affairs customer groups, and other auxiliary enterprise customers. This includes almost all those customers with whom FM currently has SLAs. See recommendation 3C.

- Increase the sample size of the work-order survey system.
- Report results of project completion surveys and follow up with survey participants to report course corrections and process changes.
- Introduce an annual all customer survey system.
- Bring customers into the strategic planning process.
- Provide data collection and a feedback system as part of regular meetings with customers to develop a proactive correction system; a customer complaint handling policy and process.

3.3 Describe the process you use to establish the type of organizational structure and levels of service most likely required to meet customers’ needs and expectations and describe the communication processes you use to share those service levels and structure.

Facilities Management reports that the department has features that align the organization with the needs of the customers. These features include the following.

- A dedicated customer service organization exists that works with all levels of the organization to ensure that all customer concerns and/or issues are addressed.
- The maintenance department provides services in a three-zone configuration. The zones are divided into E&G, research, and auxiliary areas to match customer organizational structure.
- SLAs are in place between FM and all major reimbursable customers. SLAs are reviewed annually with customers, and deficiencies are addressed before SLAs are finalized.
- The Facilities website provides customers with:
  - Policies and procedures relating to services provided.
  - How to request Facilities support, and obtain updates on requested work.
- The Office of Facilities has established very clear work order priorities with associated target response times. Results are reported at monthly operations review meetings. Response time compliance rates are reviewed at monthly operations review meetings.

Commenting on the reported aspects of the department, the review team has observed that the customer service organization function is not viewed as highly effective in addressing customer concerns. Furthermore, the campus community is not overly knowledgeable about the zone organization. Those who are aware of the zone maintenance approach are mostly favorable about their service experience, but the zone organization structure is not yet achieving the levels of customer satisfaction that is intended.

The review team also notes that FM workers are not invested in the zones, and the fact that the zones still operate from the same central shops and travel to and from their region
assignments daily does not allow for improvement in efficient use of labor resources normally attributed to the zone concept, namely the elimination of travel time and mobilization.

The level of procedural documentation in the use of SLAs is high; however, there is substantial disagreement between FM and a number of customers over the SLAs, such as levels of service actually received, the standards applied, and cost for services, including their understanding of the billing documents. A number of customers have identified the SLAs as a major point of contention.

**Recommendation 3C**

In the final analysis, organizational structure, customer service departments, procedures, and processes are all implemented in order to provide quality customer service at an efficient level so that resource use is maximized. If the intended outcomes are not being achieved, then a new approach is required.

Toward this end, a refocused customer service strategic initiative is needed. This is needed and is imperative for FM to successfully meet its mission. The following statements are recommendations for FM.

**Develop and execute a customer service strategy**

It is recommended that FM design and implement a focused customer service strategy—a framework for action can serve as a set of durable operating practices that create a replicable and consistent customer service success formula. “A good strategy honestly acknowledges the challenges being faced and provides an approach to overcoming them.”

A customer service strategy with the following elements is recommended.

**Implement the customer service strategy through service leadership**

All those within FM who are serving in leadership/management, middle management, and supervisory positions need to do a better job of nurturing the development of service values and service skills throughout the organization.

**Talk with and listen to customers**

The customer satisfaction survey process, although well intended, lacks coordination within FM and does not provide the actionable feedback that is needed. Also, measuring performance relative to the importance of customer service attributes is critical. There is a need to determine which service attributes are most important to targeted customers and which attributes that FM excels in, or is underperforming. This action establishes a sound basis for service improvement priorities. The notion of capturing service attributes from the viewpoint of the customer can be translated into service-values that can form a motif or a service theme, a north star that serves as guiding values for

---

services and for project delivery. A systematic listening process to the voice of the customer is also needed. Systematic listening improves service quality decision making and provides the basis for establishing the overall service strategy. FM needs to demonstrate that they understand the differences between customer preferences and needs.

It is the review team’s experience that when developing SLAs, the best service level agreements are built when there is open, respectful two-way conversations between those who provide the services and those who use and pay for them.

Billing charges also need to be communicated with more transparency and granularity. Customers want more detail, easy to read charges, and understandable billing.

**Use a variety of tools to capture the voice of the customer**

Surveys are not the only method of capturing customer satisfaction. Listening to the customer and capturing service quality information requires ongoing collection of information through a variety of approaches. Judicious selection and use of tools such as electronic surveys, telephone surveys, customer advisory groups, service reviews, and employee field reporting is recommended. Many customers who participated in the interview process identified that personal contact for discussing their experience in working with FM is preferred.

**Manage the total customer experience**

There is a need for FM to adopt the practice of managing the total customer experience from the service or project inception to completion of the service work or project close-out. This includes the service expectations that customers have before the experience occurs and through the customer satisfaction assessments they are likely to make when the work is done.

Customers play a special role in service encounters; they are not simply passive recipients of the work processes, especially for capital projects. They play an active role in the delivery of the service experience. In other words, they don’t just consume services; they help create it. And they are not always good at this. Therefore, it makes good sense to recognize the role of customers and to include in the customer service strategy a method of managing customer variability as mentioned in the above sections of this report. Customer understanding of the service and project process, their specific capabilities of participating as a member of a team when developing SLAs or as a member of the project team, and their willingness to extend effort, time and knowledge, and service preference for the constituency they represent are only a few of the variabilities that must be managed.
Implement the customer service strategy through people

The front-line service provider is the customer service person representing the organization. These people are the organization’s brand.

Great customer service is no accident. FM needs the right people in front of customers, and these people need to have all of the skills and talent necessary to deliver the service attributes that customers need.

Hiring the right people is the first rule. After that, training these people in customer service and supporting and rewarding them is recommended.

Implement the customer service strategy through technology

Technology investments are strategic. FM should ask the question: What is the best technology for the customer service strategy? A holistic approach is recommended with emphasis on the use of technology in a manner that improves the performance of services in ways that matter to customers. The current website, the use of the CMMS for work management, and providing customer feedback are only a few areas that can continue to benefit from the appropriate application of technology. Additional considerations include the following steps:

- Revisit with customers about their basic expectations for service levels. Frank discussions as to department funding levels, benchmarking data, and what can be reasonably provided can go a long way to shaping customer expectations among the most important customers.
- Benchmark processes against other best-in-class organizations for the means and methods of increased service performance, with a target of surpassing APPA standards. Means and methods are the keys to driving service processes and service delivery structure.
- Be proactive. Asset management techniques are the emerging means and methods and should be evaluated for a fit with UTSA.
- Provide enhanced training for those customers who routinely interact with the work control organization.
- Provide routine feedback mechanisms to let customers know on a short cycle how you are meeting the agreed upon expectations.

3.4 Describe the process that enables customers to obtain services and monitor progress or status. Describe the processes available to customers, encouraging them to provide feedback on results and/or perceptions of quality and value.

Facilities Management uses TMA, a comprehensive work-order system, to document and track services requested by customers. Customer requests can be received via several methods at the work control center. Customers are encouraged to use the web-based electronic work request form known as iService Desk. Work requests can also be made via phone and e-mail.
Facilities Management seeks feedback through a customer survey on 10 percent of all completed requests. The information from the customer surveys is reviewed during the monthly operations review meeting. Any customer complaint comments are addressed immediately by the Customer Service director who seeks to find resolution as promptly as possible.

During interviews by the peer review team, customers generally expressed satisfaction with the ability to enter work orders through the web-based iService Desk. They found the web form to be user-friendly and easy to navigate. There were some comments made that the request number generated in the iService Desk does not accurately represent the actual work-order number. Other customers expressed a concern over a lack of feedback or ability to review charges to work requests.

The peer review commends FM for the tremendous efforts put forth to create a process that enables customers to request services easily and simply through the iService Desk, and for the customer survey efforts and the creation of the Customer Service director position. These are good first steps to “fight for feedback” and improve the customer relationship.

**Recommendation 3D**

*It is recommended that FM continue to work with customers to create ways to increase transparency of services provided and charges associated with the services. One way to do this is to provide customer reports that extract information from the TMA system. Crystal Reports and other reporting tools are available to make it possible for customers to generate information as needed.*

3.5 Describe how customer feedback is used to affect continuous improvement and innovation.

As stated previously, customer surveys are sent out on 10 percent of all completed work requests. Feedback from the surveys is reviewed monthly and annually during the operations review meeting. The information obtained through customer surveys and customer meetings is used to help FM make changes to service plans, service level agreements, the development of the Project Management Charter, and even the need to restructure services and move to the zonal maintenance structure. However, as with most surveys, the response level is fairly low, making it difficult to validate changes or know that customer needs are being met.

The peer review team commends FM for reaching out and seeking customer feedback. Often times, it is difficult to produce the feedback necessary to understand the customers’ perspective on given situations. Using the town hall meetings with customers during the development of the iService Desk web form is an example of FM efforts to involve customers and gain input to improve services.

**Recommendation 3E**

*Defining the role of the Customer Service director will help improve the use of customer feedback in the improvement process. It is recommended that the Customer Service*
director reach out to the customer base by further developing the town hall style meetings for customers to attend. Regularly scheduled town hall meetings may increase the feedback from customers and provide more insight on how FM can improve services and support to the wide variety of customers.

3.6 Describe the practice used to evaluate the extent to which both the leadership of the organization and its front-line staff meet customer needs and expectations.

Facilities Management has a formalized process to measure and review how well leadership and front-line staff are meeting customer needs and expectations. The monthly review of KPIs has been established and the information presented during the monthly review meeting is used as the cornerstone of measuring the performance of the department. The review of the information has been instrumental in driving change throughout the FM organization and identifying opportunities for improvements. Examples of these changes are the move to zonal maintenance and the creation of the director of Customer Service. Facilities Management has also developed Standards of Customer Service to help keep a focus on meeting the customer needs and expectations. To date, this has served the FM Department very well in helping to guide and facilitate change. The leadership within the department has also demonstrated a willingness to seek input from the customer base through attending regular meetings with specific customer groups.

**Recommendation 3F**

See recommendations in 3C and continue to refine the performance measure against customer service in the monthly review meeting to validate that customer needs and expectations of FM are being achieved. One way of validating the relevance of the performance measures is to periodically share the monthly review information with strategic customers for the intent of obtaining feedback. Often times, having “fresh eyes” to review the data will create thought provoking discussion and actionable ideas.

Continue seeking relevant methods to measure the effectiveness of FM in meeting the needs and expectations of customers as they change and evolve over time.

Don’t blame the workers: customer comments on monthly work-order customer satisfaction surveys and completed project surveys provide strong evidence that front-line staff do an excellent job communicating with facilities customers.
4.0 ASSESSMENT AND INFORMATION ANALYSIS

Assessment and information analysis describes how your organization uses information and analyses to evaluate and drive performance improvements. Of interest are types of tools used, and how the tools are used to measure and enhance organizational performance.

4.1 Describe the processes that are used to identify and collect key performance indicators/benchmarking for your most critical areas. Describe your key performance measures determined to be critical to your organization.

Facilities Management is involved in both internal and external data collection, reporting and benchmarking activities. Internally, FM has established a monthly operations review meeting to track performance measures. Under this program, the information is assembled monthly using data from the CMMS and other campus systems. The data presented is reviewed by the department’s extended SET. The department has identified the following performance metrics as areas of importance: Free Balance Forecast, Main Campus O&M Net Balances, Downtown & HemisFair Campus Net Balances, Project Management Fees, Engineering and Project Management Projects, Remaining CIP Balances, State Fire Marshall’s Office Open Findings, Work Order Customer Satisfaction, Preventive Maintenance Schedule Compliance Tri Campus, Maintenance Schedule Compliance Main Campus, Maintenance Schedule Compliance Downtown & HemisFair Park, Preventive Maintenance Backlog Tri Campus, Corrective Maintenance Schedule Compliance Tri Campus, Corrective Maintenance Schedule Compliance, O&M Zone Maintenance Work Orders Compliance, Work Order Aging, Preventive Maintenance Schedule Compliance Fleet, Vehicle Maintenance Average Days to Complete, Vehicle Maintenance Number of Work Orders, Deferred Maintenance Remaining Balances, MMBTUs per GSF, Total Utilities Cost per MMBTU and GSF Tri Campus, Total Utilities Cost and Consumption, Total Water Cost per GSF & kGAL, GALS per GSF, Actual Utility versus Budgeted Utility, FY12 FTE Staffing Levels, and Overtime. The program has been in existence since 2008 and seems to be providing valuable aggregate performance information for managing the department operations.

Also, FM produces an Annual Utility Cost/Consumption report. The annual report provides a high level of detail showing rate structures, costs, and consumption for all utilities at all campuses in the aggregate as well as detailed information by campus. Included in the report is electric, gas, and water utility information for all three campuses.

Externally, FM participates in the biennial Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE). The survey is conducted by the office of the vice president for Business Affairs to test the climate of employee engagement within the division. Facilities Management also participates in the APPA FPI Survey, empowering the department leadership with the vital data, statistical references, and reporting tools necessary to measure operations and performance against peer institutions.
The activities described above well position the Facilities Management Department to benchmark against internal, as well as external standards and trends. Participating in the national surveys provides valuable performance metrics opportunities to formally benchmark against peer institutions and aspiring peer institutions. Senior department leaders and other staff members are actively involved in a variety of professional organizations providing additional opportunities for informal benchmarking against performance metrics.

The APPA review team commends the Facilities Management Department for developing the monthly operations review meeting, the Annual Utility Cost/Consumption report, and participating in the Survey of Employee Engagement and the APPA FPI Survey. These efforts demonstrate the general overall understanding and appreciation of the value of data as a piece of the decision-making process and provide an opportunity to cultivate a workforce inclined to use data and information for continuous improvement.

**Recommendation 4A**

*It is recommended FM develop and publish an annual report outlining the services provided for the university as a whole. Sharing annualized information with key stakeholders will help elevate relationships and develop advocates for the Facilities Management Department. Examples of annual reports from four facilities operations can be found at the links listed below:*


*Facilities Management for the most part has the information that it needs to support decision making, and they are using the information effectively. The one area that needs the most attention is for FM to develop more accurate benchmarking information based on measurement definitions. Specifically, this finding refers to the campus maintained gross square footage (MGSF). FM currently reports its comparative costs and staffing in relation to the campus gross square footage (GSF). The differences between GSF and MGSF are substantial and have a major impact on comparisons when using the APPA FPI Survey.*

**4.2** Describe the process that is used to incorporate the results of key performance metrics into a systematic evaluation that supports improvement of key processes, decision-making and innovation, and achieving continuous improvement within the facilities departments. Include discussions on ROI calculations.
As previously stated, FM has a defined internal performance metrics program that is providing value in support of continuous improvement initiatives. The information gathered has been instrumental in the decision to move to a zonal maintenance structure. Decisions to increase the project management fees and labor rates are also based on the measures routinely tracked and evaluated by FM leadership. Facilities Management participates in external surveys that can also support continuous improvement through benchmarking with similar peer institutions.

Return on investment (ROI) calculations were not found to be widely used criteria for the development of project decisions. This is an area that can be supported by the increased use of information within the CMMS as well as utility information.

The APPA review team found information and performance metrics to be limited to the monthly operations review meeting; the depth and breadth of the information sharing primarily to the senior executive team.

**Recommendation 4B**

*The CMMS can be used to track the labor and material cost against an asset, building, or infrastructure component. When the information is available for analysis, it can be used to calculate the ROI for the replacement of an asset or major renovation to the infrastructure or facility.*

*Facilities Management is encouraged to evaluate the collection and use of data in the CMMS to support development of deferred maintenance projects. Having the correct data in the CMMS will assist incorporating ROI calculations as a criterion in the development of deferred maintenance projects.*

4.3 Describe the process that is used to ensure that performance measures being used are current and valid, and how these align with those of peer institutions.

Facilities Management uses a variety of sources to identify performance measures. Participation in the APPA FPI Survey provides access to information for the purposes of benchmarking against peer and aspiring peer institutions. The department is also involved with other organizations, such as IFMA, where they are able to informally benchmark within the peer groups and organizations, and also uses the APPA staffing guidelines for landscape and custodial services. FM leadership indicated the measure against the national standards and aspires to improve its performance and stay current as a result. However, Facilities Management expressed the concern of having no formal method to provide a facility condition assessment. Some of the metrics used in the department’s comparative evaluation to peer institutions seemed to miss the mark by using non-similar data. For example, when UTSA makes comparisons to APPA’s FPI data points, not all criteria were in alignment to make a fair comparison.
Recommendation 4C
Facilities Management is reminded of the importance to use the proper metrics when benchmarking. One suggestion is to have a third-party analysis performed to validate that self-reported information entered into surveys such as the FPI is accurately collected and to verify that the proper peer groups are used for benchmarking. Companies such as Sightlines and VFA provide services that can be used to validate benchmarking efforts.

4.4 Describe the procedures used to communicate the results of the performance indicators and benchmarking to key campus decision makers and other interested stakeholders (internal and external) for the purpose of education, budgeting, and engagement. Describe the process used to validate the effectiveness of that communication process.

The associate vice president for FM meets regularly with the vice president for Business Affairs to discuss related issues and achievements. The associate vice president also attends the monthly staff meeting held by the vice president for Business Affairs. The assistant vice president and director for Engineering & Project Management, the director for Facilities Planning & Development, and the university architect attend a monthly Master Planning Committee meeting with various external stakeholders including the executive vice provost. And as stated previously, FM extended senior executive team has an established monthly operations review meeting that facilitates the internal review of the department’s performance metrics. However, the APPA review team identified only a few instances where the information and performance metrics were shared internally to the organization front-line supervisors and staff. Also, the performance metrics were not found to be extensively shared with key external stakeholders and clients.

Recommendation 4D
For the purposes of educating and engaging the key stakeholders (internal and external), it is recommended that FM develop strategies to increase dissemination of information and performance metrics as deep into the organization and as broadly across the institution as possible. Opportunities exist to use multiple media forms to reach out and educate and engage stakeholders. The department might consider creating a newsletter or social media platforms, posting performance metric charts centrally in shop areas, and publishing information on the FM website.

As budgets become increasingly strained, it is important for FM to consider transparency for key external stakeholders. It is recommended the department reach out to the client base for the purpose of identifying opportunities to provide information useful to them.

4.5 Describe the process used to ensure that hardware and software systems are effective, user-friendly, secure, reliable, and up-to-date. Include a description of the business continuity plan describing actions to be taken in the event of an emergency, or other out-of-normal event.
Facilities Management has two full-time staff members who help with the department’s hardware and software systems and the daily needs to keep them safe, secure, and reliable. To remain current with technology it has developed an extensive computer replacement plan that seeks to ensure regular upgrades to computer hardware and software systems. Also, FM has plans and is actively working to upgrade the CMMS software and hardware to make the system web based, and has indicated a phased approach to implementing more wireless mobile devices once the CMMS is upgraded to the web-based system.

FM has developed and documented internal procedures for reacting to certain situations and out-of-normal events and is in currently working on a comprehensive business continuity plan. Campus-wide emergency procedures and business continuity plans are in the process of being developed and are waiting for formal approval. Once developed, FM will be able to perform tabletop or formal exercises to test business continuity and emergency response plans for campus emergencies as needed to support the mission of the university.

The department has a draft vehicle replacement plan under review. During time of crisis and/or an emergency, it is imperative to have good, serviceable equipment available. Not to mention, vehicles are necessary to meet the mission of the organization on a daily basis.

The APPA review team recognizes the efforts of the Facilities Management Department to work with other institutional organizations and departments to develop and put in place a process to respond to emergencies and help ensure the continuity of business over time.

**Recommendation 4E**

Facilities Management is encouraged to continue working with institutional departments to develop response procedures and business continuity plans. However, it is important for FM to recognize emergencies result from a variety of events that will necessitate a response.

It is recommended Facilities Management develop an emergency response plan and train FM staff on how to respond, as well how they will be affected. FEMA ([http://www.fema.gov/training-0#item1](http://www.fema.gov/training-0#item1)) has developed a system that is known as the National Incident Management System (NIMS). Many of the NIMS trainings are available via web-based delivery and can be provided at no cost. NIMS is used by many first responder services, such as police and fire, and is recognized as a standard to managing emergencies and incidents that can often vary in size and scope.

It is further recommended that Facilities Management work with the appropriate IT departments to ensure all mission critical servers, required software, and files are accessible during times of crisis. This would include, but is not limited to, elements such as CAD files, infrastructure and building information, CMMS data, etc.
Facilities Management should complete the strategic vehicle replacement plan for the university. The university fleet is a critical resource when it comes to responding to emergencies effectively and efficiently.

5.0 MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

5.1 Describe the process used by the department to identify and develop position responsibilities, determine competencies required, and develop job descriptions to ensure these all align with work unit and department roles and responsibilities, and that they are well understood by all members of the staff.

Job descriptions are developed by Facilities Management in coordination with HR and are the maintained by the HR Department. Facilities Management staff members in each functional area have been intimately involved in the development of the career progression and job families/career paths where applicable. Job descriptions are developed based on specific job audits and reviewed by supervisors and facilities leaders. As job changes occur, or when discrepancies are noted, job descriptions are appropriately updated.

Facilities Management has established effective career path/job families and an organizational hierarchy that provides effective replacement planning, within the constraints associated with being a state agency. Clear employee progression guidelines have been established for housekeepers and groundskeepers, and job families/career paths and entry-level positions are especially well defined. As individuals demonstrate the appropriate level of expertise, complete specific training requirements, and have the required years of experience, they are eligible for progression from entry level to the next level. Career progression beyond that is limited primarily due to a flat organizational structure. Additionally, formal job families/career paths have been established for electricians, plumbers, project coordinators, administrative staff, utility operators, and mechanical maintenance employees and other trades functions.

The review team applauds the effort made thus far by FM to quantify requirements for skill levels and advancement paths. However, interviews with some employee groups generated concerns that the effort needs more commitment to the implementation of these requirements. Comments received indicate very little advancement and training occur and that workers need to leave the university to move ahead. Additionally, comments concerning inequities in pay are common.

Recommendation 5A
Revisit the basic objectives of the HR initiative. People are the most important resource of the FM Department. Job descriptions, needs assessments, training, and advancement opportunities should be connected to a more holistic program that is tracked with specific success factors.
5.2 Describe employee recognition programs and practices and how they are used to encourage, recognize, and reward improved performance.

Facilities Management has a well-defined employee recognition program that integrates well into the vice president for Business Affairs excellence awards. The program is flexible enough to allow nominations by peers or supervisors with a variety of submittal formats being accepted (e-mail or memo). However, the front-line maintenance, housekeeping, and grounds maintenance staff view the program’s opportunities as primarily focused on office staff positions.

The department provides monthly and quarterly employee awards as part of its Promoting Excellence in Facilities program. Details of the various elements of the recognition program were provided to the review team and are available for staff to access via the website.

Recommendation 5B
Facilities Management should consider strategies to engage the front-line staff and promote their participation in the existing recognition programs. The Excellence Awards Committee provides several opportunities to promote and improve participation through its membership selection and scoring criteria. In addition, FM may want to expand their recognition program beyond its current practice in order to provide more recognition opportunities for the staff. The current program provides four recognition opportunities a year for a staff of 319. A program that provides recognition opportunities for 10 percent of the staff that requires few administrative requirements, and delegates recognition authority to front-line supervisors may prove effective. An example of such a program is The University of Texas at Austin’s On-The-Spot Award that could be tailored to The University of Texas at San Antonio’s unique requirements. Departments are allocated On-The-Spot Awards that equate to 10 percent of full-time positions. Supervisors are delegated the authority to make the awards. Recipients get 8 hours off and a nominal item from Central Stores.

Management is encouraged to actively look for more ways to recognize employees for their work. Industry professionals have identified more than 1,000 ways to reward employees, and some of these should be considered. Some cost nothing but can yield dramatic improvements in employee productivity. 6

5.3 Describe your process for setting individual goals and how they promote innovation in the department.

The FM self-evaluation provided to the review team stated that individual development plans are incorporated into individual annual performance plans and are evaluated during the annual performance evaluation period. Although not formally requested, supervisors obtain feedback from peers and customers throughout the performance period, and this information is used to help develop staff evaluations. Key performance metrics are

---

considered during the development of individual performance plans and annual performance evaluations, but FM does not have a formal process that aligns them.

The review team noted during the interview process with front-line staff and supervisors that opportunities exist for improving a uniform and consistent application of this method of setting annual individual goals. This seemed to be practiced by supervisors/managers of the professional staff and for managers and supervisory level staff but is not effectively practiced at the front-line levels in maintenance and operations.

**Recommendation 5C**

It is recommended that FM increase its capability to work with staff in all areas of training, education, and development. The focus should first include an assessment of individual needs for skills and abilities needed to keep abreast and current for individual job requirements, followed by an assessment of needs for leadership/management development. APPA programs such as the Institute for Facilities Management, Supervisors Toolkit, and the Leadership Academy should be considered, along with participation in regional and international APPA association functions.

Goals for individuals are intended to be set through the annual performance review process. In practice, it seems that few managers and supervisors are following this procedure. When it comes to promoting innovation in the workplace, it is left up to the individual managers to incorporate this into the performance evaluation process. It is recommended that a more rigorous process for goal setting and follow up be implemented.

Facilities Management is a large department that has substantial needs for assistance from an HR professional and could benefit greatly from strengthening its internal HR capabilities.

5.4 Describe how the facilities department fosters an organizational culture that rewards cooperation, communication, and skill sharing across work units.

Performance evaluations are aligned with FM goals and objectives that are aligned to the FM strategic plan, which is further aligned with the Business Affairs and institutional strategic plans, all of which include core values and mission statements. Business Affairs recently created guiding principles for the entire organization. Additionally, training on these guiding principles is mandatory for all staff and is offered in bilingual formats.

The university’s annual merit program rewards employees for their achievements toward meeting departmental goals and objectives. The Celebrating Excellence award program recognizes the staff for their accomplishments and achievements. The vice president for Business Affairs has a complimentary recognition program.
5.5 Describe how work performance and attendance expectations are reviewed and the process used to communicate such information to employees.

The university has well-defined attendance policies that are reported to be discussed during an employee’s evaluation period and at periodic staff meetings.

Facilities Management supervisors continuously monitor staff performance and provide feedback to employees on both positive and negative performance actions. Supervisors may obtain feedback from peers and customers throughout the performance period, and this information is then used to help the supervisor conduct individual performance evaluations. When necessary, supervisors employ appropriate progressive discipline to assist employees in improving their individual performance. Employees demonstrating exceptional performance may be nominated for the Celebrating Excellence award.

See recommendation in 5C.

5.6 Describe how career development needs are assessed, provided, and monitored.

All FM supervisors are required to complete the Facilities Fundamental Supervisory curriculum, which was developed in coordination with the HR Department. Business skills training is provided by HR and the Office of Information Technology. Additional formal training is provided to individuals in specific job functions when requirements are identified.

**Recommendation 5D**

*Typically, the assessment, provisions, and conduct of career development needs of individuals is not a strong skill set for FM supervisors. Goals for individuals are intended to be set through the annual performance review process.*

*Additional action is needed to make a management commitment to an investment in the growth and development of the FM staff through training, seminars, professional involvement, career ladders, and other means that unlock human potential. The recognition for growth and development of the staff should be given a higher priority and must be supported with financial resources, as well as a philosophy that supports employee development. Given the circumstances of geographic location, local area employment competition, and other economic realities, it makes sense that any investment in preparing people to become more productive and effective will produce an attractive return on investment.*

5.7 Describe the processes used by the organization, both at the institutional and departmental level, to promote organizational diversity both in its workforce and leadership.

Facilities Management has established hiring practices that are consistent with university and state guidelines. The department has formal written guidelines that mandate non-FM
stakeholders as well as multiple staff level representation on prospective employee selection and interview committees.

Although there was no data on diversity shared with the review team, it is apparent from our interactions with so many members of the FM community that it is a very diverse department. No interview participant expressed a concern about the department’s diversity.

5.8 Describe how the organization utilizes both formal and informal assessment methods and measures to determine employee well being, employee satisfaction, and motivation.

The vice president for Business Affairs conducts a biennial survey (SEE) of employee engagement. This has been discussed in criterion 1.2 of this report.

Recommendation 5E
Facilities Management leaders are encouraged to continue with the development and implementation of an action plan to target those dimensions viewed to be most important to improving job satisfaction.

5.9 Describe the approaches used to ensure the effectiveness of recruitment programs to provide well-qualified staff and to retain high performers.

The university is mandated by state regulations to publically post all new and vacant positions. For certain positions, posting are sent to professional associations such as APPA, IFMA, AFE, AIA, and others.

Staff retention is based on annual performance evaluations that result in merit awards and potential promotional opportunities. Upward mobility opportunities are available in newly formed job families with defined career paths. Maintenance supervisors indicated that the hiring process has greatly improved over time, and there is sufficient flexibility for the hiring official to bring forward qualified candidates within the prescribed hiring process. The front-line housekeeping staff indicated that housekeeping uses the same hiring official for all hires and that candidates are coached on how to respond; specifically, claiming higher levels of English proficiency and increasing the risk of hiring candidates with less actual capability.

Recommendation 5F
Facilities Management managers are reminded that errors in employee selection are costly and time consuming to correct. Correcting a selection error may result in transferring or terminating a worker or changing a worker’s assignment, either of which is an unfortunate outcome that should be avoided. Correcting a selection error cannot only be stressful to the manager, but it can also demoralize the misplaced worker and his or her co-workers. It also requires that the manager spend unexpected time on recruiting, selecting, and training a replacement or in some cases restructuring the way work is done.
5.10 Describe the processes used by both the department and the institution for orienting new employees so they can successfully fulfill their responsibilities.

Human Resources host Day O.N.E. @ UTSA (Orientation for New Employees) for benefits-eligible staff employees three times monthly. During the program, employees are acquainted with the university, provided information about employment and benefits, and complete all required documents. Orientation is mandatory for all new benefits-eligible staff employees at The University of Texas at San Antonio. All facilities employees are provided orientation in their specific work areas, as needed.

Facilities Management and Human Resources have collaborated on the development and provision of additional supervisory training to ensure supervisors are managing their employees consistent with university policy and practices. This training is viewed as very successful by HR as it has improved the supervisors’ management of their direct reports. In addition, new employees receive training in the guiding principles to align them with the commitment to provide excellent customer service in a courteous timely and efficient manner.

**Recommendation 5G**

*New employee orientation effectively integrates the new employee into the organization and assists with retention, motivation, and job satisfaction and can quickly enable each individual to become a contributing member of the work team. Keeping in mind that you never get a second chance to make a first impression, FM managers should make absolutely sure that new hires feel welcome, valued, and prepared for what lies ahead during the new employee orientation process.*

*It is recommended that the FM orientation process be a written procedure with an appropriate checklist of items to cover those items that managers and supervisors can use in the orientation process.*

5.11 Describe the processes used to determine appropriate staffing levels, based on identified and approved operational performance standard(s).

Facilities Management conducts staffing analyses using APPA guidelines to determine staffing needs and provides recommendations for additional staff to support new campus development.

The department also performs a number of scenario planning efforts, including reviewing contract versus self-performance of housekeeping and thermal plant management, evaluating preventive maintenance service levels, evaluating alternative methodologies for maintenance of academic equipment, providing business plans for capital projects and reviewing various system life cycle costs on major projects.
5.12 Describe how the department manages and organizes its workforce to accomplish its advertised mission and objectives.

Facilities Management O&M has developed an organizational structure focused on client support, blending the zonal maintenance construction with shop and off-site maintenance support. As a result, zone maintenance is structured around client support in lieu of being geographically assigned, such as the case with E&G, Research, and Auxiliaries. While the organizational structure is not widely understood by campus customers, those who do understand it view it in a positive manner, especially in the area of research, as the zone structure simplified the communication of maintenance issues and necessary protocols for the specialty space. Organizing by “client” does create some challenges for shared use buildings and associated shared building systems in assigning ownership for trouble calls. In addition, the relatively few numbers of technicians within the zones does not allow for sufficient depth for critical skills (electricians and plumbers). The zone supervisors are currently mitigating this through good communications and loaned labor. Zone supervisors, along with the landscape service supervisor, report to the assistant director of O&M, who in turn reports to the director of O&M. Preventative maintenance and operations function as central shops and both report directly to the director of O&M. It does not appear that the current organizational structure is negatively impacting the ability of the technicians to work collaboratively. Facilities Management and Environmental Health Services (EHS) are currently discussing an option to realign fire sprinkler maintenance and inspections from EHS to Facilities Management.

Housekeeping services is organized into geographical zones with each zone primarily working a day or night shift. Housekeeping services reports up through the director of Customer Service.
Planning and Development, and Engineering and Project Management organizational structures seem to work well for UTSA.

**Recommendation 5I**
Consider additional consolidation between preventative maintenance, Downtown Campus, and the different zone maintenance functions in order to increase the size of the work groups to enable better work management without the necessity of loaned labor. In addition, there may be some benefits to having the functions more closely aligned under a single director. Facilities should continue developing the option to move fire sprinkler maintenance from EHS to FM.

Assess the value of housekeeping services day and night shift structures with the objective of moving to the same model campus wide where it makes sense. It is unclear as to whether or not there is an advantage of one shift over the other as far as service to the clients is concerned, and there is at least the perception that moving more work from day to night shifts is being resisted by the housekeeping staff who prefer to work days. With the relatively low salaries being paid to the housekeepers, a night shift differential could serve as a catalyst for staff support if the university determines night shifts are a more efficient delivery method for custodial services. In addition, housekeeping should consider moving to a team cleaning method as outlined in Section 7.0: Performance Results.

5.13 Describe how the department identifies needs for improvement and measures progress in the areas of regulatory requirements, health, safety, emergency preparedness, and security. Describe the processes used to train employees in these categories and how the effectiveness of those training programs is ascertained.

The Environmental, Health, Safety, Risk Management Department is functionally separated from Facilities Management and is responsible for regulatory requirements and health and safety. The UTSA-Police Department is responsible for physical security and emergency preparedness. There is a charter between Facilities Management and EHSRM that clearly defines roles and responsibilities of each group.

Overall safety awareness is high and periodic training on hazards is accomplished. Regular safety training is provided for asbestos, blood borne pathogen, etc., regularly by EHSRM. Documentation of safety related training is kept with EHSRM. Code changes are discussed annually during re-certification of plumbers, electricians, and other continuing education is provided to the trade shops.

**Recommendation 5J**
It is recommended that a more disciplined schedule of life safety and safety training be developed and that this training be determined by management to be mandatory. Attendance at training sessions should be recorded and documented. This is especially important for required training on such topics as asbestos, lock-out/tag-out procedures,
confined spaces, and other hazardous materials such as lead and PCBs, laboratory safety, and ongoing needs for equipment operation safety.

6.0 PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Effective process management addresses how the facilities organization manages key product and service design, delivery processes, and continuous improvement. Process management includes various systems or “core competencies” such as work management, performance standards, estimating systems, planning, design, and construction of new or renovated facilities, space management, event management, and other key processes that affect facilities functions.

6.1 It is critical that a facilities organization understand its “core competencies” and how they relate to the mission, environment, and strategic goals in areas of:

- Administration
- Operations and maintenance
- Planning, design, and construction
- Utilities and energy

Describe:
- How the core competencies described in criterion 6.1 contribute to the delivery of customer value, organization success, and stewardship, in your organization.
- The facilities performance indicators and related measures for each core competency
- How the core competencies support compliance and coordination with the agencies having jurisdiction?

Many campus facilities organizations operate in independent units with little or no communication or collaboration between them. In these circumstances, individual units are left to develop their own “style” of customer service and do not work cohesively as a department to ensure that services are coordinated between them. Processes are developed in a vacuum with little or no regard to how those processes may affect or contradict other units within the same department. In the case of UTSA, however, there is an overall cohesiveness in their approach to process development and customer service. The processes that have been put into place ensure that the department takes a unified approach to process management and customer service. The numerous processes that are necessary for the daily conduct of the many different facility responsibilities are performed very well. As gaps in service levels are discovered, metrics for these deficiencies are developed and monitored for improvement.

The internal processes used by the department provide an ongoing challenge for management to ensure that they are user-friendly, efficient, appropriate, and necessary. Some of the processes, such as those required in the conduct of capital project development,
are perceived by campus customers who have had limited experience in working with the processes, as being unnecessary and bureaucratic in nature. This is not an unusual reaction, since the average lay person does not have a clear understanding of the need for managing risk, for the importance of a due diligence effort, and the numerous regulatory requirements associated with construction projects. This does emphasize management’s need to increase communication on capital project processes in order to help the customer better understand the requirements. There was also very little evidence presented to the review team to demonstrate that construction costs were benchmarked against peer institutions.

The CMMS system (TMA) is used to dispatch, schedule, and track operations maintenance and preventive maintenance work, financial operating budget performance, customer satisfaction, staffing levels, energy and resource conservation, capital project budgets, project progress, and to schedule event set ups and moves. The utilization of the TMA work management system provides the framework for creating metrics and tracking improvements. The many metrics utilized by the department offer a good snapshot over a wide range of the services provided. All of the operational units of the department are represented in the tracking of KPIs and participate in the department’s efforts to maintain the necessary management of all processes. While the ongoing measurements offer a good snapshot of departmental performance against past performance, they do not always align with recognized industry standards. It appears that the UTSA data does not always follow the metric definitions that would help ensure accurate comparisons.

There is a focused effort to coordinate the hiring and training of specific core competency experts to address compliance with applicable agencies having jurisdiction. There is a close partnership with ESHRM through the use of a charter to coordinate work between the departments. There are also various professional staff members and external consultants that ensure that the university’s project work is in compliance with all applicable building codes and regulations.

**Recommendation 6A**

The metrics used to measure the progress and success of processes should be examined in the context of the published APPA FPI standards to ensure that an actual comparison of performance against peer institutions is possible. This effort should include a comparison of construction costs to peer institutions so that campus constituents have the appropriate context for costs comparisons and a better understanding of total project costs. With regard to capital projects, Facilities Planning and Development reported that they prepare initial project budgets that are always either compared to peer institutions or developed by professional cost estimators. This information is ALWAYS shared with customers. For institutional projects, a detailed scoping document and cost estimate is developed and this information is shared with customers prior to moving forward with the project. Many of these projects are performed by one of two competitively procured job order contractors whose agreements require that cost
estimates be developed using RS Means comparative construction cost data. Campus customers who were interviewed did not seem to be aware of this.

The TMA CMMS system has a great deal of capability that goes far beyond simple work-order management. Augmenting the CMMS to track all types of work by creating functional coding to be used in analysis is invaluable. Additionally, areas of materials management, O&M information retention and use, fleet management, tool management, etc., are valuable tools for data development into information, and subsequently, knowledge of the FM operation.

6.2 Describe the processes used to establish measurements for process inputs and outputs required to achieve efficiency and effectiveness.

There is a focused effort to develop, understand, and utilize KPIs to measure the department’s progress toward established goals and priorities. Each unit of the department has developed its own set of work processes that have a defined measurement for improvement or deficiency. Accepted industry standards are used as benchmarks to measure various aspects of the organization, with a particular emphasis on APPA’s Facilities Performance Indicators program.

The monthly operations review meetings are focused on measuring and analyzing performance metrics and KPIs. The KPIs were selected specifically to align with the FM strategic plan. This forum also provides an avenue for employee recommendations for service improvements. Facilities Management is dedicated to being a data driven organization, and as the department moves further into more sophisticated use of the CMMS, they will logically need to develop KPIs that are increasingly focused on the locally defined mission.

6.3 Describe how stakeholders are involved in the development and implementation of core processes.

Regular monthly meetings with selected internal stakeholders are held to review service levels and departmental performance. These meetings involve various customers from business affairs, student life, housing, academic affairs, and other campus stakeholders. In addition, there are regular meetings with the Master Plan Committee to ensure that the campus master plan is followed and with various members of the system Office of Facilities Planning & Construction to ensure that compliance is in line with state procurement policies and procedures required through the capital construction program. The university has also developed a comprehensive set of design and construction standards for capital projects that are coordinated with University of Texas System mechanical and electrical standards. There is some difference of opinion, however, as to what the focus of the design and construction standards should be between OFPC and the UTSA university architect’s office. There was general agreement that the construction portion of the standards were adequate, but OFPC believes that the standards are too focused on design issues while the
university architect believes that there should be a larger focus and tighter control over
design issues.

**Recommendation 6B**

*While there may be disagreements regarding the focus and use of design standards, different design professionals will have different opinions on many issues impacting project design. UTSA has met with OFPC over the years and has resolved many of these differences.*

6.4 Describe the protocol established to evaluate processes established to determine opportunities for improving efficiency and effectiveness and value to the success of the organization.

Leaders within the department meet on a regular basis at the monthly operations review meeting to share the full range of KPIs across units. This meeting provides a forum for the comparison of different performance areas and facilitates discussion among departmental leadership around accomplishments and areas for improvement. UTSA also conducts periodic peer reviews to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of current processes.

The missing link in this approach seems to be the omission of the customer from the examination of processes. While Facilities Management customer surveys solicit customer feedback on departmental performance, some elements of customer satisfaction get overlooked. An example of this was a consistently expressed concern related to the 4 percent management fee that is uniformly charged to institutionally managed projects. The origination, administration, and basis for this fee are shrouded in mystery among almost all customers, and there is no avenue or platform for customers to engage in conversations about this practice. Some customers expressed a desire for different recharge approaches such as an hourly rate or a “not to exceed” flat fee. There was some suspicion that the percentage-based approach was a disincentive to minimize project costs. This was particularly true on projects in which OFPC was involved, leading customers to believe that they were paying double for duplicative efforts.

There was also a fair amount of discussion and concern by the project coordinators and senior project managers related to professional services’ errors and omissions responsibility. There appears to be “an unwritten rule” when a design team’s errors and omissions exceed 1 percent to 1.5 percent of the construction cost; at that point some degree of accountability on the part of the design team is triggered. This appears to be some policy from OFPC that has never been invoked at UTSA, but there is a high amount of anxiety that it might happen sometime in the future.

**Recommendation 6C**

*Provide a forum for customer feedback on departmental processes and cost allocations. Examine the legitimacy of the current project charge rate structure, benchmark costs with peer institutions, and explain the basis to campus customers.*
7.0 PERFORMANCE RESULTS

The performance of a facilities organization can be assessed in a number of ways: campus appearance, customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, effectiveness of systems operations, financial results, and supplier/business partner results. Having measurement tools in place to assess such performance is critical in an environment of continuous improvement.

7.1 Describe processes in place to ensure that the appearance of the buildings and grounds is in keeping with the surrounding community as well as the desired image of the institution.

The UTSA campus buildings and grounds are intensely utilized; UTSA leads the University of Texas System campuses in space utilization and is among the highest in students per building per gross-square-foot measures. Additionally, it is noted that the average age of campus buildings has increased to the point where many building components have reached or exceeded their useful life expectancy. This is an important factor when considering the wear and tear on facilities and the requirements for building maintenance, custodial services, and grounds maintenance.

Facilities Management has some excellent guiding documents to help in its effort to achieve a high level of campus appearance such as the campus master plan that includes architectural elements for new construction and landscape design. It is recognized that the campus has been evolving from a commuter campus to a more urbanized environment and that campus standards must be revised to support new goals and aspirations. Efforts to solidify these standards and maintain a current set of design guidelines is crucial for the development of the campus to remain on track with institutional and strategic goals.

The above noted, it remains incumbent upon the facilities organization to provide the best possible physical conditions that approved budgets can provide.

The APPA review team commends FM staff and its leadership team for all the hard work they are doing to achieve the desired image of the campus physical plant. Our findings and recommendations described in criterion 7.2 below, specific to campus appearance, indicate that there are a number of opportunities for improvement in campus appearance. FM appears to have a competent workforce and is building workforce capability and capacity to succeed. The review team recognizes that FM is achieving great results in light of a challenging and aging infrastructure, campus growth and change, and tough economic times. Overall, the campus community has acknowledged and appreciated the continued facilities improvements.

7.2 Describe how the organization determines that the condition and cleanliness of facilities are in keeping with the image and standards adopted by the institution as well as activities associated with its mission and programs.
Housekeeping

Facilities Housekeeping (custodial services) Department has established custodial service levels developed from APPA custodial guidelines and through customer meetings. These service levels are posted on the FM website and are included in service level agreements with reimbursable customers. Custodial supervisors inspect the buildings periodically to verify the APPA cleaning levels are being delivered.

While the cleaning standards are well defined, they are not consistently delivered across the campus. The current housekeeping organizational structure assigns cleaning responsibilities for buildings to individual staff members with housekeeping supervisors periodically inspecting the work to ensure standard compliance. The lack of specificity in task assignment, differing levels of expertise in the housekeeping staff, and differing expectations of housekeeping supervisors, results in the delivery of inconsistent cleaning levels. In addition, the housekeeping staff recognizes the differing supervisor expectations can cause morale issues.

Recommendation 7A
Under the current Quality Assurance (inspection) program, develop a formal standardized inspection program with the inspector coming from outside the department. Results are typically more reliable and reporting can be used as a performance metric in the monthly operations meeting with more confidence. FM may not need someone from outside the department if the Quality Assurance program is more structured. Additionally, it is recommended that customer survey feedback should be utilized to determine whether or not cleaning levels meet the client’s expectations and to ensure consistent cleaning levels are maintained across campus.

Consider moving toward a more structured cleaning procedure that identifies responsibilities related to specific cleaning tasks along with the time to complete them. Well-defined quality control protocols should be followed by supervisors to obtain objective assessments of cleaning levels. The OS1 Team Cleaning System provides an example of a cleaning management strategy that meets these objectives. The University of Texas at Austin and the University of Michigan effectively utilize the OS1 Team Cleaning System.

Grounds Maintenance
The review team was disappointed in the appearance of the campus grounds, and we believe that FM can do a better job of presenting the exterior campus appearance to faculty, staff, students, visitors, neighbors, friends, and alumni who come onto the campus. Members of the university community described with surprising accuracy grounds maintenance appearance issues throughout the campus that underscores the importance of the grounds and landscape appearance to the campus community. It is clear from the

---

7 Management and OS1 are registered trademarks of Management Inc. www.managemen.com.
interviews with all those who participated in the review process that campus appearance is a meaningful measure of how well FM is performing.

The review team recognizes the difficulties and unique challenges working in the UTSA property terrain and the restrictive Edwards Aquifer recharge zone. These are special environmental challenges and the recent drought conditions only serve to complicate matters, but these unique requirements should not be a reason for poor performance, lower quality of service, or the absence of best landscape practices.

The completed campus master plan sets appearance guidelines for campus buildings and grounds. The Campus Master Plan committee was described to the review team as a committee that meets regularly to discuss any changes and to approve all plans for renovations and new construction on campus that impact appearance. FM also reported that guidelines for service levels are utilized for grounds appearance.

The following recommendations are made with the acknowledgment that there may be resource constraints that could delay full implementation. An “all-out” and focused plan of action should be implemented to approve the appearance of the campus grounds.

**Recommendation 7B**

*The campus master plan contains elements of a campus landscape plan that can help guide grounds and landscape improvement. The new Wayfinding project is a good example of utilizing the recommendations of the master plan. Determine what it would take to establish a higher level of care for the entire UTSA campus grounds. If grounds maintenance standards do exist, then examine the appropriateness of these standards for meeting acceptable appearance. Use the results of this analysis to propose future maintenance, budgeting, and grounds management decisions.*

*Eyesores in the campus landscape and unmanageable areas should be identified and prioritized. To effectively realize improvements in the overall campus landscape appearance, these areas should be targeted for improvement and viewed within the concepts of the master plan. It is further recommended that the grounds area secure the assistance and guidance of a qualified landscape architect working with a knowledgeable grounds maintenance person on the FM staff. Many examples were provided by customers of new landscaping that was installed only to be ripped out and removed after maintenance neglect.*

*Designate a single individual to be responsible for landscape aesthetics and quality control issues on the campus. Many universities assign this responsibility to the university architect who, among other duties, is responsible for the image of the physical environment. Campuses that do not have a landscape architect on staff have retained an outside landscape architect as a consultant who understands the campus plan and constraints, and who is regularly called upon to assist in both design and management of the campus landscape improvement.*
The university architect should coordinate all aesthetic aspects of the campus environment and thereby help to establish and “promote a UTSA sense of place.” FM should prioritize the image and appearance of the campus in ongoing budgetary decisions and allocation of resources. The campus exterior spaces can serve to expand the university’s learning environment.

The image of the campus exterior presentation should be as important in fiscal allocations as other (largely unseen) infrastructure improvements. As a strategy, it would be prudent to attach a requirement for a campus aesthetic improvement to every project, provided that project budgets can bear the cost.

Senior FM managers should spend as much time as possible out and on the campus assessing the quality and aesthetics of the physical environment. This time will foster better connections with the larger campus community and with the FM grounds team.

Building Maintenance and Operations

FM has several programs or tools in place that enable staff to provide service levels typically associated with the funding levels provided. These include the following:

- Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) to track all maintenance work. The system allows for various entries to differentiate the work into categories of priority, type, time and materials consumed, and actions taken. This system allows for analysis of work orders to identify problem areas to prioritize the effort going forward.
- Preventive maintenance program to be proactive in equipment repair.
- Facility Condition Assessment (FCA) to identify areas beyond their useful life and needing replacement.
- Well-trained and competent workforce.
- Well-defined procedure/process for how work requests flow through the department with feedback on how customers are satisfied with results.
- Operational rounds of machine rooms and the linking of building automation system (BAS).

Although there is room for improvement, the department is providing a level of service that is commensurate with funding and the intense level of activity of the campus community. Customer interviews generally support the review team’s perception that the buildings are being well maintained.

Performance results can be improved by fully applying the tools mentioned above and by exploring new work processes that can be used to maximize worker efficiency. In this way, service levels can be maintained should resource reductions take place. These tools can also be used to enhance performance, provided the necessary resources are available.
Examples of the performance enhancing strategies are:

- 100 percent scheduling of workforce,
- Pre-planning of complex and multitrade work orders,
- Geographic zoning of the workforce to reduce travel time (locate shop work spaces in the zones), and
- Asset management to prolong asset life and reduce replacement cycle costs.

Link BAS system with CMMS to get rapid response of equipment failure that can impact energy costs.

Facilities Management is encouraged to continue to develop and refine campus design guidelines to ensure that new campus facilities can be maintained and aligned with the campus master plan, TCO, and institutional strategic goals.

7.3 Describe how the department assesses that building systems, infrastructure, and utility systems are maintained and operated at a level of reliability and efficiency that contributes to the successful implementation of the institution’s mission and programs.

The monthly operation review meeting is used to review operational metrics for building and infrastructure systems. Facilities Management uses service level guidelines defined by APPA for maintenance, and O&M performance is mapped against APPA categories, as well as other regulatory requirements, to determine the appropriate levels of service for the varied customer base.

Energy utilization is monitored by a dedicated energy manager to identify aberrant consumption, and a project is in progress to meter additional buildings for improved monitoring. A prioritized list of utility/infrastructure upgrades (for both reliability and efficiency) is maintained, and funding opportunities for these upgrades are sought as opportunities present themselves.

The review team believes that the tracking mechanism is providing very good high-level data for determining compliance with current departmental targets. Also, the programs in place will produce the expected level of performance. However, the team also believes the levels of performance, and thereby the service levels, can be improved with better reporting at lower levels in the organization. It does not appear that the front-line organization is operating in a rich data environment.

Recommendation 7C
Disseminate work metrics to lower levels of the organization with associated targets for shops to achieve. See recommendations for 7A.

7.4 Describe the processes established to ensure that funding resources are effectively used and are adequate to support a level of facilities maintenance that prevents the deferral of major maintenance and repairs.
Annual funding for O&M at UTSA is not unlike many universities since it is not adequate to prevent the deferral of needed maintenance. The UTSA deferred maintenance program has been formalized and includes key staff from operations and maintenance, engineering, and planning to identify and prioritize known deficiencies based on historical data and limited facilities condition assessments. FM has completed FCAs of a representative sample of facilities and has plans to perform a comprehensive FCA of all major facilities. Facilities Management uses the University of Texas System Facility Resource Renewal Model, which provides predictive information regarding building component life cycles and expected renewal requirements. This information provides a starting point for identification of potential facility renewal requirements and is used to identify annual deferred maintenance funding requests.

The challenge for FM is that current practices and actions must be prioritized to capture the most value from the available funds that are less than necessary to extend the useful life of campus buildings, prevent premature replacement, and promote orderly, planned capital projects to address facility renovation and renewal needs. FM may want to pursue supplementing the current practice with the assistance of a third-party agency to perform building condition auditing and data assessment and to provide reports and recommendations. This can be done in multiyear cycles such as a five-year cycle with a different area or zone of the campus scrutinized each year. This kind of assessment can also be supplemented with internal staff building audits where work orders and projects in buildings are examined to more accurately assess the condition of the buildings.

Facilities Management may find it helpful also to review the January/February 2013 APPA Facilities Manager magazine article titled, “Facilities Condition Assessment from A to Z,” by Frank Kaleb, PE, AICP. The article provides an overview of the options for performing facility condition assessments in five different categories:

- Comprehensive
- Systems based
- Qualitative
- Hybrid
- Life-cycle modeling

One of the most comprehensive studies of the life-cycle approach to determining facility capital renewal requirements for colleges and universities using the Pacific Partners Consulting Group model adopted by the University of Texas System can be found at [www.sucf.sunyfac/rockefeller.doc](http://www.sucf.sunyfac/rockefeller.doc).

7.5 Describe the tools used to assess whether the staff is highly motivated and productive, taking pride in the accomplishment of their duties.

Business Affairs conducts biennial surveys of employee engagement and FM results have both scored satisfactorily and increased for each of the three surveys conducted in the past
six years. The only area with a below standard satisfaction rating is in the area of compensation, which employees consistently score low. This instrument for determining engagement is both proven and more importantly repeatable. It establishes a baseline from which subsequent surveys can be trended. Unfortunately, the review team did not see any action plans targeted to the survey results as a planned approach to improvement.

Facilities Management also conducts quarterly “all staff” meetings that review the overall progress, accomplishments, and successes of the organization. At this meeting, employees are given the opportunity to bring forward concerns and suggestions to senior leadership. These meetings give management an opportunity to hear first-hand from the front-line staff on issues of concern. The review team did not find any indication that data collected from these meeting is used in any specific action plan to address concerns.

The monthly operations review meeting has also been mentioned as a means for gaining knowledge by tracking KPIs. It remains unclear which KPIs will provide the desired results.

In each case, adequate measures and ample opportunities are in place to gain a thorough understanding of employee concerns.

7.6 Describe the processes used to ensure that the levels of service are consistent with customer needs and requirements and within the facilities department’s capability.

The Office of Facilities Management has established several traditional methods of communication and feedback from customers. These include:

- Service guidelines and written communication/notification guidelines for both emergency and nonemergency work are posted on the FM website.
- FM staff has established and regularly participates in a number of standing meetings whose primary purpose is to inform customers and communicate the status of projects and other facilities-related activities.
- FM has developed a customer services department that includes a communication and customer representative; it also maintains a very effective FM website.
- An automated work-request process and formal methodology for entering work orders into the system has been developed.
- Construction/renovation project expectations are communicated to customers through a work plan and detailed cost estimates that are approved by customers.
- Service level agreements with auxiliary and other fee-funded customers that include very clear levels of service and the basis for each level of service are in place. Facilities Management meets with its customers annually to determine their operational requirements and then enters into a negotiated service level agreement. All services are billed to customers monthly.
All of these methods are tried and true means of communication, yet the review team found serious deficiencies in precisely how FM has implemented these various methods. See Section 3.0: Customer Focus for further details of these findings.

**Recommendations 7D**

Even though the above methods are usually effective, interviews with various customers reveal that more work is needed to achieve the desired results. It is possible that the above-mentioned methods are one dimensional, without adequate customer engagement. It would be valuable to establish more customer input to the means of communication and the exact nature of service delivery. It was mentioned in Section 2.0: Facilities Strategic and Operational Planning that the customer as a stakeholder in the process may not have been as strongly represented as they should have been. The seemingly failure of customers to recognize FM’s efforts at communication may be attributable to a lack of input into the process.

It is also recommended that the tools described above be used to extract more information on how they (customers) need the process to proceed in order to be successful. A formal customer satisfaction survey may also be very useful toward this end. It is recognized that customer interaction is a difficult arena to succeed in, especially when resources are declining. Nonetheless, continued diligence is the only acceptable alternative.

**7.7 Describe how managers and supervisors are encouraged and enabled to stay in touch with the needs of higher education, and how they relate to their own institution.**

Facilities Management has participated in a number of professional association benchmark studies and a few ad hoc programs, but as a whole, participation and recognition of activities that can enhance the FM understanding of the needs of higher education has not been enough.

**Recommendation 7E**

The FM leadership team should take the time to engender collaborative relationships with the various departments on campus. In the on-site interviews, the FM leaders were often described as “approachable” and “responsive,” therefore the increased interaction with customers would be welcomed. This increased interaction would allow the campus to comfortably discuss their needs with FM leaders. The department also has a formal process to monitor the needs of the campus through the use of monthly customer forums. A similar format should be utilized for FM leaders to meet periodically with the academic deans and/or their facility representatives.

There is also a need for FM leaders and staff to increase their participation in regional and national meetings and associations. The Central Regional Association of APPA (CAPPA) and the International Association of APPA are good places to gain additional insights into the specific needs of higher education facilities issues.
In addition, FM leaders should utilize and share the knowledge gained from their participation on councils, committees, and campus working groups.

Planning staff members and project managers regularly work closely with academic staff, faculty and the provost’s office representatives on construction, space planning, space utilization, technology, and other higher education matters. The insights learned from these interactions should be shared among other FM staff. All of this interaction helps FM stay in touch with the bigger picture of campus needs and the needs of higher education.

8.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

At the request of the institutional representative, this section would include any items or subjects that are not covered by the criteria in Sections 1 through 7. These items may include those things that are specific to the campus.

8.1 FM Organization Structure

The APPA review team found that Facilities Management leadership may want to consider a realignment of the functions and service provided by Business Operations. These functions and services, which are under the very capable direction of the director for Business Operations, are “corporate” services and functions. In other words, these services and functions serve the entire Office of Facilities Management enterprise. They are again, corporate functions and appropriately should report directly to the associate vice president for Facilities.

The current organizational alignment has these functions reporting to the assistant vice president for Facilities, which is a division of Facilities Management, with a primary focus on O&M. This alignment may restrict the overall impact and effectiveness of this unit.

Additionally, this review, and particularly Section 3.0: Customer Focus, has raised serious questions as to the effectiveness of the organizational structure and alignment of the customer service functions. Traditionally, housekeeping and events management are O&M responsibilities because there are many interdependencies and requirements for collaboration, partnering, cooperation, and coordination between the two and the functions and services provided by O&M.
CONCLUSION

The University of Texas at San Antonio is a challenging environment that contains all of the complex elements requiring application of comprehensive professional facilities management practices. Because of the institutional focus on achieving and sustaining its distinctive mission and vision, the requirements and demands for high-quality campus facilities and facilities services are rigorous and persistent.

In today’s highly competitive higher education environment, achieving functional excellence in engineering, building maintenance, grounds and landscaping, utility and energy management, planning, design and construction, environmental sustainability, and campus safety are functions that are strongly emphasized. How all these elements come together and provide value for the university is what really matters. It is emphasized that increasing interdependencies among facility functions demands a strong leadership team that works well together. Success for FM involves a long-term view, a balancing act for resource allocation, and demands the kind of leadership that understands how all the institutional components work together. Most certainly, effective leadership of a facilities department requires the care and feeding of the bricks and mortar and other tangible physical assets of the institution. The achievement of the Facilities Management “group purpose,” with a shared understanding of mission, principles, and values, is also a complex and challenging human endeavor that is as much a function of the people and the values the organization brings to the campus as it is the approaches chosen to deliver services for the care of campus buildings and grounds.

UTSA is a dynamic environment that will continue to change. FM will continue to be challenged to build onto its organizational capability to serve a highly intensive and utilized physical plant, to understand customer requirements and needs, and to continue to find ways to do more with fewer resources. Therefore, it is important for the department leaders to remember just how difficult it is to achieve and to sustain high levels of service excellence in the midst of changing times and to have patience while remaining strategic in moving the organization ahead.

Organizational structures, program requirements, and service demands will need to be flexible, malleable, and adaptable to the continuing institutional change requirements. The type of change required will vary and FM leaders are just beginning to understand that they must not only be fully engaged throughout the campus and strive to develop appropriate responses to new service requirements, but they must develop a sharper understanding of customer and stakeholder needs. As FM seeks to chart its own right path in this dynamic environment, the penalties for failing to adapt could be severe, and the rewards for genuine innovation and change germane to the campus needs will likely be substantial.
The APPA review team congratulates Associate Vice President for Facilities David Riker, all members of the FM leadership team, and the entire staff of FM who have performed the extensive work to complete the self-evaluation for this review and who have had the courage to open their organization to the review team’s critical assessment. The APPA review team was impressed with the quality of so many individuals who we met during our interview process.

In times of challenge, achieving organizational success involves leadership, vision, strong core values and ethical practices, agility, customer focus, and service quality. It has been said that “performance feedback is the breakfast of champions,” and on your behalf, we have interviewed dozens of people on campus and people within Facilities Management. The participation of this constituency in the Facilities Management Evaluation Program has helped inform this review. Throughout this report, the review team has identified and genuinely commended numerous areas of FM organizational strength and recommended improvements and insights for addressing continuing challenges that are informed by the review teams many years of experience.

It is the hope of this team that the recommendations contained in this report will prove to be of value and benefit to the university and that our site visitation was helpful to all those whom we had the opportunity to meet.

All members of the APPA review team, Daniel Costello, Viron Lynch, Rich Robben, Steve Thweatt, and Jack Hug, found the review to be both a challenging and professionally rewarding experience.