



Facilities Employee Satisfaction Survey Results CRC Research Office

Purpose: The purpose of the survey was to assess employee satisfaction with the various aspects of the programs and processes that support facilities development and maintenance.

Methodology: The Research Office worked with Cory Wathen to develop the survey instrument, which was available online. All employees were invited to participate, and one reminder was sent during the three-week survey period.

Overview of Results: One hundred eleven employees responded to the survey (an overall response rate of 17%). Over 11% of the respondents were adjunct instructors (a 5% response rate), almost 28% were classified staff (a 14% response rate) and just over 43% of respondents were full-time professors (a 27% response rate). Three respondents indicated they were managers. However, almost 15% of the respondents did not identify their employment status, because they failed to respond to the question or selected other. Analysis of differences between the employee groups was not conducted due to the small number of respondents in most of the employee groups.

The results clustered in three groups. On several items, close to 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with a given statement, indicating areas of strength. On several items, satisfaction levels were between 70% and 80%, which indicates modest satisfaction with these areas. Finally, the percentage of satisfaction on two items was below 70%, which indicates that a sizeable percentage of respondents were not satisfied with these areas.

Strong Satisfaction

Respondents were very pleased with the **maintenance and safety of the facilities**, as indicated by the high percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the facilities were well-maintained and safe (90% and 89.1% respectively). A high percentage of respondents (87.3%) also indicated that the facilities **staff were professional and responsive**.

Moderate Satisfaction

A fairly strong percentage of respondents (78.0%) indicated that **work requests were completed with sufficient quality**. Respondents were also moderately satisfied that the **facilities were accessible and were well-designed and equipped to meet program/service needs**, as indicated by the percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with these items (77.5% and 71.8% respectively).

Lower Satisfaction

Fewer respondents agreed or strongly agreed that **work requests were completed in a timely manner** (63.6%). A smaller percentage (57.3%) strongly agreed or agreed that the **work request procedures were efficient and easy to use**.

Twenty eight respondents provided additional information through their comments. These comments are summarized on the following page.

Overview of the Comments

There were multiple comments praising the responsiveness and quality of the facilities staff.

Several respondents identified facilities and equipment related items that negatively impacted program/service quality, citing issues related to temperature regulation, room layout (particularly if rooms had been retrofitted to accommodate technology), and the science portables. Several respondents questioned whether end users were sufficiently included in the design of new facilities and one respondent indicated that the college needed to become more environmentally conscious when designing buildings and our landscape. Two respondents identified particular projects that needed to be done, citing a particular problem with the computer station in BS 148 and the need to repair cracks in the walkway at the top of the stairs of parking lot F. One respondent indicated the need to upgrade technology or purchase new technologies (such as Elmo's and laptops that could be checked out) that would better support instruction. Finally, one respondent identified various maintenance issues such as dirty carpets, windows and weeds in the flower beds.

Several respondents identified issues related to accessibility, noting the need to increase the size of doorways and the number of automatic doors on campus, to improve access to and within all buildings on campus, particularly during construction projects, and to ensure that accessibility be an important consideration when planning new facilities.

There were a significant number of comments about the work request process. Several respondents indicated they did not really understand the process. Other individuals commented that the process was too cumbersome, citing issues related to room reservation and requests to move furniture/equipment. Several respondents commented about the lack of a built-in system to track the status of work requests (other than calling staff to inquire). Comments from several respondents indicated that it was easiest and most effective to contact facilities staff directly – although one respondent expressed frustration that they never got a response to a phoned in facilities request.

There were various suggestions to enhance safety on campus. Several respondents provided ideas for enhance safety in the parking lots, including providing parking lot attendants, improving the lighting, and having faculty parking closer to the buildings. Several respondents expressed concern about safety in classrooms, suggesting that desk be removed to enhance the ability to exit rooms and that all rooms have the ability to be locked from the inside in event there is an external and immediate threat.

Finally, several respondents identified issues outside the scope of the survey. One respondent expressed concern about how to respond to inappropriate behaviors, such as verbal or physical altercations, of students outside of class. Several issues related to computer and network maintenance and training were also mentioned. One respondent wanted to know if the help desk procedures were posted anywhere.