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INTRODUCTION

The Facilities Management Division (FMD) Achievement Record is developed annually to help measure, assess, and report on the division’s performance and progress towards achieving our vision, goals, and priorities as identified in our Third Integrated Plan (IP3). Most of the indicators presented are unique to FMD and align with the facilities performance indicators (FPI) defined by APPA, an association for those engaged in educational facilities management, and Facilities Management Evaluation Program (FMEP) criteria. Wherever appropriate, they are benchmarked to the U15, a group of the country’s top research-intensive universities.

The indicators selected for FMD’s 2012 Achievement Record align with our goals—Stewardship, Sustainability, Service Quality, Quality of Work Life, and Streamlined Processes. Enhanced indicators, new targets, more trending information, and benchmarking will be included in future reports as information becomes available.

2012 Highlights

This has been a year of accomplishments and challenges. We have moved forward on a number of our IP3 initiatives and other priorities.

• The RenewUS strategy, which is focused on academic and capital renewal of our campus core, is proceeding—three critical infrastructure projects and planning for the overall program are underway.

• The implementation of an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) framework was launched. The EAM project engaged FMD staff and the campus community to begin the process of selecting a new and comprehensive system to support effective asset management and to maximize the value of the university’s $5 billion worth of buildings and infrastructure.

• To support the development of our Customer Relations Plan, FMD undertook its first comprehensive customer service survey. The campus community provided excellent information that helps us better understand what we do well and what we need to improve on.

• Approval of the Climate Action Plan was a key milestone in support of the university’s Campus Sustainability Plan and commits the university to reducing its Greenhouse Gas Emissions to 20% below 2006–07 levels by 2020.

• The Health Sciences D Wing was completed and occupancy of the building commenced in 2012, shifting our focus from project construction to operations.

• Operating budget adjustments presented a challenge as we focused on reducing our staffing levels for 2013–14.

• Safety (Environment), Health and Wellness Organization Effectiveness Review was completed. The starting point of these findings will see Workplace Safety and Environmental Protection, along with the university’s other wellness and safety offices, merged to form a new unit, Wellness and Safety Resources, effective May 1, 2013.

Stewardship

• The U of S spends an average amount to operate and maintain its facilities when benchmarked against others in the U15.

• Our Facilities Condition Index (FCI) has been trending downwards and is lower than the average of other benchmarked universities. However, the U of S has one of the highest deferred maintenance (DM) backlogs and the highest capital replacement costs per gross square foot, resulting in a lower FCI and a DM backlog that continues to grow.

• Capital expenditures peaked at $170 million in 2010–11 and remained significant in 2011–12, at almost $160 million.

• Campus-wide workplace injuries remained unchanged from 2011–12 and continue to be slightly higher than other Saskatchewan universities and colleges.

Sustainability

• The U of S experienced a slight decrease in greenhouse gas emissions, a reduction in energy intensity, and an increase in total water consumption.

• An audit of solid waste in 2012 revealed that less waste is being sent to the landfill and increasing volumes and types of waste are being recycled as compared to the 2008 audit.

Service Quality

• An external assessment was conducted in 2012 to confirm service levels for custodial, grounds, and building maintenance. Service levels continue to be lower than desired but are comparable with other benchmarked universities.

• Our Customer Service Index rating is 2.73 (out of a possible 4). This falls between “fair” and “good” on the 4-point scale (poor, fair, good, and very good).

Quality of Work Life

• The Employee Engagement Index shows a slight decrease from 2011.
Stewardship

Facilities Operating Expenditures and Capital Renewal Deferred Maintenance Expenditures per Gross Square Foot Index

The Facilities Operating Expenditures and Capital Renewal and Deferred Maintenance Expenditures (CRDM) per Gross Square Foot (GSF) Index represents the level of funding for stewardship of the institution’s facilities and infrastructure. Major factors influencing these values include student density, programs offered, service levels, and market differences for labour and material. The U of S is below the overall average of the comparator group, with CRDM expenditures being considerably below average and facilities operating expenditures being slightly above average.

Facilities Operating Expenditures per Gross Institutional Expenditures Index

The Facilities Operating Expenditures Per Gross Institutional Expenditures (GIE) Index reflects the percentage of the university’s total annual expenditures invested in maintaining and operating its facilities. It is expressed as a percentage of the ratio of GIE allotted for annual facility maintenance and operating expenditures. The U of S compares slightly above average.

Facilities Condition Index

The Facilities Condition Index (FCI) is an indicator of the relative condition of facilities. It is a percentage of the value of deferred maintenance (DM) relative to current replacement value (CRV). An FCI of less than 5% indicates “good” condition, 5–10% indicates “fair” condition, 10–30% indicates “poor” condition, and over 30% indicates “critical” condition. Major factors affecting FCI include funding applied to deferred maintenance and age of buildings. Although our FCI has been trending downwards and is lower than the comparator group average, it is important to note that the U of S has one of the highest backlogs of DM and the highest CRV costs per gross square foot in the comparator group, resulting in a lower FCI and a DM backlog that continues to grow.

FMD’s Third Integrated Plan includes a long-term deferred maintenance strategy (RenewUS) that, along with a maintenance management strategy and the infrastructure master plan, will improve the condition of the university’s physical assets and ultimately the FCI. A target to maintain an 11% FCI in 2016 has been set.
The Facilities Operating Budget Index is an indication of how well FMD is “living within its means.” It is expressed as a percentage of the operating budget that was spent. The objective is to provide the highest level of service within the budget provided and to ensure that the resources (or budget dollars) available are in fact applied to achieve these service levels. FMD has a history of being accurate in setting budgets—actual expenditures frequently exceed 98% of budget but remain within budget.

The Capital Expenditure Summary illustrates actual expenditures for minor capital projects (up to $500,000) and major capital projects (over $500,000). Annual variations are influenced by factors such as project status (or stage), financial elements (including funding), duration of the construction activity, market activity, and new building space requirements. This indicator peaked in 2010–11 because of increased activity surrounding major projects such as the Health Sciences Building and phase one of the student residences.

Frequency of Campus-Wide Workplace Injuries is a measurement of the percentage of full-time-equivalent employees involved in a workplace injury reported through the Saskatchewan Workers’ Compensation Board. The U of S may be engaged in higher risk activities, but ultimately there are too many workplace injuries—almost all of which are preventable. Campus-wide workplace injuries rose slightly from 2011 and continue to be slightly higher than other Saskatchewan universities and colleges, but they remain 24% below 2008 levels.

Our goal is for the number of workplace injuries to continue to decrease. In the third integrated planning cycle, support for and development and implementation of key institutional health and safety systems and standards will advance best practices in safety and create a culture on campus that recognizes the importance of injury prevention.

The Major Capital Expenditures and Number of Projects indicator provides a snapshot of the historical, current, and projected workload as it pertains to major capital projects. Similar to the capital expenditure summary, this indicator peaked in 2010–11 because of increased activity surrounding major projects. The gap between number of projects and funding in 2012–13 is due to several nearly complete projects with minimal outstanding expenses. There are a number of emerging projects and initiatives that are not captured in this indicator as they are still in very preliminary stages.
Sustainability

Green House Gas Emissions

Green House Gas (GHG) Emissions are an indicator of the university’s carbon footprint generated by university operations. It is measured in carbon dioxide (CO₂) equivalents from three different sources (scopes 1, 2, and 3). The emissions have remained relatively constant over the past six years, while square footage has been increasing.

In 2012, the U of S approved a Climate Action Plan that outlines a new target and strategies for reducing GHG emissions.

Solid Waste Production by Type

Solid Waste Production by Type measures the amount of solid waste generated from the main campus buildings (excluding hazardous, animal, and yard waste) based on waste audits conducted in 2008 and 2012. The results show that less compostables are being discarded and most paper and cardboard is being recycled, but recyclable materials are still being discarded in waste.

The university is not only focused on reducing solid waste production, but also on appropriate diversion and alternative recycling so that only a minimal amount of true “waste” is left.

Total Water Consumption

Total Water Consumption represents the total potable water, measured in millions of litres, consumed annually by the campus (building use and irrigation, as well as use in the main campus residences). Water consumption trended downwards for a number of years until 2012, when volumes returned to more normal levels.

Although costs for water remain relatively low, our short term target is to reduce consumption by 5% in 2013. Long-term targets will be established once the Health Sciences projects are complete.
Service Quality

Service Level Index

The Service Level Index compares the level of service for custodial, grounds, and building maintenance. Level 1 is the highest and level 5 is the lowest. The university’s stated objective is to achieve a level-2 rating according to APPA criteria. To achieve level 2, a significant additional investment in resources would be required. A service-level evaluation was conducted in 2012 to confirm the FMD service levels reported in the above chart.

Customer Satisfaction Index

FMD’s third integrated planning cycle committed the division to developing and implementing a customer-relations strategy to enhance FMD’s service. To ensure we understood the campus community’s needs and expectations, we commissioned an online survey in 2012 asking faculty, staff, and students to evaluate the quality of the services provided by our division. A total of 1,012 individuals responded to the survey and provided 334 qualitative comments. Following are some of the highlights.

Survey responses were analyzed to determine a Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) that aggregates the factors that directly impact overall satisfaction with FMD and identifies how we are doing in the areas most important to our customers. Our rating is 2.73 on a 4-point scale (1 being poor and 4 being very good).

Responses suggest that FMD is meeting expectations in many areas, including materials handling (movers), aesthetic appearance of campus (lawns and landscape), and furniture procurement. Responses also indicated priority areas for improvement are cleanliness (washrooms, floors, garbage removal, stairwells), comfort and cleanliness in office areas and classrooms, and walkways around campus. In addition respondents who use our services (small to large projects, maintenance and repair) indicated a desire for a better balance among cost, quality, and timeliness.

The feedback we received will influence a significant restructure of FMD’s service in 2013, and we will continue to measure our progress by commissioning new surveys every two years. Our goal is to attain a minimum CSI rating of 3.0 by 2016.

Quality of Work Life

Employee Engagement Index

The Employee Engagement Index compares FMD employee satisfaction against overall responses to the annual U of S employee opinion survey. Questions emphasize employee well-being, satisfaction, development, leadership, motivation, and recognition. FMD employees have provided less favourable responses than the general U of S population, but the level of positive responses improved each year from 2006 until 2012, when the Index shows a slight decrease from 2011. It is likely that the overall university environment at the time of the survey may have been influenced by the projected funding gap.

FMD has set a target of 65% by 2016 and hopes to narrow the gap between our employee satisfaction and that of the overall campus. As part of FMD’s Third Integrated Plan, we will implement both a People Plan and Communications Plan to help our staff feel more engaged and better informed. We will also ensure our policies and processes are “people focused.” We want to create a model facility that is a great place to work.
Mission
We create and maintain a safe and sustainable environment that supports learning, working, and living within the University of Saskatchewan.

Stewardship
To plan, develop, and maintain the campus facilities and infrastructure in a safe, effective, efficient, and transparent manner.

Sustainability
To protect the natural environment in a socially and economically responsible manner by modelling and supporting sustainability in all actions and decisions.

Streamlined Processes
To encourage continuous improvement in the delivery of our services.

Service Quality
To provide exceptional quality of service that satisfies our customers and ensures strong relationships with all stakeholders.

Service Level
Customer Satisfaction

Quality of Work Life
To provide a supportive, balanced, and positive work environment that encourages high performance and in which employees feel a sense of purpose and belonging.

Employee Engagement

Vision
To be an exceptional team that partners with the University of Saskatchewan community by consistently providing proactive and efficient services.