



# **Fall 2014**

## **Facilities and Services**

# **Customer Satisfaction Survey Results**

New Mexico State University – Las Cruces

Office of Institutional Analysis



# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

---

## Table of Contents

About This Survey: .....	2
General Response Rates and Summary of Results: .....	2
Figure 1: Comment Themes .....	2
Section 1: General Satisfaction Scale.....	3
Table 1: General Satisfaction with Facilities and Services, Respondent Percentages .....	3
Figure 2: General Satisfaction with Facilities and Services.....	4
Table 2: Buildings with a "Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" Rating .....	4
Section 2: Primary Building.....	5
Table 3: Number of Responses by Building Affiliation .....	5
Section 3: Custodial Care .....	7
Table 4: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Custodial Services, Respondent Percentages .....	8
Section 4: Building and Environment .....	8
Table 5: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Building, Environmental and Utilities Services, Respondent Percentages .....	9
Figure 3: Satisfaction with the Effectiveness of Energy Conservation .....	9
Section 5: Grounds Services .....	10
Table 6: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Ground Services, Respondent Percentages .....	11
Section 6: Office of Sustainability .....	11
Table 7: Satisfaction with the Office of Sustainability, Respondent Percentages .....	12
Section 7: Project Development .....	12
Table 8: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Special Projects and Engineering Services, Respondent Percentages .....	14
Section 8: Facilities and Services Administrative Services.....	14
Table 9: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Administrative Service Areas, Respondent Percentages .....	15
Section 9: Environmental Health and Safety .....	15
Table 10: Satisfaction with Environmental Health and Safety (EHS), Respondent Percentages .....	15
Section 10: NMSU Fire Department .....	17
Table 11: Satisfaction with NMSU Fire Department, Respondent Percentages .....	17
Section 11: NMSU Office of University Architect and Campus Planning .....	17
Table 12: Satisfaction with NMSU Office of University Architect and Campus Planning, Respondent Percentages .....	18
Section 12: Final Question and Comments.....	18

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

## About This Survey:


New Mexico State University's (NMSU) Facilities and Services Office (FS) worked with the Office of Institutional Analysis (OIA) to administer the FS Customer Satisfaction Survey. The original survey was designed according to specifications of a Facilities and Services audit and standards set by APPA, the facilities professional organization to which NMSU belongs. The 2014 survey added a new functional area about the NMSU Office of University Architect and Campus Planning.

## General Response Rates and Summary of Results:

For Fall 2014, 447 total responses were received. This marks a slight decrease from the 484 responses received for the Fall 2013 survey. Each section of the survey received a different number of responses as few respondents completed all questions listed on the entire survey.

Approximately 130 respondents provided comments in the last question in the survey regarding the work provided by FS. The comments were categorized into seven themes (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Comment Themes



# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

---

## Section 1: General Satisfaction Scale

*"How would you rate your overall satisfaction level with the work you have seen completed by Facilities and Services in the last twelve (12) months?"*

Respondents indicated they were satisfied with FS services; 78% of respondents indicated they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the service they had received (Table 1). This was a slight increase from the prior year's survey (70%, Fall 2013). Most surprisingly, less than 10% of respondents reported being either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the overall quality of FS services. This is a marked improvement over Fall 2013, where roughly 17% of respondents had registered some level of dissatisfaction. Around 13% of respondents chose "Neutral."

Respondents from 19 buildings submitted the overall "Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" ratings, which is slightly fewer than the number of buildings reporting low ratings last year (25). Each of these buildings had either one or two negative ratings. The Chemistry Building, Ed and Harold Foreman Engineering Complex, and New Mexico Department of Agriculture each had two respondents submit "Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" ratings (Table 2).

Twenty-four (18%) comments referred to general FS services. Nineteen of these comments were positive indicating "FS did an outstanding job overall." Some comments suggested providing better equipment and transportation for FS staff. Other respondents felt communication with FS was an issue and/or that FS is understaffed.


*"The employees assigned to our building provide excellent services and are very friendly and we appreciate their hard work!!"*

**Table 1: General Satisfaction with Facilities and Services, Respondent Percentages**

	Responses	Percent
Very Dissatisfied	5	2%
Dissatisfied	17	7%
Neutral	30	13%
Satisfied	106	44%
Very Satisfied	82	34%
Total	240	100%

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

**Figure 2: General Satisfaction with Facilities and Services**



**Table 2: Buildings with a "Dissatisfied" or "Very Dissatisfied" Rating**

Building	Responses
Agricultural Science Center at Alcalde	1
Branson Library	1
Campus Police/Ag Institute	1
<b>Chemistry Building</b>	<b>2</b>
Corbett Center	1
<b>Ed and Harold Foreman Engineering Complex</b>	<b>2</b>
Facilities and Services Motor Pool	1
Facilities and Services Office	1
Foster Hall	1
Guthrie Hall	1
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	1
Milton Hall	1
<b>New Mexico Dept. of Agriculture</b>	<b>2</b>
O'Donnell Hall	1
Skeen Hall	1
Thomas & Brown Hall	1
Zuhl Library	1
Fabian Garcia Science Center	1
Pan Am Center/Aggie Memorial Stadium	1

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

## Section 2: Primary Building

"In order to better meet your facilities service needs, it is important that we be able to evaluate responses to see which areas of campus may need special attention. With this in mind, please choose your primary building on NMSU from the following drop-down list."

Over 50 buildings/areas are represented in the survey responses. Gerald Thomas Hall, Hadley Hall, and the Health and Social Services Building had the highest building affiliation totals with 22, 21, and 18 responses respectively (Table 3).

**Table 3: Number of Responses by Building Affiliation**

Building	Responses
ABQ Center	1
Academic Research A, B, C	12
Agricultural Science Center at Alcalde	1
Agricultural Science Center at Farmington	1
Agricultural Science Center at Tucumcari	1
Alumni & Visitors Center	4
Anderson Hall (PSL)	6
Astronomy Building	1
Barnes & Noble	6
Biology Annex	1
Branson Library	11
Breland Hall	11
Business Complex Building	4
Campus Police/Ag Institute	3
Cattle Feed Barn/Animal Science	1
Central Utilities Plant	1
Cervantes Village, Bldg C (Children's Village)	1
Chemistry Building	9
Clara Belle Williams Hall	4
Computer Center	6
Corbett Center	9
Dan W. Williams Hall	1
Dove Hall	3
Ed and Harold Foreman Engineering Complex	6
Educational Services Center	12
Engineering Complex I	1
Equine Education Center	1
Fabian Garcia Science Center	2
Facilities and Services Construction	14
Facilities and Services Lock Shop	1
Facilities and Services Motor Pool	1
Facilities and Services Office	11

## Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

---

Foster Hall	4
Garcia Annex	4
Gardiner Hall	3
Genesis Center C	3
Genesis Center Office	1
<b>Gerald Thomas Hall</b>	<b>22</b>
Goddard Hall	3
Golf Course	1
Guthrie Hall	8
<b>Hadley Hall</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Health and Social Services Building</b>	<b>18</b>
James B. Delamater Activity Center	3
Jett Hall	7
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	1
Jornada USDA Exp. Range HQ (Wooten Hall)	3
Knox Hall	6
Leyendecker Plant Science Research Center	2
Milton Hall	14
Nason House	1
Natatorium	1
Neale Hall	1
New Mexico Dept. of Agriculture	9
O'Donnell Hall	7
O'Laughlin House	3
Other Stadiums	2
Pan Am Center/Aggie Memorial Stadium	2
PGEL Headhouse/Lab	1
Regents Row	10
Science Hall	7
Skeen Hall	6
Speech Building	4
Stan Fulton Center	5
Student Health Center	2
Tejada Building, Extension Annex	1
Theatre Arts	2
Thomas & Brown Hall	1
Tom Fort & Sutherland Villages	1
Walden Hall	1
William B. Conroy Honors Center	1
Young Hall	1
Zuhl Library	6

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

---

## Section 3: Custodial Care

*"Facilities and Services provides basic cleaning, recycling, and routine pest control services for Instruction and General Buildings on the Las Cruces Campus. This is done according to a published schedule on the FS website. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following custodial care areas as they pertain to the building you identified as your primary building."*

For the custodial care areas specified, more than 74% of respondents indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with FS custodial services (Table 4). Roughly 78% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of custodial services, and 64% indicated they were very satisfied with the courtesy of the custodial staff.

Also like last year, the frequency of custodial services was of concern to nearly one out of every five respondents. Comments suggested that vacuuming, trash pickup, and dusting frequency needed improvement. Cleanliness of restrooms was another area of concern with nearly 10% of respondents dissatisfied with restroom cleanliness and nearly 4% very dissatisfied. However, this is slightly better than last year. This varies by building. Comments suggest that restrooms in Milton Hall, library bathrooms (Zuhl and Branson), and Guthrie need more attention. This is the second consecutive year in which respondent comments indicated relative dissatisfaction with the quality of Milton Hall restrooms.

More than 44% of respondents were satisfied with the effectiveness of the recycling program and an additional 22% were very satisfied. Satisfaction with the recycling program is slightly higher when compared to last year's survey results (41% satisfied, 21% very satisfied).

Twenty-eight (21%) comments referred to Custodial Services. Several comments singled out employees and buildings where custodians perform above (or below) expectations. A few respondents felt that some of the custodial staff frequently shirk their job duties by hiding out in remote areas and/or napping at work. At the same time, others lauded their local custodial staff for providing exemplary service.

*"My thanks to the good people in custodial work....Their smiles make my day."*

*"The quality and consistency of custodial services have steadily declined. Routine cleaning of hallways, common areas, classrooms is far from satisfactory. Response from custodial supervisors is poor at best."*



# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

**Table 4: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Custodial Services, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Cleanliness of public areas (entryways, lobbies, lounges, etc.)	44.9%	35.9%	9.6%	5.8%	3.8%	345
Cleanliness of restrooms	38.6%	36.8%	11.0%	9.9%	3.8%	345
Cleanliness of offices and classrooms	34.3%	40.4%	12.8%	7.8%	4.7%	344
Courtesy of custodial staff	63.8%	24.8%	7.9%	2.3%	1.2%	343
Frequency of custodial services	43.3%	31.0%	12.9%	9.4%	3.5%	342
Overall quality of custodial services	42.6%	36.2%	11.9%	6.4%	2.9%	345
<b>Sustainability</b>						
Please rate the effectiveness of the Recycling program	22.4%	44.7%	13.9%	14.8%	4.2%	237

## Section 4: Building and Environment

*"Facilities and Services strives to maintain a comfortable and functional environment for all members of the NMSU community. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following building and environmental utilities areas of the building you identified as your primary building."*

Respondents were satisfied, although not always very satisfied, with the building and environment services provided by FS (Table 5). Approximately 27% of respondents indicated they were very satisfied with the reliability of utilities in their building, and more than 50% were satisfied with the lighting. When respondents indicated dissatisfaction with an area, it was usually related to temperature. Although 22% of respondents were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the temperature in their buildings, this is slightly lower than last year (26%). The buildings of concern this year were Regents Row, Milton Hall, Health and Social Services Building, and Science Hall. More than 12% of respondents were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with handicap access. Like last year, more signage and repair or additional accommodations for handicap access were suggested.

Of the roughly 200 responses to the question on the effectiveness of energy conservation, nearly one-fourth were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. However, there were more respondents who said they were very satisfied than there were respondents who were very dissatisfied (Figure 2). Also, the share of dissatisfied respondents was lower this year when compared to the 2013 iteration of the survey (25% in 2014; 33% in 2013).

Twenty-one (16%) comments referred to the building, rooms and environment. Repair requests were mentioned for five buildings: Roberts Hall, Health Social Services Building, Skeen Hall, Chemistry Building, and Knox Hall. Five respondents were dissatisfied with the uncomfortable temperature in their

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results


buildings. Compared to last year, there were relatively fewer complaints in the comments regarding building accessibility.

*"I belong to a Facebook page for moms and...there was a mom who posted an urgent request for help for heaters and blankets because her heat had not been turned on yet. I was shocked when she posted that she is living in family housing on campus..."*

**Table 5: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Building, Environmental and Utilities Services, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Temperature	13.6%	47.0%	17.7%	17.7%	4.1%	345
Lighting (is it adequate for the task?)	27.3%	53.8%	12.2%	6.1%	0.6%	344
Handicap access	23.8%	39.9%	24.1%	10.7%	1.5%	336
Reliability of utilities (electrical power, heating, cooling, meet our needs and have minimal interruptions)	26.8%	48.4%	15.5%	7.3%	2.0%	343

**Figure 3: Satisfaction with the Effectiveness of Energy Conservation**



# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

---

## Section 5: Grounds Services

*"Facilities and Services provides landscape and grounds maintenance, exterior trash receptacle management and concrete and asphalt maintenance. In addition, Facilities and Services maintains the walkways and roadways around campus and is responsible for the care of lawns, trees, and shrubs. Facilities and Services is also founded to maintain campus drainage systems. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following areas as they relate to Facilities and Services grounds maintenance in your area of the university."*

As reported in past surveys, the Grounds staff are very courteous. More than 50% of respondents were very satisfied with the courtesy of the Grounds staff and another 34% were satisfied (Table 7). At least 82% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of Grounds Services, which is a large improvement over last year. The maintenance of grounds and the quality of landscape design and maintenance stayed about the same. Slight improvements were also noted with litter management as roughly 12% of respondents were dissatisfied to very dissatisfied. The quality of pest control had the lowest level of satisfaction, although over 70% of respondents were satisfied to very satisfied. According to some comments, spiders are a problem, especially in outdoor stairways and entryways. There were fewer responses related to the effectiveness of water-efficient landscaping and other water conservation measures, and of those who did respond, roughly one-fifth (20%) were neutral. Comments indicated some sprinklers pointed into sidewalks and streets, and grass was over-watered in some areas. Some respondents suggested FS should plant more low-water use plants.

Fourteen (11%) comments specified areas around campus where Ground Services could increase their efforts and areas that have received improved service. Specifically, Pinon Hall, Gardiner Hall, Educational Services Building, Frenger Mall, Wooton Hall, Gerald Thomas Hall, Knox Hall, Hadley, Skeen hall all have requests for improved landscaping. Compared to previous iterations of the survey, this year's results indicate more concern about the condition of several parking lots around campus.

***"Parking lot behind Gerald Thomas, Wooton Hall and Knox Hall is awful...I have complained year after year and we only bandage the holes! Someday someone is going to break a leg from falling in a hole or injure themselves severely!"***

## Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

**Table 6: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Ground Services, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Maintenance of grounds (mowing, weeding, trimming, edging, etc.)	37.2%	42.5%	10.6%	7.3%	2.3%	341
Quality of landscape design and maintenance (trees, flowerbeds, etc.)	34.0%	40.8%	16.1%	7.0%	2.1%	341
Litter management	28.5%	44.1%	15.3%	11.2%	0.9%	340
Management of recycling and recycling receptacles	31.4%	44.9%	14.7%	7.6%	1.5%	341
Quality of pest control (indoors and outdoors)	25.5%	46.0%	17.6%	7.9%	2.9%	341
Overall quality of Grounds services	36.2%	46.2%	13.2%	3.5%	0.9%	340
Courtesy of Grounds staff	52.5%	34.2%	11.5%	1.2%	0.6%	339
<b>Sustainability</b>						
Please grade the effectiveness of the water efficient landscaping and our other water conservation measures	26.8%	40.5%	20.5%	8.9%	3.2%	190

### Section 6: Office of Sustainability

*"Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following areas as they relate to sustainability at the university."*

On average, 86 responses were received for this section, compared to 90 for the 2013 survey. While consistent across the two years, this implies that only roughly one in five respondents to the Fall 2014 FS survey recalled any interaction with the Office of Sustainability, and many of those who did respond to these questions selected "neutral." Respondents continue to be very satisfied (48%) with the courtesy of the sustainability staff. They also like the Toner Recycling Program with 29% of respondents very satisfied and 44% satisfied (25% and 43% respectively for 2013). Opinions of the Energy Reduction Program showed considerable improvement for 2014, with nearly 80% of respondents satisfied to very satisfied with this program compared to 58% in 2013. On the other hand, respondents were less satisfied with the website; nearly 6% expressed dissatisfaction in 2014 compared to 1% in 2013. Just about 40% of respondents were neutral on the sustainability educational programs and the Environmental Education Center (EEC). These two areas also reported the lowest percent of very satisfied respondents, and both dipped below the percentage of very satisfied respondents reported in 2013 (20% for educational programs and 16% for the EEC in 2013). Three-fourths of respondents were satisfied to very satisfied with the overall quality of sustainability at NMSU. This is a slight improvement

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

over the 68% reported in 2013, although more of this change is in “satisfied” rather than “very satisfied.”

Twenty (15%) comments addressed issues of sustainability on campus. While last year’s comments highlighted a general concern with the lack of recycling bins on campus, this year responses criticized policies and other operating procedures governing the use of water resources and electricity on campus.

*“Why do we waste water by turning it on in the middle of the day? Water at night or early morning please.”*

*“I wish we had an awareness campaign about turning off unnecessary lights and even unplugging computers over holidays...”*

**Table 7: Satisfaction with the Office of Sustainability, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Educational programs (tabling, one-on-one meetings, campus presentations)	16.7%	44.0%	39.3%	0.0%	0.0%	84
Website	20.7%	43.7%	29.9%	5.7%	0.0%	87
Toner Recycling Program	29.1%	44.2%	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%	86
Environmental Education Center	11.9%	47.6%	38.1%	2.4%	0.0%	84
Energy Reduction Program	23.0%	56.3%	18.4%	2.3%	0.0%	87
Overall quality of sustainability at NMSU	21.6%	53.4%	19.3%	5.7%	0.0%	88
Courtesy of sustainability staff	48.3%	35.6%	14.9%	1.1%	0.0%	87

## Section 7: Project Development

*“Facilities modifications and enhancements are provided on reimbursable basis when requested by the user. Please evaluate Project Development and Engineering if you have used their services. In the last twelve months, have you/your office utilized any of these types of projects and engineering services?”*

Approximately 90 responses were received for the Project Development section, slightly fewer than the 103 in 2013. However, the percent of respondents stating they were satisfied increased by five to ten percent across all of the questions except for the “final budget of project” between the two years. For that particular question, dissatisfaction (including very dissatisfied) decreased from 23% of respondents to 14%. Nearly 70% of respondents were satisfied to very satisfied with the finished project, an increase from 60% in 2013. Satisfaction with the timeliness of the project increased from 41% to 53%, and satisfaction with communication from Project Development and Engineering also improved, from just under 50% to 57%. Similar improvements were seen for all three questions related to staff, and

## Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

---

dissatisfaction percentages decreased. Although slightly fewer respondents were very satisfied with the knowledge and skill of Project staff (from 24% down to 22%), 42% reported being satisfied in 2014 compared to 36% in 2013.

Twenty-one comments (16%) focused on issues related to project development. Roughly a quarter of these comments complained about the timeliness of processing and completing work orders. Respondents cited poor administrative practices, communication errors between and within units, and a lack/misallocation of proper resources—not the skills and/or professionalism of the work crews—as the primary causes of these time delays. A few respondents also complained about the poor quality of the work-order software used, while others indicated that they would appreciate greater transparency between work crews and clients regarding the status of work orders in progress.

Only fifty-four responses were received regarding the importance of sustainability to the project. The mean rating of 3.7 on a scale of 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important) indicates that, on average, respondents believe sustainability is somewhat important. This value is slightly greater than the mean reported in the 2013 iteration of the survey (3.5).

*"Response to inquiries regarding work orders is extremely tardy and at times not provided at all. Have had work orders active for several months which have not been completed."*

*"Clear and consistent communication is key to successful interactions. I believe most of the F&S staff are courteous, professional and eager to do good work. They accomplish much with the resources available."*

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

**Table 8: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Special Projects and Engineering Services, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
<b>Satisfaction with Staff</b>						
Initial response time for estimating cost	18.7%	40.7%	25.3%	12.1%	3.3%	91
Preparedness of Project Managers/Estimators	19.6%	42.4%	22.8%	10.9%	4.3%	92
Knowledge and skill of Project staff	22.0%	41.8%	23.1%	8.8%	4.4%	91
<b>Satisfaction with Finished Project</b>						
Satisfaction with the finished project	25.0%	44.3%	21.6%	8.0%	1.1%	88
The timeliness of the project (on time)	17.8%	35.6%	23.3%	15.6%	7.8%	90
Final budget of project	18.2%	29.5%	38.6%	10.2%	3.4%	88
Communication from Project Development and Engineering throughout the project	21.3%	36.0%	22.5%	13.5%	6.7%	89

	Responses	Mean
How important is sustainability to your project? (5 stars = very important, 1 star = not at all important)	54	3.7

## Section 8: Facilities and Services Administrative Services

*"In the last twelve months, have you had contact with Facilities and Services business office staff regarding the administrative side of any maintenance project or Special Projects or Engineering Work?"*

Approximately a quarter (108) of all survey respondents completed the questions on FS administrative services. Roughly 42% of respondents were very satisfied with the courtesy and professional attitude of FS staff. The knowledge and skill of FS staff were also seen as strengths. The only areas that might need improvement were with timeliness. While roughly 31% of respondents were neutral regarding the timeliness of responses to billing inquiries, nearly 19% were dissatisfied to very dissatisfied on the timeliness of response to inquiries about work status (Table 9).

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

**Table 9: Satisfaction with Facilities and Services Administrative Service Areas, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Timeliness of response to inquiries about work status	29.6%	39.8%	12.0%	13.9%	4.6%	108
Timeliness of responses to inquiries about billing	29.6%	33.3%	31.5%	3.7%	1.9%	108
Courtesy of Facilities and Services staff towards customer	42.1%	42.1%	12.1%	1.9%	1.9%	107
Accuracy of information provided by Facilities and Services employees	30.6%	45.4%	13.9%	6.5%	3.7%	108
Professional attitude of Facilities and Services employees	41.7%	41.7%	9.3%	6.5%	0.9%	108
Knowledge and skill of Facilities and Services staff	37.0%	44.4%	9.3%	7.4%	1.9%	108

## Section 9: Environmental Health and Safety

*"Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements pertaining to Environmental Health & Safety Services."*

About 125 responses were received regarding Environmental Health and Safety (EHS). The high level of satisfaction noted with this unit in past surveys continued with this survey, and every question showed some degree of improvement for 2014 compared to 2013. Approximately 90% of respondents were satisfied to very satisfied with the knowledge of EHS staff, up from 86% the previous year. EHS staff continue to receive high marks for being friendly and helpful (86% compared to 84% in 2013). The percent of respondents saying they were very satisfied increased substantially for the other questions. Timeliness of response increased to 38% from 32%, usefulness of the website improved from 18% to 27%, effectiveness of training rose from 26% to 34%, understanding of needs and requirements increased from 26% to 34%, and accessibility went from 29% to 38%. When asked if an EHS consultation helped to facilitate a resolution of a problem, 29% of respondents were very satisfied in the Fall 2013 survey; in Fall 2014, 40% of respondents said they were very satisfied.



# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

**Table 10: Satisfaction with Environmental Health and Safety (EHS), Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Environmental Health & Safety understands my needs and the requirements of my department	34.1%	45.2%	15.1%	5.6%	0.0%	126
Environmental Health & Safety is accessible to its customers (phone, voice mail, email, etc.)	37.6%	49.6%	10.4%	2.4%	0.0%	125
When contacted, an Environmental Health & Safety consultation helped facilitate resolution of my problem or issue	39.5%	38.7%	16.9%	3.2%	1.6%	124
The Environmental Health & Safety website is user friendly and helpful in providing access to information, forms, manuals, etc. that I need	27.4%	37.9%	29.0%	2.4%	3.2%	124
Environmental Health & Safety staff provide effective training	33.9%	48.4%	13.7%	3.2%	0.8%	124
When contacted, Environmental Health & Safety staff responded to my requests, or problems, in a timely manner	37.6%	40.8%	17.6%	2.4%	1.6%	125
Overall, Environmental Health & Safety staff are knowledgeable in their areas of specialty	41.9%	46.8%	9.7%	0.8%	0.8%	124
Environmental Health & Safety staff are friendly and helpful when I contact them for services	45.2%	41.1%	11.3%	1.6%	0.8%	124

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

## Section 10: NMSU Fire Department

*"Please rate your satisfaction level with the NMSU Fire Department."*

NMSU Fire Department was highly rated by respondents. More than 70% of the 69 respondents were very satisfied with the courtesy and professionalism of NMSU Fire Department staff. Both are slight increases compared to 2013. Nearly two-thirds of these respondents were very satisfied with the timeliness and quality of NMSU Fire Department service. Respondents were more satisfied with NMSU Fire Department than any other area included in this survey.

**Table 11: Satisfaction with NMSU Fire Department, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Timeliness of service	65.6%	26.6%	6.3%	1.6%	0.0%	64
Quality of service	67.2%	29.7%	1.6%	1.6%	0.0%	64
Courtesy of staff	73.0%	25.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	63
Professionalism of staff	76.6%	21.9%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	64
Service expectation	64.1%	29.7%	4.7%	1.6%	0.0%	64

## Section 11: NMSU Office of University Architect and Campus Planning

*"Please rate your satisfaction with the NMSU Office of University Architect and Campus Planning."*

As a whole, respondents reflected fairly positively about the NMSU Office of University Architect and Campus Planning (UACP). More than 85% of respondents indicated that they were either very satisfied or satisfied with the courtesy and professionalism of staff. By contrast, respondents were most critical of the timeliness of services provided by this office; more than 16% of respondents indicated they were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. More than 40% of respondents expressed a neutral feeling about the Annual Space Survey, indicating that many respondents might not be aware of what the Annual Space Survey actually does. Substantially fewer respondents replied to the survey question asking them about their 'recent' experience with the UACP. This may suggest that fewer respondents had interacted with this office recently or that this survey question might be redundant, given that respondents previously registered their (dis)satisfaction with the services provided by UACP.

# Fall 2014: Facilities & Services Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

**Table 12: Satisfaction with NMSU Office of University Architect and Campus Planning, Respondent Percentages**

Area	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total Responses
Timeliness of service	30.9%	38.2%	14.5%	10.9%	5.5%	55
Quality of service	30.9%	47.3%	14.5%	5.5%	1.8%	55
Courtesy of staff	49.1%	36.4%	7.3%	5.5%	1.8%	55
Professionalism of staff	44.4%	40.7%	11.1%	1.9%	1.9%	54
Service expectation	25.5%	43.6%	23.6%	5.5%	1.8%	55
Annual Space Survey	16.7%	37.0%	40.7%	3.7%	1.9%	54
Quality of recent service	33.3%	47.2%	8.3%	5.6%	5.6%	36

## Section 12: Final Question and Comments

*"If you have any further concerns or comments regarding the work provided by Facilities and Services, or recommendations for services you feel Facilities and Services should explore providing in the future, please feel free to share them here."*

This final question provided respondents the opportunity to comment on questions or suggestions they had about FS services. Responses were limited to 5,000 characters.

Six themes emerged that roughly correlate with the sections of interest in the survey: Custodial Care, Building Environment, Grounds Services, Sustainability, Administrative Services, and Survey Improvement Suggestions. This year, three comments referred to survey improvement.

*"My office is not on campus. Any service issues we have are not address through your administrative chain of command. This survey and my responses do not apply!"*

*"Cut out the gimmicks on your Likert scales. They are just silly."*

*"You definitely needed an 'unsure/don't know/not applicable' option for some of your questions"*