

Fall 2010
New Mexico State University
Office of Facilities and Services
Las Cruces Campus
Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

About This Survey	1
General Response Rates and Results.....	2
General Results by Survey Section.....	3
Custodial	3
Building Environment and Utilities	3
Grounds.....	3
Project Development and Engineering	3
Administrative Services.....	4
Environmental Health and Safety Services	4
Write In Question Summary:	4
Question by Question Detailed Analysis.....	10
Section 1: General Satisfaction Scale	10
Table 1: General Satisfaction with OFS, Respondent Percentages.....	11
Section 2: Primary Building	12
Section 3: Custodial Care	15
Table 2: Satisfaction with OFS Custodial Services, Respondent Percentages	15
Section 4: Building and Environment.....	16
Table 3: Satisfaction with OFS Building Environmental and Utilities Services, Respondent Percentages.....	16
Section 5: Grounds Services.....	17
Table 4: Satisfaction with OFS Grounds Services, Respondent Percentages.....	17
Section 6: Project Development and Engineering	18
Table 5: Satisfaction with OFS Special Projects and Engineering Services, Respondent Percentages.....	19
Section 7: OFS Administrative Services.....	19
Table 6: Satisfaction with OFS Administrative Service Areas, Respondent Percentages	20
Section 8: Environmental Health and Safety	20
Table 7: Satisfaction with Environmental Health and Safety, Respondent Percentages	21
Final Question: Write-In.....	22
Comment Summary by Building	22

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Appendices.....	26
Appendix A: Survey Form.....	27
Appendix B: Buildings indicating some dissatisfaction broken out by survey question.....	38
B.1 Custodial	39
B.2: Building and Environment	46
B.3: Grounds	53

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

About This Survey:

Near the beginning of the Fall semester, 2010, New Mexico State University's (NMSU) Office of Facilities and Services (OFS) and Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Outcomes Assessment (IRPOA) worked together to update the 2009 OFS Customer satisfaction survey to account for organizational changes within OFS. The intent was that OFS could send the survey out to all faculty and staff on the Las Cruces campus as a follow up to the prior year's survey. It is anticipated that this will be an annual process. The survey was designed according to specifications of an OFS audit and standards set by professional organizations to which OFS belongs. A copy of the full survey can be found in Appendix A.

The survey was hosted on the IRPOA website, and OFS director Glen Haubold sent out a series of four email invitations asking the university community to take the OFS survey. The email distribution list was set up and determined by his office in conjunction with the University Communications Department at NMSU. The survey was made available to participants between September 20 and October 8, 2010

The survey itself dealt with six specific areas of university life that OFS is responsible for: custodial services, the environment inside of campus buildings, university grounds service and maintenance, environmental health and safety services, project development and engineering within university buildings, and OFS administrative services. Additionally, respondents were given the opportunity to write in specific comments they may have about OFS services on the last survey page. All respondents were asked for their opinions on custodial care, building and environment, and grounds and landscaping, but for the areas of project development and engineering, administrative services, and environmental health and safety services, respondents were given the option to opt out of that portion of the survey if they had not used the services in the prior 12 month period.

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

General Response Rates and Results:

There was not a lot of publicity or build up prior to the start of the survey, but OFS has greatly expanded their communications with the university community over the last year. This has made the campus community much more aware of and open to communications from OFS. As a result, the number of responses was nearly triple the response number from the prior year. 808 NMSU faculty and staff members responded to the survey and 39.23% (317) of these individuals took the time to write in specific comments that specified areas they either felt needed extra OFS attention or were areas in which respondents felt that OFS was excelling. This included 20 individuals who wrote in comments for OFS instead of identifying which building they worked in at the beginning of the survey. This tells us that a significant portion of respondents felt there were important things that needed to be addressed. For this reason, it is important to look at the comments as well as the raw numbers and percentages of respondents, as the comments will give us a deeper understanding of the issues that OFS may wish to address in the future.

Overall, the results of the survey were favorable, and the majority of respondents had a good opinion of OFS, particularly of OFS staff. When there were issues cited with OFS services, the nature of many of them tended to be specific instances that had caused issues and not larger systematic issues. There were however, a lot of comments that specifically had to do with recent scheduling and staffing changes which many respondents seemed to feel left OFS with too few staff to complete their jobs, and was resulting in some issues in terms of cleanliness and grounds appearance on the NMSU campus. Many of the people who wrote in responses at the end of the survey took time to commend OFS staff for a job well done.

Overall respondents had positive attitudes about the courtesy, knowledge and skills possessed by OFS staff in all areas of the survey. Within the survey, the areas that had to deal with recent cutbacks and schedule changes of custodial and maintenance work tended to have the highest rates of dissatisfaction. There were also specific issues cited with the new OFS work order submittal form and with pricing and contracting of OFS services.

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

General Results by Survey Section:

Custodial:

Respondents indicated that overall, they were satisfied with OFS custodial services, and over 50% of respondents indicated that they felt that OFS custodial staff was doing an outstanding job. Respondents were more likely to indicate dissatisfaction with the frequency of cleaning services and with the cleanliness of bathrooms, offices, and classrooms than they were with OFS staff themselves. These sentiments were echoed in the written in comments at the end of the survey, and more comments were written about custodial services and staff than about any other OFS function. Again, the written in comments indicated that respondents felt that OFS staff were doing an excellent job, but that budget and staff cutbacks have left OFS custodial employees overextended without enough time or materials to keep their assigned areas as clean as they should be.

Building Environment and Utilities:

Overall, respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the building environment and utilities provided by OFS in their primary building. However, they were not as likely to have strong positive feelings about this area as they were to have strong feelings about custodial services. As in the prior year's survey administration, when respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with this area, they tended to be the most critical of the temperature and energy conservation measures in their building. Written in comments that tended to relate to this area of the survey echoed this finding, as many respondents indicated dissatisfaction and issues with the regulation of temperature and with the heating and cooling in their primary building. Respondents this year were much more likely to indicate dissatisfaction with the availability of services than they were in prior years. This could potentially relate to several power outages over the last 12 months.

Grounds :

Again, the majority of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the services that the OFS grounds department was providing on campus. However, in all areas except litter management, respondents were much more likely to indicate dissatisfaction in this area than they were in the prior year. Written in comments dealing with grounds service tended to center around issues with NMSU's sprinkler system or watering schedule, and with jobs left undone or partially done by the grounds department. Several respondents specifically mentioned that they felt that the grounds keeping department was understaffed which they believed was resulting in many areas of the campus being neglected.

Project Development and Engineering:

Overall respondents indicated they were satisfied with the services provided by OFS Project Development and Engineering Staff. However, both in the multiple choice and written in portions of the survey, respondents tended to indicate some dissatisfaction with the communication process involved with this department. Specific instances of poor follow up or feedback, and with coordination between project development and engineering and other OFS

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

and campus entities were cited. The Architectural Design area was also singled out as being problematic in the comment section of the survey.

Administrative Services:

Again, the majority of respondents indicated satisfaction with the administrative services provided by OFS. However, respondents were much more likely to indicate dissatisfaction with this area than they were in the prior year. Respondents were also less likely than in the prior year to indicate they were extremely satisfied with staff courtesy in this area. Written in responses relating to this area tended to center on poor communication and follow up by OFS staff, problems with timely follow up to work order requests and inquiries, with pricing that was considered to be high and non-competitive, and with the new work order system. There were multiple respondents who indicated that often a job will not be requested because the work order system is so complex.

Environmental Health and Safety Services :

Respondents who answered the survey questions relating to Environmental Health and Safety Services were likely to indicate they were satisfied with the services being provided. More than 50% of all responses in this area indicated respondents were “Very Satisfied” or “Extremely Satisfied” with EHS services. Written in responses indicated that the campus community felt that this was a good merge with OFS. Issues raised tended to center around communication and timely follow up issues.

Write In Question Summary:

There were a total of 329 written in comments either at the end of the survey or in the building selection box, written by a total of 317 individuals. The most common themes in the write in questions follow. Responses are counted in multiple categories if they dealt with multiple issues. Full text of the responses is found in Appendix C.

- 26% of all written in responses indicated that there were issues with the custodial services provided by OFS. The most common complaints dealt with:
 - The frequency of floor cleaning (vacuuming, mopping, and carpet cleaning) (37%)
 - The cleanliness of the bathrooms (26%)
 - A perceived need for more frequent custodial services overall (24%)
 - A desire for more frequent trash pickup (10%)
 - Custodial staff not being provided with adequate supplies to do their jobs (9%)
 - Unsatisfactory cleaning of stairways and entry areas (7%)
 - Poor quality of cleaning products and bathroom materials(3%)
 - Poor communication as to what custodial staff are cleaning (3%)
 - A custodial schedule that interferes with regular business hours (3%)
 - Unclean shower and locker room areas (3%)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Dust control issues (2%)
- Poor work ethics of custodial staff (2%)
- Too few custodial staff (2%)
- Dirty windows (2%)
- The need for respondents to be able to access basic cleaning supplies (2%)
- Lax security concerns of custodial staff (2%)
- Poor communication with custodial supervisory staff (1%)
- The need for more trash cans (1%)
- Inconsistent custodial services (1%)

- 22% of all written in responses took the time to commend OFS staff for doing a good job.
 - 50% of these cited custodial staff as doing an excellent job. Several of these responses singled out specific custodial staff:
 - Michelle (6%)
 - Manny (6%)
 - Antonio(2%)
 - Cindy (2%)
 - Luz(2%)
 - Mike(2%)
 - Roger (2%)
 - Miguel (2%)
 - Luisa (2%)
 - Allen (2%)
 - Tim (2%)
 - Joe (2%)
 - Heating and Cooling / HVAC services were singled out by 7% of these respondents for doing a good job. Of these, three employees were singled out:
 - Jerry V (40%)
 - Erik (20%)
 - Nick (20%)
 - 5% of respondents with answers in this category singled out the following departmental staff as providing excellent services:
 - Electrical
 - Plumbing
 - Grounds and Landscaping
 - 4% of respondents with answers in this category singled out the following departmental staff as providing excellent services:
 - Carpentry
 - Administrative services
 - Other departments singled out for good customer service included:
 - Moving
 - Recycling
 - EHS
 - Sign shop
 - Key/Lock shop

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- There were also multiple OFS employees mentioned by name in the survey as providing excellent service, many of whom were not identified by department. These included:
 - Ralph 'Bud' Jones
 - Tim Dobson
 - Jose Gambon
 - Katrina Doolittle
 - Glen Haubold
 - Robert Ortega and Crew
 - Danny
 - Joe
 - Maria
 - Tino and Crew
 - Dave in electrical
 - Bertha Swarez
 - Henry Saenz
 - Paul Valdiva
 - Robert Bilbao
 - Mike Luchau
 - Stan Dyer
 - Chuck Ryder

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- 16% of all written in responses indicated that there were issues with the grounds services provided by OFS. The most common complaints dealt with:
 - Debris, fruit, or branches not being properly cleaned up (22%)
 - Watering schedule issues or sprinkler issues (20%)
 - Landscaping issues including too much grass, the need for xeriscaping, the need for more native plants (19%)
 - Animal and pest control issues (17%)
 - Trimming and Pruning that is not being correctly done (13%)
 - Lawn maintenance issues (including mowing and pulling weeds) (11%)
 - Air quality and allergy issues caused by blowers and mowing during hours where employees are likely to be outdoors (7%)
 - Issues with the use of blowers (6%)
 - The need to clean up graffiti (6%)
 - Damage to outdoor walkways/stairs/buildings that has not been addressed (6%)
 - Understaffing of the grounds department (6%)
 - OFS vehicles driving on and damaging turf (4%)
 - The need for more outdoor trash receptacles (4%)
 - Ash cans not being emptied (2%)

- 16% of all written in responses indicated that there were issues with the administrative or scheduling services provided by OFS. The most common complaints dealt with:
 - Jobs not being completed in a timely or complete manner (34%)
 - Lack of communication with OFS or a slow response time for work orders (25%)
 - Problems with the new work order process (19%)
 - Costs for services are high/ non-competitive (13%)
 - 4% of respondents in this category indicated they saw the following issues with OFS administrative services:
 - Poor communication regarding financial statements
 - OFS work did not meet industry standards
 - Quotes provided by OFS were not accurate
 - Problems with scheduling services
 - 2% of respondents in this category indicated they saw the following issues with OFS administrative services:
 - Feelings that OFS is more concerned with making money than with taking care of safety hazards
 - Departments being forced to pay for damage caused by OFS workers
 - Poor employee retention
 - Too heavy a paperwork load for projects
 - Frustration that research facilities are supposed to use OFS for construction
 - The Albuquerque center has had issues getting OFS to consult with them
 - In house construction cost ceilings are too low

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- 15% of all written in responses indicated that there were issues with the Facilities and Facilities services. The most common complaints dealt with:
 - Problems regulating temperature in campus buildings (38%)
 - Issues with traffic flow or parking lots (10%)
 - Issues with indoor floors 910% (Note: likely typo for 9%)
 - Mold and leaks (8%)
 - Issues with handicap access (6%)
 - Indoor Air Quality issues (6%)
 - 4% of all responses falling into this category indicated the following facilities issues:
 - Interior building issues not fixed even after multiple requests
 - Poor signage
 - There is a need for more physical resources (classrooms, bathrooms, parking)
 - Building should have hot water
 - Windows are broken
 - Bathrooms are in poor condition
 - 2% of all responses falling into this category indicated they saw the following facilities issues:
 - Strange “plumbing” noises in buildings disrupting class
 - Asbestos exposure
 - Building that should be demolished
 - More need for keys in shared spaces/lecture halls
 - Power outages adversely affecting work
 - Issues with the bike path
 - Buildings in need of paint
- 10% of all written in responses stated that OFS in general was doing a good job. Of these:
 - 15% cited OFS for providing excellent customer service
 - 15% mentioned that the grounds at the NMSU Las Cruces campus look nice
 - 9% said that OFS has greatly improved their service over the last 12 months
 - 9% said that EHS provides excellent service
 - 3% cited the recycling program as being a good program
 - 3% indicated their satisfaction with building maintenance
 - 3% indicated that OFS did an excellent job with a recent building remodeling project
- 9% of all written in responses indicated that they were unhappy with the survey itself. Of these:
 - 35% wanted to see a different scale for answer choices
 - 32% did not feel they had enough information to answer the questions because they had not used OFS services

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- 23% either had concerns about the building list used at the beginning of the survey
- 3% wanted the survey to provide more detail about the different services
- 3% did not like being sent follow-up emails
- 3% felt the questions were too general
- 8% of all written in responses indicated problems with OFS staff. The most common complaints dealt with:
 - Feelings that recent staffing cuts meant that staff could not adequately complete their jobs (44%)
 - Examples of OFS staff exhibiting a poor work ethic (11%)
 - OFS moving services issues (7%)
 - Too many staff showing up for recycling (7%)
 - 4% of responses falling into this category dealt with the following:
 - Reckless driving by OFS staff
 - New schedules for services have limited communication
 - No communication when OFS staff come into offices to complete a work order
 - Perceived unprofessional behavior by staff doing welding
 - The loss of OFS staff because of low pay
 - Feelings that NMSU-A OFS staff are overworked
 - Perceived unprofessional attitude of NMSU-A Facilities Administration
 - Feelings that Robert in Project management was exhibiting poor management skills
 - Perceptions that Glen Haubold and other OFS administration does not respect the staff who work for them
 - The perception that David Shearer has made himself unavailable to meet campus needs
- 3% of all written in responses indicated that they felt there was room for preventing energy waste. Respondents whose answers fell into this category included:
 - 36% who felt that interior lights were being wastefully left on
 - 36% who felt that windows needed to be updated to prevent energy loss
 - 18% who felt that the stadium lights should not be left on at night
 - 9% who felt more needed to be done in general to maintain sustainability
- 3% of all written in responses cited other specific issues with OFS services. Of these:
 - 36% cited problems with the help OFS provided in moving office locations
 - 75% of these indicated that OFS had lost some of their personal possessions in the move
 - 18% felt that the OFS architects were not cooperative or did not offer a competitive skill set when compared to the general market
 - 18% cited specific projects that had been started but never finished
 - 9% said that the lock shop had cut the wrong keys for them
 - 9% felt that the flooding of the streets to clear pipes was a waste of resources

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- 9% felt that services for bicycles are ignored
- 3% of all written in responses indicated that they were felt there were issues with OFS recycling services. Of these:
 - 33% wanted to see more frequent trash pick up
 - 22% felt that there was a need to place more recycling bins around the university
 - 11% complained that trash and recycling were being dumped into the same bin when they were picked up
 - 11% felt that recycling bins were not being appropriately placed
 - 11% wanted to see more cardboard recycling occurring
- 2% of all written in responses indicated that they were felt there were issues with OFS EHS services. Of these:
 - 29% indicated frustration with the way that Haz Com training courses are being scheduled
 - 29% indicated that EHS staff were non responsive or rude when contacted to clean up and take care of some issues with mold
 - 14% felt that lab inspections were not resulting in a timely report of findings
 - 14% indicated displeasure with the group's reluctance to deal with bats in a building
 - 14% felt that EHS was changing rules arbitrarily
- 2% of all written in responses simply indicated that respondents had no comments at this time.

Question by Question Detailed Analysis:

The following is a more detailed analysis of the survey questions. Each question will list the overall percentages and response rates. For those questions about maintenance service, custodial service, and grounds service, a list of buildings that indicated any measure of dissatisfaction with the particular area of OFS service can be found in Appendix B.

Section 1: General Satisfaction Scale

This question read, "How would you rate your overall satisfaction level with the work you have seen completed by the office of facilities and services in the last twelve (12) months?"

Table 1 lists the overall percentage of responses for this question. Overall, respondents indicated they were satisfied with OFS services, and over 52% of respondents indicated they were either "Very Satisfied" or "Extremely satisfied" with the service they had received from OFS

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

over the course of the prior year and fewer than 11% of respondents indicated any measure of dissatisfaction with the services provided by OFS.

Table 1: General Satisfaction with OFS, Respondent Percentages

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Total Respondents
Overall Satisfaction with OFS in last year	2.3%	8.1%	37.2%	36.5%	15.9%	787

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Section 2: Primary Building

Question two asked respondents to respond to the following: “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. If your building is not listed, please type the name of your building into the write-in box.”

The following is a listing of the number of responses by each building, and has been updated to include the written in responses.

Building	Number of Respondents
• Unspecified	42
• Gerald Thomas Hall	39
• Hadley Hall	36
• Dona Ana Community College	35
• Educational Services Center	34
• PSL	30
• Off campus locations and Branches outside of Las Cruces	30
• Health and Social Services Building	28
• Breland Hall	27
• O'Donnell Hall	26
• Regents Row	24
• Skeen Hall	24
• Milton Hall	22
• Garcia Annex	21
• Science Hall	18
• Academic Research A,B,C	16
• Chemistry Building	16
• Computer Center	16
• Ed and Harold Foreman Engineering Complex	16
• OFS Office	14
• Business Complex Building	13
• Zuhl Library	12
• Branson Library	11
• Foster Hall	10
• Guthrie Hall	10
• Knox Hall	10
• New Mexico Dept. of Agriculture	10
• Jett Hall	9

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

• Student Health Center	9
• Gardiner Hall	8
• Hardman Hall	8
• Speech Building	8
• Campus Police/Ag Institute	7
• Corbett Center	7
• Clara Belle Williams Hall	6
• Goddard Hall	6
• Jornada USDA Exp. Range HQ (Wooten Hall)	6
• Other OFS locations including Facilities, Health and Safety, Utilities Plant	6
• Astronomy Building	5
• Dan W. Williams Hall	5
• Dove Hall	5
• Engineering Complex I	5
• Jacobs Hall	5
• James B. Delamater Activity Center	5
• Music Building	5
• Other on Campus	5
• Stan Fulton Center	5
• Thomas & Brown Hall	5
• Herschel Zohn Theatre	4
• Natatorium	4
• Neale Hall	4
• OFS Paint Shop	4
• PGEL Headhouse/Lab	4
• Genesis Center Office	3
• John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	3
• OFS Motor Pool	3
• A Mountain	3
• Photovoltaic Labs	3
• Surplus Property Warehouse	3
• Student or Family Housing	3
• Golf Course	3
• Alumni & Visitors Center	2
• Cervantes Village, Bldg C (Children's Village)	2
• Equine Education Center	2
• Genesis Center C	2
• Kent Hall	2

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

• O'Loughlin House	2
• Rentfrow Gym	2
• Aggie Memorial Stadium and Field house	2
• NMSU Mail room	2
• Pan Am Center Box Office	2
• Sugerman Space Grant Building	2
• Walden Hall	2
• Wells Hall	2
• William B. Conroy Honors Center	2
• Biology Annex	1
• Cattle Feed Barn/Animal Science	1
• Cervantes Village, Bldg A (Children's Village)	1
• Dan W. Williams Hall Annex	1
• OFS Construction	1
• OFS Lock Shop	1
• Passive Solar	1
• Tennis Center	1
• USDA Cotton Gin (Reimbursable)	1

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Section 3: Custodial Care

The first large set of questions in the survey asked respondents about custodial services provided by OFS in their primary building. The lead-in to this section read:

“OFS 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 OFS 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.”

Table 2 lists the areas that respondents were asked about as well as the percentages of responses for each question. In all cases, more than 50% of respondents indicated they were “Very” or “Extremely” satisfied with OFS custodial services. Over 50% also indicated that they were very satisfied with custodial staff. When respondents indicated dissatisfaction with custodial services, they were most likely to be dissatisfied with the frequency of custodial services and with the cleanliness of restrooms.

Table 2: Satisfaction with OFS Custodial Services, Respondent Percentages

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Number of Responses
Cleanliness of Public areas (entryways, lobbies, lounges etc.)	1.5%	6.0%	33.5%	30.2%	28.7%	781
Cleanliness of Restrooms	3.6%	8.2%	35.4%	26.1%	26.7%	779
Cleanliness of offices/classrooms	1.8%	8.7%	37.2%	28.5%	23.8%	761
Courtesy of Custodial Staff	0.8%	1.7%	19.6%	27.9%	50.1%	771
Frequency of Custodial Services	3.6%	10.3%	32.8%	25.1%	28.1%	768
Overall Quality of Custodial Services	1.9%	7.7%	32.9%	29.0%	28.4%	778

Because custodial services are specific to each building on campus, it is also important to look at those buildings where respondents indicated some measure of dissatisfaction with custodial services at NMSU. Please see Appendix B.1 for this breakdown.

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Section 4: Building and Environment

The next large survey section asked respondents questions about the building environment and utilities services in their primary campus building. The beginning of this survey section told respondents:

“OFS 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.”

Table 3 lists the areas that respondents were asked about as well as the percentages of responses for each question. In all cases, more than 50% of respondents indicated they were at least satisfied with the building and environmental utilities provided by OFS, though respondents were much less likely to indicate high levels of satisfaction with these areas than they were to indicate similarly high satisfaction levels with custodial services. When respondents indicated dissatisfaction with this area, it was most likely that this was related to temperature or energy conservation. Respondents were much more likely than in prior years to indicate their dissatisfaction with the availability and reliability of utility services, which could be related to several large power outages during the past 12 months.

Table 3: Satisfaction with OFS Building Environmental and Utilities Services, Respondent Percentages

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Number of Responses
Temperature	2.7%	15.7%	47.0%	22.8%	11.8%	781
Lighting (is it adequate for the task)	0.9%	6.5%	44.1%	30.0%	18.5%	780
Handicap Access	2.4%	6.8%	46.4%	26.4%	18.1%	755
Availability and Reliability of utilities (electrical power, heating, cooling meet our needs and have minimal interruptions)	2.1%	9.3%	40.3%	29.5%	18.9%	774
Energy conservation	3.8%	12.4%	49.3%	22.5%	12.0%	766

Because environmental and utilities services are specific to each building on campus, it is also important to look at those buildings where respondents indicated some measure of dissatisfaction with these services at NMSU. Please see Appendix B.2 for this breakdown.

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Section 5: Grounds Services

The third large survey section asked respondents questions about OFS provided grounds service at NMSU. The beginning of this survey section told respondents:

“ OFS provides landscape and grounds maintenance, exterior trash receptacle management and concrete and asphalt maintenance. In addition OFS maintains the walkways and roadways around campus and is responsible for the care of lawns, trees, and shrubs. OFS is also funded to maintain campus drainage systems.

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following areas as they relate to OFS grounds maintenance in your area of the university.”

Table 4 lists the areas that respondents were asked about as well as the percentages of responses for each question. In all cases, more than 75% of respondents indicated they were at least “satisfied” with these areas. In only two cases, that of pest control and of management of recycling and recycling receptacles, did more than 10% of respondents indicate they were dissatisfied with the services provided. In all areas except litter management, respondents were more likely to indicate dissatisfaction with this area than in prior years. Most notably, the dissatisfaction rates for landscape design and management, maintenance of grounds, and overall quality of services were significantly higher than the prior year’s administration.

Table 4: Satisfaction with OFS Grounds Services, Respondent Percentages

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Number of Responses
Maintenance of grounds (mowing, weeding, trimming, edging, etc.)	1.4%	6.1%	35.6%	32.4%	24.5%	787
Quality of landscape design and maintenance (trees, flowerbeds, etc)	1.8%	7.5%	34.7%	31.0%	25.0%	784
Litter management	2.2%	6.8%	40.4%	30.2%	20.4%	765
Management of recycling / recycling receptacles	2.3%	8.1%	37.7%	28.6%	23.3%	780
Quality of pest control (indoors and outdoors)	2.7%	10.2%	43.8%	25.2%	18.1%	778
Overall quality of grounds services	0.9%	4.9%	40.1%	32.4%	21.8%	781
Courtesy of Grounds staff	0.6%	1.0%	32.9%	32.4%	33.0%	775

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Because grounds service is specific to varied areas of campus, it is also important to look at those buildings where respondents indicated some measure of dissatisfaction with the services provided by the OFS grounds crew. Please see Appendix B.3 for this breakdown.

Section 6: Project Development and Engineering

The fourth large section of the survey asked respondents questions dealing with special projects and engineering services that may have been provided by OFS offices over the course of the prior year. This section was introduced to respondents with the following text:

“Facilities modifications and enhancements are provided on a reimbursable bases when requested by the user. Please evaluate the former Facilities Planning and Construction group if you have used their services.

In the last twelve (12) months, have you/ your office utilized any of these types of projects and engineering services?”

786 respondents answered this question. Of those, 73.4% indicated they had not used OFS special projects or engineering services in the prior year, and were directed to the next survey section. The 26.6% of respondents who indicated they had utilized OFS project development or engineering services were asked to rate their satisfaction level with the listed OFS Project Development and Engineering areas. Over 75% of all respondents indicated that they were satisfied with Project Development and Engineering Services, though respondents were less likely to indicate higher levels of satisfaction with these processes than with Custodial services. Overall respondents were more likely to indicate they were dissatisfied with these services than last year’s respondents were. Over 20% of all respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with how on time and on budget these projects were and with how well they were kept informed about the project. Table 5 shows a breakdown of responses for this section.

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Table 5: Satisfaction with OFS Special Projects and Engineering Services, Respondent Percentages

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Number of Responses
Initial Response time for estimating cost	4.0%	14.4%	45.8%	22.4%	13.4%	201
Preparedness of project workers	2.0%	10.9%	43.8%	28.4%	14.9%	201
Knowledge and Skill of Project staff	1.0%	8.4%	42.4%	30.3%	18.2%	203
Follow Up communication by project staff	5.4%	15.3%	38.9%	27.6%	12.8%	203
Did the final design meet your requirements	3.4%	9.9%	43.3%	26.1%	17.2%	203
Did the finished product meet their expectations	3.0%	9.9%	43.8%	26.6%	16.7%	203
Was the project “on time” and “on budget”?	8.7%	12.8%	40.3%	23.5%	14.8%	196
Were you kept informed throughout the project	9.0%	12.4%	40.3%	23.9%	14.4%	201

Section 7: OFS Administrative Services

The fifth large section of the survey asked respondents questions regarding their experiences with the project administration side of OFS. The section lead-in read:

“In the last twelve (12) months, have you had contact with OFS business office staff regarding the administrative side of any Maintenance project or Special Projects or Engineering Work (i.e. Scheduling, Purchase orders, cost and/or payments)?”

776 respondents answered this question. Of those, 75.8% indicated they had not used OFS special projects or engineering services in the prior year, and were directed to the final write in option on the survey. The 24.2% of respondents who indicated they had been in contact with OFS regarding the specified administrative type functions were asked to rate their satisfaction level with the listed OFS Administrative areas. At least 40% of respondents to this question indicated they were “Very Satisfied” or “Extremely Satisfied” with OFS Administrative services. Respondents were the most likely to indicate dissatisfaction with the timeliness of follow ups. Table 6 shows a breakdown of responses for this section.

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Table 6: Satisfaction with OFS Administrative Service Areas, Respondent Percentages

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Number of Responses
Timeliness of responses to inquiries about work status	4.0%	11.6%	33.7%	29.6%	21.1%	199
Timeliness of responses to inquiries about billing	2.7%	13.3%	33.5%	31.4%	19.1%	188
Courtesy of OFS staff towards customer	3.0%	3.0%	24.6%	39.7%	29.6%	199
Accuracy of information provided by OFS employees	4.0%	8.6%	31.3%	33.3%	22.7%	198
Professional Attitude of OFS employees	4.0%	3.5%	27.6%	36.7%	28.1%	199
Knowledge / Skill of OFS staff	2.5%	6.1%	28.9%	35.0%	27.4%	197

Section 8: Environmental Health and Safety

The final large section of the survey dealt with issues relating to Environmental Health and Safety services. This is a group that was placed under OFS over the course of the last year. This survey section is an expansion of the maintenance section in the prior year's survey. The introduction to this section read:

“EHS is responsible for facilitating University safety by implementing programs that will serve the students, employees and clients within the state. The objectives of NMSU's safety policy are top prevent personal injury or death, to reduce costs caused by inadequate safety procedures and to reduce environmental pollution.

EHS fulfills its mission to make NMSU a safe environment by implementing programs and services in eight major areas: Education, Training and Protective Equipment, hazardous Waste and materials Management, Health and Safety Inspection/ Faculty Audits/ Activity and Work Reviews, Regulatory Compliance, Accident and Exposure Investigations, Exposure Prevention/Indoor Air Quality, Radiation Licensing & Permitting, and Safety Standard & Procedures.”

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Because there was the potential that not all respondents would have utilized these services in the last year, respondents were first asked the following:

“In the last twelve (12) months, have you/ your office utilized EHS Services?”

789 respondents answered this question. Of those, 66.0% indicated they had not used OFS Environmental Health and Safety services in the prior year, and were directed to the next survey section. The 34.0% of respondents who indicated they had utilized OFS EHS services were asked, “Please rate your satisfaction level with EHS Services.”

In all cases, more than 50% of respondents indicated they had high levels of satisfaction with these areas. In only one case, that of follow-up communications, did more than 10% of respondents indicate they were dissatisfied with the services provided. Table 7 lists the areas that respondents were asked about as well as the percentages of responses for each question.

Table 7: Satisfaction with Environmental Health and Safety, Respondent Percentages

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Number of Responses
Initial Response time of EHS staff	1.1%	4.9%	37.8%	28.8%	27.3%	267
Preparedness of EHS Staff	0.7%	5.6%	33.1%	32.3%	28.3%	269
Knowledge/skill of EHS Staff	1.1%	4.5%	35.7%	27.9%	30.9%	269
Timely Completion of Work	1.5%	7.1%	38.0%	28.6%	24.7%	266
Follow-up communications by EHS Staff	1.9%	10.2%	37.0%	25.3%	25.7%	265
Courtesy of EHS Staff toward the customer	1.9%	4.1%	34.7%	23.1%	36.2%	268

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Final Question: Write-In

The final question on the survey awarded respondents the opportunity to write in any comments, questions, or suggestions they had about OFS services. The text for this question read:

“If you have any further concerns or comments regarding the work provided by OFS or recommendations for services you feel OFS should explore providing in the future, please feel free to share them here.”

Because there exists the potential for different buildings to have different needs, a summary of responses by building can be found below. Respondents who wrote answers to this question in the initial building write in box are counted here as well. Numbers in parenthesis indicate the numbers of written in responses falling into this category, no number means just one person answered this way. Responses are counted in all categories they fall into.

Comment Summary by Building

Academic Research A,B,C (6)

- Custodial Issues (5)
 - Bathrooms are not adequately cleaned (4)
 - Even after custodians visit bathrooms, floors are still dirty (2)
 - Trash should be picked up more frequently (2)
 - Offices are not cleaned/vacuumed (2)
- Grounds Issues (2)
 - Berries make a mess outside and are not cleaned up, this brings in bugs (1)
 - Should do work like blowing and mowing when people are not likely to be outside, dust kicked up bugs people with allergies/asthma (1)
- Survey Issues (1)
 - Did not like not having a “neutral” choice option (1)

Alumni & Visitors Center (1)

- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Watering is too much, it leaves standing water that often get’s visitor’s feet wet (1)
- OFS staff are good (1)

Astronomy Building (3)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Need for Energy Conservation (2)
 - Maybe there could be two “sets” of lights in larger offices so lights are only used in the part of the office that is in use (1)
 - Single pane windows create energy loss (1)
 - Stadium lights should not be left on (1)
- Grounds Issues (2)
 - Grass is overwatered (1)
 - There is too much grass, not enough xeriscaping (1)
- Custodial issues (1)
 - Dust is not being controlled (1)
 - Offices are not cleaned or vacuumed (1)
- OFS staff are good 91)
- Recycling Issues (1)
 - Need more frequent recycling pick up (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Temperature control is an issue, temperatures are extreme on either end of the spectrum (1)

Branson Library (3)

- Need for Energy Conservation (1)
 - But I think we are working towards it (1)
- OFS staff are good (1)
- Survey Issue (1)
 - Don't feel I know enough about some areas to fairly answer (1)
- Facilities Issues (2)
 - Temperature Control is a problem, especially in summer it is too cold (1)
 - We should be installing a light at Stewart and Williams so that foot and vehicle traffic moves more smoothly (1)

Breland Hall (12)

- OFS is doing a good job (3)
 - Custodial services is great (2)
- Administrative and Scheduling Issues (3)
 - New Work Order Process is confusing (1)
 - It is hard to get jobs done (3)
 - Lights in the East Wing do not work (1)
 - Despite multiple work order requests, the light in BD170A is still flickering (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- It took three hours to get someone to come and flip a breaker (1)
 - Lack of communication makes OFS seem arrogant 91)
- Grounds Issues (3)
 - Broken glass in parking lot is not cleaned up (1)
 - Graffiti is not cleaned up (1)
 - There is too much grass (1)
 - Steps on the west side of the building are broken 91)
 - Skunks are not being removed from campus (1)
- Issues with moving and remodeling (3)
 - Bulletin Boards are still not hung up (2)
 - Technical services were unduly interrupted (1)
 - Personal Bulletin Boards were taken and never returned (1)
 - Feeling that a disorganized move has hurt professional credibility of faculty members (1)
 - It is unfair that offices cannot be decorated using personal resources (1)
 - Process is good, but was scheduled poorly so it disrupted fall courses (1)
 - Asbestos removal should not be done when students are in the building (1)
- Need for more Energy Conservation (2)
 - Would like to be able to open windows and use fans for cooling (1)
- Survey Issue (1)
 - Would like to have a neutral midpoint on the scale of choices (1)

Business Complex Building (5)

- Staff are good (4)
 - Custodial Staff are good (4)
 - Antonio, Lupe, and Michelle are great (1)
 - Great communication (1)
 - Respond quickly to issues(1)
 - Carpenters and movers are good (1)
 - Cindy helps a lot with work order process (1)
- Custodial Issues (2)
 - Need to have Friday Trash Pickup (1)
 - Should be dusting as well (1)
- Grounds Issues (2)
 - OFS golf carts destroy lawns and have hit buildings (1)
 - Need less grass and more xeriscape (1)
- Recycling Issues (1)
 - Recycling team just dumps the trash in with recycling (1)
- Staff Issues (1)
 - Reckless Driving (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Poor work ethic (1)
- Too many people come at one time to pick-up recycling (1)
- Survey issue (1)
 - Would like a “not sure” and a “dissatisfied” option
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - OFS did damage to a building but forced the department/college to pay for the damage (1)
- Energy Conservation Needed (1)
 - Would like light sensors installed (1)

Cervantes Village, Building A (1)

- Custodial Issue (1)
 - Custodians are too rushed and leave things dirty and supplies unfilled (1)
- Grounds Issue (1)
 - Too few staff to get needed work done (1)

Cervantes Village, Building C (2)

- Grounds Issues (1)
 - There is a roach problem that is not being taken care of (1)
- Staff is good (1)
 - Tim Dobson was great in helping with cleaning, sanitizing, restoration of classrooms (1)

Campus Police/ Ag Institute (2)

- Administrative Issues (2)
 - The New Work Order system is too complex (2)
 - It takes a long time for work to get done (2)

Chemistry Building (8)

- Administrative and Scheduling Issues (5)
 - Work orders are not handled in a timely manner (4)
 - Requested fume hoods to be installed in August and still waiting 92)
 - Seats are not repaired (1)
 - Leaky roof is not repaired (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Broken wall has not been fixed (1)
 - Carpenters are slow to come (1)
 - Water damage has not been addressed (1)
- Some work orders are lost (1)
- Staff Issues (4)
 - Custodial Services are too busy to have time to do a good job (2)
 - The new schedule limits communication about custodial work (1)
 - OFS staff are overworked (1)
- Staff are good (3)
 - OFS staff are always professional, polite, knowledgeable (1)
 - They do a good job with Lab classes (1)
- EHS Issues (1)
 - Haz Com course should be offered at different times so that student workers can get the needed training to be able to do their jobs
- Custodial Issues (1)
 - Floors in offices have not been mopped in months (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Temperatures are extreme (1)
- Survey Issue (1)
 - Name of building should read, "Chemistry and Biochemistry Building" (1)

Clara Belle Williams Hall (4)

- Custodial Issues (2)
 - Garbage cans left out in hall make it hard for the mobility challenged to navigate (1)
 - Carpets need to be shampooed more frequently (1)
 - Offices are not being vacuumed (1)
- Staff are good (2)
 - Carpentry, heating/cooling, and recycling staff are great (1)
 - Paul Valdiva does a good job and is always courteous (1)
- Staff Issues (1)
 - We miss Henry Saenz (1)
 - It is hard for custodians to meet the needs of the building when they are short on supplies (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Prices are too high for OFS services (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Toilet and Toilet paper dispenser in women's restroom are broken (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Computer Center (7)

- Custodial Issues (4)
 - Carpets are always dirty (3)
 - Need more frequent carpet shampooing (2)
 - Bathrooms are not cleaned (1)
 - Need for better cleaning products, the sinks and toilets look gross and unsanitary (1)
- Facilities Issues (3)
 - Would prefer to have tile instead of carpet (1)
 - Roof leaks and is not repaired correctly (1)
 - We need to have better exterior signage (1)
- Staff Issues (3)
 - There are not enough staff to meet needs (1)
 - Staff bounce around too much (1)
 - Project Management is poor under Robert (1)
 - Welders in Milton used a regular outlet, and repeatedly tripped a circuit which damaged equipment on the circuit (1)
- Grounds Issues (2)
 - Debris is not being picked up (1)
 - Graffiti is not cleaned (1)
 - “Critter” issues are not proactively addressed (1)
 - Sprinklers water the sidewalk (1)
 - Mowing debris is not cleaned (1)
 - OFS vehicles leave ruts in the grass (1)
- OFS is doing a good job (1)
- Good Staff (1)
 - The one maintenance person here works so hard (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - The new billing system does not provide the customer with enough information

Dan W Williams Hall (2)

- Administrative Issues (2)
 - Poor and untimely follow up (2)
 - Poor Coordination between OFS units (1)
 - Poor Cost estimates (1)
 - Projects are not being completed to an acceptable standard (1)
 - Locks are poorly installed (1)
- Good staff (1)
 - Plumbers are great (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Dove Hall (3)

- OFS does a good job (2)
- Good staff (1)
 - Custodial staff and grounds/landscaping do not get enough credit (1)
- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Sidewalks and porches need to be cleaned more (1)
- Custodial Issue (1)
 - Windows need to be cleaned (1)
- Administrative Issue (1)
 - The New Work Order system is not good (1)

Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Complex (10)

- Staff is Good (4)
 - OFS is always responsive (1)
 - Custodial Staff are great (1)
 - Luz, Mike, Roger do an excellent job
 - Robert Bilbao, Mike Luchau, Stan Dyer, Chuck Ryder, Jose Gambon, Katrina Doolittle were all great with help on ET student project
- Facilities Issues (3)
 - HVAC system is not properly controlled (3)
- Administrative issues (3)
 - New Work Order process is too complex (1)
 - Issues with quote system (1)
 - Too many Follow up emails after submittal of work order (1)
- Recycling Issue (1)
 - Stacks up quickly, need more frequent pick up (1)
 - Custodial issues (1)
 - Shouldn't have to vacuum own office (1)

Educational Services Center (5)

- Custodial Issues (3)
 - Custodians do not have enough supplies to do their jobs (3)
 - Supervisors are non-responsive (1)
 - Carpets need more frequent cleaning (1)
 - Building is never clean enough (1)
- Staff is good (2)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Custodial Staff is Excellent (2)
- Key shop is good (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Temperatures are always extreme (1)
- EHS Issues (1)
 - Dragging feet on vent clean up
 - Ignored mold issues and laughed when brought problem to attention
- Grounds issues (1)
 - Sprinklers in front of Housing on University Avenue get the street and cars, not the lawn (1)

Engineering Complex I (1)

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - OFS takes too long to complete work (1)
 - Services are overpriced (1)

Equine Education Center (2)

- Grounds issues (1)
 - Flies are a constant problem (1)
 - No one comes to cut grass (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Lack of communication (1)
 - Takes too long to get things done (1)
- Staff issues (1)
 - Poor work ethics (1)
- Good staff (1)
 - Electrical and plumbing (1)
 - Some of the carpenters (1)

Foster Hall (4)

- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Need more trash cans outside, especially on the North side of the building (1)
 - Stairwells and courtyards are not picked up (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - OFS takes a long time to complete work
- Good Staff (1)
 - Appreciate whoever cleans off the benches near Frenger (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- EHS issues (1)
 - Need more frequent and varied scheduling for Haz Com and Lab Standard classes for student workers (1)
- Staff issues (1)
 - David Shearer is not available when campus needs him because of external obligations to Dona Ana campus (1)
- Projects and Engineering Issues (1)
 - Architects are not cooperative with helping us prepare for grant proposals and renovations, and large grants have been lost as a result (1)

Garcia Annex/Hall (10)

- Staff are good (2)
 - Manny in custodial is great (1)
 - Jerry V, Erik, Nick with HVAC are great to work with (1)
- Custodial Issues (2)
 - Vacuuming needs to be more frequent (1)
 - Carpets and windows, especially in computer lab need to be washed (1)
 - Would like it if custodians who come in during off hours would leave a note explaining what they have done (1)
- Facility Issues (2)
 - Faculty senate chamber needs better lighting (1)
 - Windows need new casing, sunscreens, or to be replaced with more efficient windows (1)
- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Grass mowing during work hours triggers allergies (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Rates are too high given the market (1)
- Good job (1)
 - We call OFS a lot and get a great response from them (1)
- Survey Issue (1)
 - I did not like receiving follow up emails (1)
- Staff Issues (1)
 - Workers often do not talk to people in charge when they come in to do something (1)
 - 2-3 years ago a hole was knocked into a wall probably with the intent to steal things, but OFS won't admit to it (1)

Gardiner Hall (3)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Poor coordination between OFS and ICT regarding a renovation project has resulted in problematic placement of light switches, internet hook ups and electric wires (1)
- Staff are great (1)
 - Especially with the move of the geology department and coordination by administration, electric, plumbing, carpentry (1)
- Grounds issues (1)
 - Skunks in drainage pipes are not removed (1)

Genesis Center C (1)

- Grounds Issues (1)
 - More attention needs to be paid to this area (1)
 - In the summer when fruit is on the purple leaf plum trees is a bad time to be pruning them (1)

Genesis Center Office (1)

- Administrative Issue (1)
 - There is not a timely response to requests (1)

Gerald Thomas Hall (20)

- Custodial Issues (11)
 - Poor quality of custodial supplies (3)
 - More Frequent Trash pickup needed to avoid bringing in bugs (2)
 - Southwest area of the building, especially stairs are not receiving adequate attention (1)
 - We shouldn't have to vacuum our own carpets (2)
 - Bathrooms are not clean (2)
 - Hallways and bathrooms look bad when we have weekend visitors coming in (2)
 - Sometimes the building smells like sewage (1)
 - We would like advance notice before floors are stripped and polished so we can move things out of the way (1)
- Good staff (6)
 - Especially Ralph 'Bud' Jones for help with U.Comm filming (1)
 - EHS is much better here than at other universities (1)
 - Custodial services go the extra mile (1)
 - Administrative staff are good to work with (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Good Service (4)
 - Work orders are handled quickly and politely (1)
- Survey Issues (3)
 - Would like a different scale with an “I don’t know” option (3)
- Grounds Issues (3)
 - Leaf blowers are bad (1)
 - Get rid of the grass (1)
 - Need more shade trees on walking paths (1)
 - Parking lot and outside rugs are in bad shape (1)
 - Needles need to be picked up and tree branched trimmed (1)
- Staff issues (2)
 - Janitorial staff have poor work ethic (1)
 - Moving staff always complain and take too long (1)
- N/A (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Temperatures are extreme in building (1)
- Energy efficiency (1)
 - Stadium lights should not be left on at night (1)
- EHS issues (1)
 - There is too long of a delay between lab visits and final reports(1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Prices are not competitive with the market, they are too high (1)
 - Work is not up to par with industry standards (1)
- Recycling Issues (1)
 - Recycling needs more frequent pickup (1)

Guthrie Hall (4)

- Good Staff (2)
 - Happy to have Michelle back, she goes the extra mile (2)
- Good job (2)
 - Good job on the remodel (1)
 - Grounds and landscaping are good. Xeriscaping would be impractical (1)
- Miscellaneous Issue (1)
 - GU 201 Remodel is missing a carpet threshold protector
- Grounds issues (1)
 - Would like to see more southwest species in the mic (1)
 - Would like to thin out overcrowded trees (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Goddard Hall (2)

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - The new work order system is difficult (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Poor temperature control (1)
 - Turning the AC off at night can possibly hurt machinery (1)

Hadley Hall (7)

- Good Staff (2)
 - The custodian, Manny, is great – hardworking and pleasant (2)
- Custodial Issues exist (1)
- Grounds issues Exist (1)
- Miscellaneous Issues (1)
 - We need more modern signs (1)
- EHS issue (1)
 - Mold in vents has not been taken care of (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - We need more parking (1)

Hardman Hall (4)

- Administrative Issues (3)
 - OFS needs work on employee retention (1)
 - Feedback on walkthroughs is not timely (1)
 - Don't like it when our custodian is taken away because you are short staffed (1)
- Good job (2)
- Staff is good (1)
 - Miguel in custodial does all he can (1)
 - Custodial supervisors are responsive(1)
- Custodial issues (1)
 - Building is in use at 7:30 so a 5am to 1 pm cleaning shift means that there are things that cannot be done (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Poor handicap access to get from parking lot to elevator (1)
 - No handicap access to restrooms (1)
- Grounds issues (1)
 - Debris build up in stairwells (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Energy Conservation (1)
 - Lights should be turned out when the building is locked (1)

Health and Social Services Building (14)

- Custodial issues (7)
 - Bathrooms are not being cleaned (4)
 - Rugs are still dirty in the morning (2)
 - Stairways need regular cleaning (1)
 - The new auditorium is not being cleaned (1)
 - Lecture tables are never cleaned (1)
 - We need toilet seat covers (1)
 - Need more frequent trash pickup (1)
 - Would like access to vacuum cleaner and trash liners (1)
 - Would like to know what the cleaning schedule is (1)
- Facilities Issues (5)
 - There are not enough keys for the new auditorium (1)
 - The Air smells bad by the end of the day, maybe we need air fresheners (1)
 - Temperatures are extreme (1)
 - Broken projector bulb takes too long to fix (1)
 - Handicap doors do not always work (1)
- Grounds Issues (2)
 - Sprinklers are sometimes left on all day in the summer (1)
 - We should turn off sprinklers when it rains (1)
- Administrative Issues (2)
 - It is hard to get in contact with OFS in the summer (1)
 - I do not know who to call when I have issues (1)
- Staff is good (2)
 - Custodians are courteous and helpful (1)
- Miscellaneous Issues (1)
 - Keys are not cut right the first time (1)
- Staff Issues (1)
 - Feel that Mr. Haubold and Directors do not work well with people or respect “worker bees” (1)
- Good job (1)
 - Like the recycling program (1)

Herschel Zohn Theatre (3)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Good job (1)
 - Much better and more honest over the last year (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Work order response time is slow (1)
 - Jobs are left uncompleted (1)
- Survey Issues (1)
 - Building name is misspelled (1)

Jacobs Hall (1)

- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Cigarette Ash cans are not emptied (1)
 - Trash that falls out of cans is not picked up (1)
 - Need to make sure dumpsters are being closed (1)

John Whitlock Hernandez Hall (2)

- Custodial Issues (1)
 - Entryways, foyers, stairs need to be cleaned – floors and ceilings (1)
- Great staff (1)
 - Luisa and Allen in custodial do a great job and are friendly (1)
 - Whoever cleaned the handicap ramp (1)

James B. Delamater Activity Center (5)

- Custodial Issues (2)
 - Labs left open after custodians leave (1)
 - Need 7 days/ week cleaning services (1)
- N/A (5)

Jett Hall (2)

- Good Job (2)
 - EHS helped with old chemical clean up, it was a good experience (1)
 - Quick Response time (1)
- Staff is great (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Jornada USDA Exp. Range HQ (Wooten Hall) (1)

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Issues with end of year utilities billing (1)

Knox Hall (6)

- Good job (2)
 - EHS is good and should remain fully funded (1)
- Facilities Issues (2)
 - Extreme Temperatures (1)
 - Power outages hamper research (1)
- Staff is good (1)
 - Danny, Joe, and Maria go above and beyond (1)
- EHS issues (1)
 - EHS should capture bats in the building instead of making us do it ourselves (1)

Milton Hall (12)

- Facilities Issues (5)
 - Leak in ceiling is causing mold and was not fixed after OFS visit (2)
 - Putting new carpet on top of old has left things musty and aggravated allergies (1)
 - HVAC is left on over weekend (1)
 - We should have hot water (1)
 - Don't allow people to put tape on white boards (1)
 - Window is cracked but not fixed, even after OFS visit (1)
- Grounds Issues (3)
 - Should not water during hottest part of day 92)
 - Sidewalks need to be cleared (1)
 - Trees need to be trimmed (1)
- Custodial issues (3)
 - Carpet cleaning is needed on a regular basis in common areas (1)
 - Cleaning schedule interferes with advising when they come in between 11 and 12 on weekdays (1)
 - Floor in O'Donnell is dirty (1)
- Staff is good (3)
 - Custodial is good (3)
 - Jerry in HVAC (1)
 - Dave in Electrical (1)
- Good job (1)
 - Grounds look good (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - It takes too long to complete work orders (1)
- Energy Conservation (1)
 - Windows are inefficient (1)

Music Building (2)

- Custodial issues (1)
 - Building should be cleaned before evening performances (1)
- Good job (1)

Natatorium (2)

- Custodial issues (2)
 - Showers and lockers are not regularly cleaned and well maintained, mold. Etc. creates health hazard (2)

Neale Hall (1)

- Facilities Issue (1)
 - Hole in ceiling of women's bathroom (1)
- Custodial Issue (1)
 - Need more frequent vacuuming
- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Should regularly spray for roaches/spiders (1)

New Mexico Department of Agriculture (1)

- Staff does a good job (1)
- Staff Issues (1)
 - OFS is understaffed (1)

O'Donnell Hall (15)

- Custodial Issues (8)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Vacuuming not happening (3)
- Too much socializing by staff (1)
- Bathrooms are disgusting and supplies are always low (1)
- Equipment and supplies are not adequate for the job (1)
- Staff Issues (5)
 - OFS is understaffed (5)
- Grounds Issues (5)
 - Trees on Presiado park side need to be trimmed (1)
 - Graffiti on green pole on park side not cleaned (1)
 - Parking lot needs repair and cleaning (1)
 - Too much grass (1)
 - Shouldn't be using blowers (1)
 - Pest control is an issue (1)
- Good staff (3)
 - Custodians work hard (2)
- Good job (3)
 - Grounds look good (1)
- Administrative Issue (3)
 - Can't get estimates or follow up on scheduled projects (2)
 - At least a week late on work orders (1)
- N/A (1)
- Survey Issue (1)
 - Want a "does not apply" option or a different scale (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Problems with temperature control (1)

OFS Lock Shop (1)

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Lack of communication between OFS departments (1)

OFS Motor Pool (2)

- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Handicap Access should be in front of the Pan Am center (1)
- Survey Issue (1)
 - Should have Mechanics Shop as a building choice (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Passive Solar (1)

- Custodial Issues (1)
 - Need more frequent services (1)

Photovoltaic Labs (2)

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Poor communication between OFS and Financial offices (1)
- Survey Issues (1)
 - Classification of Pan Am Center Office is Problematic (1)

Regents Row (10)

- Good Staff (4)
 - Tim is very good (3)
 - Irene is good and goes above and beyond (1)
- Custodial Issues (2)
 - Upset about losing Tim (1)
 - No one is mopping offices and bathrooms (1)
- Grounds issues (2)
 - Blowers and washers are too energy intensive (1)
 - Need more xeriscaping (1)
 - Trees on the side of Zuhl look sick (1)
- Miscellaneous Issues (1)
 - Lost personal property when OFS staff came to move my office (1)
- Energy Conservation (1)
 - Want to see movement towards more sustainability (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Building should be demolished (1)

Rentfrow Gym (1)

- Custodial Issues (1)
 - Cut backs made cleaning inadequate
 - Would like to be given a supply of chemicals so we can clean showers (1)
 - Substitutes do not pay attention to security (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Good staff (1)
 - Regular custodians are great (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Poor scheduling of services (1)

Science Hall (12)

- Custodial Issues (5)
 - Chalkboards and chalk trays need to be cleaned (2)
 - Custodians turn off lights while class is still in session (1)
 - Lights are left on too much (1)
 - Women's second floor restroom needs attention (1)
- Facilities Issues (5)
 - Dust filtering system is needed (1)
 - Sink in the second floor men's room is backed up lots (1)
 - Temperature regulation issues (1)
 - Soil erosion from animal pens obstructs bike path because wall is not fixed (1)
 - Need Hot water in the building (1)
- Good staff (3)
 - Robert Ortega and Crew do excellent work for the baby lab (1)
 - Custodial (2)
 - Movers and Sign shop (1)
- Grounds Issues (3)
 - Too much blower use (1)
 - More environmentally friendly practices needed (1)
 - There are roaches etc. but no spraying happens (1)
 - Litter outside is not picked up (1)
 - Weeds are not addressed (1)
- Administrative Issues (2)
 - Slow response time from OFS (1)
 - Costs are high (1)
 - Many outstanding work orders (1)

Skeen Hall (8)

- Good Staff (3)
 - Glen Haubold is good (1)
 - HVAC, Electric, Plumbing (1)
 - Janitor Joe is good (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Custodial goes above and beyond (1)
- Jose Gamon always has a quick response (1)
- Administrative Issues (3)
 - New Work order system can take two or more months and multiple entries to get a work order completed (1)
 - Special projects are non responsive (1)
 - Redundancy in efforts (1)
 - Poor communication between offices (1)
- Grounds Issuers (2)
 - Shouldn't water during hottest part of day (1)
 - Landscaping is poorly planned (1)
 - Weeds are not pulled (1)
 - Irrigation is leaky (1)
 - Trees are dying (1)
- Good job (1)
- Survey issues (1)
 - Want more detail about services (1)
- EHS issues (1)
 - Seem to change rules arbitrarily (1)
- Facilities Issues(1)
 - Leaks are not fixed and tiles are still broken (1)
 - Heating and cooling regulation is hard (1)
- Staff issues (1)
 - Inefficient when three people sent to complete work of one (1)
- Energy Conservation (1)
 - Lights should not be left on at night (1)
- Custodial Issues (1)
 - Need a trash can for the north east door (1)

Speech Building (7)

- Grounds issues (3)
 - Water leaks by the speech lot need to be fixed (1)
 - Need more trash cans outside (1)
 - Spraying for bugs needs to be free and regularly scheduled (1)
 - Need more xeriscaping and tables (1)
- Staff is good (3)
 - Janitorial (1)
 - Grounds (1)
 - Molly works hard (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Custodial issues (3)
 - Inconsistent cleaning (1)
 - Bathrooms are dirty (1)
 - Need more frequent services (1)
- Facilities issues (2)
 - Temperature regulation (1)
 - Fixing carpet and getting mats is not being done (1)
- Staff Issues (1)
 - Not enough custodial staff (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Work orders for cleaning are not being done (1)
- Good job(1)
 - Grounds are beautiful (1)

Student Health Center (4)

- Custodial Issues (2)
 - Paper towels are forgotten when substitute custodians are there 92)
- Survey Issues (2)
 - Name should be "Campus Health Clinic" (2)
- Good job (2)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Problems with temperature regulation (1)
- Staff is good (1)
 - HVAC and normal custodial (1)
 - Lock shop (1)
- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Flowerbeds look bad (1)
 - Have to put in a work order for anything that is not mowing (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Time lag between request for and completion of services (1)

Sugerman Spacegrant Building (1)

- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Poor management of services (1)
 - No outside cleaning is happening (1)
- Custodial Issues (1)
 - Building is not mopped daily (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Vacuuming is not happening (1)
- Staff good (1)
 - We miss Bertha Swarez (1)

Thomas and Brown Hall (2)

- Administrative Issues (1)
 - New work order is too complex and should have some self populating fields (1)
- Survey Issues (1)
 - Questions are too general (1)

Walden Hall (1)

- N/A (1)

Wells Hall (1)

- Survey Issues (1)
 - Want a different scale (1)
- Custodial Issues (1)
 - No one comes for weeks at a time and we have to place a work order for basic cleaning (1)
- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Yard does not get care (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - Carpet needs replacing (1)
 - Building has not been painted in 20 years (1)
 - Driveway of lot 80 is a safety hazard (1)

Zuhl Library (5)

- Good Staff (2)
 - Especially those cleaning the activity center this summer (1)
- Administrative Issues (2)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- When we call for safety issues such as a skunk or broken glass in the street, I am advised nothing will be done without a work order (1)
- Cost of special projects is high (1)
- Good job (2)
 - Much better service in last two years (1)
 - Service good after custodian switch (1)
- Custodial Issues (1)
 - First floor ladies room is always messy and under stocked (1)
 - Vacuuming does not happen (1)

PSL/Anderson Hall (11)

- Custodial Issues (5)
 - Need regular vacuuming (2)
 - Custodians are overextended (1)
 - Need daily trash pickup (1)
 - Bathrooms and kitchens need more attention (1)
 - Poor work ethic (1)
 - Offices are not swept (1)
- Facilities Issues (2)
 - There is exposed asbestos in this building (1)
 - Streets need repairing (1)
- Good job (2)
 - Great experiences (1)
 - Buildings are well maintained (1)
 - Grounds look good (1)
- Other issues (2)
 - Flooding streets to clear pipes seems a waste of water (1)
 - OFS should be paid more
- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Weeds are not taken care of (1)
 - Spider issue is not addressed (1)
- Administrative issues (1)
 - Architects work is outdated and unreliable (1)
- Good staff (1)
 - Custodial (1)
- Survey Issue (1)
 - Do not like scale (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

Other OFS Facilities (6)

- Staff Issues (2)
 - We lose staff because of low pay (1)
 - I hope to have room to move up some day (1)
- N/A (2)
- Recycling Issues(1)
 - Need more bins(1)
- Good staff (1)
 - Especially grounds because they are short staffed (1)

Dona Ana Community College (15)

- Custodial issues (5)
 - Services are not frequent enough (3)
 - Restrooms are dirty (3)
 - Main building at DACC is always dirty (1)
 - Custodial should be able to empty blue recycling bins (1)
 - Carpets need attention (1)
- Recycling Issues (4)
 - East Mesa has no can or bottle recycling bins (2)
 - Should be recycling cardboard (1)
 - Recycling bins should be near snack bar, not by library (1)
- Facilities Issues (4)
 - Temperature regulation (2)
 - East Mesa has extremes (1)
 - Learning Resource Center is always cold (1)
 - Weird regular plumbing noise at 8:30 am on Tuesday and Thursday in DACC176 disrupts class (1)
 - Sunland park campus needs more parking, lights, better temperature regulation, more labs, classrooms, and restrooms (1)
- Great job (3)
 - Custodial at East Mesa is good (2)
- Good employees (3)
 - DACC central campus OFS staff (1)
 - OFS not given the respect they deserve (1)
- Other (2)
 - I let my supervisor deal with OFS (1)
 - There are no services for bicycles (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Need more xeriscaping, especially at parking lot borders (1)
- Staff issues (1)
 - Need more staff (1)

Other on Campus Locations (3)

- Good Staff (2)
 - Tino and crew are good (1)
 - Tim Dobson and Bud Jones (1)
- Grounds Issues (1)
 - Needs are not met because grounds crew is understaffed (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Paperwork asked of us is too much (1)
 - Research facilities should not be mandated to use OFS services (1)

Off Campus locations and Branches (excludes Dona Ana) (8)

- Survey Issues (3)
 - Not sure this applies to me (3)
- Good Job (3)
 - Huge improvement in meeting Ag. Science Center needs (1)
- Good Staff (2)
 - Alamogordo custodial work hard (1)
 - Have become much more customer service oriented (1)
- Administrative Issues (2)
 - Albuquerque Center needs guidance on special projects (1)
 - Ceilings for in house construction should be raised (1)
- Staff Issues (1)
 - Alamogordo facilities are overworked and need more staff (1)
- Custodial issues (1)
 - Alamogordo Carpets not being cleaned (1)

All/None/Blank building (12)

- Survey Issues (6)
 - Not familiar with OFS (4)
 - I don't like the scale (1)

Fall 2010: OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

- Couldn't find PSL on list (1)
- Good job (3)
 - Service should be getting better now that EHS has merged (1)
- Administrative Issues (1)
 - Work Order process needs to be simplified (1)
- Staff issue (1)
 - NMSU-A facilities administration is unprofessional (1)
- Grounds issues (1)
 - Grounds crews are understaffed (1)
- Custodial Issue (1)
 - Gerald Thomas Stairs are filthy (1)
- Good Staff (1)
 - Dr. Doolittle with EHS (1)
- Facilities Issues (1)
 - DACC free lot near housing needs attention (1)

Appendices

Appendix A: Survey Form

This is the 2nd annual Office of Facilities and Services (OFS) Customer Service Survey. Because the Office of Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) and the Office of Facilities Planning and Construction (FPC) were integrated into a single work unit with OFS on July 1, 2010, questions about services provided by all three organizations are included.

Customer service is a key component of effective facilities management, and it is important to OFS that our customers feel that their needs are heard, understood, and acted upon. The OFS commitment to continuous improvement is meaningless without input from you, and we would like for you to tell us how we are doing.

We are asking that NMSU employees take 5-10 minutes to fill out this survey to help us determine how we can better meet the needs of the NMSU community. Please complete those sections applicable to any services that you are familiar with; for example, Community Colleges and Agricultural Science Centers may have only used FPC and/or EHS services in this past year.

Please be honest. This survey is used to guide our initiatives, and the results are reported to APPA, our professional organization. The survey summary and scores will be published, and last year, there were so many positive comments received about Ron Tarazoff that he received the Strickland Award for excellent customer service in OFS.

The survey will be available until Friday, October 8, 2010. All responses to this survey are anonymous. For questions about this survey, please contact Glen Haubold, 646-2101, ghaubold@nmsu.edu

For each question, please choose the answer you feel best represents your view. Feel free to provide additional information or suggestions on how OFS can improve their services in the write in box at the end of the survey

We greatly appreciate you taking the time to complete the OFS Customer Satisfaction Survey.

How would you rate your overall satisfaction level with the work you have seen completed by the office of facilities and services in the last twelve (12) months?

- Extremely Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied

- Very Dissatisfied
- Extremely Dissatisfied

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. If your building is not listed, please type the name of your building into the write-in box.

- Academic Research A,B,C
- Alumni & Visitors Center
- Astronomy Building
- Beef Office
- Biological Control Insectary
- Biology Annex
- Branson Library
- Breland Hall
- Business Complex Building
- Campus Police/Ag Institute
- Cattle Feed Barn/Animal Science
- Cervantes Village, Bldg A (Children's Village)
- Cervantes Village, Bldg C (Children's Village)
- Chemistry Building
- Clara Belle Williams Hall
- Computer Center
- Dan W. Williams Hall
- Dan W. Williams Hall Annex
- Dove Hall
- Ed and Harold Foreman Engineering Complex
- Educational Services Center
- Engineering Complex I
- Equine Education Center
- Foster Hall
- Garcia Annex
- Gardiner Hall
- Genesis Center B
- Genesis Center C
- Genesis Center Office
- Gerald Thomas Hall
- Goddard Hall
- Guthrie Hall
- Hadley Hall
- Hardman Hall
- Health and Social Services Building
- Herschel Zohn Theatre
- Hort Farm Restrooms/Offices/Class

- Jacobs Hall
- James B. Delamater Activity Center
- Jett Hall
- John Whitlock Hernandez Hall
- Jornada USDA Exp. Range HQ (Wooten Hall)
- Jornada USDA Labs
- Kent Hall
- Knox Hall
- Livestock Judging Pavilion
- Livestock Office
- Milton Hall
- Music Building
- Nason House
- Natatorium
- Neale Hall
- New Mexico Dept. of Agriculture
- O'Donnell Hall
- OFS Construction
- OFS Lock Shop
- OFS Masonry Shop
- OFS Motor Pool
- OFS Office
- OFS Recycling Center
- O'Loughlin House
- Passive Solar
- PGEL Headhouse/Lab
- Photovoltaic Labs
- Regents Row
- Rentfrow Gym
- Science Hall
- Skeen Hall
- Unspecified
- Tennis Center
- Surplus Property Warehouse
- PSL
- OFS Paint Shop
- Office of Real Estate
- Nematology Lab
- Grounds Department
- Golf Course
- Corbett Center
- Off Campus
- Small Animal Research Lab

- Softball Office and Locker Room
- Speech Building
- Stucky Hall
- Student Health Center
- Sugerman Space Grant Building
- Tejada Building, Extension Annex
- Thomas & Brown Hall
- Track Restroom
- USDA Cotton Gin (Reimbursable)
- Walden Hall
- Wells Hall
- William B. Conroy Honors Center
- Zuhl Library

Other: _____

Custodial Care:

OFS provides basic cleaning, recycling, and routine pest control services for Instruction and General buildings. This is done according to a published schedule on the OFS 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

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
Cleanliness of Public areas (entryways, lobbies, lounges etc.)					
Cleanliness of Restrooms					
Cleanliness of offices/classrooms					
Courtesy of Custodial Staff					
Frequency of Custodial Services					
Overall Quality of Custodial Services					

Building and Environment:

OFS 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.

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
Temperature					
Lighting (is it adequate for the task)					
Handicap Access					
Availability and Reliability of utilities (electrical power, heating, cooling meet our needs and have minimal interruptions)					
Energy conservation					

Grounds and Landscaping:

OFS provides landscape and grounds maintenance, exterior trash receptacle management and concrete and asphalt maintenance. In addition OFS maintains the walkways and roadways around campus and is responsible for the care of lawns, trees, and shrubs. OFS is also funded to maintain campus drainage systems.

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following areas as they relate to OFS grounds maintenance in your area of the university.

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
Maintenance of grounds (mowing, weeding, trimming, edging, etc.)					
Quality of landscape design and maintenance (trees, flowerbeds, etc)					
Litter management					
Management of recycling / recycling receptacles					
Quality of pest control (indoors and outdoors)					
Overall quality of grounds services					
Courtesy of Grounds staff					

Project Development and Engineering:

Facilities modifications and enhancements are provided on a reimbursable bases when requested by the user.

In the last twelve (12) months, have you/ your office utilized any of these types of projects and engineering services?

- Yes (respondent finishes this question)
- No (respondent continues with next yes/no question)

Please rate your satisfaction level with the following OFS Projects and Engineering areas.

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
Initial Response time for estimating cost					
Preparedness of project workers					
Knowledge and Skill of Project staff					
Follow Up communication by project staff					
Did the final design meet your requirements?					
Did the finished product meet their expectations?					
Was the project “on time” and “on budget”					
Were you kept informed throughout the project?					

Administrative Services:

In the last twelve (12) months, have you had contact with OFS business office staff regarding the administrative side of any Maintenance project or Special Projects or Engineering Work (i.e. Scheduling, Purchase orders, cost and/or payments)?

- Yes (respondent finishes this question)
- No (respondent continues with next yes/no question)

Please rate your satisfaction level with the following OFS Administrative Services.

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
Timeliness of responses to inquiries about work status					
Timeliness of responses to inquiries about billing					
Courtesy of OFS staff towards customer					
Accuracy of information provided by OFS employees					
Professional Attitude of OFS employees					
Knowledge / Skill of OFS staff					

Environmental Health and Safety

EHS is responsible for facilitating University safety by implementing programs that will serve the students, employees and clients within the state. The objectives of NMSU's safety policy are top prevent personal injury or death, to reduce costs caused by inadequate safety procedures and to reduce environmental pollution.

EHS fulfills its mission to make NMSU a safe environment by implementing programs and services in eight major areas: Education, Training and Protective Equipment, hazardous Waste and materials Management, Health and Safety Inspection/ Faculty Audits/ Activity and Work Reviews, Regulatory Compliance, Accident and Exposure Investigations, Exposure Prevention/Indoor Air Quality, Radiation Licensing & Permitting, and Safety Standard & Procedures.

In the last twelve (12) months, have you/ your office utilized EHS Services?

- Yes (respondent finishes this question)
- No (respondent continues with next yes/no question)

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied	Number of Responses
Initial Response time of EHS staff						
Preparedness of EHS Staff						
Knowledge/skill of EHS Staff						
Timely Completion of Work						
Follow-up communications by EHS Staff						
Courtesy of EHS Staff toward the customer						

Comments/ Suggestions

If you have any further concerns or comments regarding the work provided by OFS or recommendations for services you feel OFS should explore providing in the future, please feel free to share them here (limited to 5,000 characters).

Thank you again for taking this opportunity to give us feedback regarding the services OFS provides. Your input is invaluable in helping us to improve the scope of our services. Our ultimate goal is to ensure that the facilities management needs of NMSU are heard, understood, and acted upon.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Glen Haubold, 646-2101, glaubold@nmsu.edu.

Appendix B: Buildings indicating some dissatisfaction broken out by survey question

B.1 Custodial

Table B.1.a: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the cleanliness of public areas

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	19.0%
Astronomy Building	60.0%
Biology Annex	100.0%*
Breland Hall	3.7%
Cervantes Village Building C	50.0%*
Chemistry Building	18.75%
Clara Belle Williams Hall	50.0%
Computer Center	6.25%
Educational Services Center	2.9%*
Foster Hall	20.0%
Garcia Annex/Hall	5.3%
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	5.1%
Hadley Hall	8.3%
Hardman Hall	12.5%*
Health and Social Services Building	17.9%
Jett Hall	11.1%
Milton hall	13.6%
Natatorium	100.0%
O'Donnell Hall	20.0%
Regents Row	9.5%
Science Hall	11.1%
Speech Building	25.0%
Sugerman Space Grant Building	100.0%
Wells Hall	100.0%
PSL/Anderson Hall	6.7%
Dona Ana Community College	8.8%
OFS Other Buildings	16.7%*
Off Campus Locations	4.2%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.1.b: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the cleanliness of restrooms

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	33.3%
Astronomy Building	100.0%*
Biology Annex	7.4%
Breland Hall	15.4%
Cervantes Village Building C	50.0%*
Chemistry Building	31.25%
Clara Belle Williams Hall	50.0%
Computer Center	18.75%
Educational Services Center	11.8%
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Garcia Annex/Hall	5.3%*
Gardiner Hall	25.0%
Gerald Thomas Hall	12.8%
Hadley Hall	8.3%
Hardman Hall	25.0%
Health and Social Services Building	14.3%
Jett Hall	22.2%
Milton hall	45.0%*
Music Building	20.0%*
Natatorium	100.0%
O'Donnell Hall	16.0%
Regents Row	11.1%
Science Hall	16.7%
Sugerman Space Grant Building	50.0%*
Thomas and Brown Hall	20.0%*
Wells Hall	50.0%*
Zuhl Library	9.1%*
A Mountain	33.3%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	16.7%
Dona Ana Community College	26.4%
OFS Other Buildings	33.3%
Off Campus Locations	13.0%
None/All/Blank	20.0%*
Mail Room	50.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.1.c: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the cleanliness of offices and/ or classrooms

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	19.0%
Astronomy Building	20.0%*
Breland Hall	11.5%
Business Complex Building	7.7%*
Cervantes Village Building A	100.0%*
Cervantes Village Building C	100.0%*
Chemistry Building	31.25%
Clara Belle Williams Hall	33.3%
Computer Center	6.25%*
Educational Services Center	9.1%
Foster Hall	30.0%
Garcia Annex/Hall	15.8%
Gardiner Hall	14.3%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	13.2%
Hadley Hall	2.9%*
Hardman Hall	12.5%*
Health and Social Services Building	21.4%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	25.0%*
Jett Hall	22.2%
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	66.7%
Milton Hall	9.1%
O'Donnell Hall	12.5%
OFS office	7.1%*
Regents Row	4.8%
Science Hall	11.1%
Skeen Hall	4.2%*
Speech Building	37.5%
Sugerman Space Grant Building	50.0%*
Thomas and Brown Hall	40.0%
Wells Hall	100.0%
Zuhl Library	9.1%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	10.7%
Corbett Center Student Union	20.0%*
Dona Ana Community College	9.1%
OFS Other Buildings	16.7%*
Off Campus Locations	4.3%*
None/All/Blank	20.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.1.d: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the courtesy of custodial staff

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B,C	4.8%*
Chemistry Building	6.25%*
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Hadley Hall	5.6%
Health and Social Services Building	3.7%*
Jett Hall	11.1%*
Natorium	50.0%*
O'Donnell Hall	4.0%*
Photovoltaic Labs	33.3%*
Science Hall	5.9%
A Mountain	33.3%*
Dona Ana Community College	9.1%
Off Campus locations	4.3%

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.1.e: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the frequency of custodial services

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	38.1%
Biology Annex	100.0%*
Breland Hall	3.7%*
Business Complex Building	15.4%
Cervantes Village Building A	100.0%*
Cervantes Village Building C	50.0%*
Chemistry Building	33.3%
Clara Belle Williams Hall	33.3%
Computer Center	12.5%
Dan W. Williams Hall	20.0%*
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Complex	6.25%*
Educational Services Center	8.8%
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Garcia Annex/Hall	10.5%
Gardiner Hall	25.0%
Gerald Thomas Hall	23.1%
Hadley Hall	8.6%
Hardman Hall	14.3%*
Health and Social Services Building	25.9%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	25.0%*
Jett Hall	33.3%
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	66.7%
Jornada USDA Exp. Range HQ (Wooten Hall)	16.7%*
Milton Hall	9.1%
Music Building	20.0%*
Natatorium	100.0%
O'Donnell Hall	20.0%
OFS Construction	100.0%*
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
Passive Solar	100.0%*
Regents Row	13.6%
Rentfrow Gym	50.0%*
Science Hall	11.1%
Skeen Hall	4.2%*
Speech Building	37.5%
Sugerman Space Grant Building	50.0%*
Wells Hall	100.0%
A Mountain	33.3%*
Tennis Center	100.0%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	17.3%
Dona Ana Community College	12.5%

OFS Other Buildings	16.7%*
Off Campus Locations	9.1%
Non/All/Blank	20.0%*
Other On Campus	20.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.1.f: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the overall quality of custodial services

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	23.8%
Biology Annex	100.0%*
Breland Hall	7.4%
Business Complex Building	7.7%*
Cervantes Village Building A	100.0%*
Chemistry Building	18.75%
Clara Belle Williams Hall	50.0%
Computer Center	12.5%
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Center	6.25%*
Educational Services Center	2.9%*
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Garcia Annex/Hall	5.3%*
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	5.1%
Hadley Hall	5.6%
Hardman Hall	12.5%*
Health and Social Services Building	17.9%
Jett Hall	22.2%
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	33.3%*
Milton Hall	9.1%
Natatorium	100.0%
O'Donnell Hall	16.0%
Regents Row	9.1%
Science Hall	16.7%
Speech Building	37.5%
Sugerman Space Grant Building	50.0%*
Thomas and Brown Hall	20.0%*
Wells Hall	100.0%
Zuhl Library	9.1%
PSL/Anderson Hall	13.3%
Dona Ana Community College	17.6%
OFS Other Buildings	33.3%
Off Campus Locations	4.3%*
None/All/Blank	20.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

B.2: Building and Environment*Table B.2.a: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the temperature*

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	19.0%
Branson Library	36.4%
Breland Hall	14.8%
Business Complex Building	15.4%
Cervantes Village Building C	50.0%*
Chemistry Building	25.0%
Computer Center	12.5%
Dan W. Williams Hall	20.0%*
Dove Hall	20.0%*
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Complex	25.0%
Educational Services Center	20.6%
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Garcia Annex/Hall	25.0%
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	28.9%
Goddard Hall	16.7%*
Guthrie Hall	10.0%*
Hadley Hall	11.1%
Health and Social Services Building	14.3%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	25.0%*
Jacobs Hall	60.0%
James B. Delamater Activity Center	25.0%*
Jett Hall	22.2%
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	66.7%
Jornada USDA Exp. Range HQ (Wooten Hall)	33.3%
Knox Hall	20.0%
Milton Hall	19.0%
Music Building	40.0%
New Mexico department of Agriculture	30.0%
O'Donnell Hall	25.0%
Regents Row	9.5%
Science Hall	11.1%
Skeen Hall	20.8%
Speech Building	37.5%
Sugerman Spacegrant Building	50.0%*
Thomas and Brown Hall	40.0%
Wells Hall	50.0%*
Zuhl Library	8.3%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	13.8%
Corbett Center Student Union	14.3%

Dona Ana Community College	48.5%
OFS Other Buildings	16.7%
Off Campus Locations	16.7%
Stan Fulton Athletic Center	20.0%*
Other On Campus Locations	20.0%*
Young Hall	50.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.2.b: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the lighting

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	14.3%
Breland Hall	14.8%
Chemistry Building	18.8%
Educational Services Center	5.9%
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Garcia Annex/Hall	5.0%*
Gardiner Hall	14.3%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	7.9%
Goddard Hall	16.7%*
Hadley Hall	11.1%
Health and Social Services Building	3.6%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	25.0%*
Jacobs Hall	60.0%
James B. Delamater Activity Center	60.0%
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	33.3%*
Milton Hall	4.5%*
Natatorium	25.0%*
New Mexico department of Agriculture	10.0%*
O'Donnell Hall	8.3%
OFS Office	7.7%*
PGEL Headhouse/ Lab	50.0%
Regents Row	23.8%
Science Hall	5.6%*
Wells Hall	50.0%*
A Mountain	33.3%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	3.4%*
Dona Ana Community College	3.0%*
Off Campus Locations	4.2%*
Other On Campus Locations	20.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.2.c: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with handicap access

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	10.0%
Branson Library	9.1%*
Breland Hall	15.4%
Campus Police/ Ag Institute	14.3%*
Chemistry Building	6.7%*
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Complex	6.7%*
Educational Services Center	9.1%
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Garcia Annex/Hall	15.0%
Gerald Thomas Hall	11.1%
Guthrie Hall	10.0%*
Hadley Hall	11.4%
Hardman Hall	12.5%*
Health and Social Services Building	14.8%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	25.0%*
James B. Delamater Activity Center	25.0%*
Jett Hall	33.3%
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	50.0%*
Milton Hall	13.6%
Natatorium	66.7%
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
OFS Office	7.7%*
Regents Row	30.0%
Science Hall	5.9%
Speech Building	37.5%
Thomas and Brown Hall	20.0%*
Wells Hall	50.0%*
William B Conroy Honors Center	50.0%*
A Mountain	66.7%
PSL/Anderson Hall	3.8%*
Dona Ana Community College	5.9%
OFS Other Buildings	33.3%
Off Campus Locations	4.5%*
None/ All/ Blank	20.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.2.d: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the availability and reliability of utilities (electrical power, heating, cooling meet our needs and have minimal interruptions)

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	9.5%
Astronomy Building	20.0%*
Branson Library	33.3%
Breland Hall	18.5%
Business Complex Building	7.7%*
Chemistry Building	26.7%
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Complex	18.8%
Educational Services Center	8.8%
Foster Hall	30.0%
Garcia Annex/Hall	15.0%
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	2.8%*
Goddard Hall	16.7%*
Guthrie Hall	20.0%
Hadley Hall	8.3%
Health and Social Services Building	7.4%
Jacobs Hall	80.0%
James B. Delamater Activity Center	50.0%
Jett Hall	22.2%
Jornada USDA Exp. Range HQ (Wooten Hall)	33.3%
Milton Hall	13.6%
Natatorium	50.0%
New Mexico Department of Agriculture	10.0%*
O'Donnell Hall	20.8%
OFS Office	8.3%*
Regents Row	14.3%
Science Hall	5.6%*
Skeen Hall	4.2%*
Speech Building	12.5%*
Thomas and Brown Hall	40.0%
Wells Hall	50.0%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	3.4%*
Dona Ana Community College	26.5%
Off Campus Locations	8.7%
Student Family Housing	33.3%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.2.e: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with energy conservation

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	4.8%*
Astronomy Building	60.0%
Branson Library	45.5%
Breland Hall	22.2%
Business Complex Building	15.4%
Chemistry Building	25.0%
Clara Belle Williams Hall	33.3%
Computer Center	6.25%*
Dove Hall	25.0%*
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Center	43.8%
Educational Services Building	9.4%
Foster Hall	60.0%
Garcia Annex/Hall	5.0%*
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Genesis Center C	50.0%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	21.6%
Goddard Hall	16.7%*
Guthrie Hall	30.0%
Hadley Hall	2.9%*
Hardman Hall	12.5%*
Health and Social Services Building	21.4%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	25.0%*
Jacobs Hall	40.0%
James B. Delamater Activity Center	25.0%*
Jett Hall	22.2%
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	33.3%*
Wooten Hall	16.7%*
Knox Hall	10.0%*
Milton Hall	27.3%
Music Building	60.0%
Natorium	75.0%
New Mexico Department of Agriculture	11.1%*
O'Donnell Hall	21.7%
OFS Office	15.4%
Regents Row	23.8%
Science Hall	5.6%
Skeen Hall	17.4%
Speech Building	37.5%
Thomas and Brown Hall	20.0%*
Walden Hall	50.0%*
Wells Hall	50.0%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	6.9%

Corbett Center Student Union	14.3%*
Dona Ana Community College	20.6%
Other OFS Buildings	16.7%
Off Campus Locations	4.5%*
None/All/Blank	20.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

B.3: Grounds*Table B.3.a: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the maintenance of grounds (mowing, weeding, trimming, edging, etc.)*

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic research A, B,C	14.3%
Breland Hall	14.8%
Campus Police/ Ag Institute	14.3%*
Cervantes Village Building A	100.0%*
Cervantes Village Building C	50.0%*
Clara Belle Williams Hall	16.7%*
Computer Center	12.5%
Dan W. Williams Hall	20.0%*
Educational Services center	5.9%
Engineering Complex I	20.0%*
Equine Education Center	50.0%*
Garcia Hall	5.0%*
Genesis Center C	50.0%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	2.6%*
Goddard Hall	16.7%*
Guthrie Hall	10.0%*
Hadley Hall	11.1%
Health and Social Services Building	17.9%
Jacobs Hall	20.0%*
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	33.3%*
O'Donnell Hall	7.7%
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
PGEL Headhouse/ Lab	75.0%
Regents Row	4.5%*
Science Hall	5.9%*
Skeen Hall	4.2%*
Sugerman Spacegrant Building	100.0%
Thomas and Brown Hall	40.0%
Wells Hall	50.0%*
Zuhl Library	8.3%
PSL/Anderson Hall	3.4%
Dona Ana Community College	5.7%
None/All/Blank	40.0%
Student Family Housing	33.3%*
NMSU Mail Room	50.0%*
Pan Am Box Office	50.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.3.b: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the quality of landscape design and maintenance (trees, flowerbeds, etc.)

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B,C	14.3%
Astronomy Building	20.0%*
Branson library	18.2%
Breland Hall	25.9%
Business Complex Building	15.4%
Campus Police/ Ag Institute	14.3%*
Chemistry Building	6.25%*
Clara Belle Williams Hall	33.3%
Computer Center	6.25%*
Engineering Complex I	20.0%*
Equine Education Center	100.0%
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Genesis Center C	50.0%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	7.9%
Goddard Hall	16.7%*
Hadley Hall	5.6%
Health and Social Services Building	7.1%
Jornada Exp. Range Headquarters (Wooten Hall)	16.7%*
Milton Hall	4.5%*
Natatorium	33.3%*
O'Donnell Hall	11.5%
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
PGEL Headhouse/ Lab	75.0%
Regents Row	13.6%
Science Hall	5.9%*
Skeen Hall	20.8%
Speech Building	12.5%*
Student Health Center	22.2%
Sugerman Spacegrant Building	100.0%
Thomas and Brown Hall	50.0%
Wells Hall	100.0%
Zuhl Library	9.1%
PSL/Anderson Hall	6.9%
Dona Ana Community College	8.6%
Off Campus Locations	4.0%*
None/All/Blank	40.0%
NMSU Mail Room	50.0%*
Pan Am Box Office	50.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.3.c: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with litter management

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B,C	20.0%
Branson library	9.1%
Breland Hall	12.5%
Business Complex Building	8.3%*
Chemistry Building	13.3%
Dan W Williams Hall	20.0%*
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Complex	6.25%*
Educational Services Center	11.8%
Equine Education Center	50.0%*
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Gerald Thomas Hall	2.7%*
Guthrie Hall	10.0%*
Hadley Hall	3.0%*
Hardman Hall	12.5%*
Health and Social Services Building	14.3%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	50.0%
Jacobs Hall	60.0%
Jett Hall	11.1%*
John Whitlock Hernandez Hall	50.0%*
Natatorium	33.3%*
Neale Hall	25.0%*
New Mexico Department of Agriculture	10.0%*
O'Donnell Hall	4.2%*
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
Regents Row	9.1%
Rentfrow Gym	50.0%*
Science Hall	12.5%
Speech Building	25.0%
Student Health Center	22.2%
Sugerman Spacegrant Building	100.0%
Thomas and Brown Hall	25.0%*
Wells Hall	50.0%*
Zuhl Library	18.1%
A Mountain	33.3%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	6.9%
Dona Ana Community College	2.9%*
Other OFS Buildings	16.7%*
Off Campus Locations	4.0%*
None/All/Blank	60.0%
Student Family Housing	33.3%*
Pan Am Box Office	50.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.3.d Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the management of recycling/ recycling receptacles

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B,C	23.8%
Astronomy Building	40.0%
Biology Annex	100.0%*
Branson Library	9.1%*
Breland Hall	11.5%
Business Complex Building	7.7%*
Campus Police/ Ag Institute	14.3%*
Cervantes Village Building A	100.0%*
Chemistry Building	12.5%
Computer Center	6.25%*
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Complex	6.25%*
Educational Services Center	5.9%
Engineering Complex I	20.0%*
Equine Education Center	100.0%*
Garcia Annex/ Hall	5.0%*
Gardiner Hall	37.5%
Gerald Thomas Hall	13.2%
Goddard hall	16.7%
Guthrie Hall	10.0%
Hadley Hall	5.7%
Health and Social Services Building	14.3%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	50.0%
Jett Hall	12.5%*
Milton Hall	4.8%*
Natatorium	75.0%
New Mexico Department of Agriculture	10.0%*
O'Donnell Hall	15.4%
PGEL Headhouse / Lab	25.0%*
Science Hall	11.1%
Skeen Hall	4.2%
Sugerman Spacegrant Building	100.0%
Wells Hall	100.0%*
A Mountain	33.3%*
PSL/Anderson Hall	3.4%
Dona Ana Community College	22.9%
Other OFS Buildings	16.7%*
Off Campus Locations	8.0%
Student Family Housing	66.7%
Young Hall	100.0%

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.3.e: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the quality of pest control (Indoors and Outdoors)

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	33.3%
Biology Annex	100.0%*
Branson Library	9.1%*
Breland Hall	19.2%
Business Complex Building	15.4%
Campus Police / Ag Institute	28.6%
Cervantes Village Building C	50.0%*
Chemistry Building	6.25%*
Computer Center	6.25%*
Dan W Williams Hall	20.0%*
Ed and Harold Foramen Engineering Center	6.25%*
Educational Services Building	5.9%
Equine Education Center	50.0%*
Foster Hall	10.0%*
Garcia Annex/Hall	15.8%
Gardiner Hall	25.0%
Gerald Thomas Hall	10.5%
Guthrie Hall	10.0%*
Hadley Hall	11.1%
Health and Social Services Building	10.7%
Herschel Zohn Theatre	50.0%
Jett Hall	11.1%*
Kent Hall	100.0%
Milton Hall	27.3%
Natatorium	25.0%*
Neale Hall	25.0%*
New Mexico Department of Agriculture	10.0%*
O'Donnell Hall	16.0%
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
PGEL Headhouse / Lab	66.7%
Regents Row	18.2%
Rentfrow Gym	50.0%*
Science Hall	17.6%
Skeen Hall	8.3%
Speech Building	37.5%
Student Health Center	22.2%
William B Conroy Honors Center	50.0%*
Zuhl Library	9.1%*
OFS Paint Shop	25.0%*
A Mountain	66.7%
PSL/Anderson Hall	10.3%

Dona Ana Community College	8.6%
Off Campus Locations	4.0%*
None/All/Blank	25.0%*
Student Family Housing	33.3%*
Young Hall	50.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.3.f: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the overall quality of grounds services

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B,C	14.3%
Branson Library	18.2%
Breland Hall	14.8%
Campus Police/ Ag Institute	14.3%*
Cervantes Village Building A	100.0%*
Computer Center	6.25%*
Educational Services Center	2.9%*
Equine Education Center	100.0%*
Hadley Hall	5.6%
Health and Social Services Building	10.7%
Jacobs Hall	60.0%
O'Donnell Hall	11.5%
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
PGEL Headhouse / Lab	75.0%
Regents Row	4.5%*
Science Hall	5.9%*
Speech Building	12.5%*
Sugerman Spacegrant Building	100.0%
Thomas and Brown Hall	20.0%*
Wells Hall	50.0%*
A Mountain	33.3%*
Dona Ana Community College	2.9%
None/All/Blank	40.0%
Student Family Housing	33.3%*
Pan Am Center Box Office	50.0%*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area

Table B.3.g: Buildings in which respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the courtesy of grounds staff

Building	Percentage of respondents indicating dissatisfaction with this area
Academic Research A, B, C	4.8%*
Branson Library	9.1%*
Educational Services Center	2.9%*
Gardiner Hall	12.5%*
Goddard Hall	16.7%*
Health and Social Services Building	3.6%*
Jacobs Hall	40.0%
OFS Lock Shop	100.0%*
Skeen Hall	4.2%*
A Mountain	33.3 %*

* Only One respondent indicated dissatisfaction with this area