1. Expected Outcome: Improve Communication

Clients and stakeholders will be satisfied with communication efforts and therefore will be better informed about project requirements, issues and status.

Assessment Methods

Method #1: Review Client Reports.

Monthly client reports for FY12 will be reviewed to see if design leads are providing status updates in projects database on a monthly basis as directed by Design Services Director in Design Services Expectations document.

Findings:

The monthly client reports for FY12 were analyzed to determine if the design leads were keeping their project comments updated on a monthly basis. The findings show that leads are very inconsistent in their updating of comments. For the year, Design Services averaged 201 projects at the end of any given month, with an average of 48 projects that had not been updated. This equates to 24% of projects not being updated. The maximum number of projects in the year was 228 with 54 or 23.7% not updated. December 2011 was the month with the greatest number of comments that had not been updated with 95 projects which represented 51.4% of the total projects of 185 for that month. There were only two months in the year (February and September) with less than 10% of projects not updated with 7.4% & 9.1% respectively.

There does not appear to be a clear correlation between total number of projects and number of projects with old/outdated/aged comments.

Below is data chart which findings are based.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number of Projects (PIF/Design)</th>
<th>Number of Old Comments</th>
<th>% of Old Comments FY12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aged client comments for FY12 were compared to FY13 to date. It appears on surface that the months of October and February are historically lower than other months.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

The requirement for design leads to update projects on a monthly basis was documented in an expectation document provided to staff by the Director in September of 2012. In an effort to reduce the percentage of old comments even further, beginning in July 2013, the Director of Design Services will send out a reminder email to the design leads to remind them to update their projects’ comments. The reminder email will be sent out on the 25th of each month to the design leads to prompt them to update the client comments.

Given the limited time period of data gathering and analysis, this metric will continue to be monitored and analyzed.

**Method #2: Analysis of Customer/Client Surveys.**

Client survey will be sent to project clients to seek their input on satisfaction of communication efforts by the design leads. Survey results will be analyzed to determine needs for improvements by individual design leads or if there are improvements needed in methods, frequency and/or content of communications. A client survey was developed to assess project communications. The survey contains twelve (12) questions relating to the design phase of the project, ten (10) questions related to the construction phase of the project, and two (2) sections for respondents to provide comments and/or suggestions. The survey will be administered via Qualtrics thru AU Access. The survey will be sent to clients for projects that were financially closed out in FY12. The survey instrument provides for five potential responses (Very Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Neutral, Satisfied, and Very Satisfied). Each of the responses was given a point value of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively.

The survey asks two specific questions relating to clarity of written and verbal communication as well as timeliness of communication.

**Findings:**

The survey was sent to 47 clients of projects that closed out in FY12. At the time of this report, twenty surveys were completed. This report will focus on the findings within those responses. Responses gathered after reporting period will be further analyzed and reported in next year’s assessment report.

Two questions related to communication were graded with a mean ranking of 4.05 or “Satisfied” ranking. Of the twenty responses, three of the responses were graded as less than “Satisfied” on both “Clarity of written and verbal communication” and “Timeliness of communication”. This equates to 15% of the total respondents being not satisfied, or an 85% satisfaction rate.

Breakdown of responses for the questions are given below:

**Clarity of Written and Verbal Communication:**

Very Dissatisfied: 0
Dissatisfied: 2
Neutral: 1
Satisfied: 10
Very Satisfied: 6
(Mean Ranking: 4.05)

Timeliness of Communication:
   Very Dissatisfied: 1
   Dissatisfied: 1
   Neutral: 1
   Satisfied: 10
   Very Satisfied: 7
   (Mean Ranking: 4.05)

While initial analysis shows an 85% satisfaction rating, we would like to study this metric further over time to see if there is a correlation between findings from assessment methods #1 & #2.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Prior to making any adjustments to the survey or any process, procedure, etc. more data will be required. This performance metric will continue to be monitored throughout 2014 and any improvements will be noted in future assessment reports.

Additional comments:
Additional responses from questionnaire on the 2012 projects will be included in future reports.

2. Expected Outcome: Improve Project Schedules

Design Services will implement project scheduling protocol such that all funded projects are scheduled utilizing scheduling software. Projects will be managed so that 80% of projects will bid or transfer to In-House Construction on schedule. (i.e. 80% Schedule Success Rating (SSR))

Assessment Methods

Method: Review of project schedules.
   Project schedules will be reviewed and Actual Transfer/Bid Date will be compared to the planned Transfer/Bid Date.

Findings:
In 2012, Design Services bid or transferred 95 projects to the Construction Management Directorate (40 projects), In-House Construction (46 projects), Maintenance and Operations (3 projects), or kept in Design Services (6 projects) for management of the execution of the construction or furnishings installation. Of those 95 projects, 58 projects or 61% were transferred
either ahead of or on schedule (61% SSR). The remaining 37 projects or 39% were bid or transferred behind schedule. The projects that bid/transferred ahead of schedule did so an average of 29 days ahead of schedule. The projects that bid/transferred behind schedule did so an average of 68 days behind schedule.

There were 14 projects with significant delay (+50 days) in bidding/transferring of the project. These delays can be attributable to typically one of the following reasons:
1. Client requested changes to the scope of work and the schedule was not updated.
2. Significant design delays due to unknown issues when the schedule was originally created, and the schedule was not updated.
3. Poor management of the project schedule.

An analysis of schedules by the 21 client group shows that for the projects reviewed, there are six clients with only one project (ADA/Disability Services, Alabama Cooperative Extension System, Alumni Affairs and Office of Development, Office of Information Technology, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences, and the School of Pharmacy). Of these client groups, the Office of Information Technology and the School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences’ projects were bid/transferred on schedule. The remaining clients’ projects were bid or transferred behind schedule.

Of the remaining clients, two had two projects each. Of those projects a 50% success rating of completing the design on schedule was achieved.

The five projects for the College of Architecture Design & Construction were bid or transferred with a 100% SSR. To contrast, the nine projects for the Provost and Academic Affairs, Design Services achieved only 33% SSR or 3 projects were bid or transferred on schedule. The projects for other clients fall within those bookmarks with one client group with a 91% SSR, and two client groups with a 43% SSR.

There does not seem to be a clear correlation between the number of projects for a client and the SSR. This metric will continue to be analyzed to see if there are trends related to project counts per client.

Projects on the list represented the work of approximately 15 different design leads for Design Services. There are a few of the design leads that are better at 1) developing the initial project schedule, and/or 2) maintaining their project schedule. There does not appear to be a clear correlation between the number of projects bid/transferred by a design lead and their success rate in meeting the schedule. Further analysis is required to investigate performance issues related to an individual design lead.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

In 2013, Design Services implemented a change order form for authorization by the client on scope changes that impact the project schedule and/or budget. The use of this form will be required prior to change of a schedule. The design leads will be educated on the use of these schedule metrics in their performance appraisal and therefore be more cognizant of the schedule overruns and therefore will be more proactive in the management and documentation of their project schedules. This should impact the schedule metrics in that the schedule base line target dates being more accurate and should show improvement. Also, we will use the successes and failures within the project schedule to determine if our current scheduling techniques should be
modified, or if our assumed durations should be adjusted for those tasks that are repetitive from one project to the next.

**Additional comments:**

These schedule success rate metrics will continue to be measured and analyzed and will see if there is a correlation between SSR and the project dollar value. We would also like to see if the survey results can be correlated to the schedule metrics for validation of the schedule/survey i.e. were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” ratings given on projects that were bid or transferred on schedule.

### 3. Expected Outcomes: Improve Project Planning

Clients will be satisfied with the project planning efforts of the project scope. The client's project requirements will be captured and documented in the project scopes of work and accounted for in the project budget.

**Assessment methods**

**Method:** Analysis of customer/client surveys.

Client survey will be sent to project clients to seek their input on satisfaction of project planning efforts by the design leads. Proper project planning captures the requirements and needs of the clients related to project scope and budget. Survey results will be analyzed to determine needs for improvements by individual design leads or if there are improvements needed in methods utilized for developing project scopes and budgets. A client survey was developed to assess project planning efforts. The survey contains twelve (12) questions relating to the design phase of the project, ten (10) questions related to the construction phase of the project, and two (2) sections for respondents to provide comments and/or suggestions. The survey will be administered via Qualtrics thru AU Access. The survey will be sent to clients for projects that were financially closed out in 2012.

**Findings:**

The survey was sent to 47 clients of projects that closed out in FY12. At the time of this report, twenty surveys had been completed. This report will focus on the findings within those responses. Responses gathered after reporting period will be further analyzed and reported in next year's assessment report.

Three questions related to project planning (Reasonableness of the budget, Reasonableness of the schedule, and Understanding of your requirements and needs) were graded with a mean ranking of 4.03 or “Satisfied” ranking. Of the twenty responses, only 14 responded on the reasonableness of the budget question with a mean rating of 3.64 or a little better than “Neutral”.

**Breakdown of responses for the questions are given below:**

**Reasonableness of the Budget:**

- Very Dissatisfied: 1
- Dissatisfied: 2
- Neutral: 1
- Satisfied: 7
- Very Satisfied: 3
(Mean Ranking: 3.64)

Reasonableness of the Schedule:
Very Dissatisfied: 0
Dissatisfied: 1
Neutral: 2
Satisfied: 7
Very Satisfied: 9
(Mean Ranking: 4.26)

Understanding of Your Requirements and Needs:
Very Dissatisfied: 1
Dissatisfied: 0
Neutral: 1
Satisfied: 10
Very Satisfied: 8
(Mean Ranking: 4.20)

Further analysis of these responses required to determine if the survey should be modified. If additional responses are received on the 2012 projects, they will be included in future reports.

How did you use findings for improvement?
At this time it is unclear what should be improved. The issue could be as simple as communication related to the project budget, schedule and project needs. Further analysis is required to draw any conclusions. Further analysis will include review of responses based on Design Lead, Client Group, and project budget size.
We would greatly appreciate 5 minutes of your time to complete the confidential survey below. Information from this survey will be used to improve the overall services and products provided by Auburn University Design Services and Construction Management.

**Design Phase**

How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the project during the design phase?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of the budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the established budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of the schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the established schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of written and verbal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of your requirements and needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness and ability to answer your questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the rough sketches or drawings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design lead's knowledge and professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of written deliverables including text, figures and graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to work scope changes and special requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain and provide comments for any rating lower than "Satisfied". We will use this information to improve our services provided to you and other clients.
## Construction Phase

How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the project during the construction phase?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasonableness of the budget</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the established budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonableness of the schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the established schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of written and verbal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of your requirements and needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness and ability to answer your questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to work scope changes and special requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction lead’s knowledge and professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain and provide comments for any rating lower than "Satisfied". We will use this information to improve our services provided to you and other clients.