

UO Campus Planning and Facilities Management Results of the Quest for the Best Employee Focus Group Meetings



September 2019

Final Report

Institute for Policy Research and Engagement

School of Planning, Public Policy, and Management
1209 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1209
ipre.uoregon.edu



UNIVERSITY OF
OREGON

Institute for Policy
Research and Engagement

SPECIAL THANKS & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

IPRE Project Team

Robert Parker, Director

Leah Rausch, Project Manager

Faculty and Student Moderators: Sam Ault, Molly Bradley, Rachel Doyne, Aniko Drlik-Muehleck, Alyssa Gamble, Emerson Hoaglaand, Michael Howard, Jay Matonte, Corrie Parrish, Andrew Schurr, RJ Theofield, and Curtis Thomas

About Institute for Policy Research and Engagement

The Institute for Policy Research and Engagement, a research center affiliated with the Department of Planning, Public Policy, and Management at the University of Oregon, is an interdisciplinary organization that assists Oregon communities by providing planning and technical assistance to help solve local challenges and improve the quality of life for Oregon residents. The role of IPRE is to link the skills, expertise, and innovation of higher education with the transportation, economic development, and environmental needs of communities and regions in the State of Oregon, thereby providing service to Oregon and learning opportunities to the students involved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
<i>Key Findings</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Next Steps for CPFM.....</i>	<i>ii</i>
Introduction	1
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Methods</i>	<i>2</i>
Key Findings	4
<i>Culture of Excellence, Teamwork, and Support</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Strength and Solidarity within the Department.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Quality and Capacity of Staff</i>	<i>9</i>
Conclusion and Next Steps	12
<i>Quick Wins.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Long-Term Strategies</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Communication & Continuing QFTB.....</i>	<i>14</i>
Appendices	15
<i>Appendix A. Participant Feedback Form.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Appendix B. Working Groups Resources.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Appendix C. Staff Participation.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Appendix D-L. Session Dot Voting</i>	<i>25</i>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2016, the University of Oregon combined two large divisions: Campus Planning Design & Construction and Campus Operations. The merger was part of a reorganization due to retirements and other factors. The University subsequently hired Michael Harwood to lead the new division: Campus Planning and Facilities Management, or CPFM.

The merger and change of leadership led to significant additional changes within the five units that comprise CPFM – Campus Planning, Facilities Services, Utilities and Energy, Design and Construction, and Sustainability. CPFM leadership now wants to pause and provide an opportunity for employees to share their perspectives on CPFM operations. To that end, CPFM wants to understand and enhance the experience and effectiveness of employees within the Division – a project CPFM is calling “Quest for the Best.” The “Quest for the Best” seeks to identify key issues and strategies to improve the culture of collaboration and customer service at CPFM.

Between July 19 and August 7, 2019 Institute for Policy Research and Engagement (IPRE) team members conducted ten focus groups with 229 CPFM staff members. This report summarizes the responses by grouping them into themes for three questions posed to staff – what should CPFM keep doing, what should CPFM start doing, and what should CPFM stop doing?

Key Findings

Staff recognized positive improvements made over the past several years, but opportunities remain to improve the culture of the organization, interactions within the department and across campus, and efficiencies in administrative and change management procedures. Overall, participants indicated their desire to foster an organizational culture of excellence, teamwork, and support; develop strength and solidarity within the department; and appreciate the importance of high-quality staff with adequate capacity. Key recommendations from staff throughout the small group sessions include the following:

Culture of Excellence, Teamwork, and Support

- Continue offering relationship building opportunities across the department through social gatherings and activities.
- Develop a culture of supportive management that builds trust with supervisors, establishes shared goals, and values the expertise of staff.
- Improve recognition programs and motivate employee performance through shared goals or incentives.
- Encourage flexibility and a family-first culture without compromising staff capacity.

Strength and Unity within the Department

- Encourage career development and mobility through training, formalized professional development, and internal promotion.

- Improve internal communication by developing new tools and promoting information sharing.
- Solicit staff feedback early and often and allow for input on proposed changes.
- Address the disconnect between management and crews through improved communication and transparency.
- Establish appropriate boundaries between CPFM and the rest of campus while encouraging communication and understanding of the department's role.

Quality and Capacity of Staff

- Demonstrate the value of institutional knowledge by supporting internal promotions.
- improve the hiring process.
- Evaluate prioritization of construction projects over maintenance activities, considering limited staff capacity and expectations.
- Adjust pay scales to reflect staffing changes and increased workload.
- Ensure administrative procedures contribute to efficiency, instead of an additional burden.

Next Steps for CPFM

Based on feedback received by staff throughout the ten Quest for the Best sessions, leadership can advance several “quick wins,” implement longer-term strategies, and consider effective communication and continuation efforts.

Quick wins are responsive and nimble improvements. These actions can serve to establish momentum and motivation, without introducing major changes right away. Potential quick wins for CPFM could include:

- Share a letter from Leadership in the next CPFM newsletter.
- Create an “Innovative Ideas” submission form.
- Organize “solutions committees” that are open to staff participation.
- Host brown bag “lunch and learns.”
- Introduce a consistent, regular employee and supervisor review system.

Much of the feedback received through the initial sessions will require more thoughtful and careful vetting of possible long-term changes. Recommendations focus on providing additional resources, ensuring consistency across the department, and involving staff more deliberately in changes and decision-making. Possible long-term strategies for CPFM could include:

- Implement training and enhanced guidance for supervisors.
- Introduce a new onboarding and orientation process.
- Pilot a “human-centered design” approach to a new project.
- Develop an evaluation protocol for new changes and procedures.

Arguably the most important part of Quest for the Best is communicating progress, decisions, and next steps throughout the department. There are several strategies that can be used to continue the effort, including: requests for feedback, the CPFM website and newsletter, and leadership team meetings.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of 10 focus group meetings with employees from Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM) as part of the “Quest for the Best” process. The focus group meetings engaged 229 CPFM staff using a start, stop, and continue framework.

Background

In 2016, the University of Oregon combined two large divisions: Campus Planning Design and Construction and Campus Operations. The merger was part of a reorganization due to retirements and other factors. The University subsequently hired Michael Harwood to lead the new division: Campus Planning and Facilities Management, or CPFM.

CPFM is organized into five departments:

- Campus Planning
- Office of Sustainability
- Utilities and Energy
- Design & Construction
- Facilities Services

With nearly 300 employees, CPFM is the organization that literally keeps the doors open and the lights on at the University of Oregon. However, CPFM is largely invisible to UO faculty and students—unless something is wrong with a facility.

The merger and change of leadership created an opportunity to review employee perspectives on CPFM operations. Towards that end, CPFM. Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM) wants to understand and enhance the experience and effectiveness of the approximately 270 employees within the Division - a project CPFM is calling “Quest for the Best.” The Quest for the Best is an employee engagement effort focused on two things: (1) team building, and (2) process Improvement. We began by engaging you, our employees, organized into groups of ten, and to ask three questions:

- What should CPFM stop doing?
- What should CPFM keep doing?
- What should CPFM start doing?

The intended result is that CPFM identify the major issues/concerns that should be addressed. The Quest for the Best website summarizes why this process is important:

“This initiative is based on the belief that our employees on the front line will likely have some of the best ideas about how to improve our organization.”

The Institute for Policy Research and Engagement (IPRE) worked with CPFM to organize and facilitate a series of ten focus group meetings with permanent, full-time CPFM staff over the course of four weeks in July and August of 2019.

In meetings with CPFM leadership, the IPRE project team discussed a broader agenda about supporting a culture of problem-solving and doing balanced with compliance. The discussion had two elements: (1) an assessment, and (2) developing process improvement recommendations. All this work would be aimed at assessing the extent to which a solution and customer-oriented culture exists among employees.

We note that this project is not a performance evaluation, which was clearly communicated among all staff involved. The end goal of this project is one of overall team building and process improvement within the CPFM portfolio. Process improvement is a systematic approach to narrowing or closing performance gaps. Thus, by nature, process improvement is not performance evaluation and focuses on opportunities to improve systems.

The primary goal of this initial effort is to understand the experience and perceptions of CPFM employees. The objectives of the project include:

- Engage all division team members in facilitated discussions about CPFM process and procedures using the continue, start, stop framework
- Identify key themes from the discussions and suggest strategies to promote a culture of collaboration and customer-service across the division
- Provide an opportunity for team members from different departments to connect

Methods

IPRE faculty and graduate research assistants moderated ten small group sessions with approximately 25-30 participants in each session. A full list of CPFM staff participants is available as Appendix C. For each session, Mike Harwood, Associate Vice President and University Architect who directs CPFM, opened with a summary of objectives and the vision for the greater Quest for the Best endeavor. An IPRE team member then reviewed the agenda for the session, established ground rules, and explained the “continue, start, stop” framework to be used to guide the discussions. This framework is a well-tested model that asks three simple questions: (1) What should CPFM keep (continue) doing?; (2) What should CPFM start doing?; and (3) What should CPFM stop doing?

Next, session participants were broken into pre-assigned small groups of 8-10 individuals. Each small group represented a mix of work groups and crews within the larger department, ensuring a diversity of experiences and perspectives, as well as providing opportunities for relationship building. This structure also ensured that supervisors participated with front line staff, and that no staff member had their direct supervisor within their small group. Each small group had two IPRE team members to guide the discussion - one notetaker and one moderator. The

moderator followed a standard facilitation guide that included question prompts and timing.

Each group spent about 15 minutes discussing each of the three questions – sharing their opinions and responding to others. Next, each small group was tasked with identifying their “top three” suggestions or ideas. These top ideas were then shared out to the larger group of session participants, and CPFM staff were given the opportunity to “vote” for their top suggestion for each of the three questions. The voting process involved providing each participant with three dots with the instruction to place one dot on the most important suggestion for each of the categories (keep, start, stop). This process gradually narrowed the list of ideas to those participants felt were most pressing or important. It also produced more general suggestions that apply across the department, rather than very specific changes. Appendices D through L include the voting results from each of the ten sessions.

For each session, IPRE produced a summary memo identifying these top suggestions and providing additional context including the conversations from the small groups. These session summaries captured the more nuanced and specific suggestions that may not have been captured or reflected in the top themes report out. Additionally, each memo included a full set of notes from the three small group discussions, which was then shared with all CPFM leadership. The session memos did not include identifying information in order to maintain some confidentiality.

After the first six sessions were complete, IPRE project staff prepared a mid-project summary and shared the top themes with CPFM leadership. In order to compile the top themes for both the mid-session report and this final report, staff compiled the top themes from each summary memo, combined similar themes, and incorporated context, examples, and specific suggestions from the small group session notes.

KEY FINDINGS

Over ten sessions, 229 CPFM staff provided suggestions on what to continue, start, and stop in order to contribute to the ongoing “Quest for the Best” effort. Staff recognized positive improvements made over the past several years, but opportunities remain to improve the culture of the organization, interactions within the department and across campus, and efficiencies in administrative and change management procedures. Overall, participants indicated the desire to foster an organizational culture of excellence, teamwork, and support; develop strength and solidarity within the department; and recognize the importance of high-quality staff with adequate capacity.

Culture of Excellence, Teamwork, and Support

Continue offering relationship building opportunities across the department through social gatherings and activities.

Participants highly valued team-building events and social gatherings. Across every session, staff expressed their satisfaction in the quarterly team-building activities such as kickball, picnics, and holiday parties. They appreciated socializing with people they would otherwise not see and developing cross-department relationships. The increased focus on relationship building and improving employee morale was highly valued, and participants expressed a desire to make these events more inclusive of those who work odd shifts. Overall, this effort creates a more friendly and approachable work environment.

Develop a culture of supportive management that builds trust with supervisors and values the expertise of staff.

Participants expressed appreciation for their coworkers and confidence in their abilities and skills. Many enjoy freedom, self-direction, and trust within their roles. While some participants spoke highly of their own supervisors and open-door policies, this culture is not universal, and some staff said they experience the opposite. Participants indicated support for a structure where management sets goals, but people in the field are given some flexibility to make decisions that further those goals. They felt this structure would create an atmosphere of accountability and ownership, but employees are still able to seek support if necessary. While this culture exists within some groups, there is a need to cultivate this structure across the entire department.

CPFM has some tools and structure in place to provide clear direction and shared understanding that can be built upon. One group discussed the safety meeting each week where they identify priorities across projects. This meeting provides a valuable understanding of what is coming up and doesn’t feel like a “meeting for meetings sake.” In some departments, supervisors ask “what should you do in this situation” which encourages input from different staff.

Improve recognition programs and motivate employee performance through shared goals or incentives.

CPFM should look for opportunities to demonstrate appreciation for staff and the value they bring as individuals. Several groups noted feeling like a “cog in the machine” and that people are often recognized as their title, rather than as an individual. Groups specifically mentioned the recent layoffs that did not recognize the staff members’ years of service or provide a respectful send off.

Participants generally agreed that recognition and incentive programs are important to employees. While some feel the Gold Duck program is successful in promoting staff to go “above and beyond,” others felt it was only used within some pockets of the department. The program is not taken seriously across the board, and many participants observed a culture of “doing the bare minimum.” Some suggested this culture could be addressed through different incentives that provide shared, rather than individual, motivation. Groups noted the opportunity to make staff feel valued without creating a competitive process by setting shared goals (weekly, quarterly, or annually) and communicating progress towards meeting the goals with appreciation events or recognition. The Gold Duck system does not appear to achieve this for most.

Encourage flexibility and a family-first culture without compromising staff capacity.

Participants consistently noted their appreciation for flexibility in work schedules and what they described as a “family first” culture at CPM. The department offers generous family medical leave benefits, and some noted they were allowed to bring their children into the office if they had a medical appointment or other engagement. Participants hope CPM will continue recognizing the importance of life outside of work and the need for flexibility and understanding. Other groups noted their appreciation for alternative work schedules, such as four ten-hour days, the availability of night shifts, or early start times. This varied across groups, and many noted their desire to see more flexibility across CPM. Additionally, participants indicated that generous leave policies resulted in capacity issues when staffing gaps are not filled over long periods of absence.

Strength and Unity within the Department

Encourage career development and mobility through training, formalized professional development, and internal promotion.

Participants appreciated the availability of ongoing training and skill building, including both formal and informal opportunities. Interest ranged from the ability to take UO classes to safety trainings to informal job shadowing and cross training. While these pathways for development are available to some, it is not consistent across groups. Participants expressed that they would like CPM to continue notifying employees when training is available and increasing the number, time of day, and diversity of opportunities offered.

Many noted that it is an individual responsibility to research and pursue these professional development offerings. Some felt more individuals would participate if the notification process improved, and others expressed an interest in a more structured and individually-tailored approach. Many positions require specialized trainings, licensing, and certification. There may be opportunities for CPM to

provide these pathways through apprenticeship programs, or by offering formal job shadowing and “floating” opportunities. Participants want to bolster their skills and feel more capable and confident in their roles.

Ultimately, staff desire internal mobility and growth within their roles, but may not know exactly what their path looks like or what is available to them. While there are examples of those who advanced successfully, it is not always clear how to replicate that success. One group suggested a dedicated staff position to help individuals identify appropriate opportunities, especially for those who are not sure where to start. This more formal coaching may result in opportunities for internal promotion in addition to beneficial cross-training. Participants noted improved training could help to build institutional knowledge retention, avoid gaps when someone leaves, and enhance organizational resilience.

Improve internal communication by developing new tools and promoting information sharing.

Perspectives on this varied throughout the sessions, but participants overall saw progress on efforts to improve communication at CPFM. In short, staff want to know what’s going on within the department so they can support efforts and collaborate more effectively. Existing communication tools, including the newsletter, call log, and liaison meetings, serve as important channels to break down silos. One group suggested a centralized onboarding framework to clarify responsibilities and practices within groups. Many noted information sharing has improved, and participants appreciate opportunities to engage in shared decision-making across groups.

Participants expressed a particular interest in increasing communication related to new projects. For example, when projects are starting, potential interference with other services, or what closures to expect should be communicated with maintenance and custodial groups. Participants also felt that with more transparency and better planning, CPFM may find opportunities for increased efficiency. For example, one group noted that storm drains may be cleaned redundantly by several groups. Another example is when the grounds people know when a building is going to get torn down, and therefore don’t spend time trimming shrubs there. Many expressed a feeling that some crews are “the last to know.” On the other hand, participants cited recent power plant improvements as a positive example of groups collaborating towards a common goal and collaborating to resolve issues. As with many findings, some groups are stronger than others in providing structure and clarity for internal communication.

Solicit staff feedback early and often and allow for input on proposed changes.

There was broad consensus from participants that their feedback is not solicited often or early enough when implementing major changes in procedures and systems, or on projects. Participants appreciated the opportunity to engage in the Quest for the Best effort, as well as similar events where they can provide direct feedback. Recent years have brought a rapid pace of change and many staff feel they don’t have input on changes that directly affect their departments. Participants mentioned not hearing about changes until they happen, including email notification of changes that directly impact their teams. Staff indicated that

involvement in the process would result in more acceptance and less resistance. Groups noted the implementation of AIM and the reorganization of shops as examples.

Some shared that they have seen more transparency about what decisions are made and why, and that their input is solicited more often. Several groups recommended a formal review process prior to implementing organizational changes so that input can be appropriately gathered. This process could be replicated after a change is made to gather feedback and help establish a culture of accountability and demonstrate that leadership values all voices. One example provided was the Financial Accounting Management Information System. Participants felt this program did not work well for CPFM but was not abandoned for another seven years.

Some participants noted that inadequate involvement stems from a lack of long-term project planning. They felt recent changes in the department were temporary fixes, both to physical infrastructure on campus and internally. There was a sense that CPFM does not always invest in long-term solutions, opting instead to either use “band-aids” or ignore the issue. They cited not having the opportunity to provide input on these temporary changes having a significant impact on their department’s ability to function. For example, construction staff are often not involved until it is time to actually begin work, resulting in the underutilization of staff knowledge. There was a sense that CPFM makes drastic changes too frequently in response to external pressures without allowing time to adequately consider both options and the implications of implementing a given option. One group cited the zone change as an example – it happened quickly without an assessment of how much it would cost, what’s been done before, and how CPFM could learn from institutional knowledge.

Address the disconnect between management and crews through improved communication and transparency.

Participants felt there were opportunities to improve communication between crews and decision-makers. Participants felt some tasks they receive from upper management do not make sense given on-the-ground conditions. When decision making bodies don’t discuss proposed changes with crews, it leads to efforts that are not practical or end up being changed later. Some indicated they don’t always receive needed information prior to shift starting and that management does not always take the time to know individual skills sets. Improved communication and connection with management could increase the effectiveness of work assignments.

Participants desired more transparency about why decisions are made and better communication of new procedures, expectations, and policies before changes are implemented. One participant mentioned that when a task is handed off, it is sometimes a “fire drill” needing immediate attention. Participants also discussed respect and support for classified staff, specifically the sense that their comments are “brushed off” by management. Some observed a pattern of asking staff to move forward with changes that are not implemented or planned well. One group cited the custodial pod system as a recent example. Some participants felt this

attitude related to “bullying” behaviors and an antagonistic relationship between staff and supervisors.

Overall, staff seek an environment that supports effective and regular communication, empowers people to make decisions, and emphasizes accountability. Participants indicated there is a shared fear of being blamed for mistakes, so many operate with the mindset to look after themselves. Some attributed this to a significant workload where they are forced to be reactive instead of proactive. Some participants related this culture to an excess of “middle management.” Several groups suggested that this layer of bureaucracy is added to fix “problem managers” rather than addressing issues directly. Other groups suggested the addition of a 360-style performance review that allows staff to provide direct feedback about their supervisors. They suggested this may improve relationships between supervisors and staff, as well as encourage supervisors to give more thoughtful feedback and take performance reviews seriously.

Establish appropriate boundaries between CPM and the rest of campus while encouraging communication and understanding of the department’s role.

Staff expressed an interest in increasing solidarity within the department when working with other groups across campus, without creating an “us versus them” culture. As one participant noted, “As the employee at the bottom of the food chain, you feel really dumb when someone questions what you’re doing.” This feeling occurred more often when staff were not informed of changes in procedures that impact other departments on campus. Some examples included scheduling rooms, leaf slips, and purchasing, for which the process tends to change frequently. Many frontline staff felt they received angry responses on work tickets when they are not aware of changes or new processes. Whether this communication happens through email, newsletter, or meetings, participants shared a desire to “ensure we’re doing what’s expected of us so we can serve and help.” Several groups specifically noted the need to better communicate with building managers, who have regular interactions with staff.

While the standard operating procedures intend to address such issues, there is a sense most people work outside of them. Participants felt leadership needs to start enforcing campus standards and not always allow the customer to “dictate the terms of the project.” Participants desired clearly defined roles and boundaries, developed with input from employees and enforced by management. Some participants felt this attention to outside influence led to standards being ignored or sudden changes to schedules. Participants felt this resulted in inefficiency, employee frustration, and at times, safety hazards. One example cited was the powerplant outage testing.

Campus operations are inherently “behind the scenes” and participants felt campus partners do not always appreciate or understand their work and systems. One suggested solution was uniforms for employees to make them more recognizable. Another group suggested lunch and learns with campus partners as an informal way to extend outside of CPM and increase campus connectivity. There is a feeling of separation from the rest of the university - that different units operate in silos,

specifically housing and athletics. One participant stated, “We work for the university and for students, but we aren’t involved in the broader university.”

Participants noted two specific examples of challenging communication with the rest of campus. One was the decision to host graduation at multiple locations. Participants expressed frustration at the decentralized approach to graduation that requires significant preparation and capacity from teams. Compared to many other universities who may use a singular location, participants felt the process at UO was not efficient and distracted from other campus facilities responsibilities. The other example was the growing presence of individuals experiencing homelessness on campus. Some felt there were safety and health concerns not being addressed, specifically drug abuse issues. There was a sense that management should do more to address the issue and prepare staff who may encounter transient populations, which is a campus-wide need.

Quality and Capacity of Staff

Demonstrate the value of institutional knowledge by supporting internal promotions and improving the hiring process.

Participants noted several ways CPFM could better honor and maintain institutional knowledge. One group suggested asking veteran employees to share their experience with new employees and help to document critical information that may be unique to university standards or the particular work site. Participants felt current hiring practices limit the benefits of institutional knowledge, specifically the difficulty in internal promotions, not filling positions when people retire, or not back-filling jobs. These issues result in obstacles to career development and hinder employee morale and effectiveness.

Participants appreciated the quality of staff on their teams and felt CPFM hires talented individuals who take pride in their work. Many were encouraged by the growth in shop teams and investments in equipment. Some suggested several strategies for more effective hiring, including hiring panels that include classified staff, and a more proactive timeline supported through more advance planning. While participants recognized that this was not specific to the department, but rather a campus-wide issue, it has a significant impact on CPFM. Participants noted that several positions remain unfilled, even when funding exists. This is highly frustrating and affects the workload of existing staff members.

Participants suggested CPFM transitioned to hiring based on a degree rather than relevant work experience. Some felt that when a degree is required as a part of a position, it limits opportunities for internal promotions and in some cases slows the hiring process. One participant shared an example of trying to hire a manager for a trade industry, but most candidates had an associate degree or work experience rather than the required bachelor’s degree.

Evaluate prioritization of construction over maintenance, considering limited staff capacity and expectations.

Staff felt strongly that CPFM prioritized major construction projects over ongoing and deferred maintenance work. There is a perception that the old buildings on

campus do not receive enough attention compared to new construction projects. In one participant's words, CPM staff are "maintenance workers, not a construction crew." There is a desire to place higher priority on these preventative measures, including preservation of equipment, tools, and resources to prevent them from failing later on. Participants indicated this would require hiring additional staff and replacing vacant positions. Staff are interested in focusing on maintenance to save costs and headache down the line, but often do not have the capacity to do so.

Major construction projects are seen as a detriment to ongoing maintenance. With several new buildings on campus, staff perception is that funding is identified without thought for maintenance for the new facilities and the additional workload those facilities create, resulting in further reduction of capacity. With recent layoffs and budget restrictions, participants indicated they often had to do more with less and faced unrealistic expectations given limited resources.

Some participants described CPM as a "yes" organization that tends to "bite off more than it can chew." Extended capacity leads to unrealistic expectations for employees and an apparent disconnect between on-the-ground perspectives and management expectations. Groups consistently noted that CPM runs "skeleton crews" and overloads existing staff rather than addressing recruitment and retention issues. This feeling was particularly present in classified staff, who perceive an excess of middle management. One group specifically referenced they lost eight custodians in six years but have more buildings to service.

Adjust pay scales to reflect staffing changes and increased workload.

Participants noted that limited capacity resulted in other issues, including lead workers performing supervisory tasks without just compensation and a hesitance to take leave. Participants indicated many are given additional responsibilities that they feel are outside their job description and above their paygrade, yet they are not compensated fairly. For example, an employee who moved into a coordinator position was given timecard tracking responsibilities and perceived as a manager by their coworkers. This employee was promised a raise, but it was never granted. Staff want to be reclassified if they take on managerial responsibilities.

With understaffed crews leading to burn-out and turnover, some felt management was not willing to hire more staff or improve pay in order to improve retention. For both classified and OA employees, participants felt they are not paid competitively with the private sector or to reflect cost of living increases in Eugene. Participants noted that some staff had received raises but observed inequalities across the department. Some participants indicated there are issues with staff who are topped out on their step, although coordinators had a new step created for them in the most recent bargaining session.

Ensure administrative procedures contribute to efficiency, rather than posing an additional burden.

Participants consistently pointed to inefficient time tracking procedures, specifically within AIM. One group noted it can take longer to submit a project into AIM than it does to complete the project itself. Tedious time tracking was noted by participants who use both digital and paper timesheets. Staff members within the trades

indicated they felt particularly burdened with the amount of paperwork needed to do their jobs.

Participants also shared frustration with the volume of meetings they attend, and the way meetings are conducted. Issues included meetings monopolized by a select group of individuals, inappropriate language, standing meetings, and lack of a clear scope or objectives. Other groups cited meetings where staff are assigned more and more work rather than discussing progress. Additionally, a lack of agenda or meeting minutes made it difficult to follow-up on action items.

Several groups noted the opportunity to develop a better system for handling surplus materials and supplies within the department. Several suggested a revenue-generating program, commodifying and selling surplus CPFM property, which other universities have done successfully. This would dispose of things in a useful way, potentially through an auction, events, or sales to other institutional buyers.

Finally, many groups felt strongly about improving parking options for CPFM staff. Participants noted the limited options for service vehicles and employees who work during the day have difficulty finding parking when they arrive. This is a stressful element of the day and parking fees and fines pose a financial burden for some staff. Participants recognize that Transportation Services is removing spaces, not adding them, and would like to consider alternatives to on-campus parking.

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

The feedback received from CPFM staff through these sessions represent a broad menu of opportunities to improve the culture, administrative efficiencies, and communication within the department. Some suggestions can be acted upon quickly, while others will require a longer-term strategic approach and ongoing adjustments. An important piece of feedback from staff was the sense that a great deal has changed at CPFM over the last few years, and these changes are not always well communicated. In advancing suggestions through Quest for the Best, CPFM leadership can consider quick wins, long-term strategies, and cohesive communication efforts to stem this perception.

Quick Wins

Based on the feedback received by staff throughout the ten Quest for the Best sessions, leadership can advance several “quick wins” – responsive and nimble improvements. These quick actions can serve to establish momentum and motivation, without introducing major changes right away.

Potential quick wins for CPFM include:

- **Share a letter from Leadership in the next CPFM newsletter.** Provide a thoughtful and transparent reflection on the process so far, what you heard that surprised you, what is motivating you to move forward, and one or two short-term actions leadership proposes. This doesn’t have to be a full plan of action, but a more personal touch that demonstrates leadership is listening and will be responsive to staff concerns.
- **Create an “Innovative Ideas” submission form.** Several staff members shared creative ideas to problems that they deal with on a regular basis, or inefficiencies they see within the department. For example, several individuals shared ideas on how to more sustainably remove waste items or monetize surplus furniture and supplies. By providing a mechanism to collect these ideas and recognize innovation, staff may feel more motivated to share directly with leadership and encouraged by seeing their ideas take shape.
- **Host brown bag “lunch and learns.”** Invite a staff member working on an interesting project or someone from another department to give a brief presentation that staff can attend during their lunch breaks. These opportunities could serve to build cross-campus connections, but also highlight upcoming projects within CPFM, such as new design and construction efforts.
- **Introduce a consistent, regular employee and supervisor review system.** CPFM Leadership has already expressed a strong interest in introducing a “360 review” performance evaluation. This is already happening within some groups and requires some standardization across the department. This style of review provides staff with the opportunity to provide direct feedback on their supervisors.

- **Solutions Committees:** This report and top themes from the initial suggestions provide broad recommendations and ideas. Staff should have the opportunity to suggest specific strategies and ways to move forward changes. By establishing a committee structure, leadership can solicit input from a variety of staff across the department, facilitating further relationship building and engaging all levels of staff in change management and decision-making. Based on the top themes, project staff recommend committees. These groups are charged with making recommendations to CPFM leadership that incorporate diverse perspectives and consider innovative ideas. More resources on managing these committees is available as Appendix B.
 - Communication & Decision-Making
 - Team Building & Appreciation
 - Training & Professional Development
 - Parking
 - Campus Connections
 - Continuing Quest for the Best

Long-Term Strategies

Much of the feedback received through the initial Quest for the Best sessions will require more intentional, long-term changes. There is already a sense that a great deal has changed at CPFM over the last several years, and staff are wary about more rapid and sweeping changes. Therefore, these recommendations focus on providing additional resources, ensuring consistency across the department, and involving staff more strategically in changes and decision-making. These strategies are not comprehensive of all the feedback provided in the sessions but provide a starting place that will not be overly disruptive to daily operations.

As a general principle, CPFM should be systematic and intentional about pursuing broader departmental changes. Possible long-term strategies for CPFM could include:

- **Implement training and enhanced guidance for supervisors.** Participants expressed disparities in the quality of supervision across the department, and a shared interest in more supportive, open management with clear direction and protocols. Training for supervisors could include standardized performance review policies, conducting orientation and introductions to the department, providing productive feedback, and running effective meetings. There may also be opportunities for “excellent” supervisors to share their strategies and lessons learned with others. With appropriate training and support, supervisors could also play a more integral role in professional and career development opportunities for their teams.
- **Introduce a new onboarding and orientation process.** In addition to HR paperwork and general university procedures, CPFM could introduce a more tailored orientation that encourages consistency across the department. An

effective orientation includes not only standard operating procedures, but more informal information sharing and establishes the department culture from day one. Onboarding could introduce mentors and professional development opportunities, recent changes through efforts such as CPFM, upcoming projects, etc.

- **Pilot a “human-centered design” approach to a new project.** This approach incorporates human perspectives in problem-solving efforts and could be particularly useful in new CPFM design and construction projects. A human-centered approach would engage all users, including maintenance and custodial staff, in project development. Each user group has a unique perspective that may contribute important information and ensure the final project meets everyone’s needs. In addition to producing a better final product, the process also serves to demonstrate the value in the different perspectives across the department.
- **Develop an evaluation protocol for new changes and procedures.** CPFM can consider incorporating a regular review process to evaluate the performance of new changes that involves many different perspectives within the department. By providing a more formal and transparent review, staff may feel that their input is more valued and that they have a clear mechanism to share with leadership.

Communication & Continuing QFTB

Arguably, the most important part of Quest for the Best is communicating progress, decisions, and next steps throughout the department. It will be important to demonstrate that this is not just another surface level effort, but a deep commitment to improving culture and efficiencies as shared by staff. Leadership communicated that Quest for the Best will not end with this report but serve as an ongoing vision and driving force.

There are several strategies that can be used to continue the effort, including:

- **Requests for Feedback:** Appendix A provides an initial feedback form to be distributed to CPFM staff as a follow-up to these sessions. The form evaluates the effectiveness of the sessions and solicits feedback on top themes that have emerged so far. This process should be a regular and on-going strategy to benchmark the progress and effectiveness of Quest for the Best.
- **Website and Newsletter:** Continue to use the CPFM website and newsletter to communicate progress on Quest for the Best, ways for staff to stay involved, and the plans of the working groups. Staff indicated support for these existing communication channels, and a regular “QFTB Highlight” will keep the initiative on staff’s radars.
- **Leadership Team Meetings:** Continue to include QFTB on leadership team meeting agendas. On a monthly or quarterly basis, consider an “update” from each of the working groups, potentially inviting a non-management staff member to share a 10-15 minute update on their progress and ideas. This structure highlights the leadership of other staff members and may provide additional professional development opportunities.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Participant Feedback Form

This appendix provides a suggested form to collect feedback and solicit future participation from CPFM staff in the ongoing Quest for the Best project. This appendix can be easily converted into a Qualtrics survey and printed for staff without computer access.

Introduction

Thank you for participating in the launch of Quest for the Best – over 95% of CPFM staff members joined one of the ten small group discussions in July and August. Session summaries are available on the [Quest for the Best website](#) with detailed notes and the identified “top themes.”

CPFM is committed to keeping staff involved in Quest for the Best. This feedback form is an opportunity for you to: 1) Provide feedback on Quest for the Best; 2) Comment on the top themes so far; and 3) Tell us if you’re interested in working on solutions for one of the top themes.

This survey should not take longer than 5-10 minutes, but first you might want to review the [session summaries](#) to see what other groups discussed.

We appreciate your candid and productive thoughts and ideas.

Top Themes Feedback

Staff recognized positive improvements made over the past several years but offered comments and ideas on how CPFM can improve our culture, communication, and processes.

We heard from you that you would like to see:

- 1) A consistent organizational culture of excellence, teamwork, and support;
- 2) Strength and solidarity within the department; and,
- 3) An appreciation for high-quality staff with adequate capacity.

Some suggestions can be acted upon quickly, while others will require a longer-term strategic approach. An important piece of feedback from staff was the sense that a great deal has changed at CPFM over the last few years, and these changes are not always well communicated.

With this in mind, there are five key themes that we feel CPFM can advance now.

- 1) Communication & Decision-Making
- 2) Team Building & Appreciation
- 3) Training & Professional Development
- 4) Parking
- 5) Campus Connections

For each of these themes, please provide your comments, ideas, and additions on how these can be moved forward on our Quest for the Best.

Communication & Decision-Making: Staff appreciate transparency in decision-making and want to be more involved in changes at CPFM. There are opportunities to improve communication across departments and from leadership.

Comments:

Team Building & Appreciation: Staff value informal staff gatherings and appreciation events. CPFM should continue to provide team building opportunities that are available to all staff and shifts. The organization should consider other ways to show appreciation for a job well done and ways to motivate staff to achieve shared goals.

Comments:

Training & Professional Development: Trainings and professional development are not always available across all units and shifts, but staff highly value existing programs. CPFM should develop a more structured process that includes apprenticeships and job shadowing and provides a clear path and opportunities for promotion.

Comments:

Parking: Specifically, staff would like to see a solution to parking on/near campus for employees.

Comments:

Campus Connections: More broadly, CPFM staff want to be more connected to the UO campus and other departments. There is a sense that their work is not always appreciated or could be more integrated.

Comments:

The “Top Themes” list is not yet final. What is missing from this list of top issues and/or themes that CPFM leadership should know?

Comments:

Quest for the Best Feedback

Tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I understand Quest for the Best and what we're trying to achieve.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel the overall themes reflect our small group conversations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I valued participating in one of the small group sessions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I look forward to continuing the Quest for the Best process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What else do you want to share about Quest for the Best so far?

Comments:

Working Groups Interest

The next step for Quest for the Best is to form a working group for each of the top themes. Each group will be made up of a mix of staff from different units with ideas and an interest in solutions. We want your participation! All time dedicated to the working groups will be paid.

A sixth working group will focus on how CPM can continue Quest for the Best into the future. This group will make recommendations on how the working groups move forward, provide regular updates to the leadership team and CPM staff, and identify "quick wins" that can happen right away.

Please check off which working groups you're interested in participating in. Joining a group is optional, so you can skip this section if you don't want to participate.

- ☐ Communication & Decision-Making
- ☐ Team Building & Appreciation
- ☐ Training & Professional Development
- ☐ Parking
- ☐ Campus Connections
- ☐ Continuing Quest for the Best

Please provide your name here so we can contact you about next steps on the working group. If you don't want to provide your name, please contact NAME at EMAIL or PHONE with your interest.

Name: _____

Appendix B. Solutions Committees Resources

Consider some of the following strategies when establishing and managing the committees.

- **Identify a chair or co-chairs.** This may present a leadership development opportunity for staff who are interested in advancement or gaining new professional skills. Consider recruiting someone directly offline, rather than during the first meeting. Keep in mind that these individuals may need support and resources in running effective meetings or teams.
- **Establish a procedure for agenda development and meeting notes.** This responsibility can alternate across participants but should be a standard practice to capture action items and all ideas. Assist the chair/co-chair in facilitating the meeting and staying on time and on agenda.
- **Develop group ground rules and shared goals.** During the first meeting, participants should define what they want to accomplish over the course of a year and consider a road map for how to get there. Give the groups the freedom to develop their own process and meeting schedule.
- **Identify training and informational needs.** Do the groups need information from different staff or departments? Maybe it would be valuable to bring in a guest who can provide information to set the stage for their work. For example, the parking group may identify the need to meet with Transportation Services to better understand plans for parking on campus and what opportunities already exist.
- **Incorporate time for FUN and team building.** The working groups don't need to be all work all the time. This is a chance to develop relationships and open up communication channels across the department. Remind the groups that they can meet off-site or spend time doing "around the table" updates on what's happening in different pockets of the department.
- **Celebrate successes.** Share with the broader department what the working groups have accomplished and allow staff to celebrate the work they've done to date. Avoid developing "tunnel vision" and getting overwhelmed by the work left to do. This may also serve as a recruitment tool for new members of the working groups in future years.
- **Evaluate performance and progress.** Ask the group to reflect on their performance and accomplishments – both formally and informally. Revisit this report and the initial objectives and ensure that the group is still on track and addressing the initial issues identified by staff. In the development of shared goals, consider developing performance metrics and concrete outcomes that the group would like to see within one year.

Appendix C. Staff Participation

This appendix provides a full list of the 229 CPFM staff members who participated in a Quest for the Best session.

First Name	Last Name	Role
Albert	Aragon	Custodial - Day
Kersey	Bars	Paint
Bruce	Budzik	Design & Construction (Small Projects)
Gary	Dunlap	Custodial - Night (Carpet)
Ottmar	Geitner	Paint - Night
Roland	Guerrero	Electrical
Patrick	Haider	Custodial Night
Gabe	Hein	Maintenance Support
Pablo	Hernandez-Reyes	Custodial - Day
Jeremiah	Igou	Custodial - Day
Kayla	Kemp	Custodial - Night
Shelly	Knight	Design & Construction (Small Projects)
Matthew	Knox	TMW - Night
Phil	Lee	Custodial - Night (Carpet)
Melanie	Lester	Work Control Center
Jeff	Madsen	Design & Construction (Small Projects)
Michael	McGee	Grounds
Chris	McLaughlin	Custodial - Night (Carpet)
Michael	Philly	Custodial - Night
Cesar	Rojas	Custodial - Day
Lal	Singh	Custodial - Day
Nick	Sloss	Grounds
Ruby	Thompson	Custodial - Night
Mike	Allen	Maintenance Support
Rob	Basto	Design & Construction (Business Ops)
Moyer	Bleekman	Custodial - Day
Toni	Campbell	Custodial - Night
Dan	Carpenter	Custodial - Night
Nathan	Chaffee	Design & Construction (Architect)
Walter	Chambers	Custodial Coordinator - Night
Rick	Chase	Paint
Lawrence	Elliot	Construction Services
Kirk	Gilbert	Electrical
Eric	Grape	Utilities & Energy
Judy	Haines	Custodial - Night
Terry	Huuki	Carpentry
Ed	Macko	Grounds
Dave	Musgrove	Work Control Center
Mario	Perez	Custodial - Night

First Name	Last Name	Role
Richard	Reed	Custodial - Night
Eddie	Reynolds	Custodial - Night
Paul	Rollins	Carpentry - Night
Arjuna	Rousseau	Custodial - Day
Tom	Shepard	Design & Construction
Tom	Sheridan	Paint
Matt	Smith	Utilities & Energy
Kyle	Spangler	Maintenance Support
Wanita	Tiburcio	Design & Construction (Business Ops)
Boz	Van Houten	Utilities & Energy - Energy Manager
Pat	Bolls	Carpentry
Colin	Brennan	Design & Construction (Capital)
Scot	Campbell	Mobile Equipment
Tucker	Clauson	
Hilario	Colmaneres	Custodial - Swing
Marco	Diaz	Custodial - Swing
Morgan	Driggs	Work Control Center
Pete	Enfield	Laborer
Emily	Eng	Campus Planning
Cimmeron	Gillespie	Sustainability
Sharon	Ginn	Asset Manager
Chris	Hallam	Custodial - Swing
Carrie	Jones	Custodial - Swing
Scott	Moore	Carpentry
Wally	Morris	Custodial - Swing
Ivy	Pitts	Campus Planning
Jeffrey	Schmidt	Custodial - Swing
Denise	Stewart	Design & Construction (Capital)
Richard	Vaughan	HVAC
Olin	Vermillion	Plumbing
Kevin	Waldrop	Design & Construction (Engineering)
Ron	Warren	Plumbing
Kai	Adams	Utilities & Energy
Donald	Addison	Zero Waste
Tim	Allenbaugh	Design & Construction (Small Projects)
Ryan	Baker	Mobile Equipment
Rob	Berg	Electrical
Gregg	Coumas	Grounds
Jeremiah	Dylan	Carpentry - Night
Cory	Elgin	Custodial - Day
Sarah	Follett	Design & Construction (Engineering)
Jeff	Hanson	Design & Construction (Small Projects)
Shirley	Harwood	Custodial - Night
Ken	Janecek	General Maintenance Mechanic

First Name	Last Name	Role
Yuji	Jiang-Schrantz	Custodial - Night
Bill	Melheim	Custodial - Day
Linda	Miller	Custodial - Day
Dan	Morehouse	Design & Construction (Engineering)
Steve	Page	U&E Graveyard
Jaime	Perpinan	Asset Management
Mark	Stegner	Refuse
Jayne	Thompson	Custodial - Day
Dale	Waggoner	Custodial - Day
Kiles	White	Utilities & Energy
Kyle	Wilson	Utilities & Energy - Maint. Manager
Laura	Ahlgren	Custodial - Night
Craig	Aldrich	Custodial - Night
Kevin	Bloom	BAS
George	Bruce	Custodial - Night
Jeff	Butler	Director of FS
Josh	Chadwick	Carpentry
R. James	Dumas	Utilities & Energy
Stephen	Graham	Custodial - Day
Nick	Grant	Custodial Mgr.
Alison	Hake	Design & Construction (Architect)
Desiree	Higgins	U&E
Cory	Hime	Utilities & Energy
Misty	Kasper	Utilities & Energy - Program Specialist
Dan	Lavelle	Grounds
Brianna	Liberty	Design & Construction (Architect)
Tad	Lueck	Buildings & Structures Manager
Aaron	Maxwell	Grounds
Ashleigh	Sizemore	Administration
Sandi	Spithill	Custodial - Night
Jerry	Willett	Custodial - Night
Sean	Woods	Utilities & Energy
Brian	Cadwalader	Custodial - Swing
Phil	Carroll	Grounds
David	Cates	Design & Construction (Architect)
Ernie	Dangerfield	Electrical
Johnny	Earl	Custodial - Swing
Piper	Fahrney	Maintenance Support
Kevin	Farthing	Associate Director of FS (Enviro Systems)
Justin	Grishkin	Construction Services
Bret	Jensen	Zero Waste
Haybid	Jimenez-Fallas	Custodial - Swing
Steve	Mart	Custodial - Swing
Gene	Mowery	Design & Construction (Capital)

First Name	Last Name	Role
Matt	Paeschke	Utilities & Energy
Dan	Pennisi	Custodial - Swing
Judy	Peters	Work Control Center
Melinda	Seeley	Campus Planning
Steve	Seeley	Access Control
Thomas	Sharkey	Custodial - Swing
Tonya	White	Administration
David	Amundson	Campus Planning
Phil	Chesbro	Zero Waste
Bertha	Collman	Custodial - Swing
Hilario	Colmenares	Custodial - Swing
Sandi	Cullimore	Asset Management
Becket	DeChant	Grounds
Charles	Dyas	Mobile Equipment
Jill	Fogelstrom	Design & Construction
Esther	Foss	Campus Planning
Tony	Hardenbrook	Utilities & Energy
Steven	Harris	Mobile Equipment
Aaron	Jackson	Custodial - Swing
Jered	Lewis	Utilities & Energy
Aaron	Olsen	Campus Planning
Adam	Pettus	HVAC
LeAnna	Pitts	Work Control Center
Claudia	Seaholm	Custodial - Swing
August	Sherman	Custodial - Swing
Ken	Straw	Access Control/HVAC/Plumbing
Emmett	Wilson	Maintenance Support
Kevin	Wilson	Carpentry
Robin	Wood	BAS
Jeff	Ziglinski	Zero Waste
Vivan	Barbour	Custodial - Day
George	Bleekman	Design & Construction (Capital)
Tony	Brimberry	Custodial - Night
Debbi	Davis	EA to Jeff Butler
Charles	Dyas	Mobile Equipment
Mark	Fandrem	Utilities & Energy
Brandon	Floek	Electrical
Bowen	Garner	Utilities & Energy
Todd	Gillen	Grounds
Craig	Koharchick	Utilities & Energy
Bob	Lyman	Maintenance Support
William	Mapfumo	Custodial - Night
Ed	Mclver	Custodial - Night
Kat	Mclver	Custodial - Night

First Name	Last Name	Role
Ken	Peters	Maintenance Support
Dave	Petersen	Access Control
Amber	Stitch	Grounds
Tory	Thornton	Custodial - Day
Stormi	Vivian	Custodial - Night
Kevin	Waldrop	Design & Construction
Tim	Winder	Custodial Manager
Terri	Winn	Custodial - Day
Michael	Zmolek	Custodial - Night
Susan	Anderson	Custodial - Night
Angee	Brown	Access Control
Jane	Brubaker	Grounds
Darin	Dehle	
Sandi	Henley	Work Control Center
Neil	Jordan	Carpentry
David	Kenedy	Maintenance Support
Paul	Langley	Utilities & Energy - Superintendent
Sim	Lau	Custodial - Night
Rod	Madison	Grounds
Tom	Miller	Custodial - Night
Nic	Patton	Plumbing
Bob	Peterson	Paint
Larry	Peterson	BAS
Vladimir	Prime	Custodial - Night
Becca	Puleo	Design & Construction
Kenny	Ramsdal	Electrical
Mikel	Rhodes	Design & Construction (Business Ops)
Sarah	Schneider	Custodial - Night
Anne	Schwarz	Administration
Mo	Soleimani	Utilities & Energy
Rick	Tabor	Utilities & Energy
Ron	Tucker	Custodial - Night
Vanessa	Abbott	Access Control
Joseph	Boyan	Custodial - Swing
Stacy	Breaux	BAS
David	Butts	Custodial - Swing
Jeremiah	Christofferson	U&E
Jim	Cody	FS - Assoc, Director
Theodore	Davis	Design & Construction (Small Projects)
Tim	Gerling	Custodial - Swing
Mike	Hallam	Custodial - Swing
Dave	Harris	Utilities & Energy
Robyn	Hathcock	Zero Waste
Brad	Lorenz	HVAC

First Name	Last Name	Role
Gary	Malone	Utilities & Energy
Ashley	Mayfield	Maint. Support
Steve	Mital	Sustainability
Martina	Oxoby	Design & Construction (Capital)
Cullen	Page	
Pat	Rankin	Custodial - Swing
Rick	Schwab	
Andrew	Silvius	
Dale	Stadler	Design & Construction (Engineering)
Sarah	Stoeckl	Sustainability
Marie	Swarringim	Campus Planning
Christine	Thompson	Campus Planning
Jay	Van Orman	U&E
Robin	Wood	BAS

Appendix D. Session I Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the first session.

Continue

- Team building exercises (12 votes)
- Flexibility around schedules and work tasks (5 votes)
- Good supervisors (3 votes)
- More outside work engagement (1 vote)
- Training opportunities (0 votes)
- Supportive internal communication (0 votes)

Start

- Better top-down communication (8 votes)
- Gather more input from within CPFM (6 votes)
- Cut out the middlemen (2 votes)
- Offer more training programs to increase mobility (2 votes)
- Streamline the hiring process (2 votes)
- Cross-departmental communication (0 votes)
- Better external communication to campus (0 votes)
- Improved clarity on expectations of roles and responsibilities (0 votes)
- Involve employees in decision-making (0 votes)
- Act upon feedback (0 votes)

Stop

- Making changes without all the pieces in place to do so effectively (10 votes)
- Creating an “us vs. them” environment (6 votes)
- Making changes without broad input (2 votes)
- Overloading staff (1 vote)
- Pointless meetings (1 vote)
- Hiding information (1 vote)
- Micromanaging – trust your staff (0 votes)
- Retaliation against people who speak out (0 votes)

Appendix E. Session 2 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the second session.

Continue

- Culture of supportive management – no micromanagement (8 votes)
- Employee relationship building – morale raising events (7 votes)
- Keeping work in-house (4 votes)
- Gathering feedback from people on the ground (2 votes)
- Promptness in addressing maintenance concerns (1 vote)
- Open communication, especially around safety (1 vote)

Start

- Better define boundaries between CPFM and the rest of campus (9 votes)
- Better cross-department / cross-campus communication – responsive communication (8 votes)
- Include classified team members in design meetings – take advantage of on-the-ground expertise (3 votes)
- Use updated electronic technology (2 votes)
- Long-term planning (1 vote)
- Internal communication (0 votes)
- Prioritizing / being thoughtful about shorter-term change (0 votes)
- Job improvement programs (0 votes)

Stop

- Reducing staff (7 votes)
- Allowing users to dictate the project – users need to be appropriately involved (6 votes)
- Creating inappropriate tasks – involve people in decision-making (6 votes)
- Handle layoffs or staff changes more thoughtfully (3 votes)
- Doing things without feedback (3 votes)
- Restricting access to information (2 votes)
- Making change for the sake of making change (2 votes)

Appendix F. Session 3 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the third session.

Continue

- Procedures and organizational tools in place providing clear direction (9 votes)
- Campus notices process (4 votes)
- Hiring appropriate staff (3 votes)
- Team building and open communication (2 votes)
- Honoring time-off and leave policies (2 votes)
- Strategic planning processes (0 votes)
- Building up shop teams (0 votes)

Start

- Building systems knowledge and trainings (4 votes)
- Revenue generating surplus system (4 votes)
- Updating policies and procedures (4 votes)
- Bring workers into planning process at appropriate times (3 votes)
- Make staff aware of personnel changes – third party exit interviews (3 votes)
- Focus on one project at a time to completion – start to finish (2 votes)
- Review process of things that worked well before restructuring (1 vote)
- Valuing employees (1 vote)
- Holding management accountable (0 votes)

Stop

- Overloading existing staff – address capacity issues (9 votes)
- Changing procedures without input from those affected (8 votes)
- Setting unrealistic goals (2 votes)
- Restricting effective teams (1 vote)
- Reclassification of jobs (1 vote)
- Ignoring campus community who are willing and able to help (0 votes)
- Distrust of employee ability (0 votes)
- Non-expert decision-making (0 votes)
- Providing disinformation and being disingenuous (0 votes)

Appendix G. Session 4 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the fourth session.

Continue

- Top down and bottom-up communication (7 votes)
- Ground-up and cross-departmental collaboration (4 votes)
- Team building, training and safety (3 votes)
- Flexible schedules (2 votes)
- Group activities (2 votes)
- Hiring process – considering freedom to do the job (2 votes)
- Staff training (1 vote)

Start

- Address capacity issues (7 votes)
- Cohesive communication – work control consistency, adding staff (6 votes)
- Accept responsibility when things don’t go well (3 votes)
- Cross-department collaboration – information sharing, shadowing and cross-training (2 votes)
- Professional and specific training (2 votes)
- Start a homeless program (1 vote)
- Better budgeting process (1 vote)
- Empower people to make decisions (1 vote)
- Using employee skills – training and safety (0 votes)

Stop

- Being a “yes” organization and over committing without resources (8 votes)
- Overloading staff (5 votes)
- Using ineffective procedures (4 votes)
- Temporary fixes – projects without proper planning and input (4 votes)
- Unnecessary IT approval (1 vote)
- Being reactive and putting things off (1 vote)
- Redundant meetings (1 vote)
- Band-Aid fixes – do it right the first time (1 vote)

Appendix H. Session 5 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the fifth session.

Continue

- Improving employee morale (7 votes)
- Emphasize customer service (5 votes)
- Employee freedom in decision-making (4 votes)
- Training opportunities for skill-building and safety (3 votes)
- Schedule flexibility (3 votes)
- Providing small amenities (1 vote)
- Group activities (1 vote)
- Self-management (0 votes)
- Transparency and quick responses (0 votes)

Start

- Culture of “freedom to fail” (6 votes)
- Humanizing management, value and respect employees (4 votes)
- Communication with other departments (4 votes)
- Consistency in information and procedures (3 votes)
- Incentivize high-performance employees (2 votes)
- Standardization of equipment across campus (1 vote)
- Upper management more accessible and transparent (1 vote)
- Motivating people towards shared goals (0 votes)

Stop

- Unrealistic expectations (7 votes)
- Culture of disrespect / unprofessionalism (6 votes)
- Siloed thinking (2 votes)
- Hoarding information (2 votes)
- Micromanaging the managers (2 votes)
- Reduction of tools and resources (1 vote)
- Time-tracking (AIM) – wasting time (1 vote)
- Dismissing the knowledge of workers on the ground (0 votes)
- Workers feeling responsible for financial implications/considerations (0 votes)

Appendix H. Session 6 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the sixth session.

Continue

- Employee training – encouraging attendance (9 votes)
- Offering team building – but be more inclusive of odd shifts (4 votes)
- Flexibility in scheduling (2 votes)
- Family first culture (1 vote)
- Organizational restructuring and collaboration (1 vote)
- Centralization of CPFM management tools – AIM and work control (0 votes)

Start

- Review of supervisors – possible 360 degree (7 votes)
- Improving parking options (5 votes)
- Improve public relations across campus (2 votes)
- Better communication within CPFM (2 votes)
- Improving pay scales (2 votes)
- Regular and informal information sharing (1 vote)
- Centralize database (1 vote)
- Hire from within and recognize experience (1 vote)
- Cross-division collaboration and resources (0 votes)

Stop

- Prioritizing construction over maintenance (6 votes)
- Unfair compensation practices (3 votes)
- Inefficient admin activities (2 votes)
- Not taking accountability (2 votes)
- Drastically and frequently changing policies (1 vote)
- Wasting supplies, surplus supplies/materials (1 vote)
- New software without training (1 vote)
- Taking away parking (0 votes)
- Inefficient supervisor meetings (0 votes)
- Siloing departments (0 votes)
- Hierarchical culture (0 votes)

Appendix I. Session 7 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the seventh session.

Continue

- Professional development opportunities (12 votes)
- Trainings – safety and skill (3 votes)
- Continuing education for employees (2 votes)
- Updating CPFM infrastructure (2 votes)
- Integrating work internally (1 vote)
- Conversations about transparency (1 vote)
- Cross-department work (0 votes)
- Social gatherings (including on-campus tours) (0 votes)
- Hiring polite, competent people (0 votes)

Start

- Preventative maintenance – more hiring (7 votes)
- Internal promotions should maintain institutional knowledge (3 votes)
- Providing career mobility options (3 votes)
- Value institutional knowledge – developing standards and decision making (3 votes)
- Review supervisors annually (1 vote)
- Awareness of policy changes and updates (1 vote)
- Mistakes are teachable moments (0 votes)
- FASS/HR understands trade conditions (0 votes)
- Prioritize – project management (0 votes)
- Breaking down silos (0 votes)

Stop

- Overworking employees through APPA standards (6 votes)
- Running skeleton crews (4 votes)
- Excessive and unproductive meetings (3 votes)
- Starting projects without planning and scoping (2 votes)
- Mandating uncomfortable and unseasonable uniforms (2 votes)
- Extensive process for hiring new people (2 votes)
- Burdensome purchasing processes (1 vote)
- Top-down approach (1 vote)
- Inefficient leave and payroll accounting (1 vote)
- Using standardized metrics for UO (0 votes)
- Reorganizing groups (0 votes)

Appendix J. Session 8 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the eighth session.

Continue

- Pay raises (6 votes)
- Flexible hours and shifts (3 votes)
- Career development (3 votes)
- Retaining qualified employees (2 votes)
- Working as a team (2 votes)
- Excellent customer service (1 vote)
- Quality tools (1 vote)
- Trainings that are accessible to all shifts (1 vote)
- Safety procedures and training (0 votes)

Start

- Formal job shadowing and cross-training (5 votes)
- Hiring more people (5 votes)
- Talk more between departments (4 votes)
- Standardize procedures and training (2 votes)
- Holding people accountable (2 votes)
- Planning and project communication (1 vote)
- Better communication and behavior from managers (1 vote)
- Campus-wide communication (0 votes)
- Promotion and pay raises for topped out employees (0 votes)
- Trainings at better times (0 votes)

Stop

- Top-down, heavy culture (4 votes)
- Gifting good positions – favoritism (4 votes)
- “just do it” attitude (4 votes)
- Graduation at multiple locations (3 votes)
- Enforcing mandatory meetings (2 votes)
- Reducing services and standards (2 votes)
- Burdensome processes – decision-making and hiring (2 votes)
- Micromanagement (1 vote)
- Maintenance funding (unequal and lack of) (1 vote)

Appendix K. Session 9 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the ninth session.

Continue

- Recognition programs (7 votes)
- Teambuilding activities (5 votes)
- Clear direction and structure (4 votes)
- Diversity forums (2 votes)
- Trainings for management to understand the job (2 votes)
- Open door, comfortable environment and culture (1 vote)
- Regular check-in meetings (0 votes)

Start

- Better communication - interdepartmental and cross-department (6 votes)
- Different ways to incentivize – ex. Training and education (5 votes)
- Apprenticeship and mentorship programs (4 votes)
- Living wage (3 votes)
- Follow and clarify standard procedures – trainings and communication as well (2 votes)
- Clarify roles and responsibilities within CPFM (1 vote)
- Use more cooperative language (0 votes)

Stop

- Allowing campus to dictate work (6 votes)
- Asking people to do more with less (6 votes)
- Ignoring campus problems – drugs and homelessness (5 votes)
- Same people doing maintenance and construction (2 votes)
- Decentralizing (2 votes)
- Hiring additional management and administrative costs (1 vote)
- Wasting labor – don’t use overqualified people (1 vote)
- Reinventing the wheel across campus (0 votes)
- Leaving student staff untrained (0 votes)

Appendix L. Session 10 Dot Voting

This appendix includes the “dot voting” records from the tenth session.

Continue

- Professional development and opportunities for advancement (15 votes)
- Accepting employee input (5 votes)
- Good employee benefits (3 votes)
- Collaboration between units in CPM (1 vote)
- Informality and continuous (1 vote)
- Communication newsletter (0 votes)
- Annual performance reviews – for all (0 votes)
- Social gatherings (0 votes)

Start

- Establishing feedback review process – about operational processes (9 votes)
- Hiring specific tradespeople – support professional development for recruiting and employees (6 votes)
- Valuing and hiring based on work experience (3 votes)
- Improve how CPM meets customer needs (3 votes)
- Mentorship program for all levels (2 votes)
- Inclusive and proactive hiring (2 votes)
- Professional development (2 votes)
- Provide people with tools to do tasks (0 votes)
- Better internal communication post-change (0 votes)

Stop

- Making changes without consulting people who are impacted (8 votes)
- Adding more management to fix “problem managers” (6 votes)
- Overspending on building projects, not spending on maintenance (6 votes)
- Not following through – using “busy” as an excuse (2 votes)
- Segregation between design & construction / facilities management (2 votes)
- Duplicative and inefficient processes (1 vote)
- Starting projects without end-goals (0 votes)
- Constant reorganization (0 votes)