



Contents

APPA: The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers is an international association dedicated to the development of leadership and professional management applicable to the planning, design, construction, maintenance, and operation of the facilities required for quality teaching, research, and public service.

APPA: The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers
1643 Prince Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2818

Copyright ©2006 by APPA.

Printed in the United States of America. All rights reserved.

Introduction
Executive Summary
Evaluation Report and Recommendations
Leadership
Strategic and Operational Planning
Customer Focus
Information and Analysis
Development and Management of
Human Resources
Process Management
Performance Results
Other Considerations
Conclusion

The approval of the institution is made in relationship to the criteria and guidelines of APPA's Facilities Management Evaluation Program. The evaluation report comments on the strengths of the institution and, when appropriate, offers suggestions and recommendations for improvement of performance. The report constitutes no endorsement, or denial of endorsement, of the institution by APPA or by the members of the evaluation team. This document was created for the exclusive use of the institution named. All contents are confidential.



Introduction

In times of challenge, achieving organizational success involves leadership, vision, strong core values and ethical practices, agility, customer focus and service quality. Over the years, the criteria for the Facilities Management Evaluation Program has evolved toward a comprehensive coverage of strategy driven performance and alignment of the facilities services to address the ever-changing conditions which higher education institutions face.

This report is an evaluation of the office of Facilities and Grounds of the University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHfM). The observations and recommendations are those of a team of senior facilities management professionals who visited the campus February 5-10, 2006.

The review was conducted at the request of W. H. Raymond Yeh, FAIA, dean, School of Architecture, who serves as chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Facilities Management, appointed by the University of Hawaii at Manoa chancellor's office as follow up to a 2004 recommendation of a UHM Faculty Senate Committee to engage APPA in a review, evaluation, and recommendations for improvement in UHM facility services. The review was structured in accordance with the Facilities Management Evaluation Program (FMEP) of APPA: Serving Educational Facilities Professionals. Facilities professionals, with specific expertise, were selected for the evaluation team. Selections were based on their experience in the management and leadership of comparable facilities organizations relevant to those of the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Members of the review team included the following:

Jack Hugg, Team Leader
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities—Retired
University of California, San Diego
APPA Past President

Paul Tabolt
Vice Chancellor for Administration
University of Colorado at Boulder

Marc Fisher
Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities, Operations
and Maintenance
University of California, Santa Barbara

Peter van der Have
Assistant Vice President, Facilities
University of Utah

Maurice Hollman
Associate Vice Chancellor
University of California, Davis

The APPA team interviewed staff within the Facilities and Grounds organization and also interviewed numerous principal campus administrators, primary customers, and key constituents external to the Facilities and Grounds. The names of those interviewed external to the Facilities Division and the various committees whose members participated are listed below.

Denise Eby Konan, Interim Chancellor
Kathy Cutshaw, Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration, Finance, and Operations
Wayne Iwaoka, Interim Vice Chancellor for Students
Neal Smetreski, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Vassilis Symros, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education
Robert Bley-Vroman, Faculty Senate Chair
Bruce Miller, Director, Office of Sustainability
Jim Mauke, Director of Communications
Tom Schroeder, Chair, Campus Safety and Security Committee and Emergency Preparedness Committee
Kevin Nakata, HGEA Representative
Robert Nagao, Director, Manoa Budget Office, Office of VC for Administration, Finance, and Operations

Roy Takekawa, Director, Environmental Health and Safety Office
Donald Dawson, Acting Chief, Campus Security
Eric Yamashita, Campus Space Manager, Office of the VC for Administration, Finance, and Operations
Jack Sidener, Campus Planner, Office of the VC Administration, Finance, and Operations
Janice Nakashima, Physical Plant Officer, Student Housing
Jan Javina, Director, Co-curricular Activities, Programs, and Services
Francis Blanco, Director, Facilities, John A. Burns School of Medicine
Kyle Tengan, Lower Campus Supervisor
Glen Nakaya, Manager, Rainbow Stadium
Rich Sheriff, Manager, Stan Sheriff Arena
Judy Rubano, Acting Director, Administration, SOEST
Klaus Keil, Dean, SOEST
Carrie Matsuzaki, Assistant Specialist, College of Engineering
Andrew Hashimoto, Dean and Director, College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources
Jon Matsuoka, Dean, School of Social Work
Ray Yeh, Dean, School of Architecture
Lorenz Maggaard, Director, International Center for Climate Society
Frank Beaver, Interim Associate Dean, College of Arts and Humanities
Edgar Porter, Interim Dean, School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies
Sheyla Tashina, Administrative Officer, College of Education
Carolyn Okinaga, Interim Associate Dean, Outreach College
William Chismar, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration
Erika Lacrow, Interim Assistant Dean, School of Travel Industry
Carol Lee, Associate Dean, William S. Richardson School of Law
Diane Perushek, University Librarian
Andrew Rossiter, Director, Waikiki Aquarium
Clifford Morden, Interim Director, Lyon Arboretum
David Hafner, Director of Administration, Institute of Astronomy
Mary Donohue, Associate Director, Sea Grant College

Andrew Fagan, Administrator, University Health Services
Brent Watanabe, Administrator, East-West Center
Teri Wilhelm Chang, Assistant Athletic Director for
Facilities and Events

Sam Callejo, UH System Vice President for Administration
Jan Yokota, UH System Director, Office of Capital
Improvements

Brenna Hashimoto, UH System Associate Director, Office
of Human Resources

Mia Noguchi, UH System Director, Media Relations,
External Affairs, and University Relations

Duff Zwald, UH System Director, Office of Procurement
and Real Property

Scott Oshiro, UH System Procurement Officer (Facilities
Contracting)

David Lassner, UH System Chief Information Officer,
Information Technology Services

In addition to the above interviews, the review team also
met with representatives of the following groups of custom-
ers and committees:

Recent customers of remodel/alteration projects
Building facility managers and coordinators and large
department representatives

Committee on Administration and Budget
Landscape Advisory Committee
Building Services Advisory Committee

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The review team acknowledges, with deep appreciation,
the help and support of the members of the Ad Hoc Com-
mittee on Facilities Management: Ray Yeh, Gordon Grau,
Stephen Meder, Mel Won, John Carey, and Ivo Martinac.
This group's participation and willingness to share informa-
tion and supporting documents and materials were insight-
ful and essential ingredients for this evaluation. Addition-
ally, the team wishes to acknowledge the wholehearted
support, cooperation, and assistance of many members of
the university's administration.

The review team especially thanks the members of Faci-
lities and Grounds. Their willingness to share their time,

provide information, and offer their opinion and percep-
tions to the review team contributed many useful insights
to this report. This willingness on the part of Facilities and
Grounds staff to share information was especially impor-
tant since a departmental self-evaluation was not available
for the review team in advance of the site visit.

Special recognition is given to Mel Won, who did a stellar
job in preparing interview schedules and providing support
logistical support to the review team. His flexibility, pa-
tience, and efficient response to our many additional
requests for information and changes in schedule were
truly remarkable. Also, Ruth Goldstein filled an essential
role and did an excellent job of assisting the review team
members each day with meeting room arrangements,
meeting materials, refreshments, and lunch arrangements.

The participation in interviews and events by Kathy
Cutshaw, interim vice chancellor for Administration,
Finance, and Operations, was a clear demonstration of her
interest in this review and we are most appreciative of her
time. In addition, Interim Chancellor Denise Eby Konan
was most generous in sharing her time and important
insights with the review team.

The names of Facilities and Grounds staff who participated
in individual interviews are as follows:

Kalvin Kashimoto, Director, Facilities and Grounds
Nick Metivier, Procurement and Physical Plant Manager
Farouk Wang, Director, Buildings and Grounds
Carol Yoshida, Administrative Officer, Budget and Fiscal
Management

Roxanne Adams, Grounds Manager

Derek Seu, Building Services Manager

Carlton Ho, Assistant Building Services Manager

Ronald Lau, Registered Architect, Architectural Design

Dennis Kamite, Registered Engineer, Electrical Engineering
Thomas Katsuyoshi, Registered Architect, Project
Management

Blake Araki, Registered Engineer, Mechanical Engineering
Rae Miyashiro, Supervisor, Facilities Customer Service
Center

Hongly Khuy, Facilities IT Specialist

Brenda Shin, Facilities Personnel Officer

Other meetings were held with staff within Facilities and Grounds and included meetings with:

- Shop supervisors: carpentry shop, electric shop, paint shop, plumbing shop, trucking, air conditioning repair and maintenance, and AC maintenance unit
- Janitorial Supervisors: crews 1, 2, and 3, carpet cleaner supervisor
- Landscape supervisor
- Grounds maintenance supervisor
- Makai grounds crew

Separate group meetings were also held with 29 Facilities and Grounds front-line maintenance workers including: trade shops, building services, grounds and landscape services, logistical services, architects, and engineers.

In addition to a scheduled general campus tour for all of the review team members, special tours were held of the following areas:

Facilities and Grounds offices and shops including a review of shop equipment and fleet equipment

Selected buildings for maintenance and condition review

Including classroom spaces, auditoriums, wet labs, dry labs, research facilities, Sinclair Library, historic buildings, and electrical sub-stations

CAMPUS HISTORY

The University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHM) is a premier research university of international standing. Manoa is the flagship of the University of Hawaii system, the state's sole public university system governed by a 12-member Board of Regents. A land-grant, sea grant, and space-grant institution, Manoa creates, refines, disseminates, and perpetuates human knowledge; offers a comprehensive array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through the doctoral level; carries out advanced research; and extends services to the community.

Located in Manoa Valley on the island of Oahu, the university was founded in 1907 under the auspices of the Morrill Act as a land-grant college of agriculture and mechanic arts. With the addition of a College of Arts and Sciences in 1920, the college became the University of Hawaii (UH).

and in 1972, it became the University of Hawaii at Manoa to distinguish it from the other units in the growing UH system.

Today, more than 20,000 students are enrolled in Manoa courses, on campus or via distance delivery. Classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University-Extensive institution, Manoa offers 87 bachelor's degrees, 87 master's degrees, and 53 doctorates. The university offers professional degrees in law, medicine, and architecture. Approximately 65 percent of Manoa students are undergraduates; 57 percent are of Asian or Pacific Islander ancestry; and 56 percent are women.

Manoa's special distinction is found in its Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific orientation and its unique location. Together, these foster advantages in tropical agriculture, tropical medicine, oceanography, astronomy, electrical engineering, volcanology, evolutionary biology, comparative philosophy, urban planning, and international trade. Manoa also offers instruction in more Asia-Pacific languages than any other U.S. institution of higher learning. As a result, students are provided special opportunities for research, service learning, and co-curricular activities in Asian, Pacific, and Hawaiian studies. The beauty of the green Manoa valley provides a backdrop for a unique, yet inviting, campus. Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific traditions are well represented throughout the campus. There is an authentic Japanese tea house and garden, a replica of a Korean king's throne hall, and a Hawaiian taro patch. Off-campus facilities include the Lyon Arboretum, the Waikiki Aquarium, several marine facilities, and the world famous telescopes atop Mauna Kea.

The University of Hawaii was first accredited by the Western College Association in 1952. The Manoa campus is currently accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Twenty-eight professional programs are also accredited by appropriate agencies.

RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MANOA

In 2003, the top American research universities ranked University of Hawaii at Manoa among the top 50 public universities in federal research funding.

With extramural grants and contracts in excess of \$300 million, Manoa excels in research related to its physical landscape, heritage, and people. The landscape facilitates advances in marine biology, oceanography, underwater robotic technology, astronomy, geology and geophysics, agriculture, aquaculture, and tropical medicine. The heritage, the people, and the close ties to the Asian and Pacific region create a favorable environment for study and research in the arts, genetics, intercultural relations, linguistics, religion, and philosophy.

The School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology (SOEST) received the largest amount of extramural funding among the Manoa units at \$60 million. SOEST was followed by the John A. Burns School of Medicine (JABSONM) at \$41 million, the College of Natural Sciences at \$24 million, the Institute for Astronomy at \$22 million, the Pacific Basin Research Center at \$21 million, the College of Education at \$19 million, and the Cancer Research Center of Hawaii at \$18 million.

Systemwide, the majority of research funding comes from the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Commerce, and the National Aeronautics Space Administration (NASA). For nonresearch grants, the majority of funding comes from Hawaii government agencies, the Department of Education, the National Science Foundation, Hawaii health organizations, and NASA.

Construction on the new, \$150-million medical complex in the area of Kaka'ako is recently completed. The new facility houses a state-of-the-art biomedical research and education center that will attract significant federal funding and private sector investment in biotechnology research and development.

The University of Hawaii at Manoa is characterized by a wealth and variety of research projects.¹

CAMPUS PHYSICAL PLANT

Facilities and Grounds provides facilities services to the university including operations and maintenance of facilities, grounds and landscape, utility management, oversight for design and construction services for remodeling and alteration projects, and provides campus moving services. The services provided support a physical plant of varying age and condition located at the Manoa campus. The campus physical plant consists of approximately 7,120,185 gross square feet on over 275 acres. Facilities and Grounds employ approximately 350 FTEs for fiscal year 2005-06. The department operating budget for fiscal year 2005-06 is approximately \$28 million. Utilities comprise over \$14 million annually or about 50 percent of the total operating budget. The Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Biennium 2005-07 is \$41.8 million. Facilities and Grounds have identified a deferred maintenance backlog for the campus totaling \$100 million. The expected allocation for addressing this backlog for fiscal year 2005-06 is \$31.8 million.

The University of Hawaii at Manoa suffered severe flooding on October 30, 2004. At the time of this review, some buildings were still operating without permanent repairs and restoration. The damage caused by the flood totals many millions of dollars and the workload impact on the Facilities and Grounds staff has been stressful and, in cases, overwhelming for them. The event exposed many weaknesses in the campus emergency preparedness and recovery plan and the campus' abilities to respond and mitigate in a time of catastrophic loss. In many cases, in spite of many heroics on the part of numerous Facilities and Grounds staff, it has taken too long to restore many campus buildings and systems for campus users. The lingering effects of the flood are still noticeable as one tours the campus and the facilities that were damaged. Flood recovery expenses, and future flood mitigation planning add to the challenge of addressing campus facility conditions that are already observed to be suffering from countless deficiencies.

¹The above section is adopted from the University of Hawaii at Manoa website.



Executive Summary

Stated shared values of the UH System include aloha, collaboration, respect, intellectual rigor, integrity, service, access, affordability, diversity, fairness, leveraged technology, innovation, accountability, and sustainability. The UH system suggests, "...innovation and empowerment can overcome resource limitation and bureaucratic entanglements." Further, the UH System suggests a shared value for the spirit of service which infuses UH activities. We wish we consistently observed these traits in the Facilities and Grounds leadership and workforce.

The UHM is an inviting setting with the ever so beautiful Manoa Valley as a backdrop—a backdrop of abnormal beauty that has proven it can unleash its fury as evidenced by the October 30, 2004 flood that wreaked millions of dollars in damages to the campus.

An executive summary from a 1999 Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation visit stated, "The Campus has an urban feel with trees and landscaping creating a pleasant environment." The WASC summary went on to state, "...surprisingly in view of serious budget concerns, and to the credit of the grounds and maintenance crews, by casual inspection the campus appeared to be maintained very well."

As part of the WASC accreditation review, the same executive summary expressed serious concerns about instructional and support needs. The accreditation review team pointed out that,

"There are, however, major concerns about the long-term consequences of decreased maintenance of the entire plant. During the last seven years, major reductions have been made in the repairs and maintenance (R&M) budget line item. These reductions took the ratio of R&M to gross square feet from \$2.16 per square foot in 1992 to \$.35 per square foot in 1997. In fiscal year 1998, \$6.2 million has been added to the capital improvement budget specifically earmarked for re-roofing, mechanical and electrical systems. This area has been designated as a high priority for future budgets and will be protected from major additional cuts. This decision is important as UHM is an aging campus and is very susceptible to minor issues that left unattended will become major problems. The campus has a sizeable work force to take care of minor repairs, custodial activities, landscaping, grounds maintenance, environmental health and safety, and campus security. The autonomy act has been helpful in managing these important functions by providing more flexibility with staffing and procurement."

The same WASC report recognized that equipment and facilities for research present a critical part of graduate education and research. In 1999, that report noted the science faculty reported no apparent adverse effects in facilities and was astute enough to observe that over time the lack of state investment in research facilities will be felt.

Past observations from the WASC predictions are important to set the stage for the observations of the FMEP review team. Equally important is the small level of commitment which Facilities and Grounds organization exercised in preparation for the team's arrival.

A self-study and evaluation of the Facilities and Grounds organization is a prerequisite of a successful FMEP process. APPA FMEP review teams expect to arrive with a clear understanding of the mission and standards of Facilities and Grounds organization. The self-evaluation provides the participating institution with an opportunity to articulate its assessment of its own performance including an inventory of its existing best practices as well as its known deficiencies. The review team expects to arrive with a basic level of understanding of organizational mission, values,

programs, structure, policies, procedures, practices, and programs that are already in place. The absence of a Facilities and Grounds self-evaluation caused the review team to spend a considerable amount of its time seeking information that would normally have been provided in advance.

Facilities and Grounds placed itself at a severe disadvantage in the FMEP process by not evaluating and acknowledging its own assessment of its performance.

First impressions are lasting impressions. The absence of a self-evaluation was the review team's first impression of the Facilities and Grounds organization. The second significant impression of the Team occurred during a tour of the campus on the first day of its schedule. The setting of the campus, while marvelous and in a treasured location, was generally clouded by litter, debris, peeling paint, broken and heaved concrete, tripping hazards, graffiti in restrooms, burned-out light fixtures, and an observed general state of disrepair.

Buildings and campus spaces ranged from those carefully planned to the more eclectic appearance that occurs without careful planning. The review team's search for design standards for the physical plant came up empty. Simple campus standards for repetitive facility components are inherently missing. There does not appear to be a strong relationship between the UH system's planning and capital improvement responsibilities and the operational responsibilities of Facilities and Grounds organization.

The potential for a stellar physical plant has been overshadowed by neglect, deferral, fatigue, budgetary reductions, a lack of responsiveness, and closely held information in a time of desired organizational transparency.

As the review team worked through a comprehensive schedule, the prophetic words of the WASC in 1999 were noted to have, in fact, become a reality. Sinister words of anger, frustration, and despair about the performance of the Facilities and Grounds organization resounded from a large portion of the campus community. The organization appeared tired, worn-down, unappreciated, and beaten, particularly when so much focus was required to mitigate and recover from the 2004 flood. Certainly, there were

accolades and islands of support, but the vast majority of the community expressed dismay with the overall performance of the Facilities and Grounds organization.

The review team recognizes that the university is not the campus, not the buildings on the campus, not the grounds, but a collection of the faculty and students. The university consists of those who come into and move through the physical plant. The physical plant can influence and impact the ability of the institution to accomplish its teaching, research, and public service mission. The knowledge that is advanced and transferred within the physical plant should occur with the least amount of disruption possible and the most possible support from those in Facilities and Grounds.

Unfortunately, the review team observed physical conditions, maintenance practices, or the absence thereof, and reports from the campus community about service problems that compelled the team to conclude the physical plant is past the early stages of becoming a threat to the institution's ability to accomplish its mission at the same time that the institution is suffering from a rather expansive lack of permanent leadership at multiple levels throughout the UH system and the Manoa campus.

Deeper investigation into the Facilities and Grounds organization made it clear that there was not a unified strategic vision or sense of purpose among the staff. Roles and responsibilities for the campus-built environment were confused with noted disconnects between campus planning, capital improvement projects, and maintenance and operations. An overall sense of responsibility for the general condition and appearance of the total physical plant, including the upper campus, the lower campus, and auxiliary areas, could not be found. Several reported improvements in the upper campus landscape conditions were noted, despite operational roadblocks, including outdated and worn out equipment necessary for an efficient and effective workforce.

Policies were not written or centrally available at both the campus and the Facilities and Grounds level. There is an absence of written information about physical responsibilities leading to confusion about who is responsible for certain physical segments of the campus and who has the financial responsibility for the operation, repair, and in-

provements to certain segments of the campus. Technology and the internet tools are not commonly used by the Facilities and Grounds organization to share information, manage data, or facilitate the management of the plant. The organization is not known for its innovation. Baseline data and metrics to help evaluate performance are noticeably absent. Organizational budgets are not well understood and the department's financial accounting has not kept pace with organizational changes.

An outdated and elementary work order system was in place. Preventive maintenance programs are on someone's wish list rather than an actual institutional practice and computerized monitoring of building conditions does not exist. Equipment replacement programs have been incredibly shortchanged. A detailed inventory of physical conditions to support the institution's deferred maintenance estimate was informal and incomplete. The campus seeks a Facilities and Grounds organization that understands its deferred maintenance needs and that works together to establish priorities for repair and maintenance projects.

Resource limitations and bureaucratic entanglements are common. An understanding of workloads and the flexibility to increase and decrease resources according to workload demands is needed. Procurement practices and limited procurement resources cause noticeable delays that impact the timeliness of the performance of the Facilities and Grounds staff.

Decision making within the Facilities and Grounds organization is centrally controlled. Training and professional development are not an area of focus despite changes in technology. Useful products that can help improve the overall performance of the physical plant are missing. Horizontal and vertical communications need to be improved. Facilities and Grounds employees do not appear to meet the UH System shared value of "empowerment." Needless to say, morale was also found to be low. Recognition for performance would be welcome.



Evaluation Report and Recommendations

1.0 LEADERSHIP

The facilities organization's senior leaders should set direction and establish customer focus, clear and visible values, and high expectations in line with Campus mission, vision, and core values. Leaders inspire the people in the organization and create an environment that stimulates personal growth. They encourage involvement, development and learning, innovation, and creativity.

The quality of leadership, more than any other single factor, determines the success or failure of an organization. In this section of the report, attention is focused on the accomplishment of group purpose and the organizational mission.

1.1 Leadership roles and responsibilities are clearly defined.

Roles and responsibilities for those who have facility responsibility on campus and for those in Facilities and Grounds who occupy management and leadership positions are not clearly defined. Some job position descriptions are outdated and reflect times that have past, or the job descriptions incorporate responsibilities that were appropriate before a number of Facilities and Grounds reorganizations or realignments of responsibilities. Job descriptions, the format for job descriptions, and the documents that describe duties, responsibilities, and job qualifications are typical of those at comparable institutions. There is a need

to update the job description for several of the key positions in the department. More importantly, job and performance expectations have not been stated in a manner that is easily measured. If the job responsibilities that are described in a few of the key management positions were performed as defined, Facilities and Grounds overall performance would likely improve. Individual job descriptions can serve a valuable role in ensuring that the changed roles and responsibilities have been given proper attention and thought and that people know what their job requires.

The review team also observed a substantially fragmented approach to campus facilities management responsibility. Roles and responsibilities for capital projects and processes at both the University of Hawaii System, and campus levels are unclear. There is additional fragmentation of day-to-day facility responsibilities among the various campus auxiliary services departments and other self-supporting departments. Parking, athletics, and student housing have all assumed a number of responsibilities for managing facilities in their respective departments. Particularly concerning is the number of research units that have resorted to a "do-it-yourself" facility services approach. Research department representatives report that they engage in these "work-arounds" because they do not receive the service response and the quality of facility services which they need to support departmental programs and achieve their mission.

The campus does not have an integrated approach for the management of campus facilities. The university does not have a comprehensive facilities management organization that oversees the entire physical plant. The fragmentation of facility responsibilities has created inconsistent service standards for campus maintenance. Noticeable differences in campus appearance are apparent as one moves around the campus.

An excellent example of the fragmentation of facility responsibilities is demonstrated through a newspaper report from a campus walk to observe campus lighting that took place in November, 2005. As reported in the article "Chancellor takes a walk in the dark," the following question was raised: "Who is responsible for maintaining the safety and security of our campus community?" The news article pointed out, "That turns out to be a compli-

cated question that unveils how responsibilities overlap and reason is overlooked. We have independent security officers for upper campus, student housing, parking, and our libraries. Landscaping duties are likewise divided among the grounds management division, student housing, and our athletics department. Those watching over our lights and walkways are similarly under various campus authorities. Our pedestrians also stroll under the jurisdiction of the city and county of Honolulu. How many people does it take to change a light bulb?"

Over the past few years, Facilities and Grounds has undergone a number of changes in its organizational responsibilities. Responsibility for campus facilities planning and space management functions were reassigned from Facilities and Grounds to a new Campus Planner Office. The Environmental, Health, and Safety Office was separated from Facilities and Grounds and is now a stand-alone office. These two offices, Campus Planner and Environmental, Health, and Safety report directly to the office of the vice chancellor for Administration, Finance and Operations. Facilities and Grounds reports to the same vice chancellor.

The responsibility for capital improvement projects was also removed from Facilities and Grounds and assigned to a University of Hawaii System office for Capital Improvement Projects (CIP). The CIP office resides on the Manoa campus, and is supervised at the system level. It is our understanding that the CIP office has assumed many of the functions and responsibilities previously performed by the state of Hawaii Department of Accounting and General Services. (DAGS)

The responsibilities of Facilities and Grounds are largely characterized as the day-to-day operations and maintenance of university facilities, and the management responsibilities for small capital remodel and alteration projects, which include repair and maintenance program projects.

The current responsibility for facilities requires careful coordination of a successful comprehensive facilities management strategy. The coordination task has become more complex with the larger number of departments that are involved in delivery of intertwined facilities services.

The common higher education facility management organization typically has responsibility for a triad of functions. The functions included are campus physical planning, design and construction of capital projects, and operations and maintenance of the physical plant. The functions for planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance are decoupled at the University of Hawaii at Manoa with responsibility for each function distributed among campus departments and University of Hawaii System offices which is a disadvantage.

This decoupled structure may be a reasonable approach for the time being considering the current context of the institution, the magnitude of facility need, and the capabilities of the existing Facilities and Grounds organization. The review team believes that a long-term plan for Facilities and Grounds organization should consider consolidation of common facilities management tasks under a single department head. For today's decoupled arrangement to work well, it will require a concerted effort on the part of system and campus leadership to ensure the distinct organizational entities work together. Collaboration, teamwork, and sharing of information, talent and expertise must become the by-words of the decoupled functional areas. Leaders of all of the departments that have facilities management responsibilities must work together to develop and execute a comprehensive facility strategy for the campus.

Today's absence of a comprehensive plan for managing campus facilities creates noticeable transitional problems as a project moves through planning, design, and construction into maintenance and operation, or as one walks from one segment of the campus to another. At this time, there is a confused sense of ownership and responsibility for the overall campus physical plant. The likelihood of a unified and strategic facilities management direction will diminish if the leaders and employees in the numbers of departments that share in the overall facilities management function do not properly perceive their purpose and their responsibility for the physical plant. A unified and comprehensive facilities management strategy requires discussion and planning with campus senior leaders and employees engaged in departmental activities.

As an example, today's policies and procedures governing the CIP office have not been thoroughly developed or

recorded. For the CIP office to fully integrate with the campus there must be a coordinated understanding of campus master plans. Design guidelines and building standards should be developed in collaboration with the Campus Planner office, the CIP office, and Facilities and Grounds.

Facilities and Grounds should have a key role in improving the built environment, but its limitations for influence, rather than control, of several issues related to the overall plant must be understood.

It should be noted that Facilities and Grounds is severely challenged with a deteriorated and increasingly dysfunctional physical plant. They are overwhelmed by day-to-day and short-term facility issues and find little time to focus on the significant effort required for a comprehensive facilities management strategy.

To be successful, Facilities and Grounds must have the help and cooperation from campus leadership, the Campus Planner office, and the University of Hawaii System CIP office, the athletics department, student housing, parking, and other departments that share in the overall facilities management responsibility.

Additional requirements including financial, human resources and information technology are addressed in other sections of this report.

Recommendation 1A

Effective management and stewardship of campus facilities must be viewed as this triad of responsibilities that must work in an integrated fashion in order for the institution to achieve a comprehensive and strategic approach to facilities management. All three parts of the triad must work hand-in-hand to move the university along a continuum toward facility improvement. It is recommended that the three facility functional areas work together and collaborate on the development of a comprehensive facilities strategic approach. The vice chancellor for Administration, Finance, and Operations must be a prominent player in this conversation.

Campus facilities should be managed as a portfolio of assets. The boundaries between campus entities such as Facilities and Grounds, athletics, housing, and parking

should be seamless and should not be an obstacle to the various departments working together to address the institution's ongoing operation and maintenance needs. Campus leadership can help the campus develop consistent and uniform design standards, building standards, and maintenance standards. A simple example of consistency would include uniform landscape fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, signage, etc. Agreed upon standards could lead to consistent lighting and a priority response to repair and replacement of campus lighting.

Recommendation 1B

A large number of quantitative and qualitative datasets need to be developed and organized into a coherent, comprehensive capital plan for the institution. Included in this should be:

- Construction history (age of facilities), square footage and growth in square footage, replacement value of buildings and infrastructure, and a summary level of the condition of each facility.
- Condition ratings (facility condition index) by age of facilities determined by a comprehensive facility condition audit.
- Condition ratings by space type (e.g., classroom, conference room, laboratory).
- Cost of deficiencies by deficiency type (e.g., electrical, HVAC, roofs).
- Future facility component renewal costs (primary structures, secondary structures, service systems).
- Deferred maintenance (repairs and maintenance funds) levels and funding requirements.
- Graphic and table presentations of backlog projections and funding projections.
- Annual life-cycle requirements.

This list presents some of the information that should be gathered and shared as the institution works towards a well-managed and integrated facilities portfolio program. The collection of this data will require considerable work and focused investment. The information listed above is essential if the facility needs of the institution are to be properly understood by key decision makers. This framework provides a partial roadmap to advance to a more functional, attractive, and sustainable campus facility.

Recommendation 1C

Facilities and Grounds should undergo an organizational and staffing study to ensure that the organizational alignment and organizational capabilities are appropriate and supportive of the new scope of the facility management responsibilities and current requirements. Facilities and Grounds have fallen substantially behind in its performance with nothing and deteriorating plant. The review team believes very strong leadership will be needed to improve on the existing organization's performance.

Job descriptions are an essential element in managing the work of the organization. Job descriptions for the Facilities and Grounds managers and staff should be updated to reflect current job requirements and to focus attention on important outcomes of work. There is a strong need for clarity of purpose throughout Facilities and Grounds.

1.2 The leadership system is understood by and communicated among all levels. The leadership system includes mechanisms for the leaders to conduct self-examination, receive feedback, and make improvements.

Leadership system refers to how leadership is exercised, formally and informally, throughout the organization—it is the basis for and the way that key decisions are made, communicated, and carried out. It includes structures and mechanisms for decision-making; selection, and development of leaders and managers; and reinforcement of values, directions, and performance expectations. An effective leadership system respects the capabilities and requirements of employees. An effective leadership system contains mechanisms for the leader to conduct self-examination, receive feedback and improve.

The review team findings support the notion that the leadership system in Facilities and Grounds is understood by only a few people who serve at the top of the organizational structure. The rationale for key decisions has not been effectively communicated among the various levels of the organization. Recent changes in organizational responsibility have left Facilities and Grounds staff and campus constituents confused about where decisions are made and who is the appropriate responsible administrator for facility decisions.

The leadership system is unclear to many staff within Facilities and Grounds. Few of the staff understand how the organization does business or makes its decisions. Important and critical practices and messages are not clear,

including: the methodology for the selection and development of leaders and managers, the organizational purpose, the mission, vision, values, direction, and performance expectations.

The need for greater professional development, as well as the need for increased organizational capabilities, should be discussed openly. Leaders should be prepared and willing to discuss views on learning and developmental growth for the workforce.

There was no apparent mechanism for leaders to evaluate their performance and receive feedback on their performance from customers on campus and from staff within Facilities and Grounds.

Recommendation 1D

There is a need for proactive and visionary leadership in Facilities and Grounds. The director should ensure that members within the organization understand the purpose and direction of the organization. Recommendations on the development of mission, vision, and values are included in section 1.3 on the next page.

Recommendation 1E

Leadership roles and functional responsibilities should be clearly defined. The position responsibilities within the organization, especially those in managerial and supervisory positions, should be clear to those occupying the positions, and understood by peer positions within the management team and by subordinates. Employees at all levels of the organization should understand Facilities and Grounds functional responsibilities.

Recommendation 1F

The use of feedback mechanisms for leaders and managers are common and customary management tools in use in the facilities management profession today. It is recommended that multi-source feedback tools be incorporated as a regular practice in determining management and employee performance. Customer feedback should be incorporated into performance evaluations throughout the organization. Performance plans and evaluations that focus on customer service should be conducted annually.

1.3 The organization has clearly aligned its mission, vision, and values statements with those of the campus. The organization regularly communicates with employees, customers, suppliers, and other stakeholders.

The director, managers, and supervisors must clearly understand the mission and the values of the institution. All of those operating at a supervisory level or higher should be able to articulate and translate to others a clear and succinct mission to others, a vision for the organization, and core values that guide the behavior of Facilities and Grounds. The mission, vision, and values should be aligned with and support the institutional mission.

The review team believes there is an opportunity for Facilities and Grounds to define a mission statement, a vision for the organization and its core values. Achieving a shared understanding of organizational mission, vision, and core values would be a positive step toward improved performance.

The opportunities for the leadership and management in Facilities and Grounds to improve communication with their staff are considerable. Communication challenges with customers and campus stakeholders are equally pressing. Facilities and Grounds management team recognizes a need to improve communications with customers, but evidence of effective communications was lacking. Front-line staff openly identified a need to communicate with campus constituencies about services offered and about what it takes for them to perform their jobs. The communication challenges require leadership, modeled behavior and intense follow-up and scrutiny of individual and organizational performance.

The organization's current leaders appear hesitant to initiate and adopt change. Their most pressing leadership challenge is to set clear direction, define roles and responsibilities, and hold employees accountable. Leadership must coordinate work and information flow, identify, quantify, and prioritize the campus facilities most critical needs, understand the needs and requirements of campus customers, build effective relationships, communicate effectively both internally and externally, and build trust with Facilities and Grounds staff and key campus stakeholders.

In general there is a need to marshal the organization's resources, focus their attention, and empower and energize the workforce. The right direction ensures the future success, growth, and the viability of the organization.

The organization's leaders have a responsibility to know the capabilities of the workforce; its strengths, its weaknesses, and its opportunities for success. The ultimate challenge of achieving and sustaining high levels of overall plant condition with quality value-added customer service will not be met, unless there is unified leadership, management, and supervision guiding the effort. The organization must be focused and aligned.

Facilities and Grounds should develop its mission, vision and core value statements. To effectively clarify organizational purpose, to set direction, to align the workforce, and to inspire and motivate the workforce to change and improve is no small task but must be done.

Clarity of purpose must be dealt with before any sustainable progress can be achieved toward improving overall department performance. Clarity of organizational purpose can be facilitated by the development of a mission statement. The mission statement in essence answers the question; "What are we here for?" It is the organization's reason for being. The mission statement should be aligned with the institutional mission and, when developed, should be approved by the vice chancellor Administration, Finance, and Operations.

The vision statement should provide a picture of what the organization wants to become. The vision statement should describe a future ideal state to work toward and to help set long-term direction.

Core values should be developed. When it comes to core values, the review team notes that many organizations do not need to create a new list of core values, but needs to engage employees in the practice of capturing its values. The process of capture core values can help identify and reinforce the many existing organizational values that can lead to success. Many organizations focus on values like honesty, transparency, integrity, and respect for the individual. Organizational values can be the foundation for other values that express what it is like to work inside the organization. Adopted values can include such things as: coming to work, coming to work on time, an honest days work for an honest days pay, challenging the status quo, rewards for performance and exceptional service, customer service,

delivering value, continuous improvement, fairness in work assignment and work load, efficiency and effectiveness, investment in training, education and development, professionalism, and trust. Meaningful core values are essential to consistently delivering value to customers and improving organizational performance.

It is recommended that mission, vision, and core value statements be prominently displayed in work areas, on a departmental website, and in other departmental communications. Mission, vision, and values are important and are powerful leadership tools when used properly. The display of mission, vision, and value statements can serve as an additional reminder to the workforce and can reinforce the organization's purpose and direction. Displaying the mission and vision statements doesn't just add voice to these documents; it endorses them as Facilities and Grounds policy.

1.4 Facilities management
Leaders spend time on a regular basis with their customers and front-line staff.

Facilities and Grounds leaders should consider spending more time with customers and front-line staff for the purpose of building solid relationships and communication. The building and grounds managers seem to understand the importance of spending time with customers and taking time to ensure that front-line staff benefit from important conversation, communication and understanding about work issues.

The organization faces a significant challenge with internal and external communication. Regular and focused communication is essential for a campus service organization. There is a need for management to develop and implement a uniform understanding of the division's top priorities and to clearly state what values will guide its actions and behaviors.

Section 3.0 of this report covers the customer service topic in more depth.

Recommendation 1H

The criteria for this section of the review are partially intended to examine the leadership involvement in creating and sustaining service quality and customer focus. Leadership's involvement should be demonstrated by clear and visible organizational values that are further supported with quality of work, and customer satisfaction.

