FPI 2000–2011 Trends: Telling Your Campus Story

By Maggie Kinnaman, APPA Fellow

As you participate in the 2011-12 APPA Facilities Performance Indicators (FPI) survey, which is open until early December, I'd like to provide you with some motivation. Let's pretend for a moment that the data provided throughout this article is actual performance data for Institution "A" who participated in the last four years of FPI surveys. Looking at some key performance indicators, let's tell a story using the trending data for institution "A."

GSF

First, we're looking at gross square feet (GSF) maintained for this campus as decreasing by over 600,000 GSF. There may be many reasons for this, but let's say that the institution was one of the lucky few who were able to demolish older buildings and consolidate programs in newer existing space.

Questions	2008	2011
GSF maintained	3,566,144	2,922,997
CRV	$1,078,218,106	$1,184,342,082
CRV per GSF	$ 302.35	$327.57

CRV

Now, let's look at current replacement value (CRV). Remember that current replacement value is not the book value or insurance value of the campus buildings and infrastructure. Instead, it is what it would cost, in current construction dollars, to replace your entire campus.

Each year, as construction rates increase and GSF grows, CRV also goes up. Likewise, when the campus footprint decreases, CRV will also be affected. In three years the CRV for Institution "A" went from $302.25 per GSF to $327.557 per GSF. If the campus had not realized a reduction in GSF the CRV, growth would have been much greater.

AFOE/GIE

Annual Facilities Operating Expenditures/Gross Institutional Expenditures has gone down from 6.62 to 6 percent. This could be a troublesome indicator, as it says that the piece of the institutional pie representing facilities management is shrinking in comparison to the institutional pie. For some reason funding for facilities has not kept up with institutional growth, and it would be advisable for the facilities manager of Institution "A" to conduct a briefing with senior campus leaders to share with them the realities of campus assets.

Questions	2008	2011
Custodial cost/GSF	$ 1.40	$ 1.36
GSF per custodian	35,037	32,592
Grounds cost per acre	$ 5,749	$ 5,496
Acres per grounds FTE	15.9	17.9
Maintenance cost per GSF	$ 1.55	$ 1.57
GSF per maintenance FTE	66,751	71,192

OPERATING EXPENSES

Now let's look at the core facilities annual operating expenses and staffing for custodial, grounds, and maintenance. Looking across these three core services, grounds seems to be the area most impacted by the lack of institutional commitment seen in the ratio facilities annual operating expenditure/gross institutional expenditure. For grounds both the cost per acre and the acres per grounds full-time equivalent (FTE) have gone down over three years. I would anticipate that customer service ratings would go down in accordance since grounds services tend to be such a visible service, if they are significantly reduced levels of employee and student satisfaction can be impacted.

In the maintenance area, even though gross square footage went down by 600,000, the GSF per maintenance FTE went up. This would tell me that there was some downsizing in the staff of the maintenance department, and the impact of this downsizing will be seen as we move into the investment side of our institutional story.

Finally, in the custodial area we see a minor reduction in cost per GSF, but fewer GSF assigned to each FTE. Perhaps custodial services were less effective in the past, and the department saw the reduction in GSF as an opportunity to assign fewer GSF to each custodian.

Questions	2008	2011
Energy Cost per GSF	$ 2.62	$ 2.27
BTU per GSF	155,939	121,361

In the energy arena Institution "A" is doing a great job. Energy costs per GSF have gone down as have BTU/GSF, which is a key sustainability indicator. It would be a strategic move on the part of the institution to take the energy savings and realign them to enhance the diminished maintenance program.

Questions	2008	2011
Useful Life of MCB	54.10	53.67
FCI	9.43%	11.70%
Needs Index	20.70%	18.91%
Minimum Investment	2.11%	2.08%
Actual Investment	2.08%	2.71%

FCI

Now, to the investment section of our story. Facilities Condition Index (FCI) speaks to the condition of the buildings and infrastructure. As you see, this indicator got worse over the three years, 2008 to 2011. You also see that the Needs Index, which includes FCI plus programmatic needs, went down. This reduction in the overall Needs Index was achieved by an increase in the capital investment. Obviously that increased investment went toward programmatic improvements in the facilities versus building and infrastructure upgrades.

Also, remember our concern related to maintenance staffing and the number of GSF each FTE had to support. Well without adequate maintenance staffing the balance between preventive maintenance (PM) work orders and routine work orders is disrupted. There is less of a focus on PM work orders and more of a focus on routine work orders. This eventually impacts deferred maintenance backlog which adversely affects the FCI index. This is what we see as the reality for Institution "A".

Questions	2008	2011
Customer Rating	4.563	4.556
Employee Rating	4.314	4.318

CUSTOMER AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION RATINGS

Finally we come to the customer rating and the employee rating over the three years. As expected we see a reduction in customer satisfaction that although modest probably reflects the lack of commitment in the grounds program. In the employee rating area we see a modest increase in satisfaction that may come from the custodial employees who have been assigned fewer GSF per FTE. Their workload has been modestly reduced.

BY PARTICIPATING YOU CAN IDENTIFY YOUR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES AND DEVELOP STRATEGIES TO BRING YOUR ORGANIZATION INTO BETTER ALIGNMENT. YOU CAN ALSO UTILIZE THE DATA AND INFORMATION IN YOUR EFFORTS TO EDUCATE THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY ABOUT FACILITIES REALITIES.

OPPORTUNITIES

So there you have it—there are some opportunities and challenges for Institution "A" as it moves forward into the future. As we all know, looking at data alone does not give us the entire story, but it certainly points out areas that require future investigation. Participating in FPI gives institutions just that opportunity. By participating you can identify your strengths and weaknesses and develop strategies to bring your organization into better alignment. You can also utilize the data and information in your efforts to educate the campus community about facilities realities. After all, if you don't do it, who will?

By the way, the data utilized in this analysis for Institution "A" is actually the overall averages for all participants in the FPI surveys for 2008 and 2011. It turns out that Institution "A's" story turns out to be the story for our FPI survey pool.

I encourage you to participate in the 2012 FPI survey so that you are armed with data and information to help add to the credibility of your institutional story.

Maggie Kinnaman is an APPA Fellow and Past APPA President. She can be reached at *maggiekinnaman@comcast.net*.

Tracking Your Facilities Vital Signs

Participate in the 2012 FPI SURVEY at
http://appa.org/Research/FPI/index.cfm