

**Executive Summary of the Senate Subcommittee Report on Buildings and Grounds**

March 14, 2000

The Subcommittee identified four major areas for improvement which need to be addressed. These areas are increased state funding, development of better communication, development of better emergency procedures, and creation of peer review and oversight procedures. A brief summary is presented below, with a more detailed description and the bases for these recommendations contained in the body of this report.

1. **FUNDING:** The Subcommittee recommends that additional state allocations be provided to (a) eliminate over a 10 to 20 year period the current \$200 million backlog of deferred maintenance on the buildings and grounds; (b) increase the annual budget for Facilities and Maintenance by at least \$3 million to prevent further deterioration of existing physical facilities; (c) increase the current Facilities and Maintenance manpower to provide better stewardship of the existing buildings and grounds on the UIC campus; and (d) integrate Facilities Maintenance and Capital Programs into the Enterprise Resource Planning software system which is currently under development.
2. **COMMUNICATION:** The Subcommittee recommends (a) creating more visible means of reporting maintenance and repair problems; (b) easier access to the Facilities Maintenance website and listserv; (c) quicker feedback from Facilities Maintenance on acknowledgment of receipt of comments; (d) feedback from Facilities Management personnel when a job is completed; (e) increasing campus-wide notification of scheduled repairs; (f) increasing involvement of the users of campus facilities in the decision-making processes for construction and repair; (g) revising environmental standards for health-related issues related to building design; (h) increasing awareness of Facilities Management and Capital Programs websites; (i) more frequently updating both Facilities Management and Capital Programs websites with informative data; and (j) maintaining current bldg-issues@uic.edu listserv.
3. **EMERGENCY PROCEDURES:** The Subcommittee recommends (a) preparing building-specific emergency procedures; (b) improving campus-wide communication when an emergency arises; and (c) establishing better off-hours emergency contact procedures for users of the facilities.
4. **PEER REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT:** The Subcommittee recommends (a) conducting a professional external peer review of Facilities Management and Capital Programs approximately every 5 years; and (b) instituting a reporting system and program at least for Facilities Management and Capital Programs back to this Subcommittee on a more frequent periodic basis.

Report of the Senate Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds  
March 14, 2000

**Introduction:** In fall, 1998, the Senate Committee on Support Services selected members of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds. The charge given to the Subcommittee was "...to review policies regarding, and the performance of, units which provide relevant support for the academic programs. The Subcommittee is to make appropriate recommendations for Senate action. The Subcommittee is, through the parent Committee, to serve as the Senate's advisor to the director of the relevant units on the formulation and implementation of policies governing operation of the units. The Subcommittee is, through the parent Committee, to advise the Chancellor on the appointment of, and on the periodic evaluation of, the director of the relevant units." Membership on the Subcommittee consisted of Bob Reynolds, chair, Bruno Ast, Marilyn Borgendale, Aileen Cassidy, Mark Donovan, James Foerster, Marty Gartzman, Michael Harms, Volker Kleinschmidt, Christine Nowacki, and Albert Schorsch.

**Background campus information:** The UIC campus is comprised of in excess of 100 buildings located on over 300 acres of urban property. The floor area of the state-supported buildings is in excess of 12 million square feet. There is in excess of 24,000 students, approximately 2,200 faculty, 2,200 administrative and professional personnel, and 5,500 support staff, for a total population of nearly 34,000. Of the buildings which are state-supported, there is an estimated replacement value of \$1.6 billion. These figures do not include the value of self-supporting auxiliary facilities such as the UIC Pavilion, parking facilities, both Campus Unions, as well as central utilities and chilled water, high temperature hot water, steam, and electrical distribution lines.

**Magnitude of campus infrastructure challenge:** Due to previous budgeting decisions and constraints, UIC has accumulated a significant backlog of deferred maintenance and infrastructure renewal needs, which is estimated by the campus to be approximately \$200 million. This figure currently is increasing at the rate of approximately \$10 million per year.

Much has been written on this subject under the sponsorship of the American Physical Plant Association (APPA) and the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP). Deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs have also been extensively studied by the accounting firm of Coopers and Lybrand. The major conclusions on this subject as published by these entities are:

- \* Higher education is under-funding the renewal of its physical facilities;
- \* State-sponsored institutions do not follow private sector practices for accounting for depreciation of assets;
- \* State-sponsored institutions typically rely on current-year appropriations to fund capital renewal, as opposed to establishment of sinking funds to cover projected needs; and
- \* Most estimates of what would constitute a prudent yearly level of funding for infrastructure renewal lie in the range of 1.5% - 3.0% of the replacement value of campus facilities.

UIC has taken steps to improve the availability of resources to improve its physical facilities. Each year, the campus receives state-appropriated repair and renovation (R&R) funds (typically \$2.3 million per year) to address infrastructure needs and renovate and/or enhance existing facilities. Approximately 30 - 50% of this allocation is devoted to infrastructure work in a typical year.

The campus and university administration also set aside additional funds for infrastructure program work on an annual basis. The funding level for this program was established at \$3.5 million/year in the mid-90's. For FY 2000, \$7.0 million was made available due to special legislative action, but this involved trade-offs which had a negative impact on operating and maintenance (O&M) funds and salary enhancement programs. As a result, it is felt unlikely that this campus/university program will be funded at more than \$3.5 million/year for the foreseeable future.

The total of the two sources just discussed (R&R plus O&M) is approximately \$4.65 million. Additional funds are periodically applied to supplement this level of funding. For example, a total of \$16 million was obligated from all sources for infrastructure-related capital projects in FY 2000. This included additional one-time Capital Development Board (CDB) funds for critical infrastructure needs related to programmatic remodeling. In addition, Facilities Management directed an additional \$1.06 million from its internal budget for additional R&R work.

The level of funding just described, although significant, is not adequate to maintain the campus facilities at a steady-state level, much less to reduce the estimated \$200 million backlog of needed work. Based on the 1.5 – 3.0% level noted previously, funds in the range of \$24 to \$48 million would be needed in plant upgrades on an annual basis to avoid disinvestment in our physical facilities.

For new buildings, money is allocated for operation and maintenance, but it is almost always chronically underfunded at the state level. Not enough has been authorized to keep newly constructed buildings from deteriorating. This situation needs to be addressed on the planned College of Medicine building, the emerging South Campus project, the addition to the Pharmacy Building, and all other buildings either planned or underway.

**Process:** As it's first order of business, the Subcommittee discussed ways to determine what were, and the extent of, the concerns of the campus community about conditions of the campus infrastructure. The Subcommittee felt it could not provide these answers on its own, and choose to poll the entire campus community, as widely as possible with the limited time and resources available.

In early spring semester of 1999, the Subcommittee advertised widely across the campus, via ACADEMY, UICPRINT, and ads placed in UIC News and Chicago Flame, the creation of a listserv for reporting concerns about campus buildings and grounds. This listserv accepted comments through April 30, 1999. There were 333 individual submissions to the listserv, several of which contained multiple items of concern. It must be stressed that this was not designed to be an unbiased survey. The Subcommittee did not attempt to ensure a balanced input from all campus community sectors. The Subcommittee made no attempt to seek a population-related input from faculty, staff, students and administrators. The Subcommittee did, however, attempt to reach all sectors of the campus community, and then let the members of each sector respond freely.

Beginning May 1, the submissions were tallied by Facilities Management personnel, and entered into a database which allowed members of the Subcommittee to sort the comments by location, category and status. Prior to entering the data, Facilities Management sent each comment to the appropriate trade shop for their evaluation of the status: Has it been done/fixed? Can it be done/fixed? If so, then when can it be done/fixed? Any comments?

During this same time, the Subcommittee continued to meet on a periodic basis to evaluate the progress of the database creation, and to offer and discuss preliminary suggestions for eventual inclusion into this report to the Senate Committee on Support Services. It is the results of these combined efforts which forms the foundation of this report.

**Insights and impressions from data collection and evaluation:** As of November 1999, in excess of 30% of the 333 comments had either been fixed (at least once) or were in the process of being attended to by Facilities Management. This is a positive sign, due to the very diverse range of problems reported, and the difficulty in addressing many of them which would involve major to massive renovation efforts.

**Recommendations:** The Subcommittee applauds the recent allocation increase for infrastructure repair from the Governor and the state Legislature. Unfortunately, this is just a scratch on the surface of the needs of the campus. Based upon the information contained in Appendix A, and the deliberations of the Subcommittee, the Subcommittee issues here a series of recommendations which should be considered for implementation by the University.

### ***Funding***

1. Funds desperately need to be allocated at the state level to eliminate the estimated backlog of \$200 million in deferred maintenance. To do otherwise is not responsible stewardship of the campus facilities. These funds should not be diverted from current programmatic allocations.

It is noted that the one-time allocation of \$200 million will not permit the elimination of this backlog, as many of the deferred maintenance items will require long term planning and effort to rectify. A more rational scenario would be to commit sufficient funds over a 20 year period to eliminate this backlog. This 20 year window would require, at a minimum, an additional \$10 million each year tied to inflation increases. If possible, a 10 year period would be preferable to reduce further deterioration of the campus infrastructure during this period of catch-up. These monies should be specifically allocated for this purpose, and for no other purpose.

As a means of assisting in setting the priorities for elimination of the backlog of deferred maintenance items, a comprehensive survey of physical plant needs should be undertaken (if the information is not already available), seeking campus community input and involvement in this process. The purpose of this survey would be to document accurately and comprehensively the magnitude of the existing infrastructure problems as well as an attempt to predict upcoming problems "on the horizon" which may need attention in the foreseeable future. The data from this survey should then be used to determine the magnitude of needs to bring the UIC campus up to a level commensurate with a world-class institution achieving AAU status, and to assist in establishing priorities on elimination of the deferred maintenance backlog.

Whereas the items in the data set in Appendix A provides clues about categories of problems, as was pointed out above, the survey was not conducted in a systematic manner and can not be considered to be an accurate reflection of current conditions on campus.

As a part of this recommendation, the Subcommittee suggests that the strides made by the University of Minnesota in improving its campus infrastructure be considered as a model for the UIC campus. The University of Minnesota is also an urban state-supported campus, and may serve as a model for our future efforts.

2. At the same time that the backlog of deferred maintenance items is being eliminated, there is also a desperate need for sufficient recurring funds to maintain the existing infrastructure. The allocation of these funds should not be at the expense of other currently allocated funds. It should be emphasized that this recommendation addresses only those aspects of maintenance related to existing problems with buildings and grounds as they arise. Not included in this recommendation is sufficient support for preventive maintenance. Ideally, adequate fiscal resources would be made available to create an efficient preventive maintenance program for the campus.

As pointed out earlier in this report, the deferred maintenance list is growing by approximately \$10 million per year. The current fiscal year budget allocation for Facilities Management is about \$31.4 million. It is estimated that a minimum of an additional 5 to 10% is needed yearly, increased yearly for inflation. It should be noted that for the past 10 years, there has been no increase in the materials budget of Facilities Management. This lack of increase is in real dollars, with not even an increase to account for increased costs of materials over this past decade.

3. In addition to the funds necessary for deferred and current infrastructure repair and maintenance, additional state funds are needed to provide the necessary manpower to adequately maintain the facilities. This includes additional janitorial staff, skilled tradesmen, and hourly workers. At the current staffing level, the university buildings are not cleaned sufficiently, the grounds are not being maintained, and safety items such as emergency lighting are being ignored, to provide a few examples.
4. Funding needs to be secured and allocated for Facilities Management/Capital Programs management information systems.

The job assignment, job tracking, job billing, and planning/management systems of Facilities Management and Office of Capital Programs are inadequate for the complexity of their missions. Improvement and integration of these systems into the new University of Illinois Enterprise Resource Planning software systems is essential. The lack of workable interface between job costing and the billing of the departments is one key deficiency of the present system, as is the inability of campus units to track the progress of the service requests.

### **Communication**

5. The Subcommittee felt very strongly that **at all levels concerned** a more effective line of communication be established. This we believe will do more to raise awareness of the problems which exist and the efforts under way by the university to address such problems.
  - A. There needs to be a self-explanatory and readily available means of reporting to a central location on items in need of attention (lights out, problems with water, restrooms in need of cleaning, locked doors, inoperative or malfunctioning elevators - in short - any problem with buildings and grounds). The creation of such a reporting system needs to be widely publicized. New faculty, staff and students should be made aware of this reporting system. Announcements need to be created and posted on reporting procedures. Building Managers or other responsible persons need to be identified and their locations publicized. Reporting sheets with instructions for completing and submission need to be made available. Phone numbers of Classroom Services as well as that of Facilities Management should be prominently posted on every classroom telephone.
  - B. Reporting and tracking procedures conducted by the current Service Desk are in need of some revision. Therefore, we recommend that a more efficient central electronic reporting system be created which will receive and quickly route each complaint to the appropriate work office. This may entail either improvement of the existing servdesk listserv, or creation of an entirely new reporting/responding system. (See Recommendation #4, above and #5C and 5D, below)
  - C. This new or improved reporting system needs to report back *quickly* that the submission was received. Especially when problems for a building or area are reported by a central departmental/unit person or office, communication should be enhanced when the tradesperson or building services worker reports back to the reporting department/unit that the problem is fixed, or if not, what the prognosis may be. The Office of Classroom Services has developed a listserv for all users of multimedia classrooms for the purpose of keeping all instructors informed on the condition of the equipment in these classrooms. Facilities Management should investigate the feasibility of developing a similar system for the users of each building on campus. Rapid feedback will create a less antagonistic atmosphere within the campus over the conditions of the buildings and grounds. If a person knows that a problem is being attended to, that person becomes more tolerant of the problem until it can be fixed.
  - D. Major problems brought to the attention of Facilities Management need to be better publicized. For example, if there is a section of sidewalk which is in need of replacement, a short note in UIC News can be made to the effect that "The sidewalk between Stevenson Hall and CCC is in disrepair. This repair is scheduled for ##." These notices should be published in a special section of the UIC News set aside for concerns related to the buildings and grounds, similar to the current police report in the UIC News.
  - E. It has been noticed by many members of this Subcommittee as well as from anecdotal comments received while conducting the survey (Appendix A) that many routine maintenance problems, such as burned out lights, poor conditions in a hallway or restroom, no toilet paper in a restroom, dirty conditions in a particular area, etc, will languish for days into weeks at a time. There needs to be improved awareness *at all*

*levels* within the campus community for the encouragement and means to report these problems when first noticed. This especially includes, but is not limited to, the custodial staff, all level of Facilities Management workers who are routinely in most areas of the campus. The current failure of reporting such conditions may reflect lack of concern as well as a lack of adequate channels for reporting of such problems.

6. There needs to be improved communication between the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and with the users of the facilities prior to the making of major decisions.

The decision-making process for campus building maintenance and improvements, their environmental systems, and the rank order of these is a complex process involving participation among campus engineers, project managers, architects, space and budget planners, academic administrators, and to a degree, faculty, staff and students. The complexity of the process requires that representatives of these interests be physically present in the same room when critical decisions about building systems, especially those environmental systems affecting quality of life, are discussed, rather than simply signing off separately to approve decisions. The quality of building environmental systems is too often sacrificed for programmatic needs. Currently, the university community is normally informed of plans *after* they have been approved or after they have begun. Several members of this Subcommittee felt that this fostered a sense of secrecy on the part of university administration, which leads to a sense of mistrust. This situation can be avoided by better communication with the campus community at all stages in the progress of building and renovation plans.

7. The Subcommittee suggests revised environmental standards for new buildings planned for the campus, taking into consideration impact of computers and laser printers on office air environment. Windows that open may be a morale and health factor and are suggested for consideration in new campus buildings.
8. Increased awareness is needed of the recently developed links from the UIC home page to reporting directly to Facilities Management problems related to buildings or grounds. Better and repeated publication of this link needs to be instituted.
9. The web page created or maintained by Facilities Management needs to be simplified and improved to make reporting of problems easier. It should be easier to locate this web page from the UIC home page, and there should be multiple "points of entry" from a variety of sites.
10. Although this is currently underway, Capital Programs needs to update and improve their web site with information related to more long range plans for the university.
11. Keep the bldg-issues@uic.edu listserv open as a location for persons to comment on conditions related to the campus buildings and grounds. This site is not intended to serve as a substitute or a duplication of the current reporting mechanisms for problems, but a means of providing a site for open discussion of chronic problems. This site should continue to be monitored, and responded to, by the Subcommittee, so that the posters will know that their concerns are being heard.

The Subcommittee fully realizes that, in the absence of a dramatic increase in state resources to address the problems discussed in section 1, it will be difficult to improve the morale of members of the campus community and make them more pro-active. Deteriorating work facilities with little or no progress on reversing these conditions leads to a lack of concern about personal stewardship on the part of the users.

### ***Emergency Procedures***

12. In light of the recent problems created with the loss of a transformer in University Hall, and the impact which this has had on numerous safety-related issues, the Subcommittee recommends

that all university emergency procedures be reviewed, revised, made specific, and announced for each building, as well as develop emergency communication strategies for widespread campus power outages, or loss of other vital services.

- A. In the event of power failure, current university emergency procedures require employees to call the UIC police, and to await for further instructions. Some UIC buildings have reserve power, many do not. Those that have reserve power can sometimes maintain operations while awaiting an announcement on the cause and probable duration of the outage. Those buildings that do not have power reserves should be evacuated immediately, since any battery-power based emergency staircase lighting systems only last, in general, up to 30 minutes. Delays in notification of evacuation for these latter buildings risk exposing UIC personnel to dark staircases. Students, faculty and staff should be notified, for each respective building, whether their building is an "evacuate first" or "wait for further instructions" building in the event of power failures.

Perhaps the recently implemented Y2K program can serve as a model upon which to create and build the building-specific emergency procedures

- B. An improved e-mail system for emergency situations needs to be devised and implemented, so that the entire campus can be notified within the first half hour of a serious emergency.
- C. Because of reduced emergency and engineering staff present during weekend and holidays, special emergency procedures should be established for each building. Consideration should be given to implementation of the use of cellular telephone trees or a low-power AM radio station with announcements, to which designated employees with battery-operated radios could tune.

#### ***Peer Review and Oversight***

- 13. A comprehensive external professional peer review of Facilities Management and Capital Programs should be instituted on a 5 year cycle. The purpose of this review would be to provide both units with an outside perspective on plans, progress and processes. This peer review system should be modeled after the ongoing peer review systems for academic units on campus.

While the Vice Chancellor for Administration has hired external consultants to determine national best practices in campus buildings and grounds construction and management, the Subcommittee recommends that an extensive external peer review of Facilities Management and Capital Programs operations, management and systems commencing in 2001, and be repeated every 5 years or sooner. We propose that an equal number of external reviewers be chosen by this Subcommittee and by the Vice Chancellor for Administration, with recommendations from Facilities Management and the Office of Capital Programs. This peer review should include recommendations for the better coordination of campus decision-making and action for environmental quality improvement for building and grounds from Facilities Management, the Office of Capital Programs, the Office of Space Analysis and Allocation, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, budgeting and other relevant offices and agencies. Recommendations for improvements in management systems and mission performance should be included in each review, as should the reporting of measures such as decreases or increases in rates of Facilities Management workforce absenteeism; significant vacancies in key positions; service requests managed; maintenance deferred; capital projects scheduled, delayed, and completed; and budgetary advances and constraints.

The result of, and recommendations received from, each external professional peer review, along with any other management or systems consultations performed for Facilities Management and Capital Programs should be transmitted by the Vice Chancellor for Administration to the UIC Senate through the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, and also directly by the Vice

Chancellor for Administration to the Chancellor, Provost, and University of Illinois Central Administration.

14. Both Facilities Management and Capital Programs should be encouraged to submit to this Subcommittee or our parent Committee, on a periodic basis, a report on complaints received and actions taken, if any, and plans for campus improvement, both near-term and in the future. From these reports, it is further recommended that a condensed version of this information be published in the UIC News on a periodic basis, similar to the current "Police Report" now being published, as well as being updated on the above mentioned Facilities Management and Capital Programs websites.

**Recap:** As seen by this Subcommittee, the biggest problems currently on campus related to buildings and grounds are (1) lack of sufficient funds to repair or maintain facilities adequately, and (2) lack of communication at all levels and in all reporting directions. We strongly believe that enhanced efforts need to be put forth by the UIC Senate, the UIC Chancellor, the UI President and the UI Board of Trustees to secure funds to undertake a massive renovation of all aspects of the UIC campus which are in need of such renovation. New buildings are being built on campus at the same time that existing buildings are deteriorating badly. This should not be happening and it should not be permitted to happen.

The Subcommittee heartily applauds the past and ongoing efforts by the campus in improving the grounds and for improvements in several buildings. These efforts have made the UIC campus a better and more attractive place to live, work and learn. Nevertheless, the campus appears to be in need of a massive rehabilitation. Facilities Management and Capital Programs personnel have cooperated openly and willingly with this Subcommittee in making these evaluations and recommendations, but their efforts are hampered by an excess of physical problems with the campus infrastructure and with insufficient resources, both personnel and financial.

## **Appendix A - The Database**

For full viewing of the database, please go to

<http://www.uic.edu/depts/ppad/b&g/index.html>

This will take you to a page titled UIC Senate Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds. There are three options - sort by location, sort by category, sort by status. Click on any of these three options, and you will go to the list of complaints, sorted by whichever choice you made. Once in that list, you will see 4 columns. *Location*, *Category*, *Short description*, and *Status*. You can click on *Location*, *Category*, or *Status* and the display will be rearranged appropriately. For each item in the *Short description* column, click on the description and the description will be expanded to show the full details (sans person who entered the complaint). Click on the back button to go back to the list of items.

The following tables are derived from the data contained in this listserv and this database. Numbers in each cell represent number of comments (percentage of comments) for each category and status. For example, in the ADA - Fixed box, there was one complaint received which was listed in the Fixed category. This represented approximately 14% of all comments received related to ADA issues.

On February 25, 2000, the Subcommittee received from Roslyn Hoffmann, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration, an updated list of responses to complaints related to parking structures and lots. The data contained in the database do NOT reflect this update of the 13 original comments/complaints. The update moved one Scheduled to In Progress, one In Progress to More Done, one Looked Into to Denied, two from Open to Fixed, and 8 items remained unchanged. This update reflects the continuing efforts of the campus to address the issues of the deteriorating campus infrastructure, even in the face of inadequate resources.

CATEGORIES OF COMMENTS/COMPLAINTS = 20

| <i>Category</i> | <i>Fixed</i> | <i>In Progress</i> | <i>Scheduled</i> | <i>Explanation</i> | <i>Open</i> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| ADA             | 1 (14%)      | 1 (14%)            | 0                | 2 (29%)            | 3 (43%)     |
| Bldg Maintain   | 1 (3%)       | 9 (24%)            | 0                | 9 (24%)            | 19 (50%)    |
| Bldg Services   | 6 (21%)      | 3 (11%)            | 0                | 3 (11%)            | 18 (64%)    |
| Classrooms      | 2 (12%)      | 8 (50%)            | 0                | 0                  | 4 (25%)     |
| Communication   | 1 (25%)      | 0                  | 0                | 2 (50%)            | 1 (25%)     |
| Elevators       | 0            | 10 (36%)           | 9 (32%)          | 3 (11%)            | 5 (18%)     |
| Grounds Improve | 8 (24%)      | 4 (12%)            | 6 (18%)          | 9 (26%)            | 7 (21%)     |
| Ground Maintain | 8 (67%)      | 0                  | 3 (25%)          | 0                  | 1 (8%)      |
| HVAC            | 4 (8%)       | 0                  | 1 (2%)           | 14 (27%)           | 30 (59%)    |
| Health & Safety | 3 (21%)      | 1 (7%)             | 1 (7%)           | 1 (7%)             | 5 (36%)     |
| Lighting        | 6 (29%)      | 7 (33%)            | 0                | 1 (5%)             | 7 (33%)     |
| Misc            | 3 (10%)      | 4 (13%)            | 5 (17%)          | 11 (37%)           | 7 (23%)     |
| Other           | 4 (25%)      | 3 (19%)            | 2 (12%)          | 5 (31%)            | 2 (12%)     |
| Parking         | 3 (23%)      | 2 (15%)            | 1 (8%)           | 1 (8%)             | 6 (46%)     |
| Recycling       | 0            | 0                  | 2 (100%)         | 0                  | 0           |
| Roofs           | 0            | 0                  | 0                | 2 (50%)            | 2 (50%)     |
| Signage         | 1 (9%)       | 0                  | 1 (9%)           | 3 (27%)            | 6 (55%)     |
| Space           | 0            | 0                  | 1 (14%)          | 1 (14%)            | 5 (71%)     |
| Transport       | 0            | 0                  | 0                | 0                  | 1 (100%)    |
| Tunnels         | 0            | 0                  | 0                | 0                  | 2 (100%)    |

LOCATION = 58

000 = 33  
 699 = 43  
 999 = 11  
 A&A = 1  
 AH = 1  
 AHPB = 3  
 ALHN = 1  
 AOB = 2  
 BH = 1  
 BRL = 1  
 BSB = 29  
 CCC = 4  
 CCCO = 1  
 CEB = 3  
 CHS = 1  
 CMET = 5  
 CMW = 4  
 CMWT = 1  
 CSB = 20  
 CSN = 2  
 DENT = 2  
 DH = 2  
 ECSW = 29  
 EEI = 2  
 ERF = 2  
 ESB = 10  
 HLPS = 1  
 HRB = 1  
 IIDD = 9  
 IJR = 1  
 ISPI = 7  
 JH = 1  
 LC = 3  
 LH = 1  
 LIB = 7  
 LIBHS = 4  
 LIERI = 1  
 MB = 5  
 MSB = 1  
 NPI = 1

NURS = 3  
 PEB = 2  
 PHARM = 2  
 RRB = 1  
 SELE = 2  
 SELW = 1  
 SEO = 19  
 SES = 16  
 SGM = 1  
 SH = 4  
 SPHE = 3  
 SRC = 2  
 SSB = 1  
 TH = 2  
 UH = 11  
 UICH = 1  
 WHI = 7  
 WSPS = 1

Location 000 = campus in general  
 Location 699 = east campus  
 Location 999 = west campus

STATUS = 5

| <u>Category</u>    | <u>#</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|--------------------|----------|-------------------|
| <i>Fixed</i>       | = 51     | 15.1%             |
| <i>In progress</i> | = 52     | 15.4%             |
| <i>Scheduled</i>   | = 32     | 9.5%              |
| <i>Explanation</i> | = 72     | 21.4%             |
| <i>Open</i>        | = 130    | 38.6%             |

## **Appendix B - Limitations of the Database**

This was not a scientific survey of the entire campus community. The 333 individual responses represent only about 1% of a campus population of approximately 34,000. Does this mean that 99% of the campus population is satisfied with the campus infrastructure as it stands at present? Did only the most dissatisfied 1% of the campus community respond to the call of the Subcommittee?

Regardless of how non-representative the responses may be, the Subcommittee was pleased with the number of comments in such a short time - both in breadth and passion of comments (see Appendix A). They signify a wide-range of problems with the campus infrastructure which MUST be addressed if UIC is to become a world-class institution. The range of problems with the campus infrastructure is so broad that the Subcommittee believes that the current fiscal and human resources to maintain and improve the campus infrastructure are seriously inadequate at present and, perhaps, for the foreseeable future.

The data base is a one-time "snapshot" of the problems the UIC community reported in spring of 1999, and Facilities Management's initial response to the comments. At the time of the submission of this report to the Senate Committee on Support Services, it is acknowledged that many of the problems have already been addressed and additional problems have occurred.

The Subcommittee did see several shortcomings in the data as presented here, which need to be considered while reading this report:

1. Several items listed in the *Fixed* category were, indeed, fixed, but the fix was short term in that the problem has occurred again. This may indicate more basic problems with the infrastructure. For instance, the report of several lights being out in a specific location may not be a matter of simply changing a few light bulbs, but a more generic chronic lighting problem with the fixtures, wiring, etc. Also, if three reports related to one-time locked doors (which were then subsequently fixed) and one report related to a chronically malfunctioning elevator, this does not mean that 75% of the problems have been fixed, as the magnitude of repairing the elevator is much greater than that of simply making sure the doors are unlocked when they are supposed to be. Thus, considerable caution needs to be exercised in the interpretation of the data contained in the data base.
2. Distinction of the categories of *Scheduled*, *Explanation* and *Open* are not clear. The Subcommittee understands *Scheduled* to mean it was on a Facilities Management or Capital Programs plan with a proposed date for implementation. *Explanation* often included several different kinds of reported problems. We understand that *Open* may mean that there are no plans whatsoever to address this problem, or that the cost of addressing this problem may be beyond resources available or planned, or that the concern/problem reported may not be feasible to address. Originally, this category was intended to serve as a flag to the Subcommittee to indicate that this particular item needs some evaluation by the Subcommittee, the Committee, or the Senate, but this is not always the case. Each of these *Open* comments (the largest category) should be looked at in more detail to determine their applicability.
3. As pointed out above, the largest category is that of *Open* status. In the first table, it is shown that many ADA-related items, issues related to building maintenance, building services, HVAC, health & safety, and lighting (parts of which could also be considered related to health & safety) are listed as *Open*. These need to be investigated further. As stated above, it is heartening to note that in excess of 30% of the 337 comments either have been fixed (at least once) or were in progress of being attended to at the time of the creation of the data for the database. The Subcommittee felt that this reflected a genuine desire and effort on the part of Facilities Management to respond in a timely manner to valid comments on problems and deficiencies in and around the campus.
4. The buildings which received the largest number of comments/complaints are BSB, ECSW, CSB, SEO, SES, UH and ESB. The high number of comments is probably a function of the severity of

the problem, the aggravation factor of the problems, the number of persons who are impacted by the problems, and in at least some instances the result of a concerted e-mail writing effort by those who use those buildings to bring these items to our attention. We do not feel that it is possible at this time to separate out the magnitude or extent of each element.