

Response to the 2016 Administrative Services Survey

Thank you for responding to our recent survey on our administrative services. In our strategic plan we reinforce the role of the division in serving the academic and research mission of the University. Our goal is to provide the right services to the campus, to a set of standards and at a competitive cost, and to monitor our effectiveness and efficiency in meeting those standards. Most of our support departments identify their service standards and performance levels on their websites and they conduct regular benchmarking of their service levels and resourcing.

We measure ourselves where we can against our G6 and U15 peer group. In recent years we have also used an external surveying tool provided by the Education Advisory Board (EAB), which provides benchmarks in administrative service levels across North American universities. Unfortunately the EAB tool is limited as to the applicability of its areas, and our approach has therefore evolved to the broad general survey you completed as well as function-specific surveys that are typically conducted at the time of using a service.

This year we surveyed 127 members of PVPD, department chairs and senior department administrators, and 74 responded for a response rate of 58%. Thank you. We expect to repeat this survey annually and will aim for broader representation and a higher number of responses in future years.

What did we learn from the 2016 survey?


- ❖ First, it is very clear that the implementation of Mosaic had a significant impact on service levels. No surprise there. As we stabilize the system and become more familiar with its use, we expect that departments will experience improved service. We are also exploring opportunities for cross-campus process efficiency which we believe offers the potential for simplified workflow.
- ❖ Secondly, we know that the HR Service Centre (HRSC) has faced major challenges recently with the implementation of Mosaic and the assumption of work from Graduate Studies. It is clear that a focused plan is required for the HRSC and Wanda McKenna our AVP and CHRO has that underway. We have supported the HRSC with incremental resources during the Mosaic implementation. Significant progress has been achieved on many process issues since the survey. In addition, Wanda and the HR team are working on an HR strategic plan, which will include service standards to better meet the needs of the faculties and departments. I know that she is in touch with several of you as she develops and executes the plan.
- ❖ Thirdly, it is apparent that some departments perceive challenges with aspects of the services offered by Facilities Services These concerns fall in to three main categories:
 - Maintenance, both deferred and timeliness. We do prioritize maintenance work, primarily because of resourcing challenges. As you know, we are trying to strike a balance financially.

- Design and Construction, where delays on Wilson Hall are doubtless a factor. There seems also to be a concern around project communication.
- Custodial Services, where the issue appears to be service standards, and where again we are trying to strike a balance financially.

Mohamed Attalla will be exploring these concerns in detail. In Facility Services, service levels and performance against those standards is reported continuously on the Facility Services website and I would encourage the community to review the site and provide input directly if standards and schedules are not meeting expectations.

- ❖ Overall, our team is exploring the survey feedback and comments in combination with other feedback to identify areas of concern and develop plans to address those concerns.
- ❖ Finally, we now have a baseline against which to compare progress in future surveys.

Thank you once again for your feedback. We are striving for a high quality of support and your insights help us.



Roger Couldrey
Vice-President (Administration)

Attachment (1)

Overall Satisfaction - all units									Satisfied or fully	Unsatisfied or very
Answer Options	Fully Satisfied	Satisfied	Mixed	Unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count		
Office of Legal Services	6	11	5	0	1	17	2.09	40	74%	4%
Security Services	4	19	4	3	1	2	2.29	33	74%	13%
HR - Employee Labour Relations	10	10	13	1	3	4	2.38	41	54%	11%
Office of Vice-President (Administration)	6	12	3	4	2	1	2.41	28	67%	22%
Financial - Strategic Procurement	6	8	8	3	1	7	2.42	33	54%	15%
Financial - Travel and Accounts Payable	4	13	12	5	1	2	2.60	37	49%	17%
Facilities - Utilities Services	2	15	9	3	2	9	2.61	40	55%	16%
Financial - Student Accounts & Cashiers	2	9	5	2	1	12	2.61	31	58%	16%
HR - EOHSS (health & safety)	4	19	5	5	4	2	2.62	39	62%	24%
Financial - Accounting & Reporting	4	13	9	8	1	0	2.69	35	49%	26%
HR - Organizational Development)	1	15	16	4	1	4	2.70	41	43%	14%
HR - Employee Health Services	2	13	12	4	2	8	2.73	41	45%	18%
Financial - Budgeting Services	4	6	12	5	4	2	2.97	33	32%	29%
Facilities - Custodial Services	2	11	13	6	5	5	3.03	42	35%	30%
Facilities - Maintenance Services	1	8	22	5	4	2	3.08	42	23%	33%
HR - Service Centre	1	8	18	5	8	3	3.27	43	23%	33%
Facilities - Design & Construction	1	6	13	6	6	9	3.31	41	22%	38%
Audit and Risk Services	1	2	1	3	2	4	3.33	13	33%	56%

