Facilities Office Renovation – ‘AS IS’ Mapping

**Customer**
- Create Work Ticket
- E-mail / Call
- Review Customer Changes
  - Yes: Go To P3 O
  - No: Space Planning?
    - Yes: Go To P2 Q
    - No: Go To P2 R

**AVP Campus Planning**
- Assign Work Ticket Designer
- Review Scope & Estimate
  - Return Campus Planning?
    - Yes: Go To P3 G
    - No: Return Space Planning
      - Go To P4 H

**Space Policy Committee**
- Review Project
  - Space Policy Needed?
    - Yes: Go To P3 U
    - No: Go To P4 T

Changes to original request is 100%

12/10/2013
Note: On revisions some departments do not send form back to faculty for signature

Rejected contracts may go to either rep for re-processing

Penultimate Semester: Contact faculty advisor for names of honors students

Consider for Phase 2 implementation - Put on hold if waiting on Confirmation of final semester enrollment

Text Box
Pains & Issues:

Please Read First: The issues and pain points identified during the As Is Process Mapping workshop and the Analysis workshop are noted below. The Issue is numbered and its Root Cause Analysis is in red text, preceded by RCA prefix.

1. Customer doesn’t understand impact of changes to scope
   RCA: There isn’t a guideline for customers

2. Customer doesn’t always heed advice on front end
   RCA: There aren’t any consequences in place

3. Someone other than the requestor changes the scope
   RCA: There isn’t a single point of authority and it unclear of the communication path

4. Funding not in place when requesting an estimate
   RCA: Form needs to note funding is not available when requesting an estimate. Form needs to indicate ‘Estimate Only’

5. Changes are made as other people see project being implemented
   RCA: Customer not clear on what they want/need in the beginning

6. Standards not always followed
   RCA: Standards are not being enforced. Customer unaware of the standards

7. People do work outside of Campus Planning, Space Planning & Physical Plant
   RCA: Customers sometimes do the work themselves

8. Finalized scope not always formalized
   RCA: There isn’t a process in place for all those involved to meet to review and sign-off on the estimate

9. Vendors do not take responsibility for correcting their errors, therefore it falls to Physical Plant to correct
   RCA: No direct coordinator for communication and follow-up

10. Multiple vendors – coordination & communication challenges (cheaper) – scheduling conflict
    RCA: There isn’t a single point of contact for the project, there isn’t always one sole source solution

11. Initial scope of work doesn’t include maintenance
    RCA: Customers do not understand what is maintenance request and what is classified as renovations. Scope does not clarify what part of the request is maintenance.

12. Multiple responsible staff on campus
    RCA: There isn’t a central coordinated project management group to oversee projects
13. No single project coordinator, project manager  
RCA: There isn’t a formal process defined

14. Adhoc coordination between Campus Planning, Space Planning & Physical Plant  
RCA: There isn’t a formal process defined

15. Limited data on maintenance & scheduled projects  
RCA: There isn’t a centralized facilities system

16. No centralized projects management repository  
RCA: There isn’t a centralized facilities system

17. Customer doesn’t know status of project – lack of communication  
RCA: There isn’t a centralized system or approach to projects

18. Construction during class times  
RCA: Failure of process to stay within timelines defined

19. False deadlines – need to establish educated deadline  
RCA: There isn’t always a clearly defined scope, failure of the process

20. Priorities are fluid within the institution and staff doing work  
RCA: There isn’t a systematic approach to assign priorities

21. Adhoc prioritization w/no recognition of existing workload  
RCA: There isn’t a systematic approach to assign priorities

22. Can’t establish realistic expectations with changing priorities  
RCA: Customer not educated on priorities of hierarchy

23. Don't know that people are changing spaces (including Campus Planning, Space Planning & Physical Plant)  
RCA: Customers are not following University Policy

24. Customers don’t know to communicate with Campus Planning & Space Planning  
RCA: Process not clearly defined

25. Lack of understanding among leadership about the of importance of space utilization  
RCA: There isn’t an education process in place for staff/faculty
26. Departments do not identify a single point of contact for the project, lack of communication throughout the Division
   RCA: Process does not require customer to identify a point of contact

27. Personnel changes at the department level changes who oversees the project
   RCA: People leave current position or the university

28. Customers do not use the ticketing system for making request (WORG)
   RCA: There isn't an education process in place

29. There isn't a thorough planning meeting with all the key players (statement of work, timeline, cost)
   RCA: Process does not require this type of meeting

30. Authority signatures are not required on estimate forms
    RCA: Process does not require one

31. There isn't any check and balances in place
    RCA: Process does not require any check and balances
Analysis of the ‘AS IS’ process

1. Are all roles essential? Yes

2. What is the number of hand-offs?
   - Work order form – 2
   - Scope form – 3
   - Estimate form – 2

3. Are any steps automated? No

4. Iterations (how many times is process repeated in a timeframe)? Six to eight times (face to face meetings) review changes

5. What tasks consume the greatest amount of time? Face to face meetings, educating the customer

6. Does the task add value? Having the AVP review the work order tickets does not add value

7. What steps can be eliminated or automated? Combine the scope and estimate form. Having way to assign the work order systematically to Campus planning or space planning. Purchase an facilities software system.

8. What steps should be added? Periodical meetings with all the key players to review scope, timeline. Have financial authority sign off on request for an estimate, and on final project scope. Need to identify point of contact from customer side for all communication flow.

9. Percentage of errors (forms returned, corrected, contacted person for corrections, etc.) 100% of all projects are modified from original scope