



Council of Principal Investigators

Mail Stop 1112 • College Station, TX 77843-1112 • (979) 458-1861 • cpi@tamu.edu • <http://cpi.tamu.edu>

Texas A&M University - Texas A&M Health Science Center - Texas Engineering Experiment Station -
Texas AgriLife Research - Texas Transportation Institute

CPI Meeting Agenda
March 7, 2012
11:30 a.m. – 1:15 p.m.
Rudder Tower, room 601

- (11:30 – 11:55) Lunch
- (11:55 – 12:05) *Call to Order/Opening Remarks:* (Moderated by L. Rauchwerger)
– Welcome
- (12:05 – 12:25) *Update and Discussion on the Division of Administration* – Dr. Rodney P. McClendon, Vice President for Administration, Texas A&M University
- (12:25 – 12:45) *Open Forum Discussion:* (Moderated by L. Rauchwerger)
- (12:45 – 1:15) *Other Business:* (Moderated by L. Rauchwerger)

Update on OSRS PI/Faculty Advisory Committee (PIFAC) – Dr. Terry L. Thomas, PIFAC Chair
- (1:15) *Adjournment*
- Attachments:*
- March 2012 CPI Newsletter
 - Results from PI survey on Facilities Services

2011-12 CPI roster: *Chair* — Lawrence Rauchwerger, *Engineering* • *Vice Chair* — Reza Langari, *Engineering* • *Past Chair* — Terry Thomas, *Science* • *AgriLife* — Non-COALS — Jamie Foster, Ronald Randel, Travis Whitney • *Architecture* — Walter Peacock • *BCD* — Lynne Opperman • *Bush School* — Lori Taylor • *Business* — Joobin Choobineh • *COALS* — Clinton Allred, Mary Bryk, Kim Dooley, Michael Kolomiets, Bhimu Patil, Gregory Reinhart, Heather Wilkinson • *Education* — Rafael Lara-Alecio • *Engineering* — Nancy Amato, Mladen Kezunovic, Deepa Kundur, Christi Madsen, J. N. Reddy, Ramesh Talreja, Victor Ugaz • *Geosciences* — Steve DiMarco, Mary Jo Richardson, Niall Slowey • *IBT/PHARM/RCHI* — James Martin • *Liberal Arts* — Chester Dunning, Walter Kamphoefner, Mary Meagher • *Medicine* — Vernon Tesh • *Science* — Wolfgang Bangerth, Jean-Luc Guermond, Paul Hardin, Emil Straube • *SRPH* — Chuck Huber • *TEES Non-COE* — Richard Mercier • *TAMU at Galveston* — Joan Mileski • *TAMU at Qatar* — Hadi Nasrabadi • *TTI* — Lance Bullard, Beverly Kuhn, Joe Zietsman • *University Libraries* — Sandy Tucker • *Veterinary Medicine* — Bhanu Chowdhary, Noah Cohen, Jane Welsh

The CPI is sponsored annually through funding from Texas A&M University Division of Research, Texas A&M Health Science Center, Texas AgriLife Research, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, and the Texas Transportation Institute



Council of Principal Investigators

Principal Investigators,

The meeting materials (including results of the PI survey on Texas A&M Facilities Services) for the March 7, 2012 CPI meeting (Rudder 601; 11:30-1:15 p.m.) are available at http://cpi.tamu.edu/CPI_3.7.12.pdf. Dr. Rodney P. McClendon, Vice President for Administration, will discuss updates and activities of the Division of Administration at Texas A&M University. Results from the PI survey on Texas A&M University Facilities Services are included in the March 7, 2012 meeting materials.

If you plan to attend in person as an observer, please email cpi@tamu.edu. Meetings are open to the public and are webcast live at <http://ttvn.tamu.edu/webcasts> on Channel 20. Previous CPI meetings can be viewed at <http://cpi.tamu.edu/videos>. The monthly electronic newsletter is included below and includes items of interest to the research community. Please send comments regarding the newsletter to cpi@tamu.edu. To learn more about CPI membership, activities and initiatives, visit <http://cpi.tamu.edu>.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Rauchwerger
Chair, Council of Principal Investigators

+++++
CPI Newsletter – March 2012
+++++

Included in this issue are updates/information on:

- Summary of February 8, 2012 CPI meeting
- Summary of February 15, 2012 CPI EC meeting with Provost
- Summary of February 29, 2012 CPI EC meeting research administration representatives from Texas A&M, AgriLife Research, HSC, TEES and TTI
- MEMORANDUM: OSRS Principal Investigator/Faculty Advisory Committee (PIFAC)
- EPIK-Maestro Working Group Update
- Intellectual Property Constituent Committee (IPCC) Update
- Human Subjects Protection Program Working Group
- Conflict of Interest Working Group
- Texas A&M-National Natural Science Foundation of China Collaborative Research Grant Program
- Update from the Office of Research Compliance and Biosafety
- *Sigma Xi* Membership
- *Sigma Xi* Symposium
- Email Changes to Support Official University Message Delivery
- FACULTY-DISCUSS Listserv
- CPI meeting calendar

Summary of February 8, 2012 CPI meeting

At the February 8, 2012 CPI meeting, Dr. James Kracht and Dr. Sumana Datta presented on ‘Enhancing and Expanding Undergraduate Research’ and Dr. Karen Butler-Purry presented on “Promoting and Strengthening Graduate Studies at Texas A&M”. The meeting was held from 11:30-1:15 p.m. in Rudder 701. The agenda and materials are available at http://cpi.tamu.edu/CPI_2.8.12.pdf, and the meeting video can be found at http://cpi.tamu.edu/videos/2.8.12_video.

11:30-1:15 p.m. in Rudder 601. Additional CPI meeting information can be found at: <http://cpi.tamu.edu/meetings>.

Summary of February 15, 2012 CPI EC meeting with Provost

The CPI EC held its coordination meeting with the Provost on February 15, 2012 from 1:30 – 2:30 p.m. Attendees discussed issues regarding the university’s current investment in graduate studies; issues regarding graduate student tuition and fees; better treatment of graduate students; target number of graduate students and current efforts in developing a graduate student enrollment plan with the Deans. The CPI wants to improve the lives of Texas A&M University graduate students. It was noted that the top complaint of graduate students at Texas A&M University was treatment by faculty.

Summary of February 28, 2012 CPI EC meeting with meeting research administration representatives from Texas A&M, AgriLife Research, HSC, TEES and TTI

Because of the spring break schedule, the CPI Executive Committee (EC) held its monthly coordination meeting on February 29, 2012 from 11:30-1:15 p.m. Research administration representatives from Texas A&M, AgriLife Research, HSC, TEES and TTI are invited to these coordination meetings. Attendees discussed CPI participation in the interview schedule for the position of Assistant Vice President for Research Development. Ms. Katherine Rojo del Busto discussed the final report for the Human Subjects Protection Program (HSPP) Working Group and provided an update on the Conflict of Interest Working Group. Also discussed were the results of the CPI-generated PI survey on Facilities Services. These results were forwarded to Dr. Rodney McClendon's office in anticipation of his March 7, 2012 presentation to the CPI. The CPI Chair received a request from System Internal Audit to provide feedback on how Maestro’s development is progressing in meeting the research needs of Texas A&M and its faculty. To respond to this request, the CPI Chair, in coordination with the OSRS/PIFAC Chair, will solicit input from their respective committees on questions for a PI survey regarding Maestro development.

Attendees also discussed items for the March CPI newsletter and agenda items for the March 7, 2012 CPI EC meeting with the President, Provost and VPR.

MEMORANDUM: OSRS Principal Investigator/Faculty Advisory Committee (PIFAC)

The following is from a March 1, 2012 memorandum to the CPI from the Vice President for Research regarding the OSRS Principal Investigator/Faculty Advisory Committee.

One of the major goals behind the plan and model for the shared-service entity that now manages pre- and post-award functions for sponsored research at Texas A&M—The Texas A&M University System Office of Sponsored Research Services (OSRS)—was to establish a governance structure to ensure the delivery of quality services to the research community, while maintaining a responsive and cost-effective administrative environment. I am pleased to inform you of the establishment of the Principal Investigator/Faculty Advisory Committee (PIFAC), one of the essential governance bodies in the shared-service plan.

The objective behind PIFAC is to represent the interests and concerns of the research community in the arena of sponsored research administration. The committee will provide direct input to the A&M System chief research officer, OSRS leadership, and system member CEOs on matters affecting OSRS operations, including

enhancements to customer service and the establishment of best practices. The following document offers a full overview of PIFAC: <http://www.tamus.edu/assets/files/cro/pdf/OSRS-PIFAC-0213.pdf>.

The PIFAC members, selected by CEOs and other University leaders (as per the previous link), are as follows:

Dr. Terry L. Thomas, Chair (tlthomas@tamu.edu)
Professor, Department of Biology, College of Science
Texas A&M University
Representative for the A&M System Office of Research

Dr. Dean C. Alberson (d-alberson@tamu.edu)
Assistant Agency Director
Roadside Safety and Physical Security Division
Texas Transportation Institute
Representative for Texas Transportation Institute

Dr. Ronald D. Boyd (rdboyd@pvamu.edu)
Distinguished Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, College of Engineering
Prairie View A&M University
Representative for A&M System Universities Outside Brazos County

Dr. Kim D. Jones (kjones@tamuk.edu)
Director of the South Texas Environmental Institute Professor and Chairman
Department of Environmental Engineering, Frank H. Dotterweich College of Engineering
Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Representative for A&M System Universities Outside Brazos County

Dr. Lawrence Rauchwerger (rwerger@tamu.edu)
Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Dwight Look College of Engineering
Texas A&M University
Representative for Texas Engineering Experiment Station

Dr. Gregory D. Reinhart (g-reinhart@tamu.edu)
Professor and Head, Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Texas A&M University
Representative for Texas AgriLife Research

Dr. Carol A. Rice (ca-rice@tamu.edu)
Extension Program Leader for Family Development and Resource Management;
Professor and Extension Health Specialist
Texas AgriLife Extension Service
Representative for Texas AgriLife Extension Service

Dr. Deborah C. Simmons (dsimmons@tamu.edu)
Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education & Human Development
Texas A&M University
Representative for Texas A&M University

Dr. Niall C. Slowey (slowey@tamu.edu)
Professor, Department of Oceanography, College of Geosciences
Texas A&M University
Representative for Council of Principal Investigators

Dr. Farida Sohrabji (Sohrabji@tamu.edu)
Professor, Department of Neuroscience & Experimental Therapeutics, College of Medicine
Texas A&M Health Science Center
Representative for Texas A&M Health Science Center

As vice president for research, I want to express my gratitude to these individuals for agreeing to represent Texas A&M and other system members on this committee. These principal investigators will act as critical intermediaries between faculty-researchers and OSRS, so I encourage you to reach out to them and share any pressing concerns, needs, or questions that you feel need to be addressed. The group will serve as problem-solvers and partners in ensuring OSRS delivers the best possible service to principal investigators across the Texas A&M System.

In the future, University-wide communications on PIFAC action items or notices will likely come from the chair of the committee, Dr. Terry Thomas. I am grateful to him for agreeing to serve in this important capacity. Dr. Thomas has extensive experience as a principal investigator and has been an important partner in the deliberations leading to the formation of OSRS, so he will bring an abundance of institutional knowledge to his leadership role on the committee. One of the first orders of business will be the development and establishment of PIFAC bylaws.

Finally, your continued partnership and work to strengthen the research enterprise at Texas A&M is critical to maintaining the University's steady rise among the nation's top institutions of higher education. OSRS continues to work through the Phase I transition of bringing together talents, expertise, and best practices to enhance research administration to the University and other system members in Brazos County. PIFAC will serve as another critical piece of the OSRS governance structure, helping ensure that OSRS remains responsive to the needs of principal investigators. I encourage you to share this memorandum widely with your colleagues. A list of PIFAC members with contact information has been posted on the Division of Research website at <http://vpr.tamu.edu/resources/researchadmin/grantmanagement/pifac>.

Contact:

Dr. Terry L. Thomas, tthomas@tamu.edu

EPIK-Maestro Working Group Update

On March 1, 2012, the EPIK-Maestro Working Group met at the OSRS Building, Valley Park Center. Ms. Leonarda Horvat, Chief Information Officer and Director of TEES Information Systems, and representatives from her office presented updates and new developments regarding Maestro. Ms. Horvat reported that due to schedule changes, the summary report to the EPIK-Maestro Steering Committee will take place the following week. We were informed that critical actions are taking place right now in the process of developing and administrating the EPIK-Maestro program, including time assigned to personnel, transferring personnel, building discovering machines, etc. Ms. Horvat informed the group that work continues with the negotiation component where some piloting activities are taking place. The status of historical data with the subcomponents (awarded account number, legacy number and other), was also discussed.

Grants.gov requirements and contract negotiator issues were presented and discussed in the meeting. Under the Grants.gov requirement, two solutions were presented and discussed regarding Grants.gov requirements. PIs noted that it is extremely critical to ensure the application packet, with all the requirements stated in the RFP, are met. It was noted that the university and many System agencies work with several major federal and state agencies. At the federal government for example, the university works with the NIH, NSF, IES, Department of Agriculture, Education, Defense, Transportation, etc. Each sponsoring agency has its own format.

Also discussed, from the PI's perspective, was the issue of ensuring proposals are received on time. It was noted that many times PIs submit proposals in the last minute, and it is important to be sure that the entire proposal packet arrives to the sponsoring institution on time, and with all the requirements listed in the RFP. The working group will continue redefining all these critical components as well as the rest of components that represent the EPIK Maestro program. The final point in the agenda that was presented was the contract negotiator component.

The next EPIK-Maestro Working Group meeting is scheduled for April 5, 2012.

Contact:

Dr. Rafael Lara-Alecio, a-lara@tamu.edu

Dr. Beverly Kuhn, b-kuhn@tamu.edu

Dr. Jamie Foster, jlfoster@ag.tamu.edu

Intellectual Property Constituent Committee (IPCC) update

The Intellectual Property Constituent Committee (IPCC) met on January 26, 2012 from 3-5 p.m. in the Williams Administration Building. Attendees discussed the following: updates on revised System Policy 17.012, *Intellectual Property Management and Commercialization* (<http://policies.tamus.edu/17-01.pdf>); updates on invention release procedures; IPCC report through the 1st Quarter FY12; Semiannual license agreement and commercialization activity report FY11. It was reported that the Intellectual Property Oversight Committee (IPOC) that the IPCC reports to, had not met since mid-2011 and a meeting is not scheduled to date.

Contact:

Dr. Lynne Opperman, lopperman@bcd.tamhsc.edu

Human Subjects Protection Program Working Group

The Human Subjects Protection Program Working Group was organized by the VPR in July 2011 to make recommendations on enhancements to strengthen the University's human subjects protection program (HSPP) – ensuring compliance without compromising the conduct of outstanding research. The Working Group's final report (http://cpi.tamu.edu/HSPP_FINAL.pdf) was submitted to the VPR and shared with the CPI EC at their February 29, 2012 coordination meeting. The Working Group consisted of representatives from across the University community, including representatives from colleges; CPI; Faculty Senate; and others with an interest in human subjects research.

Conflict of Interest Working Group

On August 25, 2011, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) posted new regulations governing conflict of interest in the *Federal Register*. The new regulations are accessible on the NIH website along with a side by side outline of major changes and can be viewed using the following link <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coi/>.

The new regulations include a number of substantive changes including changes in the definition of significant financial interest, expansion of the scope of investigator disclosure obligations, supplemental reporting of information to PHS awarding entities, a public accessibility of information requirement, and investigator required training. Implementation is required by August 24, 2012.

To comply with the new requirements, the Vice President for Research organized a Conflict of Interest Working Group to update the University rule on conflict of interest and make recommendations related to implementation of the new federal requirements. Lou Tassinary, Executive Associate Dean of the College of Architecture, serves as chair of the Working Group.

As part of the process of updating the University rule on conflict of interest, the Working Group has developed proposed changes to the related System regulation as the System regulation provides much of the substantive content necessary for the University rule. The Working Group's most recent proposed version of the System regulation on conflict of interest (available at http://cpi.tamu.edu/DRAFT_15.01.03_COI.pdf) includes the following notable changes:

- Application of disclosure obligations to all sponsored research activities and not just PHS and NSF funded research;
- Updates to the definition of significant financial interests consistent with the changes in the federal regulations (i.e. threshold lowered from \$10,000 to \$5,000);

-
- Identification of a Designated Official(s) for review and management of disclosures (including the option to appoint a conflict of interest committee);
 - Satisfaction of the public accessibility of information requirement through the appointment of Public Accessibility Contact rather than establishing a website to serve the same function; and
 - Articulation of mandatory training requirements, per the federal regulations (i.e. at least once every four years).

To ensure the development and implementation of a System regulation and University rule which does not unduly burden our faculty and researchers and allows outstanding research to flourish while simultaneously satisfying our compliance obligations, PI's are encouraged to provide feedback to Ms. Rose Ndegwa, program coordinator, at rose.ndegwa@tamu.edu, by March 19, 2012 so that feedback may be incorporated into the Working Group's recommendations to the System.

Update from the Office of Research Compliance and Biosafety

The Office of Research Compliance and Biosafety has entered a contract with IMedRIS to create an online submission system for the institutional committees associated with research with humans, animals, and biohazards. The initial team meeting has taken place, and there will be weekly progress calls with the vendor as the group moves forward. The online system is on track for full implementation by Sept. 1, 2012.

The Human Subjects Protection Program has launched a new communication structure that provides a single point of contact for colleges and partners for the Institutional Review Board for information and progress updates with application and document submission. This list can be found online at <http://rcb.tamu.edu/humansubjects/resources/resolveuid/d4f53e54-c9ad-44d6-9bbd-75433cfc4182>.

The Biosafety and the Biosafety Occupational Health Program have enhanced training opportunities and now offer Biosafety Level 2 and Bloodborne Pathogen training on a weekly basis. See the website (<http://rcb.tamu.edu>) for specific dates and times as well as registration instructions.

Texas A&M-National Natural Science Foundation of China Collaborative Research Grant Program

The Vice President for Research has issued a call for Letters of Intent for the Texas A&M-NSFC Collaborative Research Grant Program. This newly developed program between Texas A&M University and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) aims to encourage research collaborations between faculty at Texas A&M and faculty in Chinese universities. The program will facilitate faculty-to-faculty collaboration and further research ties yielding preliminary results that will enable joint applications to various extramural funding programs.

The announcement at <http://vpr.tamu.edu/funding/nsfc>, gives details about this program, including priority research areas from which proposals are being solicited and submission processes. The due date for letters of intent is Friday, March 30, 2012, at 12 noon. Full proposals must be submitted to Texas A&M and NSFC by May 31, 2012.

Awards, which will offer up to \$25,000 in support for the Texas A&M faculty member and up to 50,000 RMB for the Chinese collaborator, must involve a joint research project directed by two principal investigators—one from Texas A&M and one from a Chinese university. A distinctive feature of this program is that the collaborating PI in China must have a current NSFC grant. Holding an NSFC award will facilitate receipt of funding from NSFC in support of this joint research program. The program is open to all tenured or tenure-track faculty at Texas A&M.

This program is open to all areas of research that are mutually supported by NSFC and Texas A&M. Research areas supported by NSFC are described in its [annual program guide](#) and more generally at [NSFC's English website](#).

***Sigma Xi* Membership**

Sigma Xi is an honor society for scientists and engineers that recognizes the achievement of individuals through their election to membership. *Sigma Xi* promotes the advancement of knowledge through research, teaching, service, and the public's understanding that science is conducted in order to improve the human condition.

Members have the opportunity to participate at the local and national level, to receive the bi-monthly award-winning magazine *American Scientist*, and to network with research colleagues. Members are eligible for nomination for both local and national level awards. In addition, undergraduate and graduate students are eligible to compete for Grants-in-Aid to support their research (up to \$1,000). A detailed description of *Sigma Xi* and access to the application can be found at: <http://sigmaxi.tamu.edu>.

Applications should be submitted by email to sigmaxi@tamu.edu or by mail to MS 1112 attention: *Sigma Xi*.

***Sigma Xi* Symposium**

The *Sigma Xi* "Grand Challenges in Science Symposium" will kick off the 2012 Student Research Week with "Science of Damage and Repair," Monday, March 19, 2:00-5:30 p.m., in Rudder Tower, Room 510. This symposium will feature four scientists, presenting on research topics such as fibrosis, neurological disease, kidney disease, and cancer treatment. After the presentations a panel discussion will be held. *Sigma Xi* will showcase how Texas A&M faculty/scientists are working to overcome challenges related to damage and repair of body systems as well as quality of life.

<http://sigmaxi.tamu.edu/about/2012-sigma-xi-symposium>

Email Changes to Support Official University Message Delivery

To help ensure delivery of official messages to students, the Office of the Vice President and Associate Provost for Information Technology (VPAPIT) recommends university offices and academic units make the following email procedure change:

ALL official university email should be sent to students' @neo.tamu.edu addresses instead of @tamu.edu or other personal addresses. This will ensure all university email is delivered to a single mailbox, reducing confusion for students and the entities communicating important information.

To support this change, the following email improvements will take effect after Spring Break on March 19:

- Students' @neo.tamu.edu addresses will become the default, preferred email address in the Compass student information system.
- Messages to students from Howdy class rosters, TAMUDirect email lists and the Bulkmail Request System will be sent to students' @neo.tamu.edu addresses only. Copies of messages will no longer be sent to students' @tamu.edu addresses.
- Email sent to @neo.tamu.edu will be delivered even if the mailbox is full.
- Texas A&M Email (Neo) mailbox quotas will be increased from 250 Mb to 1 Gb.

These changes are based on recommendations to VPAPIT from the Email Advisory Committee and input from the Student Body President and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Email Advisory Committee included representatives from Admissions and Records, College of Engineering, General Academic

Programs, Graduate Studies, Horticulture Department, Office of the Registrar, Student Affairs, Student Financial Services and Study Abroad.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Texas A&M Information Technology at it@tamu.edu. Texas A&M Information Technology, <http://IT.tamu.edu>

FACULTY-DISCUSS Listserv

A listserv (FACULTY-DISCUSS@listserv.tamu.edu) has been set up to facilitate communication among faculty and others. The list is not moderated, i.e., messages to the list are not approved by a moderator or editor. However, only people subscribed to the list can send to the list.

You can join or sign-off from the listserv by following this link:
<https://listserv.tamu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?SUBED1=faculty-discuss&A=1>

CPI calendar

CPI meetings can now be added electronically to your calendar. Go to http://calendar.tamu.edu/?calendar_id=1230&upcoming=upcoming&limit=100 to see the meeting schedule from January – August 2012.

PI Survey on Facilities Services



1. What is your title?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Professor	53.2%	50
Associate Professor	25.5%	24
Assistant Professor	18.1%	17
Research Scientist	2.1%	2
Research Associate	1.1%	1
Other (please specify)		3

answered question	94
skipped question	4

Other responses:
 Clinical Professor, Associate Research Specialist, Research Engineer

2. Who is primarily responsible for coordinating maintenance and renovation requests for your office/lab?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Self	39.1%	36
Staff	60.9%	56
Other (please specify)		7

answered question 92

skipped question 6

"Other" responses

1. Postdocs and assistant;
2. I do not have a lab;
3. Sometimes my graduate students or lab personnel or front office personnel may meet them if I am out of office (e.g. teaching);
4. No one renovates or maintains my office or lab as far as I know.;
5. I have no idea, because there is no renovation or maintenance, only crisis repairs like broken pipes.
6. Dean's Office;
7. Nothing is renovated or maintained in the building as far as I can tell.

3. Texas A&M University Facilities Services and Utilities and Energy Management now utilize AggieWorks, an automated work request used for: submitting a work request; tracking and monitoring the status of the request; and tracking time, materials, and cost associated with the request. If you are the primary person responsible for coordinating maintenance and renovation requests, on a scale of 1 to 10, (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest), how would you rate your experience and satisfaction in using AggieWorks?

	Response Percent	Response Count
1	17.1%	6
2	8.6%	3
3	8.6%	3
4	11.4%	4
5	14.3%	5
6	2.9%	1
7	11.4%	4
8	14.3%	5
9	11.4%	4
10	0.0%	0

answered question 35

skipped question 63

4. Thinking about your most recent experience with Facilities Services, on a scale of 1 to 10, (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest), how would you rate your satisfaction with the overall cost, customer service, and quality of the work performed by employees of Facilities Services?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Rating Average	Response Count
Cost	25.9% (15)	12.1% (7)	19.0% (11)	3.4% (2)	17.2% (10)	0.0% (0)	6.9% (4)	10.3% (6)	1.7% (1)	3.4% (2)	3.88	58
Customer Service	13.0% (9)	10.1% (7)	17.4% (12)	8.7% (6)	11.6% (8)	7.2% (5)	14.5% (10)	7.2% (5)	7.2% (5)	2.9% (2)	4.75	69
Quality of Work	8.5% (6)	8.5% (6)	12.7% (9)	8.5% (6)	12.7% (9)	8.5% (6)	19.7% (14)	11.3% (8)	7.0% (5)	2.8% (2)	5.31	71

Do you have additional comments? 25

answered question 74

skipped question 24

4. cont. - additional comments

1. Plumbing repair: The repair was effective. But, there was no notice of when the repair was to be made so the area could not be made ready/items cleared out of the way, then repair was made a mess was left in lab including sawdust on lab items and packaging trash on counters. The repair was effective, so experience could have easily been very positive.
2. A window in my office has a huge opening and after supposedly fixing this problem, it did not appear to improved at all.
3. I have no idea about the costs so I cannot rate that.
4. I am responsible of a program located in the first floor of Harrington Tower. Even though I donot have direct access to information in terms of cost, I very satisfied with the customer service and quality work.
5. I only request help from FS when there is an emergency which usually does not have a cost.
6. They are terrible about communication, scheduling, consistency.
7. My building, Milner Hall is a dump, whoever is in charge of looking after it isn't.
8. Although I do not have much experience with this, the prices for work performed by Facilities Services seem *extremely* high.
9. They have to come in to fix things on new buildings that should never have happened in the first place, by whomever is overseeing the building. Those individuals are either lazy, incompetent, or totally overworked.
10. The biggest negative in this area is the time to start a project. It sometimes takes months from the time something is requested, which is often detrimental to productivity.
11. No experience
12. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.
13. The only work I've had is painting my office, which I had to do myself.
14. I reported a burned out/shot out bulb on a safely light outside the building months ago. It has yet to be replaced.
15. I haven't used Aggie works, but note that this change was not advertised. I also note that these types of services never have a contact phone number attached to answer questions. All of these web-based services typically double the time to get anything done.
16. My lab is off-campus; Facilities Services doesn't do the work.
17. Very difficult to get a response some times, even to come out and assess problems.
18. The time it took to get an estimate was longer than the project.
19. I organized the installation of power in a new server room and the original bid was extremely high. Facilities services (who are supposed to be experts in this area) said nothing. I pushed for a second bid and the price dropped from \$5K to \$1.2K. In the end, things worked out but I was not impressed.
20. Submitted a request 4 months ago and still waiting for the repairs to begin
21. I have a hard time getting anyone to respond to my submissions on AggieWorks! Especially if it is not a super routine problem.
22. Physical plant is way too expensive!
23. I have never had an opportunity to work with AggieWorks and never knew of its availability. Perhaps it is because few of us in the College of Ed Harrington building have laboratories.
24. I have not used the AggieWorks system so cannot answer question 3.
25. have not used the AggieWorks system in the past, costs were too high and my lab staff and I ended up painting the desired space with paint that I furnished myself

5. On a scale of 1 to 10, (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest), how would you rate the service and quality of the following types of work performed by employees of Facilities Services?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Rating Average	Response Count
Emergency Work	2.9% (2)	8.8% (6)	11.8% (8)	8.8% (6)	17.6% (12)	4.4% (3)	8.8% (6)	23.5% (16)	11.8% (8)	1.5% (1)	5.76	68
Small Repairs	6.8% (5)	8.2% (6)	13.7% (10)	9.6% (7)	20.5% (15)	9.6% (7)	11.0% (8)	15.1% (11)	5.5% (4)	0.0% (0)	5.10	73
Remodeling/Renovations	6.8% (4)	10.2% (6)	18.6% (11)	10.2% (6)	16.9% (10)	6.8% (4)	11.9% (7)	8.5% (5)	10.2% (6)	0.0% (0)	4.92	59
Routine Maintenance	11.3% (8)	1.4% (1)	26.8% (19)	8.5% (6)	21.1% (15)	7.0% (5)	8.5% (6)	8.5% (6)	7.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	4.66	71

Do you have additional comments?

17

answered question	79
skipped question	19

5. cont. - additional comments

1. There is no routine maintenance and this has added thousands of dollars of deferred items in our building
2. The response to leaking pipes has usually been fairly prompt and one of the last guys to come was very good and professional. The one before wasn't and stated he didn't care about fixing it so it won't repeat b/c that wasn't his problem..... The non-emergency work is generally not done in a timely fashion and is outrageously expensive. For example, a quote of more than \$1500 to carpet a small (120 sq foot) office with standard carpet!
3. Normally things are being taken care of in a reasonable time frame but the cost is ALWAYS handed down to the individual faculty...(?)
4. Routine maintenance is not something that is high on the list of our building person. The answer usually is that maintenance is too complicated. When stuff breaks another person comes out for emergency repair and they are usually good.
5. No, except to note that there are institutions of higher education in the second world that are in much better shape than our facilities.
6. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.
7. Emergency service on weekends allows 45 minutes for response--at least as I was told when my office was flooding on a Saturday morning. Facilities Services--or perhaps it was some other unit--responded in 44 minutes 40 seconds by sending an electrician with a pair of pliers to repair a water leak. So, I guess the outfit met its response time policy, but the response was certainly less than satisfactory.
8. It can take months to get things done, and the price is high for renovations and repairs. At other universities, I was allowed to use pre-approved outside contractors, and physical plant would supervise
9. No experience with emergency work
10. My lab is off-campus; Facilities Services doesn't do the work.
11. I gave low marks for emergency work b.c. of an incident in which my lab was flooded (due in part to an error made by Physical Plant). The repair took a very long time, far longer than the original estimate.
12. We still have parts laying from renovation 2 years ago in the hallway.
13. At Evans Library we have had toilets and faucet handles out of order in the women's restrooms for weeks now - during a time that 3 to 5 (of 9 total) restrooms are completely closed for renovations. There are waiting lines during many times of the day. The hand-written signs and pieces of plywood are unsightly.
14. In the 22 year I have worked here, I have always painted my own offices, provided and/or cleaned my own carpets, and kept my own labs in working order. I did receive new blinds a year or so ago -- in my office.
15. There is no option in this survey format for not relevant
16. Due to the slow response from the electricians, our departmental handyman purchased and installed the requested powerbars requested for a teaching laboratory
(removed one comment of "N/A")

6. How has your experience in working with Facilities Services changed from last year to now?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Improved	16.5%	13
Declined	16.5%	13
Stayed the same	50.6%	40
Unsure	16.5%	13

(please specify)

12

answered question

79

skipped question

19

Comments from (please specify)

1. Unsure. Varies wildly from poor to excellent depending on individual facilities staff involved. The majority of my experiences have been good.
2. Stayed the same. Same issues - slow, expensive, low quality work.
3. Stayed the same. I've not interacted with you guys.
4. I have no idea because I have only been here 16 years and there has been no maintenance or renovation during that time that could enhance my work.
5. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.
6. Declined. Response time is slower.
7. Unsure. I have not been involved in any maintenance or repair.
8. Unsure. My lab is off-campus; Facilities Services doesn't do the work.
9. Stayed the same. Too expensive! I would like to have the opportunity to bring contractors in at a lower cost.
10. Improved. Folks are great to work with
11. Unsure. insufficient number off experiences to assess
12. N/A

7. What are some specific examples of how Facilities Services has improved?

Response
Count

18

answered question

18

skipped question

80

1. Can't think of any. The only thing is AggieWorks lets you submit and monitor job.
2. They have outside contractors to perform work whenever it is out of their expertise.
3. Efforts to follow up
4. By replacing specific items in the suit.
5. Responsiveness to work requests has vastly improved
6. PI/customer consultation
7. They appear to be more prompt.
8. replaces light bulbs in a more timely manner
9. I haven't used AggieWorks.
10. N/A
11. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.
12. Work, when done, can be excellent and people doing work are very cooperative and helpful.
13. Responses to correct automatic door closures on a BSL2 laboratory.
14. I think the Aggie Works system has made significant improvements, although I do miss the personal care/relationship that I received through direct contact with my Area Maintenance Shop.
15. the time from calling in to initial action is now somewhat shorter
16. The AggieWorks system is very nice and response has been rapid
17. they have stopped sending out those stupid e mails about conserving energy during the summer when in fact in the building I work in, just about every staff member has a space heater because the building is so cold (during the summer)
18. AggieWorks is a very good documentation system for requests

8. What are some suggestions of how Facilities Services can improve?

	Response Count	answered question	skipped question
1. Hire more technical people who actually do the work. Pay the competent ones so they stay. Eliminate the ones who are not competent.	31	31	67
2. Prices should be competitive with external contractors. And the attitude of all staff should be customer service and do the job right - we should not be shocked when someone has these attitudes.			
3. Aggie work response needs to be more prompt. It take sometimes weeks to hear back from them, when I quote is required, and they need to get a contractor. Costs to carry out work need to be more reasonable.			
4. Status tracking like Fed Ex			
5. Weekend services are minimal. Emergencies have in some cases taken more than an hour to respond to.			
6. I really do not know how the communications work within their group, the faculty are in the dark.			
7. Allowing external quotes. I currently do not even try to submit any improvement quotes since FS has a monopoly and can (and will) charge insane prices. In addition, routine work takes 3 times as long to complete. Allowing external quotes would force general maintenance to step up their game.			
8. With the state of TAMU infrastructure, it seems to be beyond the capabilities of Facilities Services to keep it up.			
9. Appreciation for the quality of existing research space			
10. Reduce cost, improve response time for requests			
11. I don't know what group is in charge of overseeing new construction, but improvement is greatly needed, without charging more for their "oversight" which doesn't appear to be working.			
12. A flaw with Aggie works is that it makes it difficult to have a conversation with a person about an issue. There ought to be an option for this.			
13. Faster response time for emergencies.			
14. Don't allow job requests to sit unanswered for months (or even weeks).			
15. Get more highly skilled employees that are capable of understanding what we say and then fixing the problem.			
16. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.			
17. Answer questions/requests.			
18. We have problems with heating and cooling in our building. These are repaired on a piecemeal basis, but the overall problem is not addressed. The quality of individual repairs is variable.			
19. faster turnaround			
20. The cost is extremely high, they are very slow. We should be allowed to work with private entities such that we can use our funding more appropriately instead of wasting the funds with the facilities. In this budget cut climate, such outrages cost does not help.			
21. Better response time, especially during emergencies.			
22. Quick response with order of magnitude cost estimates.			
23. Improve direct communications with originator of request.			
24. I have no idea			
25. Respond to requests for work! Keep "customer" informed of what is happening. Don't take forever and charge outrageous fees. Almost all of the work that facilities has done in labs, greenhouses, etc., could have performed for far less and much faster by outside vendors.			
26. Sometime routine maintenance is not performed as requested or it takes a long time for consideration			
27. Hire plumbers on contract for routine repairs if you do not have enough on staff to meet needs. Keep plumbing supplies in stock if that is the problem. Use heavy-duty toilets and faucets in high-traffic areas.			
28. The entire campus is too cold all year around. Why is it necessary to air condition everything down to 65 degrees?			
29. Faster speed and lower cost.			
30. I had my office repainted and carpet replaced. It cost thousands of dollars and took over three months to do. Home Depot would have done it for a few hundred and within a few weeks. Suggestion: become more efficient or let us use outside contractors for things like this.			
(one comment of "N/A" removed)			

9. What are some questions you would like Dr. McClendon to address during his March 7, 2012 CPI presentation ?

Response Count	answered question	skipped question
23	23	75

1. Why is getting anything accomplished so difficult and met with such resistance?
2. The facility services personnel seem to be very slow in either getting to the work that need to be done and/or during repairs. Is it because they are paid on hourly basis?
3. What has he done to improve the cost and quality of the service provided by physical plant ? What metrics is he using to demonstrate progress and can he show them to us?
4. I'm wondering how Dr. McClendon would envision the facilities five years from now?
5. We are a Tier I research University yet the Minnie Bell Heep center Bldg 1502 in West Campus does not have a SINGLE red emergency outlet for supporting freezers and preserve valuable research frozen samples when the electricity goes out. When can we expect that this aspect of Life Sciences Research would be considered? Our generator is so old and only allows moving the elevator to release trapped people in case of electrical outage. What about the research? the last time the electricity went out a few years ago for many hours due to maintenance the Ex- Dept. Head sent two of us faculty to KROGERS to buy Dry Ice! That was the Tier I University non-solution! Also the Handicapped ways are terrible, our entrance for handicapped will only caused somebody to fall to the side, the cement is unleveled and cracked, broken. We do not have good handicapped bathrooms either. Maybe administrators should go in a wheelchair everywhere or in crutches and test the field themselves and see what they think! There is an idea for a ADMINISTRATOR FIELD DAY ;) I am sure they will have some fun. I am not going to ask them to do research in our facilities... Water falling on tissue culture labs and ruining equipment... and individual faculty having to pay for building repairs...only "Pro" profs can handle this one!
6. See 8.
7. How he can bring our facilities closer to first world standards.
8. Staff efficiency and productivity. Also, a website for lodging customer service requests (including concerns and complaints with a form procedure that should be instituted for investigation of staff efficiency/ inefficiency complaints).
9. Address what group is in charge of overseeing new construction, but improvement is greatly needed, without charging more for their "oversight" which doesn't appear to be working.
10. What is plan to keep up with aging infrastructure?
11. Why does it take so long to begin a requested project?
12. How can costs to individual faculty members be reduced. The university already has a large proportion of IDC that should cover basic repairs.
13. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.
14. Do to the contract with Selmens, the university now seems powerless to control the indoor climate in response to outdoor temperature and changing heat loads in the spaces. Can anything be done to adjust thermal and lighting comfort for building occupants?
15. Why do we have to get all the repairs done with the facilities? Why can't we shop around to save the university money?
16. Facilities services gives unreasonably high bids for projects under \$10K because they have a monopoly in this case. I think this problem needs to be addressed.
17. Prioritization of meeting facilities compliance issues.
18. How do we implement preventive maintenance?
19. I look at this campus and I see decades of neglect. There are water line breaks all the time because the people operating the backhoes are too ??? to research where they are digging.
20. What is he going to do about the concerns and issues raised by faculty? Will he provide a detailed feedback to all customers outlining how he would make the whole system better?
21. What are the services that this office provides? I thought I needed to go through the Dean's office.
(removed two responses of "none" and "N/A")

10. Thank you for taking the time to take this survey. Your input is highly valuable, please rate your survey experience using a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest):

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Rating Average	Response Count
Did you find this survey relevant?	15.1% (11)	6.8% (5)	8.2% (6)	2.7% (2)	17.8% (13)	8.2% (6)	15.1% (11)	16.4% (12)	5.5% (4)	4.1% (3)	5.30	73

How can we improve future surveys?
20

answered question	73
skipped question	25

1. Have bigger text boxes.
2. My staff does the mgt/work requests. the survey did not reflect the difference in job duties so many parts I could not answer. In addition, there are different types of requests based on office and labs and each may use different individuals that have primary responsibility. survey is poorly worded as well.
3. Maybe if the facilities were fixed we would not need more surveys. I feel that by filling up surveys we are justifying the need for more ADMINISTRATION and what we need are MORE TROOPS doing the work on the ground not on SURVEYMONKEY.
4. Include a section for miscellaneous comments (and/ or issues that have not been addressed in the survey).
5. There was no mechanism to say a specific question was not answerable.
6. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.
7. I just am not involved with this issue.
8. Remind us of the DIVISION of responsibilities and NAMES of units. For example, I am not sure that FACILITIES SERVICES is the unit that I evaluated in my response about emergency service.
9. I thought the survey was going to cover Facilities Coordination, Facilities Services, Utilities & Energy Management (UEM), Office of Safety and Security, Environmental Health and Safety, etc.. If the e-mail were more specific regarding the survey topic, I might not have responded. I have had very little direct contact with facility services.
10. keep them short and targeted like this one
11. I am at an off campus location and we do not use Facilities Services.
12. Provide option for no opinion
13. Questions are so focused that they miss many things. Most people have only a few interactions with facilities and cannot give general or overall opinions.
14. I'm off campus, so this service does not apply to my office/lab.
15. As long as you keep them short, I am ok with that.
16. For some of the questions, I did not have enough information. Please provide a N/A (not applicable) option in the future.
17. Where is the IRB approval and necessary statements?
18. Didn't really apply to me; our facilities person could likely answer the questions but I can't
19. This survey is flawed to the point of being useless. Options have to be included to identify areas that are not relevant to an individual. Otherwise, the data received is uninterruptable.