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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.
Principals 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

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 (rboyd@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, tlthomas@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](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](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](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](http://vpr.tamu.edu/funding/nsfc).
**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](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](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
Council of Principal Investigators | March 2012 Newsletter

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 tamu-it@tamu.edu. Texas A&M Information Technology, http://IT.tamu.edu

FACULTY-DISCUS Listserv

A listserv (FACULTY-DISCUS@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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other responses: Clinical Professor, Associate Research Specialist, Research Engineer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other** responses:

1. I do not have a lab.
2. Postdocs and assistant.
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.

**Other responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Skiped question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** Who is primarily responsible for coordinating maintenance and renovation requests for your office/lab?
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 work requests used for submitting a work request; tracking and monitoring the status of the request; and tracking time, 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 answered question, 63 skipped question.
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?

Do you have 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/doors cleared out of the way. Then repair was a mess was left in 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. Even though I do not have direct access to information in terms of cost, I very satisfied with the customer service and quality work.

3. I only request help from FS when there is an emergency which usually does not have a contact phone number attached to it. When it is contactable, it is a hard time getting anyone to respond to my submissions on AggieWorks. Especially if it is not a super routine problem.

4. Do you have additional comments? 25 answered question 74 skipped question

5. I only request help from FS when there is an emergency which usually does not have a contact phone number attached to it. When it is contactable, it is a hard time getting anyone to respond to my submissions on AggieWorks. Especially if it is not a super routine problem.

6. They are terrible about communication, scheduling, consistency, etc. Although I do not have much work performed by Facilities Services seem extremely high. Facilities Services seem extremely high.

7. My building: Whether it is a dump, whatever is in charge of it does not have a cost.

8. Although I do not have much work performed by Facilities Services seem extremely high. Facilities Services seem extremely high.

9. They have to come in to fix things on new buildings that have not happened in the first place. By whomever is overseeing the building. Those individuals are either lazy, incompetent or badly 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 the project.

11. No experience with web-based services especially effective to double the time to get anything done.

12. I received a printed notice on my office that the building months ago. If has yet to be replaced.

13. The only work I’ve had painting my office which I had to do myself.

14. I reported a burned out light bulb on a anyway light outside the building months ago. It has yet to be replaced.

15. I returned used Aggie Works, but note that the change was not advertised. I also note that these types of services never have a contact phone number attached.

16. My lab is located in an #30 area, it is very unpleasant to work with Aggie Works and never knew of its availability. Perhaps it is because few of us in the College of Ed Harrington building have located.

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. Organized the installation of power in a new server room and the original bid was extremely high. Facilities Services seem extremely high.

20. Submitted a request 4 months ago and still waiting for the report 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 and never knew of its availability. Perhaps it is because few of us in the College of Ed Harrington building have located.

23. I have never had the opportunity to work with Aggie Works and never knew of its availability. Perhaps it is because few of us in the College of Ed Harrington building have located.

24. I have never used the Aggie Works system so cannot answer question.

25. I have never used the Aggie Works system so cannot answer question.
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Type</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Work</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Repairs</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling/Renovations</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine Maintenance</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have additional comments? 17 answered question, 79 skipped question, 19 responded.

Following types of work performed by employees of Facilities Services?
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 because that wasn’t his problem.    
3. 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 stuff was handed down by the physical plant. This was due in part to an error made by the physical plant. The repair took a very long time, far longer than the original estimate.  
4. Emergency service on weekends allows 45 minutes for response--at least as far as I was told when my office was flooding on a Saturday morning. Facilities and physical plant would supervise.  
5. No experience with.emergency work and repairs.  
6. Non-related with Facilities Services yet.  
7. Emergency service on weekends allows 45 minutes for response--at least as far as I was told when my office was flooding on a Saturday morning. Facilities and physical plant would supervise.  
8. If I take months to get things done, and the price is high for renovations and repairs.  
9. occurring utilities, I was allowed to use pre-approved outside contractors, and physical plant would supervise.  
10. My lab is off-campus; Facilities Services does not do the work.
11. My experience with facility maintenance is that I receive a quote for renovations and repairs 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.  
12. We still have parts lying from renovation 2 years ago in the hallway. Long time, longer than the original estimate.  
13. A library's new books are unread and unreadable. Clean and clear, but all the signs of plywood are missing.  
14. In the 22 year I have worked here, I have always enjoyed my own office, provided break space in my own space, and kept my own books in working order.  
15. There is no option in this survey format for not relevant.  
16. Due to the slow response from the electricians, our departmental handymen purchased and installed the required power points required for a teaching lab.
6. How has your experience in working with Facilities Services changed from last year to now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- Unsure. Varies wildly from poor to excellent depending on individual facilities staff involved. The majority of my experiences have been good.
- Stayed the same. Same issues - slow, expensive, low quality work.
- Stayed the same. I’ve not interacted with you guys.
- I have not been involved in any maintenance or renovation during that time that could enhance my work.
- Response time is slower.
- Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.
- Unsure. Varies wildly from poor to excellent depending on individual facilities staff involved. The majority of my experiences have been good.
- Improvised. Folks are great to work with.
- Unsure. Insufficient number of experiences to assess.
- N/A.
1. Can't think of any. The only thing is AggieWorks lets you submit and monitor job.
2. 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).
3. Efforts to follow up
4. By replacing specific items in the stair...
5. Responses to work requests has vastly improved
6. Promptness of 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. Not have been involved with Facilities Services yet.
11. Work when done can be excellent and people doing work are very cooperative and helpful.
12. I think the Aggie Works system has made significant improvements. Although I do miss the personal care/relationships that I received through direct contact with my Area Maintenance Shop.
13. Responses to come automatic door closures on a DSL lab resear.
14. The AggieWorks system is very nice and response has been rapid.
15. The time from calling in to initial action is now somewhat shorter...
16. The AggieWorks system is a very good documentation system for requests.
18. AggieWorks is a very good documentation system for requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7. What are some specific examples of how Facilities Services has improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Skipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Hire more technical people who actually do the work. Pay the competent ones so they stay. Eliminate the ones who are not competent.

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. AggieWork response needs to be more prompt. Don’t take forever and charge outrageous fees. Almost all of the work that AggieWork does in labs, greenhouses, etc., could have been performed for less and much faster by outside vendors.


5. 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 AggieWork. In this budget cut climate, such outrages cost does not help.

6. 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 paying fees for services we could get from elsewhere.

7. We should address complaints on a case-by-case basis, but the overall problem is not addressed. The quality of individual repairs is terrible.

8. We have been using outside contractors for things like this, and within a few weeks. Suggestions: become more efficient or let us use outside contractors.

9. We have been using outside contractors for things like this, and within a few weeks. Suggestions: become more efficient or let us use outside contractors.

10. The overall problem is not addressed. The quality of individual repairs is terrible.

11. I don’t know what group is in charge of overseeing new construction. But improvement is greatly needed. Without changing more for their “oversight” which does not appear to be working.

12. We have been using outside contractors for things like this, and within a few weeks. Suggestions: become more efficient or let us use outside contractors.


14. Our door is often left open.

15. Get more highly skilled employees and get them in touch.

16. No one has ever talked with Facilities Services yet.

17. Answer questions accordingly.

18. Improve direct communication with the students and the community.

19. Provide more prompt service to students.

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 paying fees for services we could get from elsewhere.


22. More highly skilled employees and get them in touch.

23. Improve direct communication with the students and the community.

24. No one has ever talked with Facilities Services yet.

25. Provide more prompt service to students.

26. More highly skilled employees and get them in touch.

27. Improve direct communication with the students and the community.

28. More highly skilled employees and get them in touch.

29. Improve direct communication with the students and the community.

30. More highly skilled employees and get them in touch.

31. More highly skilled employees and get them in touch.
9. What are some questions you would like Dr. McClendon to address during his March 7, 2012 CPI presentation?

1. Why is getting anything accomplished so difficult and met with such resistance? 2. The facility services personnel do not seem to know when the facility services have met the projected 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 University non-solution! The university already has a large proportion of IDC that should cover basic repairs. 12. How can access to individual faculty members be increased? 13. Not have been pleased with facility services yet. 15. Why do we have to get the repairs done with the facility services? Why can't we stop the studies to save the university money? 17. Why do we have to do everything in this case? I think this problem needs to be addressed.

1. Why is getting anything accomplished so difficult and met with such resistance? 2. The facility services personnel do not seem to know when the facility services have met the projected 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 University non-solution! The university already has a large proportion of IDC that should cover basic repairs. 12. How can access to individual faculty members be increased? 13. Not have been pleased with facility services yet. 15. Why do we have to get the repairs done with the facility services? Why can't we stop the studies to save the university money? 17. Why do we have to do everything in this case? I think this problem needs to be addressed.
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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Did you find this survey relevant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you find this survey relevant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Provide option to no opinion

13. Passed correct that mis responses. Most people have only a few interactions with Facilities and cannot give general or overall opinions.

14. I am on campus location and we do not use Facilities Services.

15. Keep them short and geared like this one:

16. Provide option to no opinion

17. Define with Facilities Services.

18. Rerun survey with appropriate service.

19. I just am not involved with this issue.

20. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.

21. There was no mechanism to say a specific question was not answerable.

22. Not have been related with Facilities Services yet.

23. In charge of the survey and issues that have not been addressed in the survey.

24. Includes a section for miscellaneous comments and issues that have not been addressed in the survey.

25. More Troops doing the work on the ground couldn't be included to identify areas that are not relevant to an individual. Otherwise, the data received is uninterpretable.

26. 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 have not have responded. I have had very little direct contact with Facilities Services.

27. Maybe if the facilities were closer they would be on site for more Administration and management. If the facilities were closer they would be on site for more Administration and management.

28. My job does not work, needs the survey did not reflect the difference in my job duties so many parts I could not answer in addition. In addition, there are different types of facilities, and each may use different individuals that have primary responsibilities. Survey is poorly worded as well.