

David M. Dunn, B. Arch., OAA, MRAIC¹

Comments on Developing Standardized Tools for Assessing Employees Ratings of Facility Performance by Daniel Stokols and Frederick Scharf

REFERENCE: Dunn, David M., "Comments on 'Developing Standardized Tools for Assessing Employees Ratings of Facility Performance' by Daniel Stokols and Frederick Scharf", *ASTM STP 1029, Performance of Buildings and Serviceability of Facilities*, Gerald Davis and Francis T. Ventre, eds., American Society for Testing and Materials, Philadelphia, 1990.

KEY WORDS: cost reduction, life-cycle costing, payback analysis, performance monitoring

In my role at BNR, I have the responsibility for the evolution of design and development standards, and project goals for both new construction, and the massive churn, or reconstruction within our labs. Flexibility, productivity, cost-effectiveness, speed and enhanced innovation are critical goals. Moving the yard-sticks in terms of design performance is a constant objective. Therefore opportunity to measure progress, and demonstrate success, or calibrate the negative impact of a design decision is a valuable commodity.

The most important issues confronting designers and facility design managers today are those relating to the ability to link subjective design ideas to bottom line performance in the 'language' of the board of directors. In the past, the cost of environmental evolution did not appear to be offset with productivity gains or cost reduction because 'measures' were not available to demonstrate success. Further, yardsticks for measurements of environmental and organizational performance must be seen to be pure. Our challenge is to generate the believability of a payback analysis on life cycle costing studies for hardware in man-environment interface situations.

The view of priorities for development of standards for measurement will vary depending on an individual's role in the facility management business, but I believe there are several key ones:

- *Development of global performance measures as benchmarks*
- *Development of formulae for measurement of subjective evolution in the environment (ie. quality of light, air, etc.)*
- *Marketing of the importance of workplace performance monitoring*
- *Clearer understanding of bottom line linkage*

This panel should consider the fact that workplace evaluation is currently viewed by many, as a cost, not a cost reduction, subjectively giving employees an opportunity to 'complain' about their workplace. To some extent productivity questions using words like 'hinder' or 'lost-time' tend to reinforce this perception. To be truly effective, measures of performance should be benchmarked, and tied to that part of human response related to productivity, innovation, and pride.

¹ David M. Dunn, B. Arch., OAA, MRAIC, Chief Architect, Bell-Northern Research, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.