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1. Survey Question Results:
   • 66% response rate
   • Forms of communication
     o Most effective: Emails
     o Ineffective: Websites
     o Most Unused: CPC meetings
     o Meetings in general were viewed as “Effective”
   • Suggestions/Comments:
     ▪ Use a web-based project management tool for file sharing and issue
       tracking in place of project websites.
     ▪ Management meetings were more effective than UG meetings.
     ▪ Constant communication back to all users/department should be
       used to manage expectations and or changes.
     ▪ Better tracking of decisions is needed to avoid or better understand
       the necessity for changes later on.
   • Design Team
     o Overall team rating: 82%
     o Hire team again: Yes, both firms
     o Comments:
       ▪ Detailed, proactive, available, timely.
   • Design Consultants
     o Overall team rating: 71%
     o A couple responses admitted not working with the consultants, so lowered
       scores.
       ▪ A response option of “N/A” or similar could have addressed this
         issue.
     o Comments:
       ▪ MEP had issues with communication, design revisions and changing
         players.
   • CM/GC Team
     o Overall team rating: 85%
     o Hire team again: Yes
     o Comments:
       ▪ Criticism of pulling members off the project too early, which led to a
         performance level that did not represent previous phases’ good-
         workmanship. Lack of constructability and cost review in CD phase.
       ▪ Great team, responsive, attentive during design and construction.
   • UO Project Management Team
     o Overall team rating: 75%
     o Comments:
       ▪ Worked mostly with Martina and Janet, both very responsive.
         ▪ A response option of “N/A” or similar could have addressed
           this issue.
- Team cohesiveness lacked during staff leaves.
- Better communication and management was needed at the beginning of SD for design challenges and User Group meeting efficiency.

**UO User Group**
- Overall group rating: 73%
- Comments:
  - Campus-wide group that could have had more J-school students and staff, and less membership changes.
  - Satisfied with process, but needed more direct feedback during meetings.
  - User group was main decision-maker in design, but during construction that was left to the OAC and there was no follow up with the larger user group.

**Achievement of Project Goals**
- Overall rating: Exceeds Expectations
- Highlights: Maintain and improve pedestrian pathways system that encircles Allen Hall.
- Equals Expectations: Create additional faculty offices; Improve the family of entrances Allen Hall shares with Lawrence and Pacific Halls
- Split between Equals Expectations and Far Exceeds Expectations: Promote faculty, staff, and student collaboration and community; Improve visibility and use of the First Amendment Plaza as a gathering space.
- Response success rates will benefit from reevaluation after a period of occupancy.
- Goals were clear during design, however, they were not reinforced throughout the design process.

**Achievement of Project-Specific Patterns**
- Overall rating: 78%
- Digital Connection: 68%
- Technological Energy: 75%
- Sense of Here: 80%
- Pedagogy-Driven Program: 75%
- Scales of Professional Collaboration: 77%
- Leaking Information: 80%
- Fluid Spaces: 82%
- Center of the World (i.e. Building Hearth): 80%
- Faculty/Staff Lounge: 73%
- Student Lifestyle – Student Development: 78%
  - Collected equal number of “50” and “100” responses.
- Reconnect and Unify: 85%
- Digital Commons: 81%
- Response success rates will benefit from reevaluation after period of occupancy.
- A response option of “N/A” or similar could have addressed the issue of evaluators not familiar with patterns.

**Changes to the Project Design**
- During Design: Good
During Construction: Good (slightly better)
Comments:
- Architects and CM/GC very responsive to changes
- Need for better documentation of design decisions
- Changes during construction are more costly to owner

What Went Right?
Top 3 comments:
- Excellent team relationships
- Building transformation
- Accomplished project goals; on schedule and on budget

What Went Wrong?
Top 4 comments:
- Design changes/ approval delays
- Ineffective user group meetings
- Unrealistic budget
- Final (finish) details

Changes to Project/Process:
Top 3 comments:
- Decision-making/last-minute changes
- Budget
- Earlier reviews of design, goals/patterns, shop drawings

Lessons Learned:
Top 3 comments:
- Need for clear decision tracking
- Plan ahead/explore options early (i.e. existing conditions)
- Despite VE, budgets were still not adequate or clear

2. Derived themes and feedback quotes:

Ineffective User Group meetings
- Management meetings were more effective
- Face to face interactions were very useful when we could get the SOJC users to the meetings
- User meetings need to be led by someone at the UO management level who continually establishes parameters of cost, UO standard spec, and state requirements.
- It would also be helpful if the user management helped communicate the entire plan to their department at different increments during the project so individual expectations do not cause problems upon move-in.
- Some focus group meetings lacked a consistent internal staff coordinator one who could remember and be accountable for discussions and directions that led to decisions that were later changed or challenged.
- Widely disparate group, needed more journalism students and staff, cross-section was good but too large group is ineffective, turnover of members
- Design decisions were made by a larger group prior to the beginning of construction, but design issues were only addressed by OAC leaving others out of the loop.
- Need more direct feedback during sessions, but it's a two way street.
- Design sessions occasionally lacked significantly new or advanced design options/ideas that reflected prior input
- The vision of the user group seemed to exceed the vision of the design team. That could have been made worse by internal disconnects within the design team.
- UG meetings needed to be more effective - Design Team lesson learned.
- More effective process in SD with User Groups - less material better content or more focused content. Use of Focus Groups early.
- Be careful about who in the design team has "control" of design decisions before a final decision is made about hiring architects.
- Lack of clear notes from meetings. Sometimes meetings were too long or the sections were not clearly segmented so the correct people weren't present.

Goals
- Not continually reiterated throughout the process
- The design seemed to respond more to the patterns that were interesting to architects instead of the ones that challenged our thinking about programs. Regular review of goals and patterns might have kept a better balance.

Design Changes/Communication
- Need for good clear notes on all decisions in design that could and were questioned again during construction. This led to some last minute changes to scope and direction than decided in design meetings.
- Web-based project management tool or at least some kind of software to better facilitate the sharing of information and the tracking of issues would have helped the project along.
- Missing scheduled CPC at the end of SD which delayed the transition to DD. Design team needed to be further along, communication between DT and UO PM could have helped in terms of preparing for CCP. Too much VE late in CD's.
- With all of the late additions by the SOJC, there were some instances that were difficult and took more time to track than to actually do the work. It seemed like a design would come out based on TBG's discussion with the SOJC and the design would change 2 days later. This is not really a design issue nor a construction issue, but a standard problem that comes up during the completion.
- To keep a list of all of the owners' change requests. Track the list and verify that the SOJC really wants it: they just are not asking for something that is not too big of a deal.
- There seemed to be a lot of mechanical changes. This may have been attributed to a changing of designers early in the project. I would have like to see more of a focus on the "rough" finishes (existing concrete, shotcrete, etc) earlier whether is was in form of more mock-ups, design discussion, etc. UO budget status was not known until late in the job, so the team did not know the status of contingencies.
- Electronic plans: so many times the plans for the building were changed but the Users never had access to the latest plans because the team relied on a set of paper plans kept in the trailer. Changes were applied directly to those and a handful of
other plans. An electronic plans system that keeps the latest version for everyone in the project to access would eliminate so many communications problems.

3. General survey feedback:
- Option to “go back” to change or add responses
- Status bar to show survey progress - % completion