



CEL & Associates, Inc.

Real Estate Strategies, Benchmarking & Performance Solutions

2019 NAVY PPV HOUSING
“OUT OF CYCLE” SUMMARY
FOR
COMMANDER NAVY INSTALLATIONS COMMAND

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru Q versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

Prepared by: CEL & Associates, Inc.

Prepared: June 2019

1

2019 SUMMARY – Navy PPV “Out of Cycle” Survey for Commander Navy Installation Command “CNIC”.
The REACT R survey process and reporting is the proprietary property of CEL & Associates, Inc. and no title, ownership interest or future use has been granted. The information provided herein cannot be copied, published, reproduced, disseminated or otherwise disclosed, sold, licensed, transferred, referenced or used in any part thereof without CEL & Associates, Inc.'s prior written consent.

Introduction

Commander Navy Installations Command (“CNIC”) engaged CEL & Associates, Inc. (“CEL”) to conduct a Resident “Out of Cycle” Satisfaction and Opinion Survey of Family Housing (“FH”) and Unaccompanied Housing (“UH”) residents living in Navy privatized (“PPV”) housing. The survey was conducted at 42 Installations⁽¹⁾ within 12 projects between April and May of 2019. CEL provided a full range of reporting, this Summary is a high-level overview of results.

The complete REACT Methodology and Scope have been added as Addendum A and B.

A. Overall Family Housing Results

1. Overall Response Rates:

The response rate for Overall Navy PPV FH of 24.0% is considered in the average range for multifamily housing and a reflection of the resident opinion. The response rate for the Unaccompanied project 8.8% may not be valid, but, instead, suggestive of the resident opinions. All PPV FH Projects had a response rate of greater than 20% with the exception of one Project.

Historically, response rates have averaged around 35% for the same population. The lower response rates may be attributed to a difference in how the survey was publicized and/or lack of promotions. However, a response rate of 24% is reflective of the residents’ opinions.

A minimum response rate goal of 20% was set for each Installation as well as each neighborhood within an Installation.

2. Results by Overall and Project:

Overall satisfaction scores ranged from a high of 78.6 to a low of 63.4.

Project	Overall	Property	Service	% Rec.
Navy PPV Overall FH	70.1	68.3	71.0	24.0%
Project A	66.2	63.9	67.7	28.1%
Project B	64.9	64.2	64.6	25.0%
Project C	71.9	68.9	73.2	27.2%
Project D	77.9	78.1	77.7	33.1%
Project E	70.1	69.0	70.7	29.7%
Project F	68.2	66.6	68.4	22.1%
Project G	78.6	74.1	82.5	17.7%
Project H	75.3	74.2	76.2	25.9%
Project J	63.4	63.8	63.3	22.1%
Project K	74.9	71.9	76.9	20.8%
Navy PPV Overall UH	74.9	75.3	73.6	8.8%

Scores are not a percentile. 1-100 scoring range. Converted to 5-point range example 70 = 3.5

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

Response Rate Data FH

# of Projects	10
# of Installations	42
Surveys Distributed	35,125
Surveys Received	8,416
Response Rate	24.0%

Scoring Range	Rating
100.0 to 85.0	Outstanding
84.9 to 80.0	Very Good
79.9 to 75.0	Good
74.9 to 70.0	Average
69.9 to 65.0	Below Average
64.9 to 60.0	Poor
59.9 to 55.0	Very Poor
54.9 to 0.0	Crisis

3. Results by Overall and Project by Business Success Factor:

CEL has developed a proprietary scoring system for purposes of assessing Resident opinions. Residents respond to each survey question using a five-point Likert scale. Aggregated answers are then grouped into three overall categories termed Satisfaction Indexes [Overall (“O”), Property (“P”) and Service (“S”)] and into nine sub-categories termed Business Success Factors.

A review of the Business Success Factors (BSFs) indicates areas of strength and areas of opportunity. BSF #9 Renewal Intention is the lowest scoring for all projects and contains prompts such as “I would recommend this community to others”.

Highest Rated BSF is #5 Leasing. Lowest rated BSF is #9 Renewal Intention, which contains prompts such as “I would recommend this community to others”.

Portfolio Name	Satisfaction Scores			Business Success Factors								
	O	P	S	SF 1	SF 2	SF 3	SF 4	SF 5	SF 6	SF 7	SF 8	SF 9
PPV Overall FH	70.1	68.3	71.0	71.6	67.0	70.4	68.0	79.1	75.9	67.1	69.3	61.0
Project A	66.2	63.9	67.7	67.1	62.8	59.0	64.8	75.2	74.7	66.7	64.9	55.2
Project B	64.9	64.2	64.6	65.2	59.5	66.0	63.0	76.3	68.5	63.1	63.8	55.1
Project C	71.9	68.9	73.2	74.1	69.4	68.9	71.0	83.2	77.1	68.9	71.9	62.7
Project D	77.9	78.1	77.7	80.2	72.4	79.7	77.6	85.4	80.5	77.2	76.7	67.2
Project E	70.1	69.0	70.7	71.6	66.8	68.4	68.4	79.0	75.0	69.3	69.1	59.3
Project F	68.2	66.6	68.4	68.5	64.0	70.1	66.2	77.1	72.6	64.6	67.7	62.5
Project G	78.6	74.1	82.5	85.0	81.1	75.8	79.1	84.8	85.3	73.2	80.2	67.8
Project H	75.3	74.2	76.2	77.6	72.8	76.2	72.1	82.4	80.9	73.0	74.3	65.9
Project J	63.4	63.8	63.3	62.6	58.1	66.1	56.9	72.3	72.4	62.5	60.3	50.9
Project K	74.9	71.9	76.9	77.8	73.9	77.0	73.2	82.3	81.9	68.9	74.8	67.2
PPV Overall UH	74.9	75.3	73.6	75.1	70.4	75.5	74.3	80.5	72.8	75.1	75.0	70.7

The highlighted cells represent the high, low and median score range. Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range. Note: O = Overall Score, P = Property Score and S = Service Score.

Business Success Factors	
1 - Readiness to Solve Problems	6- Quality of Maintenance
2- Responsiveness & Follow-Through	7 - Property Rating
3 - Property Appearance and Condition	8- Relationship Rating
4 - Quality of Management Services	9- Renewal Intention
5- Quality of Leasing	

Scoring Range	Rating	Scoring Range	Rating
100.0 to 85.0	Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0	Below Average
84.9 to 80.0	Very Good	64.9 to 60.0	Poor
79.9 to 75.0	Good	59.9 to 55.0	Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0	Average	54.9 to 0.0	Crisis

Scores are not a percentile. 1-100 scoring range. Converted to 5-point range example 70 = 3.5

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

4. Scores and Rating by Installation sorted by Overall Score:

Of the 42 Installations surveyed, ratings by category were as follows:

- 5 rated “Outstanding”
- 4 rated “Very Good”
- 11 rated “Good”
- 5 rated “Average”
- 12 rated “Below Average”
- 4 rated as “Poor”
- 1 rated as “Very Poor”

Chart Redacted

Scoring Range	Rating	Scoring Range	Rating
100.0 to 85.0	Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0	Below Average
84.9 to 80.0	Very Good	64.9 to 60.0	Poor
79.9 to 75.0	Good	59.9 to 55.0	Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0	Average	54.9 to 0.0	Crisis

Scores are not a percentile. 1-100 scoring range. Converted to 5-point range example 70 = 3.5

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

5. Current and Prior Scores by FH PPV Project:

Scores decreased for the three Satisfaction Indexes from 2018 to 2019 for all Navy FH PPV Projects. The average decline for the Overall Satisfaction Index was 11.6 points. The largest decrease was 15.9 points and the smallest decrease was 7.5 points.

Current and Prior Scores by Project

Portfolio Name	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score		
	Current	Prior	Change	Current	Prior	Change	Current	Prior	Change
Project A	66.2	77.5	-11.3	63.9	75.8	-11.9	67.7	78.7	-11.0
Project B	64.9	78.7	-13.8	64.2	77.6	-13.4	64.6	79.5	-14.9
Project C	71.9	84.5	-12.6	68.9	82.7	-13.8	73.2	85.1	-11.9
Project D	77.9	89.1	-11.2	78.1	88.1	-10.0	77.7	89.5	-11.8
Project E	70.1	86.0	-15.9	69.0	84.8	-15.8	70.7	86.6	-15.9
Project F	68.2	75.7	-7.5	66.6	74.6	-8.0	68.4	75.5	-7.1
Project G	78.6	88.8	-10.2	74.1	86.0	-11.9	82.5	91.4	-8.9
Project H	75.3	85.5	-10.2	74.2	84.9	-10.7	76.2	86.1	-9.9
Project J	63.4	74.7	-11.3	63.8	74.0	-10.2	63.3	74.9	-11.6
Project K	74.9	86.6	-11.7	71.9	84.1	-12.2	76.9	88.5	-11.6

Note: Current Scores below 70 are highlighted in Purple.

Scoring Range	Rating	Scoring Range	Rating
100.0 to 85.0	Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0	Below Average
84.9 to 80.0	Very Good	64.9 to 60.0	Poor
79.9 to 75.0	Good	59.9 to 55.0	Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0	Average	54.9 to 0.0	Crisis

Scores are not a percentile. 1-100 scoring range. Converted to 5-point range example 70 = 3.5

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.



6. Current and Prior Scores by FH PPV Project for 5 years:

Between 2019 and 2018 all FH PPV Index scores decreased. A review of the Overall Scores for each PPV indicates that there is not a common trend in scoring changes prior to 2019. For example, between 2015 and 2018, Project K's Overall scores increased, although the scores dipped in 2017. Project E's Overall scores decreased between 2015 and 2018; however, there was a noted increase between 2017 and 2018.

	Project	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Overall Score	Project A	66.2	77.5	76.8	79.1	78.5
	Project B	64.9	78.7	82.4	78.4	78.8
	Project C	71.9	84.5	86.2	87.0	86.8
	Project D	77.9	89.1	91.5	91.0	89.7
	Project E	70.1	86.0	83.3	85.6	87.0
	Project F	68.2	75.7	73.1	81.1	78.6
	Project G	78.6	88.8	81.9	81.1	75.7
	Project H	75.3	85.5	80.9	82.9	86.1
	Project J	63.4	74.7	76.0	78.6	76.5
	Project K	74.9	86.6	84.4	85.9	85.8
	Project	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Property Score	Project A	63.9	75.8	75.9	78.3	78.4
	Project B	64.2	77.6	81.4	77.2	78.5
	Project C	68.9	82.7	84.5	85.3	84.9
	Project D	78.1	88.1	91.3	91.7	90.8
	Project E	69.0	84.8	82.0	84.1	84.7
	Project F	66.6	74.6	72.4	79.9	77.4
	Project G	74.1	86.0	80.1	77.3	73.0
	Project H	74.2	84.9	81.1	82.3	85.1
	Project J	63.8	74.0	74.6	77.3	75.9
	Project K	71.9	84.1	82.1	83.5	83.9
	Project	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Service Score	Project A	67.7	78.7	76.9	79.8	78.7
	Project B	64.6	79.5	83.3	79.4	79.4
	Project C	73.2	85.1	87.1	88.0	87.7
	Project D	77.7	89.5	91.7	91.2	88.7
	Project E	70.7	86.6	84.0	86.5	88.5
	Project F	68.4	75.5	72.9	81.5	79.0
	Project G	82.5	91.4	83.0	83.7	77.5
	Project H	76.2	86.1	81.6	83.3	87.0
	Project J	63.3	74.9	76.8	79.3	76.6
	Project K	76.9	88.5	86.2	87.6	87.7

The highlighted cells represent the high, low and median score range. Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

7. Select Questions for Navy PPV Overall FH Results:

The following questions were selected as areas indicative of Overall Resident Satisfaction. As an example, the responses to question 2j) Overall level and quality of service you are receiving, indicates 55% of respondents were “Very Satisfied” or “Somewhat Satisfied”, 15% “Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied” and 29% “Somewhat Dissatisfied” or “Very Dissatisfied”.

More residents would recommend their community (52%) than would not (28%) based on the response to Question 7c.

2j. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving.

CEL Score 68.3 or 3.4	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	2,417	2,173	1,301	1,295	1,138	92	8,416
	29%	26%	15%	15%	14%	1%	100%
	4,590		1,301	2,433		92	
	55%		15%	29%		1%	
	% Satisfied		Neutral	% Dissatisfied		No Opinion	

3a. Responsiveness of maintenance personnel.

CEL Score 77.8 or 3.9	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	3,630	2,444	705	846	710	81	8,416
	43%	29%	8%	10%	8%	1%	99%
	6,074		705	1,556		81	
	72%		8%	18%		1%	
	% Satisfied		Neutral	% Dissatisfied		No Opinion	

5a. Overall condition of your home.

CEL Score 66.1 or 3.3	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	1,849	2,752	941	1,814	1,034	26	8,416
	22%	33%	11%	22%	12%	0%	100%
	4,601		941	2,848		26	
	55%		11%	34%		0%	
	% Satisfied		Neutral	% Dissatisfied		No Opinion	

7c. I would recommend this community to others.

CEL Score 66.6 or 3.3	5	4	3	2	1	No Opinion	Totals
	1,921	2,422	1,667	1,075	1,231	100	8,416
	23%	29%	20%	13%	15%	1%	100%
	4,343		1,667	2,306		100	
	52%		20%	28%		1%	
	% Agreed		Neutral	% Disagreed		No Opinion	

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

8. FH Comment Analysis Overall:

The resident comments were analyzed for frequency of response. Items were color coded in red font for a negative comment and blue for positive. Since all residents completing a survey had an opportunity to make comments the frequency of response was based on the total number of FH surveys completed (8,416).

Each resident who provided comments may have commented on more than one topic. Each topic listed below was mentioned more than 200 times.

The results of the survey question “Do you have any unresolved issues management is aware of but has not been resolved” was added in as a comment topic as Outstanding Issues. This is also the highest frequency of response item with 2,669 (31.7%) mentions. Resident suggestions such as “It would be nice to have a pool” were categorized as Suggestions. This was the second highest frequency category with 1,062 (12.0 %) mentions. Value for BAH was mentioned 864 times (9.7%). Items mentioned under 3% are listed on the next page..

Top Frequency of topics included
Outstanding Issues- Not Mold
27.2%, Suggestions 12.0%, Value
for BAH 9.7% and Management
Company Positive (8.0%)

Category	OVERALL	%
Outstanding Issues	2,669	31.7%
Suggestions	1,062	12.0%
Value for BAH	864	9.7%
Management Company - Positive	711	8.0%
Staff Positive	677	7.6%
Home - Positive	564	6.4%
Overall Condition - Interior	503	5.7%
Landscaping - Outside Home	461	5.2%
Base - Positive	411	4.6%
Security - Theft	393	4.4%
Management - Communication	385	4.3%
Management - Unspecified	370	4.2%
Appliances	359	4.0%
Maintenance - Quality of Work	347	3.9%
Maintenance - Response Time	329	3.7%
Management Company - Negative	324	3.7%
Pest Control (Nuisance) Non-Rodent	323	3.6%
Move in Condition	281	3.2%

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

8. FH Comment Analysis Overall Cont.:

Items mentioned with a frequency of less than 3.0% listed below.

Category	OVERALL	%
Open Work Order	254	2.9%
Manager/Management - Positive	251	2.8%
Litter Control - Community	234	2.6%
Playground - Needs Updated/Repairs	225	2.5%
# of Parking Spaces	219	2.5%
Street Light Outages	210	2.4%
Roads	207	2.3%
Health & Safety Other	192	2.2%
Carpet Old/Worn/Won't Replace	166	1.9%
Overall Home Condition - Exterior	161	1.8%
Parking Enforcement - Resident	142	1.6%
Landscaping - Neighborhood	139	1.6%
Mold - Interior – not specified	127	1.4%
Move Out Fees	127	1.4%
Pets - Policy Unrelated to Breed	123	1.4%
Pest or Pet Feces	120	1.4%
Speeding	115	1.3%
Security - Break ins	109	1.2%
Fees or Expenses - Other	103	1.2%
Security - Not Specified	102	1.2%
Manager/Management Negative	92	1.0%
Leasing - Negative	91	1.0%
No AC	91	1.0%
RECP - Not Specified	90	1.0%
Home or Bedrooms - Small	89	1.0%
Maintenance - Negative	87	1.0%
Lack of Follow-up – Maintenance	81	0.9%
Assignment - Housing Choices	79	0.9%

Category	OVERALL	%
Lawn Maintenance- Enforce	71	0.8%
Parking - Visitor	66	0.7%
Staff - Not Specified	65	0.7%
RECP - Unfair Groupings	63	0.7%
# of Visitor Spaces	61	0.7%
RECP - Other Billing Issues	58	0.7%
Mold interior reported but not remedied	56	0.6%
Noise - Neighbors	55	0.6%
Paint - Interior	55	0.6%
Trash Dumpsters - Dirty/overflow	54	0.6%
Staff - Not Specified - Negative	51	0.6%
RECP - Home Not Energy Efficient	51	0.6%
Follow-up - Management	46	0.5%
Pool - Negative	45	0.5%
Leasing - Positive	42	0.5%
Children - Enforce rules	40	0.5%
Assignment - Size for Family	39	0.4%
Assignment - Rank Issue	31	0.3%
Water Quality – Poor	24	0.3%
Mold - Already Abated	22	0.2%
Mold – Exterior – not specified	22	0.2%
Fitness Center - Repair	18	0.2%
Security Gates - Not working	18	0.2%
Pets - Breed Control	16	0.2%
Lead-Based paint	15	0.2%
Smoking - enforce or create rules	13	0.1%
Unauthorized Entry - Maintenance	12	0.1%

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

B. Family Housing Supplemental Question Results for Q10, Q11 and Q12

The following questions were asked to assess how well residents understand the role of the Navy Housing Office, preferences regarding co-located Navy Housing-PPV Partner Offices, and if residents believe there was pressure to give high scores in previously conducted surveys.

10) Are you aware that the Navy Housing Service Center is your advocate for on and off Installation housing including Privatized Housing?					
Yes		No		Don't Know, No Answer	
Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
3,764	44.7%	3,281	39.0%	1371	16.0%

39.0% of residents surveyed indicated they were not aware the Navy Service Center is their advocate for all housing including PPV.

11) Please tell us your preference in regard to the Navy Housing Center office being co-located with the PPV partner community leasing office.		
I like having the HSC and PPV leasing offices co-located	2,441	29.0%
I would prefer the HSC and PPV leasing offices to be separate	1,077	12.8%
I do not have a preference regarding co-location	3,235	38.4%
Don't Know, or Not Applicable	1,640	19.5%
No Answer	23	0.3%
Total	8,416	100%

67.4% of residents surveyed like having HSC and PPV leasing offices co-located or have no preference.

12) When completing previous surveys regarding your satisfaction with privatized housing, were you directly pressured to give higher ratings?					
Yes		No		Don't Know, No Answer	
Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
536	6.0%	6,929	78.2%	1,400	15.8%

78.2% of residents indicated they did not feel pressured to provide higher ratings, while 6.0% selected Yes, they felt pressured.

For Q12 (pressure on previous surveys) results were similar among all projects. A review of the resident comments of those selecting "Yes, I felt pressured" indicate the following:

- Several residents confused the CEL annual survey with other surveys conducted by the PPV's that are not confidential. These are point in time surveys sent out after an interaction such as Move-in and Maintenance calls.
- Several residents believe the "Strive for 5" campaigns are a form of pressure. It should be noted that many industries including banking, telecom, medical, hotels, etc. use similar techniques.

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

C. FH Awards

Awards for Service Excellence: All Navy FH locations surveyed participated in the CEL National Award Program for Service Excellence. This award recognizes those private sector and military housing locations and/or Installations/Firms that provide an excellent level of service to residents.

- ◆ 14 Platinum Awards
- ◆ 15 A List Awards

To be award eligible, neighborhood/Installation must meet Service Index score and Response Rate criteria as follows:

- **Platinum Award:** Neighborhood - Service Satisfaction Score of at least 93.1 (varies annually), and a Response Rate of at least 20%.
- **A List Award:** Neighborhood - Service Satisfaction Score of at least 85.0, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.
- **Crystal Award:** Installation - Must have multiple neighborhoods with a consolidated score of at least 85.0, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.

Neighborhood Awards - Navy PPV FH has 14 Platinum Award winners and 15 A List Award winner, for a total of 29 Award winners of 243 neighborhoods surveyed (11.9%).

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

D. Recommendations

Due to recent events, such as increased media reporting on privatized military housing and the related Senate Hearings, the Privatized Partners and each Service Branch should escalate efforts to increase resident outreach through education, communication, staff training, addition of new programs, and improved business processes and procedures. CEL suggests the following:

1. **Continue with Resolution of Current Issues:** Continue the process of working with the Projects/PPVs to:
 - Determine and resolve top resident concerns; and
 - Evaluate and correct all Health and Safety Issues.
2. **Determine Health and Safety Processes Going Forward:** CNIC should determine how Health and Safety issues should be documented and addressed going forward, including the level of involvement CNIC should have in this process. (Please note that CEL surveys are confidential and not designed to isolate an issue within a specific home). The CEL survey results are an indicator of overall resident satisfaction in a variety of areas that impact the success of a Project. The concerns identified by the CEL Survey are often areas that management otherwise has no ability to measure e.g. customer service provided, effectiveness of new initiatives, changes needed in staffing, effectiveness of vendors or business processes, residents likes or dislikes.)
3. **Establish Action Plan Process:** Determine how CNIC will work with PPVs on the creation and/or review of Action Plans, as well as the process for periodic follow-up to assess Action Plan completion and effectiveness. Some action items can be addressed immediately, while others may require a longer project effort including capital expenditures.
4. **Staff to Attend Action Plan Trainings:** Have a representative from each project/installation attend the Action Plan Training to be provided by CEL. The Action Plan Training will cover how to complete an Action Plan, as well as tips to correct deficiencies.
5. **Educate Residents with Communication:** Based on the survey results, there are areas that require additional resident education. Resident communication should encompass multiple and consistent methods of communication.

An issue will resurface if communication efforts are lacking or inconsistent. Some communication tools will be effective with some residents, but not with others, so all methods must be utilized consistently and frequently.

- a) **Value for BAH:** Due to the many resident complaints regarding BAH, residents should be educated as to how BAH was handled historically (prior to PPV) and how it is handled for military managed locations and why. The PPV staff should be educated on BAH and have written reference guides so they provide consistent and accurate information to residents.

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.



- b) **Safety:** This is an area where there is a noted increase in resident complaints as observed through the survey comments. Safety was rated as the #1 area of importance by residents when asked on other CEL surveys for another Branch for both PPV and military managed housing. Residents need to be educated on how they can be a part of the safety process.
- Consider a crime watch program with possible use of “Block Captains”.
 - Conduct semi-annual training for residents by inviting a “Crime Prevention Officer” to speak and provide tips.
- c) **Create a Navy Housing Fact Sheet:** Create a Fact Sheet provided by the Navy for inclusion in all Move In packets, including a signed receipt from residents. The Fact Sheet should address Safety, Value for BAH, processes for reporting different types of issues, RECP information and any additional information that is often misconstrued or re-directed to the wrong source. This Fact Sheet should also include how and when to contact the Housing Office and further reinforce to residents that the Housing Office is their advocate.

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

Addendum A

The Survey: The survey was developed by using a core set of questions provided by CEL. The “core” question set for the FH resident surveys is identical to all private sector and military residents surveyed. By utilizing a core set of questions, CEL can compare results of the Navy PPV Resident survey with other military and private sector housing results.

CNIC included additional supplemental questions to the survey. The results derived from the supplemental questions were reported separately so as to not impact the overall scores, nor prevent a direct comparative analysis between all locations and branches surveyed by CEL.

The Survey Process: CEL worked with CNIC and each PPV Partner to set up the survey process and to obtain information on each neighborhood to be surveyed within each Installation. The PPV Partners provided the email addresses which were compared to a Master Unit List of all homes and occupancy. All surveys were completed online and only CEL had access to the results of any individual survey.

- ◆ **Distribution:** The survey was distributed to 35,125 residents living in Navy PPV Family Housing with 8,416 responding for a response rate of 24.0%. Additionally, 5,091 surveys distributed to UH residents with a response rate of 8.8%.
- ◆ **Population:** The survey was distributed to one resident per household living in Navy PPV Family and Unaccompanied at the time of the survey launch.
- ◆ **Online Survey:** A survey invitation was sent via email to all Residents with a valid email address. Each email included a unique link to the online survey. Up to three email Reminders were then sent out to non-respondents at seven-day intervals. CEL provided an email addresses that was publicized by CNIC for residents to request a survey in the event the email containing the survey link was not received or deleted. CEL verified the resident address provided and survey completion status for the address prior to sending a survey link to any home.
- ◆ **Quality Control:** The unique survey link was associated with a specific Resident address within a neighborhood to ensure each home only completed one survey, thus ensuring quality control and a consistent distribution methodology.

- ◆ **Core set of questions used for comparison to private sector and military housing.**
- ◆ **The Navy PPV Out of Cycle survey was conducted online. Email invitations were sent to each home.**
- ◆ **The results derived from the supplemental questions were reported separately so as to not impact the overall scores.**

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.

Addendum B

Analytics: For purposes of assessing Resident opinions, CEL has developed a proprietary scoring system. Residents respond to each survey question using a five-point Likert scale. Aggregated answers are then grouped into three overall categories termed Satisfaction Indexes and into nine sub-categories termed Business Success Factors.

The three Satisfaction Indexes provide the highest-level overview and offer a snapshot of how a company, Partner, Installation, or single neighborhood is performing.

The Overall Satisfaction Index includes scores from all coded questions. These question scores are included in each of the Business Success Factors. Questions pertaining to Quality of Leasing and Renewal

Intention are not categorized in the Service or Property Index but are included in the Overall Satisfaction Index.

REACT R Summarizes satisfaction by way of three Satisfaction Indices and Nine Business Success Factors



Scoring: The calculated scoring ranges are as follows:

Scoring Range	Rating	Scoring Range	Rating
100.0 to 85.0	Outstanding	69.9 to 65.0	Below Average
84.9 to 80.0	Very Good	64.9 to 60.0	Poor
79.9 to 75.0	Good	59.9 to 55.0	Very Poor
74.9 to 70.0	Average	54.9 to 0.0	Crisis

The CEL scoring methodology is a 1-100 calculated scoring and not a percentile or average. As an example, a 1-100 score can be divided by 20 to obtain a 5-point scale i.e. score of 70 can be divided by 20 to obtain a 5-point scale of 3.5.

CEL utilized the survey and improvement process used by all its military and private sector clients called “REACT” (*Reaching Excellence through Assessment, Communication and Transformation*). This process allows for direct comparison of all surveys conducted by CEL for purposes of comparative data and in-depth trending analysis.

Note: This version has been modified with sections redacted/removed and Project Names referenced as Project A thru K versus actual names to protect business sensitive information.