

Measurement and benchmarking of workplace performance

Workplace
performance

Key issues in value adding management

Theo J.M. van der Voordt

177

*Department of Management in the Built Environment, Faculty of Architecture and
the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands, and*

Per Anker Jensen

*Department of Management Engineering, Technical University of Denmark,
Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark and Department of Management Engineering,
Centre for Facilities Management, Lyngby, Denmark*

Received 7 October 2017
Revised 5 December 2017
13 February 2018
Accepted 19 February 2018

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to present a process model of value-adding corporate real estate and facilities management and indicators that can be used to measure and benchmark workplace performance and the added value of workplace interventions for an organisation.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper compares the performance measurement and benchmarking theory with current practice and data from different work environments. The paper builds on two books on adding value through buildings, facilities and services, both edited and co-authored by the authors of this paper. The books were based on literature reviews, interviews with practitioners, cross-border studies of performance measurement and benchmarking and in-depth analyses of various value parameters by experts from different countries. In addition, theory and empirical examples of benchmarking have been included.

Findings – The paper presents 12 value parameters that are seen as relevant in measuring and benchmarking of workplace performance: four people-oriented, four business processes-related, two economic and two social parameters. Because not all values can be easily expressed in monetary units, various other ways of measuring are presented that can help to monitor and to benchmark workplace performance. The 12 values and ways to measure can be used to support a more integrated business case approach that goes beyond “dollar-metrics” and spreadsheet-based decision-making. Both quantitative and qualitative performance indicators, including hard and soft factors, are needed to define the trade-off between the costs and benefits of interventions in corporate real estate, facilities and services and to cope with the interests and needs of different stakeholders.

Practical implications – To add value to an organisation, workplaces have to provide value for money by a positive trade-off between the benefits, i.e. support of the organisational objectives and the primary processes and the costs, time and risks connected with achieving these benefits. Widely used indicators to measure the costs are the investment costs, running costs and total cost of occupancy. These metrics are primarily connected to efficiency, i.e. to optimal use of the resources of a firm, but much less to effectiveness and benefits such as user satisfaction, productivity, health and well-being.

Originality/value – The paper links performance measurement and benchmarking to value-adding corporate real estate and facilities management and presents new ways to measure and benchmark the performance of buildings, facilities and services in connection to organisational performance.

Keywords Performance measurement, Workplace, Benchmarking, KPIs, Added value, Business case

Paper type Literature review



1. Introduction

Corporate real estate management (CREM) aims to align the portfolio and services to the needs of the core business, to obtain maximum added value for the business and to contribute optimally to the overall performance of the organisation (Dewulf *et al.*, 2000). According to EN 15221-1, facilities management (FM) is the integration of processes within an organisation to maintain and develop the agreed services, which support and improve the effectiveness of its primary activities (CEN, 2006). In the new ISO standard, FM is also linked to the quality of life (ISO, 2017a). Another related concept is usability, which may be defined as a combination of effectiveness (providing the right output), efficiency (using the right input) and satisfaction or experience of clients, customers and end users (Alexander, 2005; ISO, 2017b).

In both definitions of CREM and FM, supporting (business) processes and adding value to the organisation are key concepts. This paper presents a newly developed process model of value-adding corporate real estate and facilities management and discusses which indicators can be used to measure and benchmark workplace performance and the added value of workplace interventions for an organisation.

The paper builds on two books on adding value through buildings, facilities and services, both edited and co-authored by the authors of this paper (Jensen *et al.*, 2012; Jensen and Van der Voordt, 2017). The books were based on literature reviews, interviews with practitioners, cross-border studies of performance measurement and benchmarking and in-depth analyses of 12 value parameters by experts from different countries. For the purpose of this paper, theory and empirical examples of benchmarking have been added.

The paper first briefly presents the value-adding management model (Section 2). Then, it discusses the performance measurement and benchmarking theory (Sections 3 and 4) and current practice and empiric data from different work environments (Section 5). Finally, it discusses the gaps between the theory and practice and reflects on further improvements of both the theory and practice (Section 6).

2. Value-adding FM and CREM

Figure 1 presents the new value-adding management (VAM) model that has been developed to support decision-makers to define and implement FM or CREM interventions that create a positive trade-off between the benefits and costs and add value to the organisation (Hoendervanger *et al.*, 2017). This process model includes four steps that were adopted from the well-known Deming cycle: plan-do-check-act.

The main actions in the plan phase are to identify the drivers to change, i.e. to define if there is a gap between the desired and actual performance of the organisation and the accommodation, facilities and services, and to define which interventions may result in improved performance, and whether the benefits outweigh the costs and sacrifices.

The *do phase* encompasses the implementation of the proposed interventions and management of the change process.

In the *check phase*, the costs and benefits of the intervention(s) and its impact on the performance of the organisation and its buildings, facilities and services has to be measured. To be able to measure whether the performance has improved, an *ex ante* measurement before the intervention is implemented is needed as well (baseline measurement). The *output* of the change process regards the change in CREM/FM performance (e.g. less m² per person, reduced CO₂ emission or lower facility costs), whereas the *outcome* refers to whether the changed FM/CREM performance fits with the organisational strategy, mission, vision and objectives and as such adds value to the organisation and its customers and end users. For example, if the objective of the organisation is to be as green as possible and to perform on a




Figure 1.
VAM model
(Hoendervanger *et al.*, 2017)

high level of social responsibility, a further reduction in energy consumption adds value to the organisation. On the other hand, if the organisation just aims to fit with the current legislation and the performance assessment in the plan phase shows that it already fits with the legal requirements, being “more green” does not add value to the organisation (though it is very welcome from a societal point of view!).

The distinction between output and outcome is related to the basic distinction in Michael Porters value chain (Porter, 1985) between support activities and primary activities, which is also reflected in the management model in EN 15221-1 (CEN, 2006). It is important to be aware of this distinction in all phases of the VAM model.

It is also important to check which FM/CREM interventions result in synergy, i.e. improve the outcome regarding more than one value parameter and which ones may result in conflicting outcomes, e.g. a higher profit but a lower level of employee satisfaction due to a reduction in m² per employee. Figure 2 shows examples of input -> output -> outcome/




Figure 2.
Examples of input ->
output -> outcome ->
added value chains

added value chains to illustrate the complexity of the cause–effect relationships between interventions, FM/CREM performance and organisational performance (Hoendervanger *et al.*, 2017).

When all objectives have been attained, the *act phase* may be limited to consolidation of the new situation, until new drivers to change come to the fore. If the objectives are not sufficiently attained, or if too many negative side effects come to the fore, new interventions or strengthening of earlier interventions should be considered. Another option is to reconsider the objectives; maybe the aimed performance was not realistic and feasible within the current conditions. If new or revised interventions have to be implemented, the plan-do-check-act phases start again. A further elaboration of the four steps and tools to support each step can be found in Hoendervanger *et al.* (2017) and Van der Voordt *et al.* (2016).

The next sections elaborate the check phase. This is the phase where performance measurement and benchmarking are in focus. We discuss how to measure the output and outcome of FM and CREM interventions and the role of benchmarking and how practice copes with these topics. The empiric data all focus on work environments. Finally, a new benchmark framework is proposed with 12 value parameters and suggestions on how to measure these values. The proposed value parameters and ways to measure can be used as input to integrated business cases that incorporate both monetary and non-monetary performance indicators.

3. Performance measurement: aims, areas and indicators

Performance measurement is a prerequisite to know how well people or facilities perform.

Schuur (2015) refers to the old adage “what gets measured, gets done” and states that measurements are important because they convey the following types of information about the performance of an organisation:

- Focus attention on the factors that influence the achievement of the organisation’s goals.
- Show how effectively the organisation uses its resources.
- Assist in setting goals and monitoring trends.
- Provide the inputs for analysing the sources of errors or underperformance.
- Identify opportunities for on-going improvement.
- Identify whether an organisation is “winning” or “losing”.
- When winning, give the organisation a sense of accomplishment.
- Monitor progress.

Nowadays, many conceptual frameworks, measurement systems and performance indicators are available (Anderson and McAdam, 2004; Riratanaphong, 2014; Støre-Valen and Lohne, 2016). Keegan *et al.* (1989) made a distinction between cost and non-cost indicators and internal versus external indicators. Sink and Tuttle (1989) identified seven interrelated performance criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, quality, productivity, quality of work life, innovation and profitability. Loosemore and Hsin (2001) made a distinction in functional, physical and financial performance and show that used KPIs are different in different sectors such as the health-care sector, education and post-delivery.

According to the balanced scorecard (BSC) of Kaplan and Norton (1992) and the related strategy map (Kaplan and Norton, 2004), organisational performance should be evaluated from four perspectives:

- (1) financial: profitability, revenue, sales growth;
- (2) customer: customer retention, customer satisfaction, market research;
- (3) internal business processes: processes to meet or exceed customer expectation; and
- (4) learning and growth: how to grow and meet new challenges.

Bradley (2002) classified various performance criteria into six perspectives of business performance according to the BSC concept:

- (1) financial health;
- (2) cost efficiency (financial perspective);
- (3) stakeholder perception (customer perspective);
- (4) organisational development;
- (5) environmental responsibility (internal business process perspective); and
- (6) productivity (learning and growth perspective).

The triple P model of Tangen (2005) relates efficiency to input and effectiveness to output, and connects performance to productivity (defined as the ratio between output and input), profitability and performance indicators such as quality, delivery, speed and flexibility. The model in Figure 1 is also based on the relationship between input and output and adds outcome as an additional way to assess the result of a change process called throughput.

Lavy *et al.* (2010) allocated building and facilities-related performance indicators to four categories:

- (1) financial indicators (all kinds of costs);
- (2) physical indicators (e.g. physical conditions of the building, health and safety, resource consumption);
- (3) functional indicators (such as productivity, parking, staff turnover and adequacy of space); and
- (4) survey-based indicators (such as data from employee or customer satisfaction surveys).

As such, they present a mix of FM/CREM performance indicators and business performance indicators. Jordan (2011) focuses on quality, cost and schedule indicators.

To summarise, so far, no consensus comes to the fore about which system is most appropriate and which performance indicators are key, why, for whom and for what purpose.

4. Benchmarking

A useful way to evaluate the outcomes of interventions is to compare the applied key performance indicators (KPIs) with similar data from before the interventions were implemented and data from other units within the same organisation (internal benchmarking) and data from other organisations (external benchmarking). According to Adewunmi and Ajayi (2016), benchmarking may help managers to improve performance, service quality and their processes, to make strategic plans to be the best in the industry, to obtain explanations for improvements that are made now and in the near future and to make well-argued business cases. For benchmarking to be successful, it is important to have a full commitment to continuous improvement, ability to learn from others, and commitment to implement improvement (Magd and Curry, 2003).

Since the early 1990s, benchmarking associations for FM/CREM have been established in several European countries by professional bodies, consulting companies and research institutions. The dominating focus in all countries has been cost/m² and/or cost/person for different types of facilities and services. The European FM network EuroFM initiated a FM benchmarking project in 1997 to support cross-border benchmarking. It was soon realized that the way to define and structure essential items such as cost and space measurements varied too much between countries to make cross-border data benchmarking reliable. Instead of this, it was decided to make a process benchmarking of the different national benchmarking systems. The final report presented a comparison of the systems in Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, The Netherlands and the UK (EuroFM, 2001).

In 2002, a European collaboration was initiated to develop FM standards to establish a common basis for benchmarking in Europe. The European FM standards published from 2006 to 2012 cover seven standards. The first six standards created the foundation for benchmarking, whilst the latest standard EN 15221-7 specifically concerns benchmarking (CEN, 2012). EN 15221-7 defines benchmarking as the process of “comparing strategies, processes, performances and/or other entities against practices of the same nature, under the same conditions and with similar measures” (CEN, 2012). This standard relates the content of benchmarking to strategy, process and performance. All three types of benchmarking can serve the purpose of identification of improvement options. Strategic benchmarking can also support resource allocation decisions, identification of best practices, budget review and planning and alignment with corporate objectives. Process benchmarking can further support prioritisation of problem areas, verification of legal compliance, identification of best practices and improvement of process effectiveness. Performance benchmarking can also support prioritisation of problem areas, as well as assessment of various aspects of property performance. The triplet seems to reflect the development in FM from a narrow focus on cost reduction to a broader and more strategical orientation with increasing focus on adding value. The first two European standards EN 15221-1 and 2 published by the European standardisation organisation CEN have been replaced by two global ISO standards in 2017 published by the International Standardisation Organisation, ISO.

The benchmarking standard presents different types of benchmarking differentiated according to content (strategy, process, performance), measures (quantitative and/or qualitative), comparator (internal, competitor, cross-sector), domain (local, national, international) and frequency (one-off, periodic, continuous). In literature, there is also mentioning of a comparator called “one against many”, where an organisation conducts benchmarking of own FM or CREM performances against a database with benchmarking data from a large group of other organisations (Jensen, 2008; Wauters, 2005; Kimmel, no year). To define the *added* value of any FM or CREM intervention, benchmarking before and after an intervention is important as well (Jensen and Van der Voordt, 2015). EN 15221-7 defines a number of benchmark indicators, divided in six areas; see Table I.

5. Performance measurement and benchmarking in practice

5.1 Prioritised values

To explore which values and performance indicators are prioritised in practice, a series of 10 interviews was conducted with five practitioners in The Netherlands and five practitioners in Denmark – all from private companies (Van der Voordt and Jensen, 2014). The findings showed a huge variety, both in prioritised performance areas and related indicators; see Table II. Values related to satisfaction and cost were most frequently prioritised, with satisfaction ranked as more important than cost in Denmark and the other way around in The Netherlands. Productivity was also important, in particular in Denmark. Values in

Table I.
Benchmark indicators (based on CEN, 2012)

Area	Indicators
Financial	Annual costs per FTE, workspace and/or m ² net floor area (NFA)
Spatial	NFA per FTE, person or workstation NFA, internal area and/or gross floor Area divided by the total level area
Environmental	CO ₂ emissions in total, per FTE and/or per m ² NFA measured in tons per annum Energy consumption in total, per FTE and/or per m ² NFA measured in kWh per annum Water usage in total, per FTE and/or per m ² NFA measured in m ³ per annum Waste production in total, per FTE and/or per m ² NFA measured in tons per annum Other environmental scores
Service quality	Quality of FM and/or specific services
Satisfaction	Satisfaction with FM and/or specific services
Productivity	Core operating hours of facility (facility management-related) Timeliness of service provision (facility management-related) Uptime facility (business continuity-related) Recovery time (business continuity-related) Staff turnover (human resources-related) Absenteeism (human resources-related)

	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth
DK1	Transparency of cost and priorities	Scalability	Release management resources	User satisfaction	Satisfaction with service provider
DK2	Core business objectives	Innovation	Coherent strategy between core business and FM	Productivity of core business	Communication
DK3	Create time	Create well-being			
DK4	Satisfaction of outsourced staff	Make processes smarter	Improvements and innovation	User centricity and service orientation	Corporate social responsibility
DK5	Increase energy conscience, reduced CO ₂ emissions	Ease of operation	Deliver better service with less or the same cost	Satisfaction	
NL1	Profit (ebit); improving cash position	Cost reduction	Transparency of real estate data for shareholders		
NL2	Cost reduction	Affordability			
NL3	Sustainability	Cost reduction	Identity	Satisfaction	
NL4	Cost reduction	Improving core business/ productivity	Health		
NL5	Efficient use of space	Forecasting future m ² needs	Balance between owned, rented and sale and lease back	Forecasting of future capital need	Engagement

Table II.
Prioritised values from 10 interviews with practitioners

relation to adaptation and environmental values were also mentioned in both countries, while culture was only represented in The Netherlands.

A recent survey amongst the members of the international corporate real estate association CoreNet Global showed that cost reduction, increasing employee efficiency and

productivity and enhancing flexibility are most highly prioritised, both in 2010 and in 2016 (Nase *et al.*, 2017); see Table III.

A comparative analysis of various studies in the health-care sector showed that, also in this sector, cost and productivity rank highest, with satisfaction at the third place (Van der Voordt, 2016).

5.2 *The trade-off between benefits and costs of new workplace practices*

Remarkably, many organisations that adopt new workplace practices like new ways of working and activity-based workplaces (i.e. sharing a variety of task-related workplaces) mainly focus on the benefits. This is in line with the definition of management as the transformation of resources into utility, thus focusing on the benefits (Maucher *et al.*, 2014). However, according to Jensen *et al.* (2012), adding value regards the trade-off between the benefits and costs. Table IV gives an overview of possible costs and benefits of activity-based workplaces, monetary and non-monetary (Van der Voordt, 2003).

CREM strategy	2016 survey			2010 survey ³			Rank change
	GM value ¹	Rank	N ²	GM value	Rank	N	
Reducing real estate costs	2.38	1	229	2.22	1	213	=
Increasing employee efficiency and productivity	2.52	2	231	2.98	2	191	=
Enabling flexibility	2.61	3	227	3.30	3	194	=
Enhancing employee well-being and satisfaction	2.69	4	230	3.86	5	185	+1
Encouraging and supporting employee innovation and creativity	2.87	5	231	3.80	4	179	-1
Promoting marketing, sales and organisational brand	2.98	6	230	4.41	7	201	+1
Supporting environmental sustainability	3.22	7	231	4.02	6	203	-1
Increasing the value of the organisation's real estate assets	3.77	8	231	4.51	8	179	=

Notes: 1) GM = geometric mean (average) of individual response scores; 2) N = number of respondents; 3) figures from Gibler and Lindholm (2012, p. 43)

Table III.
Comparison of two CoreNet global member surveys on prioritised values

Possible benefits/main drivers to change	Possible costs and risks
Better communication and collaboration (due to openness)	Costs of changing the environment
Increased productivity	Costs of implementation
Lower costs due to efficient use of space and resources	Resistance to change -> lower employee satisfaction -> loss of productivity, increased sick leave
Flexibility in the use of space	Reduced job satisfaction due to the loss of status, privacy, territory or identity
Support of culture change (by more social interaction)	Loss of social cohesion and team spirit
Increased job satisfaction due to more autonomy and dynamics	Lack of privacy
Attracting/retaining young talent and more customers due to a positive image of a creative, innovative and supportive work environment	Loss of productivity due to distraction by phone calls, too much communication, changing places
Contribution to a sustainable environment	

Table IV.
Possible benefits and costs of adopting activity-based workplaces

Regarding performance of workplaces, in practice, most attention is paid to cost data and m^2 data. For this purpose, The Netherlands Facility Costs Index can be used as a means to benchmark. In 2016, an average of €461 per m^2 rentable floor space was found, excluding VAT (NFC, 2016). The median workspace was 19.8 m^2 rentable floor space, the median costs per workplace €9,128 per year. No distinction is made between traditional cellular offices and modern, activity-based work settings. Data by [Van't Spijker and Van der Meer \(2010\)](#) showed higher accommodation costs per m^2 gross floor space in Dutch offices in commercial offices with a flex ratio of 0.5 á 0.7 than in traditional offices with personal desks (about €425 versus €325). Calculated per person, the costs are much lower in flex offices (€4,000-€4,900) than in traditional offices (€6,000-€7,800). These figures also show that it is important to use the same units instead of a variety of costs per m^2 net or gross floor space, workplace, person or full-time equivalent (FTE).

Regarding employee satisfaction and (perceived) productivity support, the satisfaction index of the Center for People and Buildings can be used as a benchmark indicator. [Brunia \(2016\)](#) found that, on an average, the architecture and interior design of activity-based work settings is more appreciated than in traditional offices (probably because of its younger age), whereas privacy, opportunities to concentrate, storage facilities, acoustics and perceived support of one's own productivity are more than 10 per cent less in activity-based work settings than in traditional cellular offices. [Table V](#) shows some data from over 100 cases.

Internationally, various benchmark data are available as well, such as the Leesman index (employee satisfaction) and the Global Occupier Metrics of Cushman and Wakefield (costs, m^2).

5.3 Benchmarking of workplace performance in three cases

In his PhD study, [Riratanaphong \(2014\)](#) explored which workplace performance areas are being used in two office organisations in Thailand and one case from The Netherlands. This study showed that, in practice, a huge variety of performance measurement topics is used. The data on performance measurement were collected from company reports and interviews with the case organisation's representatives. The impact of workplace change on employees' appraisal was examined by an external researcher using the work environment diagnosis instrument (WODI) that records employee satisfaction, perceived productivity support by the work environment and prioritised aspects ([Maarleveld, et al., 2009](#)). The empirical data have been compared with the criteria from the six perspectives mentioned by [Bradley \(2002\)](#) and the seven performance criteria that were identified by [Sink and Tuttle \(1989\)](#). [Tables VI and VII](#) show some examples of the variety in performance indicators.

Most performance criteria found in the case studies are measured by cost data such as operational cash flow (efficiency), quality management indicators (quality) and economic profits/earnings (profitability). However, the three case studies also included several performance criteria and performance measures beyond cost efficiency. All performance criteria that were mentioned by [Bradley \(2002\)](#) and [Sink and Tuttle \(1989\)](#) showed up to be included in all three cases, be it with different interpretations and in different ways. None of the organisations assessed the impact of their real estate on organisational performance by collecting data before and after the change, with one exception: in case 3, both ex ante and ex post data were collected about the appraisal of change by the end users. Apart from the BSC, no performance measurement framework that is presented in the literature was applied in practice in its original form. Probably, these frameworks are not well-known by practitioners or perceived as too complex and not practically applicable.

Table V.
Dutch data on
average percentages
of satisfied and
dissatisfied
employees in
traditional and
activity-based work
settings

	Traditional offices with personal desks 43 cases <i>N</i> = 7,707 <i>Satisfied</i>	Activity-based work settings 68 cases <i>N</i> = 12,385 <i>Satisfied</i>	Traditional offices with personal desks 43 cases <i>N</i> = 7,707 <i>Dissatisfied</i>	Activity-based work settings 68 cases <i>N</i> = 12,385 <i>Dissatisfied</i>
Organisation	66	65	10	12
Work (content, complexity)	83	79	5	6
User involvement	46	40	19	27
Accessibility of the building	79	79	10	11
Architectural appearance of the building	42	64	30	11
Number and diversity of places and spaces	42	46	27	29
Spatial configuration of workplaces	53	53	18	20
Openness and transparency	50	53	18	23
Workplace comfort	58	54	22	25
Interior design	37	58	33	20
Privacy	50	29	24	44
Opportunities to concentrate	46	33	34	45
Opportunities to communicate	71	69	10	12
Storage space	42	32	22	33
IT facilities	56	52	19	22
Provided facilities	53	54	14	14
Indoor climate	36	35	42	42
Light	55	60	19	16
Acoustics	46	38	22	35
Opportunities for remote working	47	54	21	18
<i>Perceived support of productivity</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Supportive</i>	<i>Not supportive</i>	<i>Not supportive</i>
Own productivity	46	36	19	30
Team productivity	43	36	17	26

5.4 Statoil study of international FM benchmarking

Even before the European standards were developed, there were a number of cases of international benchmarking of FM – particular from multinational companies aiming at creating overview, standardising and streamlining the FM provision in the different national companies in the corporation. Most of such cases have been presented at business conferences. There are limited examples of research-based cases. An interesting example concerns the Norwegian-based international oil company Statoil.

In 1999, Statoil conducted a first international benchmarking project together with seven large corporations from Denmark, Finland and Sweden. Together with a consulting company, they conducted a combined performance and the process benchmarking process by visiting all participating corporations and collecting both quantitative and qualitative data (Jensen *et al.*, 2008). The study showed that Statoil had a cost level of their FM that was similar to or a little below the most relevant comparison partners. A number of improvement areas were recommended to further develop FM in Statoil. One recommendation was to introduce internal rent of spaces to make the cost of use of space visible to the user organisation, which was soon implemented. Another recommendation was reduction of the

	Bradley (2002)	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
<i>Stakeholder perception</i>	Employee satisfaction with: Quality of indoor environment (lighting, air conditioning, temperature, noise level); provision of safe environment; location (access to employees, local amenities); ratio of office space to common areas; provision of amenities; amount of workplace reforms and space modifications; professional skills; information sharing Survey ratings of the facilities, building, property management and CRE services; number of complaints; call frequency; cost per m ² help desk; location (proximity to transportation, access to customers, distance to other sites and businesses)	Employee satisfaction with: lighting, temperature, noise, odour- or dust disturbance, ICT-related support services, management of facilities, safe environment, self-protection equipment in case of accident Satisfaction of the building users	Employee satisfaction with: diversity of the spaces, opportunities to work outside the office, atmosphere, interaction and knowledge exchange, IT, IT-related support services and facilities Rank in customer survey; number of complaints	Employee satisfaction with: air quality (dust, odours, fresh air), temperature, adequate space, lighting, noise, appearance of the workplace, IT-related support services and management of facilities Customer satisfaction survey
<i>Productivity</i>	Productivity (% of perceived productivity support from working environment) Absentee rates by buildings	Health and well-being in the workplace; productivity survey	Health and well-being in the workplace through workplace innovation (WPI); productivity survey	Health and well-being through workplace desk; productivity survey (WODI)

(continued)

Table VI. Examples of CRE performance measures according to Bradley (2002), left, and measures found in three case studies, right, adapted from Riratanaphong and Van der Voordt (2015)

Table VI.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
Strategic involvement	Master plan of the IT system; management of the information system; IT solution in HRM	Implementation of WPI; smart IT solutions for WPI	Implementation of flex workplaces
<i>Cost efficiency</i>			
Occupancy costs	<p>CRE involved in corporate strategic planning; CRE integrated with HR strategies; CRE actively involved in firm-wide initiatives such as special asset use, consolidations, shared services</p> <p>Total occupancy cost per employee; occupancy cost as a % of the total operating expense; occupancy cost as a % of the operating revenue</p>	Office rent/sq. m./ month	Depreciation expense
Operating costs (building and FM)	<p>Taxes (property and land)</p> <p>Operating costs; facility costs (buildings and equipment); overhead costs; fees and services</p>	Utility (electricity and water) cost/unit; parking cost/month; overhead cost	Salary costs; social charges; personnel costs of third party

space per workplace by using modern office solutions. Following this, Statoil introduced a space strategy in 2001 with the objective to reduce the average office space from 39 m² in 2001 to 25 m² per office user in 2010. This was to be achieved by rebuilding 500 cell offices per year to open-office solutions.

After a few years, this strategy of Statoil appeared to be unrealistic. From 2001 to 2005, the use of space per office user was only reduced from 39.0 m² to 34.5 m². All employees still had dedicated workplaces. The office use and office solutions were still mainly traditional with approximately 78 per cent in cell offices and 22 per cent placed in open-office environments. The estimates that were the basis of the objective of 25 m² per office user set up in 2001 were theoretical and not adequately based on analyses of existing office solutions. Therefore, Statoil initiated a second benchmarking project in 2005 with a particular focus on space utilisation and with involvement of the same consulting company. The project should contribute to a review of the space strategy from 2001 based on specific space analyses. They chose four benchmarking partners, three from Norway and one from Denmark. After a meeting with each party, the consulting company collected data for selected buildings from each participant and made detailed analysis of space utilisation of the floor plans.

This second benchmarking study showed an average total space of 28.0 m² per workplace, with Statoil being the highest with 33.5 m², whereas the lowest was extreme with just 11.8 m², and the second lowest 24.3 m². The primary space varied less, from 9.7 to 13.2, with an average of 11.7 m². The secondary space was in average 9.5 m². The shared space was in average 6.8 m², but varied from 7 per cent to 30 per cent of the total space. Besides the highest total space, Statoil also had the highest primary space and the highest percentage of shared space. Furthermore, the benchmarking showed great differences between each of the building and wings and each of the participant. In continuation of this benchmarking project, Statoil formulated a new space strategy for office buildings. They now aimed for establishing approximately 5 per cent over capacity in office spaces to avoid being forced to implement comprehensive moving processes, when changing needs occur for an organisational unit.

Table VII.
Examples of performance criteria according to Sunk and Tuttle (1989), left, and performance measures found in three case studies, right (adapted from Riratanaphong and Van der Voordt, 2015)

Performance criteria (Sink and Tuttle, 1989)	Performance measures from case studies		
	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
<i>Effectiveness</i> Degree to which an organisation accomplishes what it set out to accomplish	Work done according to assigned plan from government	Market introduction in time; realized sales	Data for benchmarking the company's output
<i>Efficiency</i> Ratio of resources expected to be consumed and resources actually consumed	Investment plan	Operational cash flow	Budget comparison
<i>Quality</i> The assurance of quality at the organisational system (i.e. input, process, output)	Quality assurance; internal audit as a part of the organisational system	Quality improvement; team participation	Quality management, i.e. the evaluation of physical condition of facilities as a part of organisation's performance measurement system

The case study shows that Statoil developed from having a strong focus on space reduction towards focusing on space as a resource that should be easy adaptable to changes in the business organisation and fit with the organisational culture.

6. Gaps between theory and practice and suggestions for the future

The comparisons between the theory and practice show that, in spite of the EuroFM standards on benchmarking, still no consensus seems to exist regarding what performance areas and KPIs should be included in benchmarking practices. Whereas the theory and practice show a number of similarities, a huge variety of performance areas are applied in practice, with different names, different KPIs and different priorities. Partly this makes sense, because prioritised values and selected KPIs depend on the context (e.g. a healthy economy or an economic crisis), type of organisation (public or private, age, vision and mission, core values, market share, etc.) and the current or expected mismatch between the demand and supply. However, to be able to benchmark, performance measurement systems should be better comparable, which requires a more standardised framework and common performance areas and KPIs. The benchmark indicators based on CEN (2012) can be used as a starting point, but should be extended with additional topics such as productivity benefits, adaptability, health and safety, image and corporate social responsibility indicators. A standardised benchmark framework with a wider scope – including effectiveness – can be used as input to a more holistic approach and integrated business cases that go beyond spreadsheets with a focus on efficiency, cost and m² data (Bititci *et al.*, 2012; Oseland and Burton, 2012). It may help to also discuss values that cannot be easily expressed in metrics.

6.1 Towards a new benchmarking framework

In our book on FM and CREM as value drivers (Jensen and Van der Voordt, 2017), a list of 12 value parameters is presented, that is based on a comparison of a number of different lists in the literature; see Table VIII.

These values have been elaborated by experts from six different European countries, who were asked to present a state of the art of current knowledge and available evidence of the impact of buildings, facilities and services on these values. Furthermore, experts have been asked to explore how these values could be managed and measured. Table IX presents

Group	Parameter
People	Satisfaction
	Image
	Culture
	Health and safety
Process and product	Productivity
	Adaptability
	Innovation and creativity
	Risk
Economy	Cost
	Value of assets
Societal	Sustainability
	Corporate social responsibility

Table VIII.
Twelve value parameters according to Jensen and van der Voordt (2017)

Value	Interventions	Tools to measure impact	KPIs (top 3)
Satisfaction	More suitable spatial layout More collaborative spaces Better indoor climate	Employee surveys Interviews Walk-throughs	Employee satisfaction with: Workplaces Collaborative space Indoor environment
Image	Move to a new location High-quality surroundings Reorganisation of spatial layout	Stakeholder surveys Group discussions Analysis of social media	Perceptions of corporate identity, corporate value, corporate brand
Culture	More open settings to support collaboration Shared desks/places New behavioural rules	Employee surveys Observations Interviews Workshops	Perceptions of corporate culture Match between culture and work environment
Health and safety	Higher level of personal control Ergonomic designed furniture Better indoor air quality	Capture and react on complaints Workplace H&S assessment	Sick leave Number of accidents % of satisfied employees
Productivity	Higher level of transparency to support collaboration Facilities for concentrated work Ergonomic furniture	Observations Measuring the time spent or saved Employee surveys	Output per employee Perceived support of: individual productivity Team productivity
Adaptability	Surplus of spaces, load-bearing capacity, installation capacity and facilities Removable and relocatable units and building components	Building performance assessment, i.e. using Flex 2.0 or Flex 2.0 Light Observation of adaptations of the building-in-use	Weighted assessment values, i.e. scores on scales of Flex 2.0 or Flex 2.0 Light
Innovation and creativity	Better visibility and overhearing Different types of meeting spaces and informal areas Virtual knowledge-sharing ICT	Spatial network analysis Social network analysis Logbooks on knowledge-sharing activities	Level of enclosure/openness Average walking distance Diversity of workspaces and meeting places
Risk	Emergency and recovery plans Back-up supply systems Insurances	Measuring time of business interruptions Measuring risk expenses	Uptime of critical activities Total risk expenses Total insurance expenses
Cost	Cost saving by establishing the FM department Process optimization Outsourcing	Accounting with an appropriate cost structure Measuring space, number of workstations and FTE	Cost/m ² , workstation or FTE of the total FM, space, workplace
Value of assets	Disposal of CRE Sale and lease back Improve owned CRE by adaptive reuse	Estimate the annual potential gross income and annual operational expenses Market valuation Estimate the cost of new development	Capitalization Market value Cost of new development
Sustainability	Sustainability framework Reduction of energy consumption Reduction of travel and transport activities	Critical success factors from corporate strategy Survey with multi-criteria scoring methodology Continuous review process	Consumption of primary energy and water CO ₂ emissions Access to transport
Corporate social responsibility	Employing challenged workers Promoting public transport Circular purchasing model	Depends on CSR policy and target	People: diversity of staff Planet: utilization of space Profit: total FM/CREM cost

Table IX.
Examples of interventions, assessment methods and KPIs (Van der Voordt *et al.*, 2016)

a number of interventions, assessment methods and KPIs for each value (Hoendervanger *et al.*, 2017).

Table X presents examples of output and outcome indicators in connection to FM/CREM performance and organisational performance. KPIs may regard quantitative numbers that can be compared with objective standards, e.g. the actual m² per person in comparison to a corporate standard, or CO₂ emission in comparison to legislation or scores in certification schemes like BREEAM, LEED or DGNB. However, many intangible and “soft” factors can only be measured in a qualitative and sometimes also more subjective way, for instance by measuring the *perceived* support of productivity or the *perceived* support of corporate culture by surveys.

To what level the output and outcome has been improved can be measured by calculating the difference between FM/CREM performance and organisational performance before and after the intervention(s).

6.2 Performance management

Whereas performance benchmarking is an essential method to monitor performance and compare ones’ own performance with other organisations, and can indicate which areas need improvement, performance benchmarking cannot in itself help to find specific improvement measures. In the last decades, the focus in the organisational performance field has shifted from performance measurement (i.e. what to measure, how to measure and how to report the results) to performance management (i.e. how to use the measures to manage performance of the organisations) (Bititci *et al.*, 2016).

A recommended management procedure is to conduct performance benchmarking on a regular basis, and based on that, by intervals, select an area for improvement and conduct process benchmarking within that area. Process benchmarking relates to comparisons of one’s own work processes and procedures against the processes in other organisations with

Table X.
Examples of output and outcome indicators to measure the impact of FM/CREM interventions such as workplace change (based on Hoendervanger *et al.*, 2017)

	FM/CREM performance indicators, i.e. a positive or negative impact of (workplace) change on:	Organisational performance indicators, i.e. a positive or negative impact of (workplace) change on:
Benefits	Quality of the work environment Access to public transport Use of space (high occupancy level, low vacancy) and other resources Healthy and safe indoor environment Adaptability Balance between openness and enclosure Walking distances Personal control of the indoor climate Diversity of available workspaces and meeting places Quality of visual clues	Job satisfaction and staff turnover Market share Corporate identity, brand and culture Absence due to sick leave Number of accidents Individual and team productivity, quantitative and qualitative Uptime of critical activities Consumption of primary energy and water, CO ₂ emissions, material use, waste and high level of recycling Attraction and retaining of talented staff Community satisfaction
Sacrifices	Downtime of critical activities Total expenses of risk and damages Investment cost and lifecycle cost per m ² , per workstation or per FTE (subdivided in total FM, space and infrastructure, people and organisation, space and workplaces)	Reduced market share Reduced profitability Less involvement and commitment of shareholders and stakeholders

an aim to reveal differences of importance for the performance. While performance benchmarking in most cases involves quantitative KPIs, process benchmarking typically includes both quantitative and qualitative comparisons. By detailed comparison of specific processes, real learning can be achieved and ideas for improvement identified (Jensen, 2008).

6.3 Follow-up actions and research

An interesting next step for organisations such as EuroFM to further improve the EN 15221-7 standard on benchmarking could be to monitor and analyse current benchmarking practices, search for similarities and dissimilarities, explore what makes sense and what does not and use the 12 value parameters as a reference frame. To stimulate its application in practice, dissemination of information and training would be welcome as well. This also holds true for the application of other systems.

Another next step could be – as proposed at a recent research workshop (Appel-Meulenbroek, 2017) – to further explore how business cases are made in practice, who is involved in the decision-making process, what values are included and why, which performance indicators are most efficient and most effective and which research methods would be most appropriate. Finally, further research is needed to develop academically sound and practically applicable methods for measuring and benchmarking effectiveness.

References

- Adegunmi, Y.A. and Ajayi, O.D. (2016), "Attitudes of Nigerian facilities management professionals to the benefits of benchmarking", *Facilities*, Vol. 34 Nos 7/8, pp. 468-492.
- Alexander, K. (Ed.) (2005), "Usability of workplaces – report on case studies", CIB – International Council for Research and Innovation in Building and Construction. CIB-report 310.
- Anderson, K. and McAdam, R. (2004), "A critique of benchmarking and performance measurement. Lead or lag?", *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 5, pp. 465-483.
- Appel-Meulenbroek, R. (2017), "Minutes of a brainstorm session on five important issues in workplace research", *Workplace research track. 24th Annual Conference of the European Real Estate Society, 29 June – 1 July 2017, Delft*.
- Bititci, I., Cocca, P. and Ates, A. (2016), "Impact of visual performance management systems on the performance practices of organisations", *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 54 No. 6, pp. 1571-1593.
- Bititci, U., Garengo, P., Dörfler, V. and Nudurupati, S. (2012), "Performance measurement: challenges for tomorrow", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 305-327.
- Bradley, S. (2002), "What's working? Briefing and evaluating workplace performance improvement", *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 150-159.
- Brunia, S. (2016), "CfPB indicator 2015", *Internal report*, Center for People and Buildings, Delft.
- CEN (2006), *Facility Management. Part 1: Terms and Definitions*, European Standard EN 15221-1, European Committee for Standardization, Brussels.
- CEN (2012), *Facility Management. Part 7: Guidelines for Performance Benchmarking*, European Standard EN 15221-7, European Committee for Standardization, Brussels.
- Dewulf, G., Krumm, P. and De Jonge, H. (2000), *Successful Corporate Real Estate Strategies*, Arko Uitgeverij, Nieuwegein.
- EuroFM (2001), "Facilities management benchmarking in Europe – a comparative study of FM benchmarking systems in six European countries", *EuroFM Report*, Delft.
- Gibler, K.M. and Lindholm, A.-L. (2012), "A test of corporate real estate strategies and operating decisions in support of core business strategies", *Journal of Property Research*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 25-48.

- Hoendervanger, J.G., Bergsma, F., Van der Voordt, T. and Jensen, P.A. (2017), "Tools to manage and measure adding value by FM and CREM", in Jensen, P.A. and van der Voordt, T. (Eds), *Facilities Management and Corporate Real Estate Management as Value Drivers: How to Manage and Measure Adding Value*, Chapter 17, Routledge, Oxfordshire, pp. 299-322.
- ISO (2017a), *Facilities Management – Vocabulary*, International Standard ISO 41011:2017, International Standard Organization, Geneva.
- ISO (2017b), *Ergonomics of Human-System Interactions – Part 11: Guidance on Usability*, 9241-9211:2017, International Standard Organization, Geneva.
- Jensen, P.A. (2008), *Facilities Management for Students and Practitioners*, Centre for Facilities Management – Realdania Research, DTU Management Engineering, Lyngby.
- Jensen, P.A. and Van der Voordt, T. (2015), "How can FM create value to organisations? – A critical review of papers from EuroFM research symposia 2013-2015", *Research Report*, A EuroFM Publication, April 2015.
- Jensen, P.A. and Van der Voordt, T. (2017), *Facilities Management and Corporate Real Estate Management as Value Drivers: How to Manage and Measure Adding Value*, Routledge, Abingdon-on-Thames.
- Jensen, P.A., Nielsen, K. and Balslev Nielsen, S. (2008), *Facilities Management Best Practice in the Nordic Countries – 36 cases*, Centre for Facilities Management - Realdania Research, DTU Management Engineering, Kgs. Lyngby.
- Jensen, P.A., Van der Voordt, T. and Coenen, C. (Eds) (2012), *The Added Value of Facilities Management: Concepts, Findings and Perspectives*, Polyteknisk Forlag, Lyngby.
- Jordan, B. (2011), "Meaningful key performance indicators: Real or illusory?", *Corporate Real Estate Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1992), "The balanced scorecard – measures that drive performance", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 70 No. 1, pp. 71-79.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (2004), *Strategy Maps: converting Assets into Tangible Outcomes*, Harvard Business School Publishing, Brighton, MA.
- Keegan, D.P., Eiler, R.G. and Jones, C.P. (1989), "Are your performance measures obsolete?", *Management Accounting*, Vol. 70 No. 12, pp. 45-50.
- Kimmel, P. (n.d.), *Benchmarking for Facility Professionals*, FM Benchmarking/IFMA Foundation, Houston, TX.
- Lavy, S., Garcia, J.A. and Dixit, M.K. (2010), "Establishment of KPIs for facility performance measurement: review of literature", *Facilities*, Vol. 28 Nos 9/10, pp. 440-464.
- Loosemore, M. and Hsin, Y.Y. (2001), "Customer-focused benchmarking for facilities management", *Facilities*, Vol. 19 Nos 13/14, pp. 464-476.
- Magd, H. and Curry, A. (2003), "Benchmarking: achieving best value in public-sector organisations", *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 261-286.
- Maucher, H., Malik, F. and Farschtschian, F. (2014), *Maucher and Malik on Management*, Campus Verlag, Frankfurt.
- Nase, I., Gupta, K. and Arkesteijn, M. (2017), "What is served for breakfast?", *Internal report*. TU Delft, Delft.
- Oseland, N. and Burton, A. (2012), "Quantifying the impact of environmental conditions on worker performance for inputting to a business case to justify enhanced workplace design features", *Journal of Building Survey, Appraisal and Valuation*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 151-164.
- Porter, M.E. (1985), *Competitive Advantages: Creating and Sustaining Competitive Performance*, Free Press, London.
- Riratanaphong, C. (2014), "Performance management of workplace change in two different cultural contexts", PhD thesis, Delft University of Technology, Delft.

- Riratanaphong, C. and Van der Voordt, D.J.M. (2015), "Measuring the added value of workplace change. Performance measurement in theory and practice", *Facilities*, Vol. 33 Nos 11/12, pp. 773-792.
- Schuur, R.G. (2015), *Literature Review: Performance Management and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)*, Corenet Global, Atlanta.
- Sink, D.S. and Tuttle, T.C. (1989), *Planning and Measurement of in Your Organisation of the Future*, Industrial Engineering and Management Press, Norcross.
- Støre-Valen, M. and Lohne, J. (2016), "Analysis of assessment methodologies suitable for building performance", *Facilities*, Vol. 34 Nos 13/14, pp. 726-747.
- Tangen, S. (2005), "Demystifying performance and productivity", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 34-46.
- Van der Voordt, D.J.M. (2003), *Costs and Benefits of Innovative Workplace Design*, Center for People and Building, Delft.
- Van der Voordt, T. (2016), "Adding value by health care real estate: parameters, priorities, and intervention", *Journal of Corporate Real Estate*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 145-159, Special Issue.
- Van der Voordt, T. and Jensen, P.A. (2014), "Adding value by FM: exploration of management practice in The Netherlands and Denmark", in: Alexander, K. (Ed.), *Research Papers Advancing knowledge in Facilities Management. Proceedings of the European Facility Management Conference 2014, Berlin*, 4-6 June 2014.
- Van der Voordt, T., Jensen, P.A., Hoendervanger, J.G. and Bergsma, F.K. (2016), "Value adding management of buildings and facility services in four steps", *Corporate Real Estate Journal*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 42-56.
- Van't Spijker, A. and Van der Meer, J. (2010), "Het nieuwe werken werkt echt! kwalitatieve en kwantitatieve effecten", *Facility Management Magazine*, Vol. 23 No. 182, pp. 18-21.
- Wauters, B. (2005), "The added value of facilities management: benchmarking work processes", *Facilities*, Vol. 23 Nos. 3/4, pp. 142-151.

Further reading

- Neely, A., Adams, C. and Crowe, P. (2001), "The performance prism in practice, measuring excellence", *The Journal of Business Performance Management*, Vol. 5, pp. 6-12.
- NFC Index Coöperatie u.a (2017), *Jaarbericht NFC Index® Kantoren 2016*, NFC Index, Naarden.

About the authors

Theo J.M. van der Voordt is an Emeritus Associate Professor in Corporate and Public Real Estate Management (CREM/PREM) at the Department of Management in the Built Environment, Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology. He is also a Senior Researcher at the Center for People and Buildings in Delft, The Netherlands. His research focuses on accommodation strategies that optimally match demand and supply, workplace management, performance measurement, health-care real estate strategies, adaptive reuse as a means to cope with vacancy and adding value by FM and CREM. Theo J.M. van der Voordt is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: D.J.M.vanderVoordt@tudelft.nl

Per Anker Jensen is a Professor in Facilities Management and Head of the Externally Funded Center for Facilities Management – Realdania Research, Technical University of Denmark. Before he started an academic career, he worked for 20 years in practice as a Consultant, Project Manager and Facilities Manager. He was a Member of the Board of EuroFM and Chairman of EuroFM's Research Network Group in 2007 and 2008.

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.