



CEL & Associates, Inc.
Real Estate Strategies, Benchmarking & Performance Solutions



SUMMARY OF
ARMY HOUSING TENANT SATISFACTION RESULTS
FY25 FOR
HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
FAMILY HOUSING (OWNED AND LEASED)

Prepared by: CEL & Associates, Inc.
Prepared: June 2025

Introduction

Army Headquarters engaged Archetype I LLC in conjunction with CEL & Associates, Inc. ("CEL") to conduct a Tenant Satisfaction and Opinion Survey of Family Housing tenants living in Army Owned and Leased Housing within 16 Installations consisting of 114 Neighborhoods from March to May 2025. This Summary is a high-level overview.

Methodology, Scope and Scoring

Detailed information on the survey methodology, scope and scoring is provided in the addendums at the end of this report.

Overview of Housing Results

The survey results indicate an overall improvement in tenant satisfaction. The Overall Score increased from 73.0 in FY24 to **74.1** in FY25, the Property Score from 71.7 to **72.0**, and the Service Score showed a greater improvement, rising from 73.8 to **75.7**, thereby moving to the low range of the "Good" category.

Business Success Factors

The Business Success Factors (BSFs) results for FY25 provide valuable insights into functional performance, highlighting areas of high satisfaction and identifying those requiring targeted improvements. Of the nine BSFs scores have improved for five, demonstrating progress in several key areas. Notable enhancements were observed in Relationship Rating, which increased by **4.6** points, indicating improved management problem-solving capabilities and treatment of tenants. However, the lowest score was for **BSF #2** Responsiveness & Follow Through, which declined 2.8 points, dropping to **68.7**. The questions for this BSF focus on responsiveness and follow-through from the management and staff.

Installation and Neighborhood Ratings

Out of 16 Installations, **75.0%** (12 Installations) achieved an Overall Score in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average categories (ranging from 100.0 to 70.0), whereas **25.0%** (4 Installations) fell into the Below Average range (69.9 to 65.0) or lower. In terms of the 111 Neighborhoods with surveys returned, **78.4%** rated similarly, with **21.6%** classified as Below Average, highlighting areas requiring focused improvement.

Tenant Satisfaction Metrics

- **62.8%** of tenants reported satisfaction with the overall service level.
- **69.0%** expressed satisfaction with their homes.
- **64.1%** were satisfied with the condition of their homes.

Response Rate Analysis

Surveys were sent to **9,095** homes, with **2,086** responses, yielding a response rate of **22.9%**, deemed **Average** by the CEL Response Rate Scale. This is a 3.3% decline from FY24's **26.2%** response rate. Of the **16** Installations, **75%** (12) met or exceeded the 20% response rate goal; two had rates in the 19% range, and two achieved 15.6% and 16.7%. The Installations, with 15.6% and 16.7% response rates were reviewed further and found to be representative of the tenants' opinions.

Key Questions and Observations

Key questions assessing tenant satisfaction included:

- Problems reported to management follow-up scored **68.7**
- Service level and quality overall scored **74.0**
- Follow-up on maintenance requests increased to **70.9**
- Overall condition of the home scored **73.7**
- Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.) rated **68.3**, while exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.) scored lowest at **66.5**

Top and Bottom Scoring Questions

The top five scoring questions range from **86.7** to **78.8** and include areas such as courtesy of maintenance and management, safety and security features of the home/unit, and ease of the renewal process.

The bottom five scoring questions range from **68.7** to **65.5** and include areas such as follow-up after a problem is reported, condition of common areas, exterior and interior features/services, and awareness of the dispute process.

More education is needed regarding awareness of the dispute process as over 1,100 tenants scored 3 or below for this question, with 10% (219) having no opinion (0).

Tenant Feedback

The results of an overview of the tenant comments, categorized into positive and negative feedback, have been provided. The housing presents a mix of experiences from its tenants. On the positive side, the proximity to schools, professional maintenance services, friendly housing staff, and a peaceful atmosphere are highlighted. However, concerns such as overcrowding, outdated facilities, inadequate parking, delayed maintenance, safety issues, and poor trash management indicate areas needing improvement. Addressing these challenges could enhance the overall living conditions and satisfaction among tenants.

It is important to note that while the data may not present the entire picture at specific Installations or Neighborhoods it offers valuable insights at the overall portfolio level. For example, issues like "parking problems" may not be pervasive across all Installations but are significant at specific locations.

Conclusion

In summary, the results indicate a generally positive sentiment towards living conditions, with notable strengths in maintenance courtesy and responsiveness. However, areas such as interior and exterior features and common spaces reveal opportunities for improvement. Issues like outdated appliances and communication gaps were highlighted as areas needing attention. Addressing the recurring issues identified in the survey can lead to improved overall satisfaction among tenants.

Score Ratings	
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

A. Overall, Directorate and Installation Results (Owned and Leased)

Overall Response Rates:

The minimum response rate goal was set at 20% with an overall project goal of 30%. A response rate of **22.9%** falls within the "Average" range (20% to 24.9%), representing a decrease of 3.3% from the FY24 Survey.

75.0% (12 out of 16) of Installations met or exceeded the 20% minimum response rate goal. Two Installations narrowly missed this benchmark by margins of 0.2% and 0.7%.

Response Rate	
Distributed	Received
9,095	2,086
22.9%	
FY24	Difference
26.2%	(3.3%)

Satisfaction Index Results for Overall:

The Satisfaction Index Results for FY25 indicate an overall improvement in scores.

The Overall Score increased from 73.0 in FY24 to **74.1** in FY25, the Property Score from 71.7 to **72.0**, and the Service Score showed a greater improvement, rising from 73.8 to **75.7**, thereby moving to the low range of the "Good" category.

Satisfaction Indexes					
Index	FY25	FY24	Var.	5 Point Score FY25	CEL Rating FY25
Overall	74.1	73.0	1.1	3.71	Average
Property	72.0	71.7	0.3	3.60	Average
Service	75.7	73.8	1.9	3.79	Good

Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

Business Success Factors ("BSFs") Results:

The Business Success Factors ("BSFs") results for FY25 highlight significant insights into functional performance, identifying areas of high satisfaction and those requiring targeted improvements. Of the nine BSFs scores improved for five, showing some progress in several key areas.

BSF #8 – Relationship Rating had the largest increase, rising 4.6 points to **77.1**, reflecting better service received and courtesy and respect with which tenants are treated.

BSF #2 – Responsiveness & Follow Through had the lowest rating at **68.7**, or 3.44 out of 5, dropping 2.8 points. This BSF covers responsiveness and follow-through from the management and staff.

Business Success Factors						
Factor		FY25	FY24	Var.	5 Point Score FY25	CEL Rating FY25
1 - Readiness to Solve Problems	↑	73.9	72.8	1.1	3.70	Average
2 - Responsiveness & Follow Through		68.7	71.5	(2.8)	3.44	B. Average
3 - Property Appearance & Condition	↑	71.2	69.1	2.1	3.56	Average
4 - Quality of Management Services	↑	75.1	71.1	4.0	3.76	Good
5 - Quality of Leasing Services		77.7	79.9	(2.2)	3.89	Good
6 - Quality of Maintenance Services	=	78.0	78.0	0.0	3.90	Good
7 - Property Rating		72.3	73.1	(0.8)	3.62	Average
8 - Relationship Rating	↑	77.1	72.5	4.6	3.86	Good
9 - Renewal Intention	↑	72.0	68.9	3.1	3.60	Average

Arrow up indicates increase.

Overall Comparison by Directorate:

The Satisfaction Indexes by Directorate range from a high Overall Score of **87.2** for Training to a low of 70.5 for Europe. All six Directorates rated in the Outstanding to Average in Overall Satisfaction.

Note: The Other Leased and Training Directorates are each comprised of one Neighborhood (Camp Shelby and Eisenhower respectively).

Line	Directorate	Surveys			Satisfaction Scores			# of Installations	Overall CEL Score Rating
		Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.	Overall	Property	Service		
1	EUROPE O&L	6,743	1,404	20.8%	70.5	68.2	72.4	7	Average
2	OTHER LEASED	43	35	81.4%	84.4	84.0	84.8	1	Very Good
3	PACIFIC	2,123	580	27.3%	81.0	79.6	81.7	4	Very Good
4	READINESS	92	35	38.0%	86.4	80.8	88.6	1	Outstanding
5	SUSTAINMENT	86	26	30.2%	83.4	76.1	87.5	2	Very Good
6	TRAINING	8	6	75.0%	87.2	80.9	91.4	1	Outstanding

Current and Prior Scores by Overall and Directorate:

The Army FH portfolio consists of six Directorates, with Europe being the largest, encompassing seven Installations and 6,743 tenants. Europe is the only Directorate with a Satisfaction Index below 70.0. However, the Overall and Service Satisfaction Indexes showed improvement in FY24 and FY25. In FY25, the Overall Score increased by 1.1, and the Service Score increased by 2.2 points.

The remaining five Directorates have Overall Scores ranging from 81.0 to 87.2.

Portfolio Report Name	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			Response Rate		
	FY25	FY24	Var	FY25	FY24	Var	FY25	FY24	Var	FY25	FY24	Var
Army Owned & Leased	74.1	73.0	1.1	72.0	71.7	0.3	75.7	73.8	1.9	22.9%	26.2%	(3.3%)
Europe Owned & Leased	70.5	69.4	1.1	68.2	68.2	0.0	72.4	70.2	2.2	20.8%	25.8%	(5.0%)
Other Leased	84.4	84.9	(0.5)	84.0	83.8	0.2	84.8	84.9	(0.1)	81.4%	61.8%	19.6%
Pacific	81.0	83.5	(2.5)	79.6	82.2	(2.6)	81.7	84.1	(2.4)	27.3%	25.5%	1.8%
Readiness	86.4	82.3	4.1	80.8	76.2	4.6	88.6	86.0	2.6	38.0%	41.8%	(3.8%)
Sustainment	83.4	84.8	(1.4)	76.1	83.7	(7.6)	87.5	84.4	3.1	30.2%	37.7%	(7.5%)
Training	87.2	81.8	5.4	80.9	78.5	2.4	91.4	85.2	6.2	75.0%	83.3%	(8.3%)

Color grids have been used for visual representation of the high, median, and low range of data for each Satisfaction Index. All scores are based on a 1-100 score rating or 1-5. Scores are not a representation of percentages of a surveyed population.

Score Ratings	
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

Overall Project Status by Number of Installations:

Out of 16 Installations, **75.0%** (12 Installations) achieved an Overall Score in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average categories (ranging from 100.0 to 70.0), whereas **25.0%** (4 Installations) fell into the Below Average range (69.9 to 65.0) or lower.

Key highlights include:

- 6 Installations (37.5%) recorded improvements or had no change in the Overall Satisfaction Index.
- 10 Installations (62.5%) experienced a decline in the Overall Satisfaction Index.
- 7 Installations (43.8%) showed progress in the Service Satisfaction Index.

Metric	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score
Based on 16 Installations	Percent			Count		
Increased Scores or No Change	37.5%	50.0%	43.8%	6	8	7
Decreased Scores	62.5%	50.0%	56.2%	10	8	9
Rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0)	75.0%	68.8%	81.3%	12	11	13
Rated in Below Average range or lower (69.9 thru 0.0)	25.0%	31.2%	18.7%	4	5	3

Overall Project Status by Number of Neighborhoods:

Out of the 111 Neighborhoods with surveys returned, 87 (**78.4%**) were rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 through 70.0) for Overall Satisfaction. On the other hand, **24** Neighborhoods (21.6%) fell into the Below Average or lower category. A more detailed assessment at the Installation and Neighborhood level is recommended to fully analyze tenant satisfaction.

Analyzing these results at various levels offers a clearer method to address tenant issues. For instance, lower satisfaction scores in a Neighborhood may point to specific problems like maintenance delays or pest issues that are not widespread. This detailed analysis allows for targeted improvements, ultimately enhancing overall satisfaction.

Metric	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score	Overall Score	Property Score	Service Score
Based on 111* Neighborhoods	Percent			Count		
Increased Scores or No Change	52.7%	49.1%	59.1%	58	54	65
Decreased Scores	47.3%	50.9%	40.9%	52	56	45
Rated in the Outstanding, Very Good, Good, or Average ranges (100.0 thru 70.0)	78.4%	71.2%	81.1%	87	79	90
Rated in Below Average range or lower (69.9 thru 0.0)	21.6%	28.8%	18.9%	24	32	21

*Note: This project had 114 Neighborhoods. Score change calculations are based on 110 Neighborhoods because three Neighborhoods had no surveys returned and one Neighborhood had no prior scores. Score range numbers are based on 111 Neighborhoods because three Neighborhoods had no surveys returned.

Score Ratings	
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

Key Questions

The questions chosen cover satisfaction with service levels, property maintenance, home conditions, interior/exterior features, health and safety, and the likelihood of recommending the housing.

Observations:

- Problems reported to management follow-up scored **68.7**
- Service level and quality overall scored **74.0**
- Follow-up on maintenance requests increased to **70.9**
- Overall condition of the home scored **73.7**
- Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.) rated **68.3**
- Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.) scored lowest at **66.5**

Note: Several questions were revised between FY24 and FY25, but a comparison was made to previous scores where the intent remained unchanged.

Question as Listed on the Survey	Satisfied 5/4s	Neutral 3s	Dissatisfied 2/1s	No Opinion	CEL Score	5 Point Score
Service Related						
3c. Follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved (Re: Management)	51.6%	16.4%	26.8%	5.2%	68.7	3.43
3d. Courtesy and respect with which you are treated	75.8%	12.5%	9.1%	2.7%	83.2	4.16
3e. Frequency of contact and clarity of communications. (Re: Management)	57.9%	18.4%	19.7%	4.0%	72.9	3.65
3f. Overall level and quality of service you are receiving in housing	62.8%	14.2%	20.7%	2.3%	74.0	3.70
Maintenance						
4b. General work order or maintenance request completion time	66.4%	9.6%	21.5%	2.5%	75.5	3.77
4c. Quality of maintenance work	69.6%	12.2%	15.5%	2.8%	78.6	3.93
4d. Follow-up on maintenance requests to ensure satisfaction	52.5%	18.6%	23.3%	5.6%	70.9	3.54
Home – Interior/Exterior and Condition						
5a. Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	53.3%	12.2%	33.5%	1.0%	66.5	3.32
5b. Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	56.8%	12.0%	30.4%	0.8%	68.3	3.42
5d. Overall current condition	64.1%	15.3%	19.8%	0.7%	73.7	3.69
Would Recommend						
7d. I would recommend this housing community to others assigned to this installation.	62.7%	11.6%	23.5%	2.2%	73.2	3.66
Satisfaction with Home including Health and Safety						
8a. Your current home/unit	69.0%	9.3%	21.3%	0.5%	74.9	3.74
8b. The health and safety of your Home	69.8%	10.6%	18.1%	1.4%	77.2	3.86

Top and Bottom Five Scoring Questions(Owned and Leased):

CEL reviewed the Top and Bottom scoring questions for the FY25 Tenant Survey.

Results at an Installation or Neighborhood level can vary significantly and therefore it should not be assumed that the Overall Results are representative of a single Installation. Reporting and associated comments should be reviewed down to a Neighborhood level to isolate top issues and areas of greatest need or focus.

Key Observations:

The top five scoring questions range from **86.7 to 78.8** and include areas such as courtesy of maintenance and management, safety and security features of the home/unit, and ease of the renewal process.

The questions order changed but the areas of highest satisfaction are similar to the FY24 survey.

Top 5 Scoring Questions		
Question	Score	BSF
4a) Courtesy of maintenance personnel	86.7	6
2a) Safety of your home/unit	84.0	Not Coded
3d) Courtesy and respect with which you are treated (by Management)	83.2	8
6b) The lease renewal process	79.0	5
2b) Security features of your home/unit	78.8	Not Coded

Scores are based on a 1-100 score rating. Scores are not percentages of the surveyed population.

The bottom five scoring questions range from **68.7 to 65.5** and include areas such as Follow-up after a problem is reported, condition of common areas, exterior and interior features/services, and awareness of the dispute process.

More education is needed regarding awareness of the dispute process as over 1,100 tenants scored 3 or below for this question with 10% (219) having no opinion (0).

Bottom 5 Scoring Questions		
Question	Score	BSF
3c) Follow-up after a problem is reported to be sure that it has been resolved	68.7	2
5b) Interior features (flooring, fixtures, cabinetry, etc.)	68.3	7
1b) Condition of the common areas (parking, sidewalks, playgrounds, etc.)	67.5	3
5a) Exterior features (landscaping, pest control, etc.)	66.5	7
7f) I am aware of the formal dispute resolution process and how to access it, if needed	65.5	Not Coded

Scores are based on a 1-100 score rating. Scores are not percentages of the surveyed population.

Note: Non-coded questions are assessed separately and do not impact the Business Success Factors. These questions are usually designed to gather feedback on specific topics without affecting overall satisfaction levels.

Business Success Factor Key

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 - Readiness to Solve Problems | 6 - Quality of Maintenance |
| 2 - Responsiveness & Follow Through | 7 - Property Rating |
| 3 - Property Appearance & Condition | 8 - Relationship Rating |
| 4 - Quality of Management Services | 9 - Renewal/Referral Intention |
| 5 - Quality of Leasing/Housing Office | |

Tenant Feedback Overview

This section provides an overview of tenant comments, categorized into positive and negative feedback. It is important to note that while the data may not present the entire picture at specific Installations or Neighborhoods it offers valuable insights at the overall portfolio level. For example, issues like "pest control" may not be pervasive across all Installations but are significant at specific locations.

Positive Feedback:

- Convenience: Some tenants appreciate the proximity to schools and the convenience of dual voltage and not having to deal with house bills.
- Professionalism: The service crews were quick and professional in completing repairs.
- Community: The community is peaceful and calm, with neighbors who help each other.
- Maintenance: Some tenants have had positive experiences with maintenance, noting that issues were resolved promptly.
- Housing Office Support: The housing office staff are described as friendly and responsive.

Negative Feedback:

- Overcrowding and Outdated Facilities: Some described as overcrowded, outdated, and subpar.
- Parking Issues: There is a lack of adequate parking spaces for tenants.
- Pet Waste: There are complaints about the lack of dog waste stations and tenants not cleaning up after their pets.
- Maintenance Delays: Follow-ups on maintenance requests are often late, and contractors are described as rude.
- Housing Allocation: There are issues with housing allocation, with some tenants feeling that the process is unfair.
- Safety Concerns: Speeding in certain areas and issues with external security are mentioned.
- Living Conditions: Some tenants describe their living conditions as depressing.
- Trash Management: The trash system is inadequate, with infrequent pickups leading to overflow.
- Cleanliness: Common areas and apartments are often dirty upon move-in.
- Noise and Disruptions: There are complaints about noise from neighbors and unsupervised children.

While valuable insights emerge from this feedback, it is essential to note that these comments may not fully capture the diversity of experiences across the various locations.

CEL utilized Co-pilot generative AI, which includes commercial data protection and is licensed to CEL, to populate this data. Additionally, the CEL team conducted a high-level review of the comments to ensure accuracy and relevance.

B. Scores and Rating by Installation

Response Rates by Installation:

A minimum goal of 20% was set for the project and each Installation. Falling below this does not automatically invalidate the project or Installation; further review is required for lower response rates.

Out of the 16 Installations, 75.0% (12) met or exceeded the 20% minimum response rate goal. 2 Installations were less than 1% from the 20% goal (Italy and Humphreys).

Observations:

- Seven out of sixteen Installations achieved a response rate greater than **30%**.
- Camp Shelby recorded the highest response rate at **81.4%**.

Upon reviewing the two Installations (Bavaria and Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall) that did not meet the 20% minimum goal and had response rates lower than 19% both were reviewed and found to be reflective of the tenants' opinions.

	<i>Directorate</i>		<i>Installation Name</i>	<i># Dist.</i>	<i>Rec.</i>	<i>% Rec.</i>
1	Europe	1	Ansbach	522	108	20.7%
		2	Bavaria	2,825	441	15.6%
		3	Benelux	111	43	38.7%
		4	Italy	383	76	19.8%
		5	Rheinland Pfalz	556	126	22.7%
		6	Stuttgart	1,096	307	28.0%
		7	Wiesbaden	1,250	303	24.2%
				TOTAL	6,743	1,404
2	Other Leased	1	Camp Shelby	43	35	81.4%
			TOTAL	43	35	81.4%
3	Pacific	1	Camp Zama	625	167	26.7%
		2	Daegu	343	156	45.5%
		3	Humphreys	895	173	19.3%
		4	Kwajalein Atoll	260	84	32.3%
			TOTAL	2,123	580	27.3%
4	Readiness	1	Dugway PG	92	35	38.0%
			TOTAL	92	35	38.0%
5	Sustainment	1	Hawthorne AD	32	17	53.1%
		2	Joint Base Myer-Henderson	54	9	16.7%
			TOTAL	86	26	30.2%
6	Training	1	Eisenhower	8	6	75.0%
			TOTAL	8	6	75.0%
	TOTAL			9,095	2,086	22.9%

Color Key: Color Key – Green Font = 30% or higher, and Red Font = Under 20% minimum goal.

Scores and Rating by Installation:

The Installations are presented in order of highest Overall Scores, with a five-point scale added for comparison to CEL scores. Moreover, distinctions are made between Installations with varying operational statuses, such as leased versus owned, to ensure accurate evaluation within their contextual frameworks.

Results for the Overall Score include the following:

- Out of 16 Installations, 75.0% (12) rated from Outstanding to Average (100.0 thru 70.0).
- 18.7% (3) Installations rated Below Average (69.9 thru 65.0), and 6.3% (1) rated Poor or below (64.9 and below).
- Installations are "Owned" unless otherwise indicated. Bavaria, having both types, is noted as "Owned & Leased".

Line	Installation	Directorate	Rating Scale Overall Score	Overall	Property	Service	% Rec.	5 Point Overall Score
1	EISENHOWER	Training	Outstanding	87.2	80.9	91.4	75.0%	4.36
2	HAWTHORNE AD	Sustainment	Outstanding	86.6	75.7	92.9	53.1%	4.33
3	DUGWAY PG	Readiness	Outstanding	86.4	80.8	88.6	38.0%	4.32
4	DAEGU	Pacific	Outstanding	85.5	85.1	86.3	45.5%	4.28
5	CAMP ZAMA	Pacific	Very Good	84.8	81.0	87.8	26.7%	4.24
6	CAMP SHELBY-LEASED	Other Leased	Very Good	84.4	84.0	84.8	81.4%	4.22
7	HUMPHREYS	Pacific	Good	79.3	78.5	79.6	19.3%	3.97
8	BENELUX-LEASED	Europe	Good	79.1	75.7	82.5	38.7%	3.96
9	MYER-HH	Sustainment	Good	77.4	76.8	78.0	16.7%	3.87
10	BAVARIA-O & L	Europe	Good	75.5	73.8	76.3	15.6%	3.78
11	ITALY	Europe	Average	73.6	71.5	74.7	19.8%	3.68
12	WIESBADEN	Europe	Average	71.0	67.4	74.1	24.2%	3.55
13	RHEINLAND PFALZ	Europe	B. Average	68.8	64.2	73.6	22.7%	3.44
14	KWAJALEIN ATOLL	Pacific	B. Average	67.9	68.7	65.2	32.3%	3.40
15	STUTTGART	Europe	B. Average	65.4	64.4	66.8	28.0%	3.27
16	ANSBACH	Europe	Poor	59.1	57.9	60.7	20.7%	2.96

Score Ratings

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 and Rating by Installation, Sorted by Directorate

The Installations are sorted by Directorate and include all current and prior scores by the Overall, Property and Service Score and Response Rate. Moreover, distinctions are made between Installations with varying operational statuses, such as leased versus owned, to ensure accurate evaluation within their contextual frameworks.

Observations Include:

- Six Installations showed improvement in the Overall Score, eight in the Property Score, and seven in the Service Score.
- Eisenhower experienced a 5.4-point increase in the Overall Score and a 6.2 increase in the Service Score.
- Myer-HH had a 5.8-point decrease in Overall Score and a 7.8-point decrease in Property Score. This Installation should be reviewed down to the comment level to determine why the scoring dropped so significantly.

Line	Directorate	Installation	Overall Score			Property Score			Service Score			Response Rate		
			FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.	FY25	FY24	Var.	Dist.	Rec.	% Rec.
1	Europe	ANSBACH	59.1	62.8	(3.7)	57.9	64.3	(6.4)	60.7	61.6	(0.9)	522	108	20.7%
2	Europe	BAVARIA-O & L	75.5	73.2	2.3	73.8	72.4	1.4	76.3	73.2	3.1	2,825	441	15.6%
3	Europe	BENELUX-LEASED	79.1	75.2	3.9	75.7	71.7	4.0	82.5	78.3	4.2	111	43	38.7%
4	Europe	ITALY-LEASED	73.6	77.2	(3.6)	71.5	76.1	(4.6)	74.7	77.4	(2.7)	383	76	19.8%
5	Europe	RHEINLAND PFALZ	68.8	69.3	(0.5)	64.2	64.0	0.2	73.6	74.2	(0.6)	556	126	22.7%
6	Europe	STUTTGART	65.4	62.7	2.7	64.4	64.2	0.2	66.8	61.6	5.2	1,096	307	28.0%
7	Europe	WIESBADEN	71.0	69.3	1.7	67.4	65.8	1.6	74.1	72.0	2.1	1,250	303	24.2%
8	Other Leased	CAMP SHELBY-LEASED	84.4	84.9	(0.5)	84.0	83.8	0.2	84.8	84.9	(0.1)	43	35	81.4%
9	Pacific	CAMP ZAMA	84.8	88.2	(3.4)	81.0	86.8	(5.8)	87.8	89.4	(1.6)	625	167	26.7%
10	Pacific	DAEGU	85.5	87.8	(2.3)	85.1	85.3	(0.2)	86.3	89.7	(3.4)	343	156	45.5%
11	Pacific	HUMPHREYS	79.3	80.1	(0.8)	78.5	78.9	(0.4)	79.6	80.3	(0.7)	895	173	19.3%
12	Pacific	KWAJALEIN ATOLL	67.9	70.7	(2.8)	68.7	72.1	(3.4)	65.2	68.2	(3.0)	260	84	32.3%
13	Readiness	DUGWAY	86.4	82.1	4.3	80.8	76.0	4.8	88.6	86.0	2.6	92	35	38.0%
14	Sustainment	HAWTHORNE AD	86.6	89.0	(2.4)	75.7	81.3	(5.6)	92.9	91.9	1.0	32	17	53.1%
15	Sustainment	MYER-HH	77.4	83.2	(5.8)	76.8	84.6	(7.8)	78.0	81.7	(3.7)	54	9	16.7%
16	Training	EISENHOWER	87.2	81.8	5.4	80.9	78.5	2.4	91.4	85.2	6.2	8	6	75.0%

Color grids have been used for visual representation of the high, median, and low range of data for each Satisfaction Index.

Score Ratings	
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

Key Questions by Installation

These questions were identified as key indicators for evaluating tenant satisfaction, allowing for a deeper understanding of strengths and opportunities for improvement in housing services.

By focusing on specific questions that gauge the overall experience – from the condition of homes to the responsiveness of management – patterns emerge that highlight both achievements and areas requiring improvement.

The following questions were selected as an overview of areas of tenant satisfaction.

- Q8a. Your current home/unit.
- Q5d. Overall condition of your home.
- Q3f. Overall level and quality of services received.
- Q1a. Overall condition and visual appeal of housing.

For these questions, CEL used the percentage of dissatisfied and highlighted areas of 25% in red font and highlight.

By examining responses and identifying patterns in dissatisfaction, especially those marked at or above the critical 25% threshold – it becomes possible to target specific interventions.

Dissatisfied = a selection of a 2 or 1 response choice for that question. N/A excluded.

Directorate	Installation	Q8a. Dissatisfied Home	Q5d. Home Condition	Q3f. Services Overall	Q1a. Community
Europe	Ansbach	42.3%	38.5%	42.5%	40.0%
Europe	Bavaria-O & L	17.0%	15.0%	20.1%	22.6%
Europe	Benelux- Leased	14.8%	16.0%	23.1%	15.4%
Other Leased	Camp Shelby-Leased	4.8%	0.0%	14.3%	4.8%
Pacific	Camp Zama	4.3%	6.4%	5.1%	5.4%
Pacific	Daegu	5.8%	8.8%	5.0%	5.8%
Readiness	Dugway PG	11.1%	19.4%	8.6%	13.9%
Training	Eisenhower	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Sustainment	Hawthorne AD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Pacific	Humphreys	9.7%	14.4%	13.6%	10.0%
Europe	Italy-Leased	22.4%	13.8%	18.1%	18.3%
Pacific	Kwajalein Atoll	18.4%	11.1%	22.9%	26.3%
Sustainment	Myer-HH	15.8%	11.1%	26.3%	15.8%
Europe	Rheinland	28.3%	32.3%	22.4%	32.7%
Europe	Stuttgart	32.5%	33.6%	39.4%	30.4%
Europe	Wiesbaden	29.0%	30.9%	22.9%	29.8%

D. Awards – Army Family Housing

All Military Housing locations surveyed are eligible to participate in the CEL National Award Program for Service Excellence. This award recognizes those private sector and military housing Neighborhoods and/or Installations/Firms that provide an excellent level of service to tenants.

Installation Crystal Award Winners

Two (2) Installations achieved a Crystal Service Award for FY25. Sorted below by highest scores.

Line	Directorate	Installation	Service Score	
			FY25	% Rec.
1	Readiness	Dugway	88.6	38.0%
2	Pacific	Camp Zama	87.8	26.7%

Honorable Mention: The Installations below qualified with Service Scores and Response Rates but are not multi-neighborhood Installations as per the criteria. Each did achieve Neighborhood level awards.

Line	Directorate	Installation	Service Score
1	Sustainment	Hawthorne AD	92.9
2	Training	Eisenhower	91.4
3	Pacific	Daegu	86.3

Neighborhoods Achieving a Platinum or A List Neighborhood Award:

Neighborhood A List Awards

A List Award: Sixteen (16) Neighborhoods

Platinum A List Award: Two (2) Neighborhoods

Note: CEL does not round up for reporting or Award purposes.

Award Eligibility by Type of Award

Installation Crystal Award Eligibility:

To be award eligible, an Installation must have more than one Neighborhood, a consolidated Service Index Score of at least 85.0 and a Response Rate of at least 20%.

Neighborhood Awards Eligibility

To be award eligible a Neighborhood must meet the following criteria:

- A List Award: Service Satisfaction Index Score of at least 85.0, and a Response Rate of at least 20%.
- Platinum Award: Service Satisfaction Index Score of at least 92.7 (varies annually), and a Response Rate of at least 20%.

Addendum A

The Survey Process: CEL worked with the Army to set up the survey process and obtain information on each Neighborhood to be surveyed within each Installation. CEL utilized the survey questions provided within the OSD Directive for the Army survey. All surveys were completed online.

- ♦ All military used the same question set for FY25.
- ♦ Army Representatives had access to the CEL Online Reporting.
- ♦ The survey was confidential and anonymous.

- ♦ **Distribution:** CEL distributed 9,095 surveys to tenants living in Army Family Housing. There were a total of **114** Neighborhoods within **16** Installations.
- ♦ **Population:** The survey was distributed to one tenant per household living On-Base at the time of the survey launch.
- ♦ **Confidentiality:** The survey results are confidential and anonymous. Only CEL has access to the results of any individual survey. Reporting is only provided in summarized format.
- ♦ **Online Survey:** A survey invitation was sent **via email** to all tenants being surveyed and **via text** to those tenants that opted in to receive text messaging. The **text opt-in** was available during the duration of the open survey cycle. **Each email or text included a unique link to the online survey.** Up to ten email reminders, which included the survey link, were then sent out to non-respondents at seven-day intervals. CEL provided an email address for tenant assistance and for all survey methods verified residency prior to providing survey access.
- ♦ **Quality Control:** The unique survey link was associated with a specific tenant address within a Neighborhood to ensure each currently occupied home only completed one survey, thus ensuring quality control and a consistent distribution methodology.
- ♦ **Survey Process and Reporting:** The CEL reporting includes access to Response Rates, Questions Scores, and tenant Comments during the open survey cycle. Once the project is closed and reports are prepared, all reporting is uploaded to the CEL Online Reporting site for retrieval.
- ♦ **Survey Timing:** Because of the timing of the surveys, there may be discrepancies between the fiscal and calendar years. The REACT reports and accompanying materials reference the calendar year in which the survey was conducted. Please use the cross-reference table below to correlate the time periods:

Fiscal Year	Calendar Report Year
FY25	2025
FY24	2024
FY23	2022
FY22	2021
FY21	2020
FY20	2019 (2)

Addendum B

Analytics: For the purpose of assessing tenant opinions, CEL has developed a proprietary scoring system. Tenants 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 Army FH Overall, Directorate, Installation, or single Neighborhood is performing.

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



Reporting: CEL prepared consolidated reports by Overall Army Family Housing, Directorate, and Installation, as well as for each Individual Neighborhood within an Installation. Additional reporting included pre-populated Action Plan templates at the Installation level.

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

Scoring is calculated scores of 1-100. Not a percentile. Example of 1-100 scoring converted to 5 point would be 80 divided by 20 = 4.0.

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 a direct comparison of all surveys conducted by CEL for purposes of comparative data and in-depth trending analysis.

Evaluating Scores

The CEL & Associates, Inc. scoring system provides a consistent methodology for evaluating survey results. Satisfaction Indexes, Business Success Factors and individual evaluation questions are all scored in the same manner, for ease of isolating high-performance areas and identifying problem areas.

Scores can be interpreted in the following ranges:

- **Scores from 100 to 85 ("Outstanding")** - Any Satisfaction Index, Business Success Factor, or question score of 85 or greater is considered to be outstanding. The management team should be commended for providing excellence in service, while Asset Management is to be applauded for providing the resources necessary to keep the property in outstanding condition and market competitive.
- **Scores from 84 to 80 ("Very Good")** - Scores in this range are approaching the very best and the management team should be recognized for their efforts. While only a few points below Outstanding, scores in this category typically mean that while most tenants are very satisfied, others feel that more could be done. Special attention should be given to any areas where ratings are below "4".
- **Scores from 79 to 75 ("Good")** - Scores in this range tend to reflect a steady, stable, and consistent level of satisfaction and performance with clear opportunities for improvement. The primary indicator of whether these scores will rise is the capacity and desire to take advantage of these opportunities. Improving these scores requires maintaining current efforts, while giving special attention to those specific REACT questions receiving the fewest ratings of "5".
- **Scores from 74 to 70 ("Average")** - Scores in this range generally reflect some satisfaction with the service or property features being evaluated, but the complete standards and expectations of the tenants are not being met. Taking action in these areas can remove obstacles to tenants feeling Very Satisfied.
- **Scores from 69 to 65 ("Below Average")** - Scores in this range generally mean that performance is just not adequate and indicate areas of necessary improvement. CEL & Associates, Inc. believes it is important to strive for clear satisfaction, not just an absence of dissatisfaction, and therefore find scores in this range are a definite area of concern.
- **Scores from 64 to 60 ("Poor")** - Scores in this range signify substandard performance and strong displeasure with the property and/or the level of service. Improvements are needed immediately. Tenant expectations are significantly different from their perceptions of the property and/or service provided. Corrective measures taken soon will prevent the scores from dropping into a category where significantly more time and expense is necessary to improve them.
- **Scores from 59 to 55 ("Very Poor")** - Scores in this range are over 25 points below the scores received by the best in the industry. Corrective measures need a strong commitment, as improvements will require significant focus, time and resources. Scores in this range are not the result of a few dissatisfied tenants, but an expression of a majority of tenants. Remediation of each problem area is essential if the property is to improve its financial and operational performance.
- **Scores below 55 ("Crisis")** - When a significant majority of the tenants at a property fail to indicate a positive response, there is a major problem that must be addressed immediately. Corrective measures must be taken without delay. Improvements to areas receiving these low scores generally involve much more than a policy, staffing, or cosmetic change to the property. Significant, noticeable improvements must be made immediately to improve all areas with scores below 60.

To better understand the issues impacting tenant satisfaction, it is essential to review reporting and associated comments at the Neighborhood level within an Installation/Neighborhood.