Building Services

2012 Assessment Report

Contracted-Outsourced Custodial Service/In-house Custodial Services

Expected Outcome
All University buildings are cleaned in an effective manner.

Assessment Method I
Contracted-Outsourced Custodial Services/Buildings Services released a survey to our campus clients to gauge how efficient and effective our custodial staff is performing their tasks. On-line Survey Link: https://auburn.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8nP4MTsO0W1YBhz

The survey was broken down into 5 sections:
Section 1: Cleaning Areas (on a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the highest) – 5 questions
Section 2: Quality of Job Performance (Very Displeased to Very Pleased) – 6 questions
Section 3: Client Knowledge of Custodial Services (Yes or No) – 3 questions
Section 4: Client Expectations (Once a week, 2 times a week & Every Other Day) – 1 question
Section 5: Potential Change in Custodial Services Tasks (Yes or No) – 2 questions

The survey was administered campus wide and a total of 86 responses were received for Contracted- Outsourced Custodial Services and 54 responses were received for In-house Custodial Services. For this assessment, we are focusing on Sections 1 & 2 of the survey because these sections specifically touch on the efficiency and quality at which our staff performs their tasks.

Section 1 asked 5 questions about different areas of a building where the custodial staff perform daily duties. Each question was rated on a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the highest rating. To analyze the results from this section we grouped the ratings as follows:
1-4 (below average)
5-6 (average)
7-10 (above average)

If we received an average rating below a 5-6, we flagged this question so we can go back and work with our supervisors and staff to identify ways to improve the quality of work in the areas our clients feel we are deficient. Question 4 in Section 1 does not apply to in-house custodial services. Our staff does not clean parking decks, so this question was not analyzed.

Assessment Method II
Contracted-Outsourced Custodial Services and In-house Custodial Services collected the data from the survey from section 2 to determine how pleased the clients are with the custodial services in their areas. The following scale was used:
very displeased – somewhat displeased (below average)
Neutral – (average)
somewhat pleased - very pleased (above average)
**Findings I (In-House Custodial Services)**

For Section 1 in our survey, our average scores were as follows:

1. Cleaning Services in your office? – 5.5
2. Cleaning services in your restrooms? – 5.5
3. Cleaning services in your classrooms/auditoriums? – 3.2
4. Cleaning services of the parking decks? – 3.2 (This service is not conducted by in-house staff)
5. Overall cleaning service in your building? – 5.2

For questions 1 & 2, we had an average score of 5.5. This score meets our cleaning requirements, but also lets us know that there is room for improvement. For question 3, we had a below average score of 3.2. Since this was a below average score, we understand that this is an area we will need to give immediate attention to in all of our academic buildings. For question 5, which looked at our overall cleaning services, we scored a 5.5, which was an average score for our services.

**Findings I (Contracted-Outsourced Custodial Services)**

For Section 1 our survey, our average scores were as follows:

1. Cleaning Services in your office? -7.9
2. Cleaning services in your restrooms? -8.3
3. Cleaning services in your classrooms/auditoriums? 6.1
4. Cleaning services of the parking decks? -4.9
5. Overall cleaning service in your building? -8.3

For questions: 1 we had an average score of 7.9. This score meets our cleaning requirements. For question 2 we had an average score of 8.3. This score meets our cleaning requirements. For question 3 we had an average score of 6.1. This score meets our cleaning requirements, but also lets us know that there is room for improvement. For question 4 our score was below average score of 4.9. Since this was a below average score, we understand that this is an area we will continue to monitor for immediate attention in all academic buildings. For question 5 we had an average score of 8.3. This score meets our cleaning requirements.

**Improvements I (In-House Custodial Services)**

Based on our survey results from section 1, we scored above average in all but two questions. While these scores met our basic level of cleaning services, we would like to raise these scores to a 7 or above. Below are the following steps we are taking to improve the overall cleaning score:
- Clearly outline our routine and special cleaning services to our campus clients on our website & AU Daily
- Work with individual building contacts to relay our cleaning services guidelines
- Comment cards distributed 2x/year where we request feedback

**Improvements I (Outsourced-Custodial Services)**

Based on our survey results from section 1, we scored average in all but one question. While this score met our basic level of cleaning services, we would like to raise this score to a 7 or above. Below are the following steps we would like to take in order to raise this score:
- Clearly outline our routine and special cleaning services to our campus clients on our website & AU Daily
- Continue to work with custodial contractor and monitor services provided by and require them to be consistent in cleaning services methods
- Comment cards distributed 2x/year to request feedback
Mail Services

Expected Outcome:
Improve campus mail accessibility and services.

Auburn University Campus Mail Services purchased two postal kiosk machines to make mailing letters and packages more convenient for faculty, staff & students. The kiosks were advertised throughout the year via several press releases. The postal kiosks permitted users to weigh packages and purchase postage. They have made mailing packages and purchasing stamps more simple and convenient for our clients.

Assessment methods:
Campus Mail Services tracked daily kiosk volumes, including total letters, total parcels and postage purchases over a twelve month period. Based on Pitney Bowes Service Transaction Breakdown Report, we found the kiosks were very useful for our clients.

Findings:
After placement of each kiosk, we surveyed the daily increase of letters and parcels picked-up from each machine. The peak time usage determined daily pick up times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kiosk #1 Location:</th>
<th>Student Center, 255 Heisman Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total letters and parcels:</td>
<td>12,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage Purchases:</td>
<td>$11,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak time usage:</td>
<td>10 a.m. – 2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
<td>April 1, 2012 – March 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of findings for improvements:
Considering Auburn University’s overall growth, Campus Mail Services researched new and efficient ways to serve our customers through expansion. Campus Mail Services purchased kiosks to satisfy clients desire for a 24/7 on-campus mailing system. Campus Mail Services:

- Surveyed the increase in the daily number of letters and parcels picked-up from each kiosk
- Studied peak time usage and determined our daily pick up times
- Presented 100% growth and zero complaints

Furthermore, Campus Mail Services concluded that the kiosks brought to campus a new and fully utilized service. Campus Mail Services studied the successful placement of the first two kiosks. In turn, Campus Mail Services:

- Purchased a third kiosk following a successful utilization rate and placement results of the first two kiosks
- Increased our outreach efforts to students and their families through a Camp War Eagle marketing campaign that included new booth signage and newly designed brochures
Service Support

**Expected Outcomes:**
Service Support clients will be satisfied with services received from Service Support and services are performed safely.

**Assessment Methods:**
Method: Track the customer’s satisfaction with our services through surveys.
Survey\(^1\) customers concerning satisfaction of services provided from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012. A pool of 42 customers representing colleges, schools and various departments on campus were asked to complete the survey ([https://adobeformscentral.com/?f=RHAPXZKeEJP60a5vJZIIEcg](https://adobeformscentral.com/?f=RHAPXZKeEJP60a5vJZIIEcg)). The survey received input from 26 customers. Safety performance tracked with safety manager reports.

**Findings:**
Noted areas customers were most satisfied and least satisfied with and were able to determine our strengths and weaknesses.

**Strengths:**
80% of customers surveyed responded they were “Very Satisfied” and 20% were “Satisfied” with services provided\(^2\). No responses were “Neutral, Unsatisfied, or Very Unsatisfied”. 73% of surveyed customers selected “Customer Service” when asked; “What aspect of the product/service were you most satisfied by?” Comments from the customer survey also noted Service Support is “professional”, “respectful”, “efficient”, and “flexible”.
All customers surveyed noted services provided were performed in a safe manner. Safety Manager for Facilities Management noted there were zero accidents for Service Support for operating year 2012.

**Weaknesses:**
There were four comments providing feedback concerning some aspect they did not like about the service. Two of the four comments concerned the accuracy of work order processing, “When calling a work order sometimes the information is not relayed correctly”. One comment concerned clients not knowing when the work would be performed after the work order is submitted, “My only concern is never knowing when the work order will be processed, or what day it is slated for which is difficult for planning purposes”. Another comment concerned the departments capacity to provide services in a timely manner during peak service periods such as football season, “This service is always at a critical demand and can force some time issues”.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

Improve customer satisfaction by communicating with customers concerning their work request to define expectations. Keep Facilities Management Help Desk updated with dates that are booked so overbookings do not occur. This will decrease schedule conflicts and allow customers time to adjust their schedule or develop alternate plans if necessary. Short lead time customer requests are most impacted during peak demand periods but also during normal demand periods because they do not have time to re-adjust their plans. Service Support is able to accommodate most short lead time requests and reschedule work with other customers with lower priority requests. This allows for short lead time requests to be performed except during the peak demand periods. Some short lead time requests are turned down in order to maintain continuity with requests that were submitted and planned with sufficient lead time.

**Additional Comments:**
Service Support will continue to use surveys to track customer satisfaction.

---

\(^1\) See Survey sample link under assessment methods.
\(^2\) See Product Satisfaction graphs (pdf attached).
The safety programs implemented by Service Support and the Safety Manager have a positive impact on the workplace and the university community. Service Support will continue the daily, weekly and monthly aspects of the safety program. Additional supplemental safety training will be pursued e.g. UAB, The Deep South Center for Occupational Health & Safety program holds the Central Alabama Construction Safety Conference & Expo each year in Montgomery, AL. Service Support has sent two technicians each year to the expo for training and they have shared their knowledge with the department.

**Waste Reduction & Recycling Department**

**Expected Outcome:**
All University buildings will utilize efficient recycling practices.

**Assessment Method 1: Analysis of Collection:**
Track recycling\(^3\) and trash\(^4\) collection totals received from monthly vendor invoices and recycling facility scale tickets. Collection totals are tracked by commodity on Excel spreadsheets. All collection totals are tracked in tons\(^5\). The totals, by commodity, are analyzed every 6 months (October - March and April - September) within each fiscal year (October - September). During each assessment, the previous fiscal year's collection totals are compared with the current fiscal year's totals to assess whether or not there has been an increase or decrease from one year to the next. WRRD is also able to calculate our landfill diversion rate. This rate is a percentage of the overall amount of materials we are diverting from the landfill. (Landfill diversion rate is calculated by taking the recycling collection totals and dividing that number by the sum of the total recycling and trash collection totals for FY12. Total Recycling/(Total Recycling + Total Trash) = % Landfill Diversion.)

**Findings:**
WRRD decreased the amount of total recycling collected from 1,348.92 tons to 1,027.97 tons when comparing the 1st 6 months of FY12 & FY13. This was a 24% decrease in overall recycling. This decrease is primarily due to the 18% reduction of construction waste from 1,071.62 tons in FY12 to 684.70 tons in FY13. Commodities that increase thus far in FY13 include confidential document shredding (66%), mixed paper (77%) and aluminum/plastic/steel (41%). Cardboard dropped 5% from FY12 to FY13. Trash collection totals also dropped by 1% from 2,479.21 tons in FY12 to 2,443.51 tons in FY13. The overall landfill diversion rate decreased by 5% from FY12 (35%) to FY13 (30%).

---

\(^3\) The following recycling commodities are tracked: Mixed Paper, Cardboard, Aluminum/Steel Cans, Plastics (grades 1&2), Scrap Metal, Wood Debris & Construction Materials and Electronics & Batteries. These recycling commodities are collected from all university buildings, dining facilities, residential halls, athletic venues and Facilities Management operations and in-house construction projects.

\(^4\) Trash totals include all solid waste collected from all university buildings, dining facilities, residential halls, athletic venues and Facilities Management operations and in-house construction projects that are disposed of at Waste Management Salem Landfill in Salem, AL.

\(^5\) 1 ton = 2,000 lbs.
Use of Findings for Improvement:
WRRD plans on completing the expansion of our Campus Building Recycling Program by December 2013. With these expansions in place, we should see an increase in the percentage of mixed paper, cardboard and aluminum/plastic/steel recycled from 2nd 6 months of FY12 to FY13. Since WRRD does not have any control over the amount of construction waste, this number could impact the overall landfill diversion rate. Our department’s long-term goal for this diversion rate is 70% by 2031. While our department’s long-term diversion rate is ambitious, we feel confident that we can achieve a 40% diversion rate by the end of 2013.

Assessment Method II: Analysis of Revenue:
Track all revenue generated from selling recyclables to maximize the return on recyclables. Revenue is tracked by commodity by month on an Excel spreadsheet. Compare 6 month revenue totals from current fiscal year with those from the same months for the prior fiscal year to determine the total revenue increase or decrease.

Findings:
WRRD decreased in the amount of total revenue generated from marketing recycling from $29,358 to $23,187 when comparing the 1st 6 months of FY12 & FY13. This was a 21% decrease in overall revenue generated from recycling. This decrease is primarily due to the 92% reduction in revenue from marketing our aluminum and steel containers commingled to the City of Columbus, GA rather than marketing them separately to Waste Recycling in Opelika, AL. WRRD does not receive any revenue from the City of Columbus, GA for the loads of plastics/aluminum/steel we send them. Additional reductions in revenue came from a 38% reduction in revenue from construction waste from $8677.38 in FY12 to $5,335.50 in FY13. Other commodities that showed a decrease in revenue from FY12 to FY13 included cardboard (24%) and toner & ink cartridges (43%). The only commodity that showed an increase in revenue was mixed paper. Mixed paper increased during the 1st 6 months of FY12 in comparison to FY13 from $6,197.77 in FY12 to $8,623.75 in FY13.
Use of Findings for Improvement:

WRRD utilizes local markets (10 miles from campus) to sell most of the recyclable commodities collected from Auburn University. Plastics/aluminum/steel is the only commingled commodities that are marketed to a regional recycler (City of Columbus, GA). Over the next year, WRRD plans to work with other vendors to generate a revenue stream for this commodity. WRRD will continue to research new markets that will pay a higher price per ton for all of the commodities we market. By creating a competitive marketing strategy, WRRD can gain the highest value for the commodities it markets from Auburn University.

Assessment Method III: Recycling Program Quiz and Survey:

The Campus Building Recycling Program Follow-up Plan was piloted in 2012 in Duncan Hall to assess the effectiveness of that building's recycling program. This follow-up plan assesses building occupants and custodial staff's level of participation and awareness of the recycling program. For this assessment, recycling coordinators and students employees conduct a recycling program quiz (see Attachment 1) and survey (see Attachment 2) with five building occupants (staff or faculty members selected at random) from each building on campus. Each participant is given a recycling quiz which tests their ability to correctly identify common acceptable items. WRRD tallies up the answers for each quiz and gives the participant an overall score. This score is tracked on an Excel spreadsheet and the overall quiz score for the building is used to help WRRD identify additional educational efforts needed to increase the knowledge of what to recycle. The recycling survey is conducted at the same time as the quiz with the same building occupants. Each of the five participants are asked six questions about the recycling program to see if they understand what items are recyclable or not. WRRD tallies up the answers for each survey and gives the participant an overall score. The survey results help WRRD determine if we have the correct bin placements or not enough bins in certain areas. We also get feedback on how well the building occupants view the custodial staff's services as they pertain to recycling collection within the building. We also get general feedback about the program that helps us communicate with the building occupants more effectively. Both the quiz and survey scores are averaged together to generate an overall score for the building. This score, along with all other building scores are tracked on an Excel spreadsheet.

Findings:

The Campus Building Recycling Program Follow-up Plan was piloted in Duncan Hall on 12/12/2012. Based on the survey results, 5 out of 5 building occupants were aware of their desk-side recycling bins and 4 out of 5 building occupants were aware of plastic & aluminum recycling bin locations. On the recycling quiz, none of the building occupants scored a perfect 10 for 10 on what items are recyclable or not. The average quiz score for these 5 occupants was 7.8. All 5 building occupants thought that the custodial staff serviced the recycling bins correctly. When asked to rate the custodial staff's level of service on a scale of 1-5 (where 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=average, 4=good & 5=very good) for recycling services they conduct the average rating was 4.2 out of 5. There were comments regarding the level of recycling services the custodial staff provides. One building occupant said...
that the custodial staff doesn't service recycling and the other comment was that their desk-side recycling bin fills up. No building occupants requested additional recycling bins for the building. When asked about additional resources for their building 2 building occupants suggested sending out reminder notifications about the program and the other thought it would be a good idea to e-mail pictures of common recyclables to building occupants so they can better understand what to recycle. The overall score for Duncan Hall was an 85%. As long as building scores do not drop below 80% then we do not make any immediate adjustments to the program for that building, but do try to work with the building occupants and the custodial staff to address certain operational or educational concerns the building occupants expressed during the survey.

Use of Findings for Improvements:
WRRD is in the process of starting the Campus Building Recycling Program Follow-up Plan for each of the buildings that has or will have the Campus Building Recycling Program. Our department’s goal for these follow-up plans is to have at least one evaluation completed for each building by the end of 2013. We would like to improve the score of each campus building to an 80% or higher overall rating by the 2nd follow-up evaluation we conduct during FY14.

Attachment 1 Recycling Program Quiz

Are You an AU Recycling Expert?
Circle the items that are recyclable at Auburn University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plastic SOLO Cups</th>
<th>Glass</th>
<th>File Folders</th>
<th>Plastic Bags</th>
<th>Copy Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junk Mail</td>
<td>Food Wrappers</td>
<td>#1 PETE Plastics</td>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>Food Scraps</td>
<td>Corrugated Cardboard</td>
<td>Paper Cups</td>
<td>Padded Envelopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stickers/Adhesives</td>
<td>Paper Napkins</td>
<td>Styrofoam</td>
<td>#2 HDPE Plastics</td>
<td>Steel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus Building Recycling Follow-Up Survey

Interview 5 building occupants (Document Launch Date & Interview Date):

1. Do you have a DSR bin? (Y/N)
2. Do you know where plastic bottle and aluminum can recycle is located? (Y/N)
3. Have you seen the custodians using 2 different brutes when servicing bins? (Y/N)
4. Please rate the custodial recycling services on a scale of 1:Very Poor, 2:Poor, 3:Average, 4: Good & 5: Very Good
5. Do you need any additional recycling bins? (Y/N – Comment section: 
6. Do you need any additional resources, such as pictures with signs, to better assist you in recycling? (Y/N – Comment section: 

Note: Conduct the same post launch survey 1 month, 6 months & 1 year after initial 1 month survey was conducted.