Expected Outcome 1: Contracted & In-House Custodial Services

Campus clients will positively rate cleaning services provided by contracted and in-house custodial services in their offices, restrooms, classrooms/auditoriums, parking decks, and buildings.

Effective is defined as adequate to accomplish a purpose; producing the intended or expected results. Effective is measured by the following attributes, which are presented on a campus wide survey:

1. Timeliness / Completion
2. Satisfactory / Quality / Efficiency
3. Professionalism
4. Communication

Assessment Method 1: Campus Wide Survey

Assessment Method Description
Contracted Custodial Services/In-house Custodial Services released a survey to our campus clients to gauge how effectively our custodial staff members are performing their cleaning tasks.
The first survey was conducted in April 2013 and the survey findings were reported in the 2012 Assessment Report.
The second survey was conducted in October 2013 and the survey findings were reported in the 2013 Assessment Report.
Both 2012 & 2013 online surveys may be found at the following link: https://auburn.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8nP4MTsO0wiYBhz
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

For Assessment Method 1, we focused on Section 1 of the survey. Contracted and in-house custodial services provide routine cleaning of offices, restrooms, classrooms/auditoriums, parking decks and buildings. The cleaning survey respondents selected which building they occupy. Based on the building selection, the survey results were compiled by: (1) buildings cleaned by custodial contractors, and (2) buildings cleaned by in-house custodial staff. Survey results were sorted over 146 buildings.

Section 1 specifically measures attributes of effectiveness, such as the efficiency and quality at which our contractors and staff perform their tasks.

**Section 1**: The survey asked questions about different areas of a building where the custodial staff performs daily duties, such as how would you rate the cleaning services in your classrooms or in your restrooms. 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)  

**Findings**

The surveys were administered campus wide in April 2013 and October 2013.

From the April 2013 and October 2013 surveys, a total of **86 and 67** responses were received for Contracted- Outsourced Custodial Services, and **54 and 56** responses were received for In-house Custodial Services respectively.
In-House Custodial Services Survey Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custodial Services to be rated</th>
<th>April 2013</th>
<th>October 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cleaning Services in your office</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning Services in your restrooms</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning Services in your classrooms/auditoriums</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cleaning Services of the parking decks</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall cleaning service in your building</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-House Custodial Svcs Ratings on Scale of 1-10

Contracted Custodial Services Survey Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custodial Services to be rated</th>
<th>April 2013</th>
<th>October 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cleaning Services in your office</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning Services in your restrooms</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning Services in your classrooms/auditoriums</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cleaning Services of the parking decks</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall cleaning service in your building</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contracted Custodial Svcs Ratings on Scale of 1-10
How did you use findings for improvement?

If we received an average rating below a 5-6, we flagged the question to review with our supervisors and staff, and identified ways to improve the quality of work in the areas our clients felt were deficient.

**In-House Custodial Services** scored the weakest rating for cleaning in classrooms and auditoriums. To improve cleaning services, In-House Custodial management increased monitoring and building inspections in the buildings that received ratings below a 5-6. Our findings indicated that the cleaning equipment used was insufficient. We ordered additional equipment to perform cleaning tasks. Management reviewed and changed cleaning frequencies in the classrooms and auditoriums.

**Contracted Custodial Services** scored the weakest rating for cleaning parking decks. To improve cleaning services, Building Services management increased monitoring and inspections at the parking decks. Our findings indicated that the cleaning equipment used was underperforming and frequencies were too few. Management coordinated parking deck cleanings with the contractor, the Service Support department, and the Maintenance and Operations department. Higher pressure power wash equipment was used. Management increased cleaning frequencies.

**Additional Comments**

**Assessment Method 2: Campus Wide Survey**

**Assessment Method Description**

Campus clients are satisfied with different aspects of custodial services, including timeliness, response to emergency situations, special event cleaning, dress code, professional conduct, and supervision of custodial personnel.

The first survey was conducted in April 2013 and the survey findings were reported in the 2012 Assessment Report. The second survey was conducted in October 2013 and the survey findings were reported in the 2013 Assessment Report.

For Assessment Method 2, we focused on Section 2 of the survey. Section 2: Quality of Job Performance (Very Displeased to Very Pleased) – 6 questions. Section 2 specifically measures attributes of effectiveness, such as the timeliness and professionalism at which our staff performs their tasks. **Section 2** of the survey provided data to determine how pleased our campus clients are with the custodial services in their areas. Section 2 asked questions such as how pleased are you with the timeliness of custodial


services in your building or the professional conduct of custodial personnel. To analyze the results from this section, we grouped the ratings as follows:

1-3 Very Displeased – Somewhat Displeased (Below Average)
4 Neutral – (Average)
5-7 Somewhat Pleased - Very Pleased (Above Average)

Findings

During 2012, based on our survey results from Section 2, **In-House Custodial Services** scored ‘Above Average’ in all but two questions. During 2013, based on our survey results from Section 1, In-House Custodial Services scored ‘Above Average’ in all but two questions.

During 2012, based on our survey results from Section 2, **Contracted Custodial Services** scored ‘Above Average’ in all but one question. During 2013, based on our survey results from Section 1, Contracted Custodial Services scored ‘Above Average’ in all but one question. The weakest aspect of Custodial Services identified was supervision of personnel, averaging a 5.02 and 3.83 rating, for In-House and Contracted Custodial Services respectively.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**
During the 2013 reporting period, In-House Custodial Services’ received an above average score, in all but two questions, meeting our basic level of cleaning services. During 2013, Contracted Custodial Services received an above average score, in all but one question, meeting our basic level of cleaning services. In-House and Contracted Custodial Services would like to improve and raise all scores to a 7.

To improve the weakest custodial service rating for supervision of personnel, below are the following steps Custodial Services took to improve:

1. Clearly outline our routine and special cleaning services to our campus clients on our website & AU Daily
2. Work with individual building contacts to relay our cleaning services guidelines
3. Additional monitoring of cleaning services was performed. As a result of the findings, Custodial Services implemented a successful Client Public Relation process.
4. Custodial Services ordered additional equipment to perform job duties or tasks.
5. Semi-micro managing of the custodial contracted services was performed during 2013. As a result of the 2012 findings, additional management was hired to monitor the vast number of contract cleaned buildings. Additional monitoring, an industry best practice, will continue in an effort to achieve better results.

Additional Comments

Expected Outcome 2: Mail Services
Postal kiosks purchased by Mailing Services will be utilized efficiently; and the daily kiosk volumes will be maximized.

Assessment Method 1: Tracking Kiosk Volumes

Assessment Method Description
Campus Mail Services tracked daily kiosk volumes, including total letters, parcels and postage purchases during the 2012 and 2013 reporting periods. Analysis of the Pitney Bowes Service Transaction Breakdown Reports, for the 2012 and 2013 reporting periods, resulted in Mail Services determining that the postal kiosk machines were very useful for our clients. During the 2013 reporting period, Campus Mail Services evaluated the utilization rate and placement results of the third kiosk in Foy Hall.

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. In Kiosk #1 and #2 graphs, the 2013 time of day counts are multiplied by 200% to proportionately equal the 2012 reporting period. In the Kiosk #3 graph, the 2013 time of day count is multiplied by 180% to proportionately equal the 2012 reporting period. Determined Kiosk #3 in Foy Hall was underutilized.
**KIOSK#1 LOCATION: Student Center, 255 Heisman Drive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total letters and parcels:</td>
<td>12,160</td>
<td>4,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage purchases:</td>
<td>$11,063</td>
<td>$4,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak time usage:</td>
<td>10 am–2 pm</td>
<td>11 am–3pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kiosk #1 @ Student Center: Peak Time of Day Counts**

![Bar chart showing peak time of day counts for Kiosk #1 at Student Center with volume ranging from 0 to 3000.](chart1)

**KIOSK#2 LOCATION: Vet Med, 217 Overton Rudd**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total letters and parcels:</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage purchases:</td>
<td>$2,442</td>
<td>$807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak times usage:</td>
<td>11 am–2 pm</td>
<td>9am–2 pm &amp; 4pm-5pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kiosk #2 @ Vet Med: Peak Time of Day Counts**

![Bar chart showing peak time of day counts for Kiosk #2 at Vet Med with volume ranging from 0 to 600.](chart2)
How did you use findings for improvement?

While 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 our clients’ desire for a 24/7 on-campus mailing system.

During the 2012 and 2013 reporting periods, Campus Mail Services studied peak time usage and determined our 4:00pm daily pick up times. 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:

1. Purchased a third kiosk following a successful utilization rate and placement results of the first two kiosks during the 2012 reporting period
2. 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 during the 2012 reporting period
3. Moved the third postal kiosk in Foy Hall to a higher foot traffic area, from the front desk on the second floor to the food court on the first floor during the 2013 reporting period

Additional Comments
**Expected Outcome 3: Service Support**
Service Support clients are satisfied with services received while ensuring the services are performed safely.

**Assessment Method 1: Campus Wide Survey**

**Assessment Method Description**
Track customer satisfaction of our services through surveys. Prior responses were reported in the 2012 Assessment Report for services provided for the period January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2012. In 2012, survey customers’ responses were based on satisfaction of services provided. A pool of 42 customers representing colleges, schools and various departments on campus were asked to complete the survey. The survey received input from 26 customers. Safety performance was tracked through safety manager reports.

The 2012 survey may be found at web link, [https://adobeformscentral.com/?f=RHAPXZKeEJP60a5vJZIEcg](https://adobeformscentral.com/?f=RHAPXZKeEJP60a5vJZIEcg)

Current responses were reported in the 2013 Assessment Report for services provided for the period January 1, 2013, to September 30, 2013. The 2013 survey was conducted on October 8, 2013. In 2013, survey customers responded based on satisfaction of services provided. A pool of 46 customers representing colleges, schools and various departments on campus were asked to complete the survey. The survey received input from 25 customers. The 2013 survey may be found at web link, [https://auburn.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?Q_SS=5hGM4PuYtcZdOhn_eL1qU4Tni4Q8pGl&_=1](https://auburn.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?Q_SS=5hGM4PuYtcZdOhn_eL1qU4Tni4Q8pGl&_=1)

Customer satisfaction surveys measure services provided by Service Support by rating communication, timeliness, completion, delivery of services and professionalism. Sample survey questions included the following:

1. Communication – How do you rate the communication with Service Support?
2. Timeliness – Once on site, was the job completed in a timely manner?
3. Completion – Overall, how satisfied were you with the completed job performed?
4. Delivery of services – If the service provided was for relocation services, how do you rate the move service provided?
5. Professionalism – Was our technician(s) professional?
Findings

Noted areas customers were most satisfied and least satisfied with services to
determine our strengths and weaknesses.

Strengths:
Prior findings were reported in the 2012 Assessment Report for services provided
for the period January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012. Current findings are
reported for services provided for the period January 1, 2013 to September 30,
2013.

In 2012, we reported 80% of customers surveyed responded they were “Very
Satisfied” and 20% were “Satisfied” with services provided. No responses were
“Neutral, Unsatisfied, or Very Unsatisfied”.

When asked; “What aspect of the product/service were you most satisfied by?”
73% of surveyed customers responded “Customer Service”. 2012 customer
survey comments noted that Service Support is “professional”, “respectful”,
“efficient”, and “flexible”.
The 2013 survey data reported a 9% increase of customers who are “Very
Satisfied” when compared to the 2012 reporting period. The increase is
attributable to customers that responded “Satisfied” with the services provided
during 2012. 27% of customers responded the reason they were most satisfied
with the services provided was “Quality”. When asked; “What aspect of the
product/service were you most satisfied by?” 58% of surveyed customers
responded “Customer Service”. 2013 customer survey comments noted that
Service Support is “very professional”, “friendly”, “prompt”, and “efficient”.

Weaknesses:
Prior findings were reported in the 2012 Assessment Report for services provided
for the period January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012. Current findings are for
services provided for the period January 1, 2013 to September 30, 2013.

In 2012, there were four comments concerning unfavorable opinions of our
service. The client comments were as follows:

1. Two regarding the accuracy of work order processing, such as, “When calling
   a work order sometimes the information is not relayed correctly.”
2. One regarding work performance and timing, such as, “My only concern is
   (the unknown) or not knowing when the work order will be processed, or
   what day it is slated for, which is difficult for planning purposes”.
3. One concerning our capacity to provide services in a timely manner during
   peak service periods, for example, during football season, such as, “This
service is always at a critical demand and can force some time issues”.

In 2013, there were two comments concerning unfavorable opinions of our service. Most comments mentioned no complaints with the services provided. The unfavorable client comments were as follows:

1. One regarding our communication was “poor”.
2. One noting an area for improvement in our service, such as, “Often little long in response time. But, often schedules are very busy on campus and a department must wait in line.”

See Product Satisfaction graphs below.

How did you use findings for improvement?
Prior findings were reported in the 2012 Assessment Report for services provided for the period January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012. Current findings are for services provided for the period January 1, 2013 to September 30, 2013.

In 2012, we reported improved customer satisfaction by increasing communications, and defining work requests and expectations. We updated the Facilities Management Work Order Help Desk with event dates. Increased communications with the Help Desk decreased customer schedule conflicts and allowed customers to adjust their plans.
Short lead time customer requests are most impacted during peak demand period because customers do not have time to adjust their plans. Service Support is able to accommodate most short lead time requests and reschedule work with other customers with lower priority requests. Rescheduling allows for short lead time requests to be performed except during 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.

The 2013 customer survey indicated the communication process has improved. No comments were received concerning work order processing. We continue to improve the communication process with Facilities Management Help Desk concerning the Service Support shop schedule.

From April 2013 through September 2013, Service Support had three unfilled service technician positions. Filling the positions in the coming months should maintain the customer service levels and decrease wait times. Times of increased demand and seasonal work load increases are a challenge to reduce wait times to zero.

Service Support is able to accommodate most short lead time requests and reschedule work with customers with lower priority requests. Rescheduling 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

Assessment Method 2: Safety Performance Review

Assessment Method Description
Track safety through safety reports.

Findings
Safety performance was tracked through safety manager reports.

In 2012, we reported that all surveyed customers noted our services provided were performed in a safe manner. The Facilities Management Safety Manager noted there were zero accidents for Service Support during the 2012 reporting period.

The Facilities Management Safety Manager reported one accident for Service Support during the 2013 reporting period. The technician pinched his hand in a lift
gate which resulted in a cut requiring 4 stitches.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**
To improve our safety standards, during the 2013 reporting period, the lift gate operating procedure was modified to require two people to operate a lift gate.

**Additional Comments**
Service Support will continue to use surveys to track customer satisfaction. In 2012, while teaming with the Facilities Management Safety Manager, we implemented safety programs that had a positive impact on the workplace and the university community. Service Support continued daily, weekly and monthly aspects of the safety program. Additional supplemental safety training was pursued at UAB’s, “The Deep South Center for Occupational Health & Safety Program”, which was held at the “Central Alabama Construction Safety Conference & Expo” in Montgomery, Alabama. In 2012, Service Support sent two technicians to the Expo for training. The technicians shared their knowledge within Service Support.


**Expected Outcome 4: Waste Reduction & Recycling**

**Department**
Maximize the overall amount of material diverted from the landfill and revenue generated from recycling. Building occupants will understand and will be satisfied with the recycling program.

**Assessment Method 1: Analysis of Collection**

**Assessment Method Description**
Track recycling and trash 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. The totals, by commodity, are analyzed 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 a change from one year to the next. WRRD is calculated our landfill diversion rate. This rate is a percentage of the overall amount of
materials we divert 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 FY13.

\[
\text{Total Recycling} \div (\text{Total Recycling} + \text{Total Trash}) = \% \text{ Landfill Diversion}
\]

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

1 ton = 2,000 lbs.

Findings
WRRD decreased the amount of total recycling collected from 2,603.45 tons to 1,881.77 tons when comparing FY12 & FY13. This was a 28% decrease in overall recycling. This decrease is primarily due to the 42% reduction of construction waste from 2,047.65 tons in FY12 to 1,191.55 tons in FY13. Construction Waste, cardboard and scrap metal recycling showed a 2% decrease in collection totals. Commodities that increased in FY13 included confidential document shredding (51%), mixed paper (59%) and aluminum/plastic/steel (48%). Trash collection totals also dropped 2%, from 4,923.03 tons in FY12 to 4,812.01 tons in FY13. The overall landfill diversion rate decreased by 7% from FY12 (35%) to FY13 (28%).
How did you use findings for improvement?
WRRD plans to complete 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 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.

Additional Comments
Assessment Method 2: Analysis of Revenue
Assessment Method Description

Tracked all revenue generated from selling recyclables to maximize the return on recyclables. Tracked avoided landfill disposal fees from recycling. Revenue is tracked by commodity, by month, on an Excel spreadsheet. Compared overall revenue totals from the current fiscal year to the prior fiscal year to determine the total revenue increase or decrease.

The avoided landfill fees refers to the $23.44 per ton cost for disposing of trash in the local landfill. This fee is not paid for any amount of tonnage of recycled materials. Therefore, WRRD multiplies the total tons recycled by $23.44 to get the savings generated from landfill disposal.

Findings

WRRD increased the amount of total revenue generated from marketing recycling from $50,193 to $50,939 when comparing FY12 to FY13. This was a 6% increase in the overall revenue generated from recycling. This increase is primarily due to the 35% increase in mixed paper revenue and the 24% increase in avoided landfill disposal fees from recycling. Reductions in revenue came from a 19% reduction in revenue from copper, 42% from toner cartridges and 26% from ink cartridges. Scrap metal increased from $9,871 in FY12 to $9,927 in FY13.

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). The decrease 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 has lowered the revenue WRRD use to generate for these commodities. WRRD does not receive any revenue from the City of Columbus, GA for the loads of plastics/aluminum/steel we send them.
How did you use findings for improvement?

WRRD researched new markets to pay a higher price per ton for the commodities we market and create a competitive marketing strategy. WRRD researched generating a revenue stream for the plastics/aluminum/steel commodity.

Additional Comments

Assessment Method 3: Recycling Program Quiz and Survey

Assessment Method Description

The Campus Building Recycling Program Follow-up Plan was piloted in 2012 in Duncan Hall to assess the effectiveness of the building’s recycling
program. This follow-up plan assesses building occupants and custodial staffs’ level of participation and awareness of the recycling program. For this assessment, recycling coordinators and students employees conducted 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. The 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 how the recycling program works in their building. Scores for each survey are tracked on the same Excel spreadsheet as the quiz. 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 received feedback on the program which helps us communicate with 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 2012 at Duncan Hall. This was the only building surveyed during 2012. In FY13, there were 8 buildings surveyed: Ross Hall, Allison Lab, Science Center Classroom & Auditorium, Parker Hall, Chemistry Building, Rouse Life Science, Kinesiology Building and Comer Hall. Based on the survey results, 40 out of 40 building occupants were aware of their desk-side recycling bins and 38 out of 40 building occupants were aware of plastic & aluminum recycling bin locations.

On the recycling quiz, one building occupant out of 40 scored a perfect 10 for 10 on what items are recyclable. The average quiz score for these 40 occupants was 7.04. Out of the 40 building occupants surveyed, 25% thought that the custodial staff serviced the recycling bins correctly, while 73% were not sure if it was done right or not and 3% said they did not think 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 4.84 out of 5. No building occupants requested additional recycling bins for their building. When asked about additional resources for their building, two building occupants suggested sending out reminder notifications about the program. One building occupant said it is a good idea to e-mail pictures of common recyclables to building occupants so they have an understanding of recyclables. The overall score for all eight buildings was 87%. As long as building scores are 80% or above, we do not make any immediate adjustments to the program for that building. We work with the building occupants and the custodial staff to address certain operational or educational concerns building occupants expressed during the survey.

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

WRKD 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 2014. 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.
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.