2013-2014 Assessment Report

Building Services

Contract Management

**Expected Outcome**

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 October 2013 and the survey findings were reported in the 2013 Assessment Report.

The second survey was conducted in October 2014 and the survey findings were reported in the 2014 Assessment Report.

Both 2013 & 2014 online surveys may be found at the following link: [https://auburn.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6tfLMio23PCR4j3](https://auburn.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6tfLMio23PCR4j3)

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 who provided custodial service to their building, custodial contractors or in-house custodial staff. Based on their 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** of 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. 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. The third survey was conducted in October 2014 and the survey findings were reported in the 2014 Assessment Report.

From the October 2013 and October 2014 surveys, a total of 67 and 57 responses were received for Contracted- Outsourced Custodial Services, and 56 and 51 responses were received for In-house Custodial Services respectively.

- Custodial Service Ratings 2013 2014

**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** during 2014, based on our survey results from Section 1, Contracted Custodial Services scored ‘Above Average’ in all questions.

**Contracted Custodial Services** scored the weakest rating for cleaning classrooms. To improve cleaning services, Building Services management increased monitoring and inspections of classrooms. Our findings indicated that the cleaning staffing levels were not sufficient. Contractor added a third shift for classroom clean-up and detailing. Contractor increased cleaning
frequencies for classrooms.

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. The third survey was conducted in October 2014 and the survey findings were reported in the 2014 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 2014, based on our survey results from Section 2, In-House Custodial Services scored

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. During 2014, based on our survey results from Section 2, In-House Custodial Services scored

The weakest aspect of Custodial Services identified was supervision of personnel, averaging a for In-House and Contracted Custodial Services respectively.

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 ensure they know the custodial services supervisor.
3. Additional monitoring of task performed by supervisors 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
Waste Reduction and Recycling Department

Amount of material diverted from the landfill and revenue generated from recycling will be maximized.

Assessment Method I: Analysis of Collection
Track recycling\(^1\) and trash\(^2\) collection totals received from monthly vendor invoices and recycling facility scale tickets. Collection totals are tracked in tons\(^3\) by commodity on Excel spreadsheets. The totals are analyzed every 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 of material collected from one year to the next. The Waste Reduction and Recycling Department is also able to calculate the landfill diversion rate. This rate is expressed as a percentage and is the amount of material the university is diverting from the landfill. The landfill diversion rate is calculated by taking the recycling collection total and dividing that number by the sum of the total recycling and trash collection totals: 

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

Findings
The amount of total recycling collected in FY13 was 1,881.77 tons and in FY14 was 1,530.85 tons. This is a 19% decrease in recycling tonnage when comparing FY13 and FY14. This decrease is primarily due to a 27% reduction of construction and demolition (C/D) recycling from 1,191.55 tons in FY13 to 872.13 tons in FY14. In addition, mixed paper recycling decreased 14%. Commodities that increased in FY14 include cardboard (10%), scrap metal (8%), and toner and ink jet cartridges (68%). Trash collection totals also increased by 5% from 4,812.01 tons in FY13 to 5,038.71 in FY14. The landfill diversion rate decreased from 28% (FY13) to 23% (FY14).

Use of Findings for Improvement
For the upcoming year, the department plans to evaluate campus facilities including athletic venues not currently participating in the Campus Building Recycling Program. Expanding the program could increase overall recycling tonnage. The department does not have control over the amount of trash generated or construction/demolition debris and these will impact the landfill diversion rate. The goal is a 25% diversion rate for FY15 and the long-term goal is a 70% diversion rate by 2031.

---

\(^1\) The following recycling commodities are tracked: Mixed Paper, Cardboard, Mixed Plastic/Aluminum/Steel, Plastic (grades 1 & 2), Scrap Metal, Construction/Demolition debris, and Toner and Ink Jet Cartridges. These recycling commodities are collected from university buildings, dining facilities, residential halls, athletic venues and Facilities Management operations and in-house construction projects.

\(^2\) Trash totals include all solid waste collected from 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, Alabama.

\(^3\) 1 ton = 2,000 pounds
### 2013-2014 Building Service Report

**AUBURN UNIVERSITY MATERIAL COLLECTION**

**FY13 vs. FY14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Trash</th>
<th>CD Recycling</th>
<th>Confidential Document Shredding</th>
<th>Mixed Paper</th>
<th>Cardboard</th>
<th>Aluminum</th>
<th>Plastic 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Steel Cans</th>
<th>Mixed Plastic, Metal, Scrap</th>
<th>Bash</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Toner Cartridges</th>
<th>Ink Jet Cartridges</th>
<th>Recycling Totals</th>
<th>% Waste Diversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct-13</td>
<td>523.97</td>
<td>234.05</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>319.15</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-13</td>
<td>463.17</td>
<td>97.71</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.69</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td>270.63</td>
<td>52.03</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>275.58</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td>389.31</td>
<td>89.86</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>142.61</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-13</td>
<td>416.25</td>
<td>95.08</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>391.91</td>
<td>112.91</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>169.45</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-13</td>
<td>441.65</td>
<td>101.69</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>146.30</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-13</td>
<td>363.40</td>
<td>116.37</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>173.01</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>247.47</td>
<td>103.85</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>142.05</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>331.07</td>
<td>77.65</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>115.06</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-13</td>
<td>414.92</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>52.21</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>119.21</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td>528.62</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>156.72</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,812.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,191.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>280.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>218.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,881.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>77.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY14 Tons</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,038.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>872.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>242.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>239.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.16</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,530.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.20</td>
<td>83.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% Increase or Decrease**

- 5% decrease
- 27% decrease
- 33% decrease
- 14% decrease
- 16% decrease
- 7% decrease
- 8% decrease
- 77% increase
- 16% increase
- 19% decrease
Assessment Method II: Analysis of Revenue
Track revenue generated from marketing recyclables to maximize the return on recyclables. Track avoided landfill disposal fees\(^4\) from recycling. Revenue is tracked by commodity by month on Excel spreadsheets. The totals are analyzed every fiscal year (October-September). During each assessment, the previous fiscal year's revenue totals are compared with the current fiscal year's totals to assess whether or not there has been an increase or decrease of revenue from one year to the next.

Findings
The amount of total revenue generated in FY13 was $49,925 and in FY14 was $52,888. This is a 6% increase in revenue generated from selling recyclable commodities when comparing FY13 and FY14. This increase is primarily due to a 24% increase in scrap metal revenue. The amount of avoided landfill disposal fees in FY13 was $16,179 and in FY14 was $15,651. This is a 3% decrease in avoided landfill disposal fees when comparing FY13 and FY14. Total financial benefit (Revenue + Avoided Landfill Disposal Fees) in FY13 was $66,104 and in FY14 was $68,539. This is a 4% increase in financial benefit when comparing FY13 and FY14.

Use of Findings for Improvement
The Waste Reduction and Recycling Department uses local facilities (10 miles from campus) to market most of the recyclables collected. Commingled containers (mixed plastic/aluminum/steel) are taken to a regional recycler in Columbus, Georgia, and no revenue is received for this material. For the upcoming year, the department plans to research new markets that may offer a higher rebate per ton for recyclable commodities. By continually evaluating current and new markets, the department can maximize revenue generated from recyclables.

\(^4\) The avoided landfill disposal fee refers to the $23.76 per ton cost for disposing of trash in the local landfill. This fee is not paid for every ton of material recycled and not sent to the landfill. Therefore, multiply the total tons recycled by $23.76 to calculate the savings generated from diverting material from the landfill.
## Auburn University Material Revenue

### FY13 vs. FY14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Avoided Tipping Fees</th>
<th>Mixed Paper</th>
<th>Cardboard</th>
<th>Aluminum</th>
<th>Plastic 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Steel Cans</th>
<th>Scrap Metal</th>
<th>Brass</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Toner Cartridges</th>
<th>Ink Jet Cartridges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct-13</td>
<td>$1,946</td>
<td>$1,684</td>
<td>$585</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,065</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-13</td>
<td>$1,483</td>
<td>$1,679</td>
<td>$1,763</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$453</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td>$557</td>
<td>$729</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td>$1,248</td>
<td>$1,188</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-13</td>
<td>$1,435</td>
<td>$1,958</td>
<td>$1,396</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>$1,326</td>
<td>$1,383</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,774</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-13</td>
<td>$1,046</td>
<td>$1,401</td>
<td>$1,338</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$858</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-13</td>
<td>$1,349</td>
<td>$1,004</td>
<td>$1,072</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,012</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>$907</td>
<td>$1,824</td>
<td>$1,746</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$747</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>$1,041</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>$558</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-13</td>
<td>$2,390</td>
<td>$2,590</td>
<td>$3,583</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td>$1,028</td>
<td>$1,601</td>
<td>$1,002</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,347</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,796</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$316</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,927</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>$416</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Avoided Tipping Fees</th>
<th>Mixed Paper</th>
<th>Cardboard</th>
<th>Aluminum</th>
<th>Plastic 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Steel Cans</th>
<th>Scrap Metal</th>
<th>Brass</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Toner Cartridges</th>
<th>Ink Jet Cartridges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct-13</td>
<td>$1,554</td>
<td>$1,634</td>
<td>$2,421</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$337</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-13</td>
<td>$1,077</td>
<td>$1,414</td>
<td>$974</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$473</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-13</td>
<td>$1,164</td>
<td>$1,483</td>
<td>$1,651</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-13</td>
<td>$995</td>
<td>$1,371</td>
<td>$991</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$349</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-13</td>
<td>$1,013</td>
<td>$1,212</td>
<td>$1,697</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,056</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-13</td>
<td>$1,226</td>
<td>$1,573</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$116</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-13</td>
<td>$1,996</td>
<td>$2,311</td>
<td>$3,193</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-13</td>
<td>$831</td>
<td>$889</td>
<td>$872</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,914</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-13</td>
<td>$1,116</td>
<td>$2,693</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$642</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>$1,412</td>
<td>$2,639</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$337</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$429</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-13</td>
<td>$1,514</td>
<td>$1,903</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,762</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-13</td>
<td>$1,022</td>
<td>$1,785</td>
<td>$2,364</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$108</td>
<td>$1,288</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$429</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,646</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$143</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,355</strong></td>
<td><strong>$429</strong></td>
<td><strong>$623</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$68,539</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % Increase or Decrease

-3%  6%  -1%  -55%  24%  -60%  50%  68%  4%
Assessment Method III: Analysis of Outreach, Education and Volunteer Activity

Track outreach, education and volunteers from university and community events. Outreach is defined as events focused on general program awareness, such as tabling. Education is defined as events aimed at learning, such as presentations and training. Volunteers are defined as non-paid campus or community members offering their time and services. Totals are tracked on an Excel spreadsheet. The totals are analyzed every fiscal year (October-September). During each assessment, the previous fiscal year's activity 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.

Findings
The amount of total outreach, education and volunteer activity in FY13 was 4,103 and in FY14 was 7,817. This is a 91% increase when comparing FY13 and FY14. The increase is primarily due to a 122% increase in the outreach category. In FY14, there was a slight increase in education (2%) and an increase in volunteers (38%).

Use of Findings for Improvement
A key component to making the recycling program successful includes outreach, education and volunteer activity to students, staff and faculty. The Waste Reduction and Recycling Department continues to identify new opportunities to educate the campus community on waste reduction and recycling initiatives. For the upcoming year, additional effort may be made to engage more individuals and attend more events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>America Recycles Day</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Binder Giveaway</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Electronics Recycling Event</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Green Game</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>4,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Sustainability Picnic</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Tabling</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>5,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Papermaking</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Recycling Training</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Waste Tour</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>979</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Electronics Recycling Event</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Gameday Recycling</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Office Volunteers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Sustainability Picnic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Waste Audit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>6,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Support clients are satisfied with services received while ensuring the services are performed safely.

**Assessment Method I**: Campus Wide Survey

**Assessment Method Description**
Track customer satisfaction of our services through surveys and track safety through safety reports.

2012 Assessment Report for services provided for the period January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2012. In 2012, survey\(^5\) 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.

The 2012 survey may be found at web link: [link](https://adobeformscentral.com/?f=RHAPXZKeEJ P60a5vI ZIFcg). Safety performance was tracked through safety manager reports.

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\(^6\) 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: [link](https://auburn.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?Q_SS=5hGM4PuYtcZdOhn_el1qU4Tni4Q8 pGL&_=1). Safety performance was tracked through safety manager reports.

Current responses were reported in the 2014 Assessment Report for services provide for the period January 1, 2014, September 30, 2014. The 2014 survey was conducted on October 16, 2014. In 2014, survey\(^7\) customers responded based on satisfaction of services provided. A pool of 161 customers representing colleges, schools and various departments on campus were asked to complete the survey. The survey received input from 55 customers.

The 2014 survey may be found at web link, [link](https://auburn.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?Q_SS=7P5Vrsm2wnlGn3_1czu6fXpVwbl 9y&_=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:

A. Communication – How do you rate the communication with Service Support?
B. Timeliness – Once on site, was the job completed in a timely manner?
C. Completion – Overall, how satisfied were you with the completed job performed?
D. Delivery of services – If the service provided was for relocation services, how do you rate the move service provided?

---

\(^5\) See Survey sample link under Assessment Method I.

\(^6\) See Survey sample link under Assessment Method I.

\(^7\) See Survey sample link under Assessment Method I.
E. 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 & 2013 Assessment Reports for services provided for the period January 1, 2012 to September 30, 2013. Current findings are reported for services provided for the period January 1, 2014 to September 30, 2014.

In 2012, we reported 80% of customers surveyed responded they were “Very Satisfied” and 20% were “Satisfied” with services provided\(^8\). 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”.

Current 2014 survey data reported a 5% decrease of customers who are “Very Satisfied” when compared to 2013 reporting period. 84% of customers surveyed responded they were “Very Satisfied” and 16% were “Satisfied” with services provided\(^9\). No responses were “Neutral, Unsatisfied, or Very Unsatisfied”.

---

\(^8\)See Product Satisfaction graphs (pdf attached).
\(^9\)See Product Satisfaction graphs (pdf attached).
2014 survey data indicates Customer Service continues to be the number one reason customers were most satisfied with the services provided. When asked; “What aspect of the product/service were you most satisfied by?” 44% of surveyed customers responded “Customer Service”. “Communication” ranked second with 16% of customers surveyed. 2014 customer survey comments noted that Service Support is “professional”, “friendly”, “helpful and dependable”, and “responsive”. 94% of customers responded they would “Definitely” use our product / service in the future, 5% responded “Probably”. No responses were “Not Sure”, “Probably Not” or “Definitely Not”.

**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.”

In 2014, most customers responded they had nothing they disliked about our service. The comments for dislikes are as follows:
(1) Five comments concerning our capacity to provide services in a timely manner during peak service periods or having to wait, “Delay in responding, which is sometimes understandable as you cover a lot of territory”.
(2) Four regarding the price, “It is not a free service on campus”.
(3) Two comments concerning our availability, “not available for weekend events”.
(4) Two regarding Facilities billing, “Facilities billing, in general”.
(5) One concerning the need to be prepared, “Need to be prepared if PPE needed for a project”.
(6) One comment concerning care of items being transported, “would like to see more care taken with items in transit”.
(7) One comment concerning communication, “When I do not know if the job has been completed”.
Use of Finding for Improvements

Prior findings were reported in the 2012 & 2013 Assessment Reports for services provided for the period January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2013. Current findings are for services provided for the period January 1, 2014 to September 30, 2014.

In 2013, we reported improved customer satisfaction by increasing communications, and defining work requests and expectations. We continued to update 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 2014 customer survey indicated the communication process has continued to improve. We continue to improve the communication process with Facilities Management Help Desk concerning the Service Support shop schedule. Maintained a high level of professionalism with customers and improved delivery of service.

Service Support filled two technician vacancies in February 2014. One technician took another job in October 2014. Working to fill the open position and add an additional technician as additional work assisting with the upkeep of parking decks on campus. 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.

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 there was 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.

Facilities Management Safety Manager reported there were zero accidents for Service Support during the 2014 reporting period.

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.


In 2014, we continued with safety programs that had a positive impact on the workplace. Service Support Supervisor introduced 5S, Kaizen and Lean Principles in March 2014. The principles of 5S, Kaizen and Lean work to harmonize all activities for maximum efficiency and safety.
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 2013 and 2014 reporting periods. Analysis of the Pitney Bowes Service Transaction Breakdown Reports, for the 2013 and 2014 reporting periods, resulted in Mail Services determining that the postal kiosk machines were very useful for our clients and added two kiosk during this reporting period. During the 2014 reporting period, Campus Mail Services evaluated the utilization rate and placement results of the fourth and fifth kiosk in The South Donahue Hall, and Village Dinning 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 Hal was underutilized and replaced in another location.

**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 2013 and 2014 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. Successful re-placement of the kiosk in Foy Hall, to a higher foot traffic area created a successful utilization rate almost equaling the placement results of the first two kiosks during the 2013 reporting period
2. Continued to increased our outreach efforts to students and their families through a Camp War Eagle marketing campaign that included new booth signage and newly design brochures during the 2012 reporting period.

3. Added two kiosk to South Donahue Hall, and the Village Dinning Hall. Moved the third postal during the 2013 reporting period.

Additional Comments