



September 2007

## Inside this edition...

**2007 APPA Awards**

**Dealing with an Aging Workforce**

## Upcoming APPA Events

College and University Science Bldgs  
Oct 2 at Albuquerque, New Mexico

**RMAPP Annual Conference**  
Oct 10-13 at Albuquerque, NM

MD/DC APPA Fall Meeting  
Oct 12 at Washington, DC

ACUHO-I / APPA Housing Facilities  
Oct 12-15 at St. Louis, Missouri

IEHA Annual Educational Conference  
Oct 22-26 at Orlando, Florida

Campus Sustainability Webcast  
Oct 24 Online

Greenbuild 2007  
Nov 7-9 at Chicago, Illinois

Facilities Stewardship: Deferred Maintenance and Capital Planning  
Nov 12-13 at San Diego, California

Understanding LEED and Green Design  
Nov 28 Online

APPA's 2008 Institute for Facilities Mgt  
Feb 3-7 at Newport Beach, California

APPA's Central Region Technology Conference  
Mar 3-4 at San Antonio, Texas

APPA's 2008 Leadership Academy  
Jun 22-26 at Scottsdale, Arizona

For more details or a complete listing of upcoming APPA events, please see the website at <http://www.appa.org>.

## President's Message

It's that time of the year as all our students gather and we run around with a sack full of last minute requests that must be done! Lack of planning on your part does not constitute an emergency on mine. A lot of comfort in that saying, but I've never had the guts to use it.

As this is my last column as your President, I'd like to remind you that the strength of our organization is in its' membership and once again I'll request that your involvement is paramount to our success. We are still looking for new faces to provide us with fresh ideas on how we can best meet your expectations.

A pivotal component is your participation in our Committee's which are the true up and down lifters of RMA. Our goal is to have representation from each province/state on every Committee. Please give me a call if you are interested or would just like to learn more about any aspect of RMA. Have a great year and we'll see you in Albuquerque!

## Sustaining a Balanced Mission



**October 10-13, 2007, Albuquerque, New Mexico**

## APPA Report

Correspondent: Jill Amstutz

### Utah State University Receives APPA's Award for Excellence

Baltimore, Maryland, July 16, 2007 - Utah State University's Facilities Organization received the Award for Excellence in Facilities Management, the highest institutional honor bestowed by APPA, the association serving educational facilities professionals. The award was officially presented to USU facilities officials at APPA's annual awards banquet July 16, 2007 in Baltimore, Maryland.

According to APPA President Chris Ahoy, Associate Vice President for Facilities at Iowa State University, the Utah State facilities organization exemplifies excellence in all of the areas necessary to achieve the award: leadership; strategic and operational planning; customer focus; information and analysis; development and management of human resources; process management; and performance results.

"Utah State University has an exceptional campus, not only in terms of its buildings and grounds, but inclusive of the entire staff of the facilities organization." Ahoy said. "The Utah State University's Facilities Organization is committed to continuous improvement, outstanding customer service, individual and organizational development, and the use of core values to run its daily operation."

Since its founding in 1888, Utah State University has evolved from a small, agricultural college to one that is nationally and internationally recognized for its intellectual and technological leadership in land, water, space, and life enhancement. With seven colleges, more than 200 majors and 130 research-related classes, Utah State provides education for more than 23,000 undergraduate and graduate students. USU's facilities organization consists of nearly 300 personnel, including seasonal help, who operate and maintain approximately 500 acres and over 100 major buildings.

### Polly Pinney of Arizona State University Receives APPA Meritorious Service Award

Baltimore, Maryland, July 16, 2007 - In honor of her long-time contributions to the educational facilities profession, Polly Pinney, Executive Director of Facilities Management at Arizona State University, was awarded the Meritorious Service Award by APPA, the association serving educational facilities professionals. The award was presented to Pinney during APPA's annual awards banquet July 16, 2007 in Baltimore, Maryland.

According to APPA President Chris Ahoy, "Polly is a dedicated facilities management professional, she demonstrates this through participation in volunteer activities and extra work-related efforts, including mentoring of others seeking to excel in educational facilities management. Polly has a generous spirit of giving and provides true inspiration. People like Polly are what make APPA a strong and committed organization." Pinney currently serves as APPA's Vice President for Educational Programs, is a member of the APPA credentialing/certification task force, and sits on the APPA branding team. A graduate of APPA's Institute for Facilities Management and Leadership Academy, Pinney is a certified trainer of APPA's Supervisor's Toolkit and a faculty member of the Institute.

On the regional level, Pinney served Rocky Mountain APPA as

education committee chair and has conducted training sessions for RMA in Arizona, Colorado/Wyoming, Utah, and Montana. Pinney has also been active in the U.S. Green Building Council, the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), and the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP).

### Mark Shively of University of Wyoming Awarded 2007 APPA Pacesetter Award

Baltimore, Maryland, July 15, 2007 - Mark Shively, Associate Director, Physical Plant for the University of Wyoming, was awarded the 2007 Pacesetter Award for his dedication to the education facilities profession by APPA, the association serving educational facilities professionals. The award was presented at a special reception held on July 15 during APPA's 2007 conference in Baltimore.

Shively is the outgoing Senior Regional Representative to APPA's Executive Committee. He has served on APPA's Information and Research Committee as well as APPA's branding team. On the regional level, Shively has served as both vice president and president of APPA's Rocky Mountain region (RMA). Shively also presented a plan to the State of Wyoming Legislature and the State Education Committee to deal with major maintenance along with deferred maintenance within the entire university system.

## Arizona Report

Correspondent: Dave Brixen

### Arizona State University

By Joseph Metzger, Assoc. Director Facilities Management

ASU Facilities Management demographically follows national trends in terms of an aging workforce and continues to have difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified trades personnel.

Our age demographics are typical: 13% of our workforce are in their 60's and will most likely retire within the next two years. Over the next five years virtually all of our current departmental supervision and leadership will retire.

A staggering 47% of our workforce is over 50, with 74% falling within the classical definition of Baby Boomers (those born between 1946 and 1964). Generation-X employees constitute only a quarter of our workforce.

Nationally, it is estimated that 76 million baby boomers will retire by 2010, equating to about 33% of the American workforce. The good news is that more of these people will continue to work past their official retirement, some out of need but more just because they want to be active. The bad news is that there are significantly less people entering the workforce to fill the void. Of particular concern is the deficit of those between the ages of 35 and 45, the ages at which people are typically entering management positions.

Adding insult to injury and compounding the problem, it is becoming increasingly rare to find young people entering into the trades apprenticeships. Historically, trades fathers beget trades sons, but evidently being a working man (or woman) is no longer cool. Our recent recruitment efforts bear this out: Many applicants for our trades positions can-

not answer basic questions relating the methods and materials of the trade for which they are interviewing.

Who will follow us as we retire? Where will we find tomorrow's trades people that have the knowledge, experience and work ethic that have been so well represented by our aging workforce? And who will take our places in the leadership and management of our organizations?

Straight away we need to recognize and mentor those younger members of our workforce that are making a contribution now. Every organization has these people, ones that bring a sense of ownership and responsibility to everything they do. These individuals transcend generational boundaries and cannot be limited or defined by such terms as Boomer or Generation-X. It is essential that we recognize, mentor, reward, and promote these promising individuals now, before they leave us for better opportunities.

Retaining older, qualified workers so that they can convey their knowledge, experience, and institutional memory is equally important. Successful strategies to this end include participative management, opportunities for part time or casual work, in place career progressions and consistent recognition of significant individual contributions. Note that successfully retaining these people does not always equate to dollars and cents; it is amazing how far a few words of thanks and recognition for a job well done will go.

Given the deficit of qualified trades personnel, one strategy that ASU Facilities Management has been exploring is hiring people into lower job classifications (ie. instead of a carpenter, a trades helper) and training them. We look for people that have less actual job skills and experience but demonstrate a positive aptitude and attitude. It is far easier to train an amiable individual with good character than it is to motivate an experienced trades person with a bad attitude and a grumpy disposition.

Some years ago ASU Facilities Management had a very successful trades apprenticeship program. Unfortunately, due to budget reductions the program was eliminated. But given the current situation and the high costs of attracting qualified journey level employees, we are taking a second look at this approach. If you can't buy them, grow some of your own!

Certainly, we need to engage and mentor our Generation X team members. These people are just now coming of the age where they are entering our supervisory and management positions. However, this will require a fundamental change in the way we manage, recognize and reward.

Generation X people are more likely to ask why when told to do something; the old "because I say so" just won't do. They need to understand the whole picture and where they fit in. These people are also less likely to be motivated by promises of overtime pay because they value their personal time more. Job satisfaction is essential to them. Consequently, they are more likely to leave a job that does not include opportunities for advancement, participative management, and recognition of personal victories.

The transition to Generation-X need not be a crisis, but it certainly will become one if we do not attend to these issues promptly. We will be poor stewards indeed if we do not ensure that a wealth of talented and promising individuals are prepared to take our places in the not so distant future.

## Colorado Report

Correspondent: Position Available

### University of Colorado at Boulder

By John P. Morris, Director Physical Plant

If you are not in the know, October 2, 2007, marks National Custodial Workers Recognition Day. At the University of Colorado we like to designate a day as Custodian Appreciation Day to recognize the contribution these individuals provide to our institutions. We provide a nice luncheon complete with raffles, gifts, and awards.

As we all know custodial work is one of the most difficult tasks within Facilities Management. It has low compensation compared to other positions, is a physical job, is very repetitive and is generally underappreciated.

I have mentioned on a regular basis to our custodial staff how important their jobs are to the mission of the University, and how much I appreciate the services they provide. I stress that they are just as important as the University President; although in our economy not everyone is compensated based on their value, i.e. teachers, police officers, and custodians. Imagine the President trying to improve recruitment and retention without the services provided by our custodians. Imagine the instructor and student trying to exchange knowledge while sitting in a couple weeks worth of candy wrappers, drink containers and campus newspapers. Imagine restrooms that look like they belong at some neglected gas station – not a pretty thought. I would like to share a few thoughts with you regarding this profession.

Managing our environment is nothing new. From the beginning of time, humans have worked to arrange their surroundings for the sake of survival. Human communities, both ancient and modern, still depend on environmental management – the job that our custodians perform today.

As humans moved from the wide open spaces into indoor living space the need to control waste and provide a sanitary indoor environment became a priority for our health and comfort. Today most people in the United States spend more than 90 percent of their time in an indoor environment. Many of the pollutants once thought to lurk only outdoors we now know are just as prevalent indoors. Today's custodian is a skilled individual trained to provide a clean and sanitary indoor environment.

In any business, the impression of cleanliness can shape the attitude of employees, customers and visitors. Cleanliness can be one of the prime factors in many businesses as to whether or not they succeed. Therefore, their services are mission critical to the success of our University.

I often tell our customers that performing custodial services in our facilities is not the same as they experience in their homes. Our custodians clean on the average about 40,000 GSF each day. This is equivalent to about 20 houses. The spaces they clean are not the same as our customer's houses, where a small family and possibly some pets live. These spaces often have over 10,000 people using them every day. Imagine trying to clean your house every day after 10,000 people used your restroom, ate in your kitchen, walked on your carpet and sat in your living room. This analogy often helps our customers understand the challenge each of custodians perform on a daily basis.

I looked up a few terms in the dictionary and found the following:

**Janitor** – one who keeps the premises or building **clean**.

**Custodian** – one **entrusted** with the guarding, keeping and maintaining property.

**Housekeeper** - the care and management of property and its provisions or **the routine tasks that have to be done in order for a system to function properly**.

These definitions support the value that each of our custodians provide. They **clean** for health, they are **entrusted** with the maintenance of the University's assets, and they perform **routine tasks that are required for the University to function properly**.

Without their services we could not attract or retain students, or acquire the resources needed for research if our facilities, restrooms and classrooms were filthy and knee deep in trash. I encourage our custodians to be proud of their contributions and recognize how important their services are to our University.

I encourage each of you to set aside time to express to your custodial staff the importance of the services they provide, and if you do not already have a program in place think of doing something special for them on or near October 2, 2007.

### University of Colorado at Denver

By George Stumpf, Director Bldg Operations/Maintenance

Faculty and students on the 9th Avenue and Colorado Campus began their final semester on that campus. While the facility has served the university well over the years, new and greatly improved facilities on the Anschutz Medical Campus (AMC) will allow the entire Health Sciences Center enterprise to move forward.

1.2 million square foot (7 buildings at approximately \$450 million) of construction at the former Fitzsimons Army Medical Base is in its final stages and moves will continue over the next several months. This will bring the research, education and administrative portion of AMC up to 2.5 million square feet, the targeted square footage to be able to move off of the 9th Avenue campus.

Approximately 1000 staff will remain at the 9th Avenue campus while the second 500,000 square foot research building is completed. This is scheduled to be completed in June 2008, followed by a final move of four to six months. The 9th Avenue campus will then be remediated (i.e. all environmentally nasty items safely removed) and turned over to Shea Homes for demolition and redevelopment.

The new AMC campus will include the research and education mission of UCDHSC as well as currently two hospitals (The University of Colorado Hospital and The Children's Hospital), and plans are underway for the new Veterans Administration Hospital to begin construction in the next few years. This has all been accomplished in about ten years from infrastructure to modern facilities and remodels of existing buildings, all while operating on three campuses. Several of you struggle through the construction disruption while building one new building, imagine seven holes in the ground at once.

Besides the move to the new campus, the University is in the process of tackling several initiatives; we are in the third year of the consolidation of the University of Colorado at Denver (Auraria and Downtown Denver Campus) and the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center into the University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center. This has resulted in an identity/branding initiative. Look for a potential name change for the consolidated campuses in the near future.

Personally, the last few years have been filled with rewarding and challenging experiences. I look forward to throwing the switch to turn out the lights for the last time at the 9th Avenue campus in conjunction with my retirement.

### Idaho Report

Correspondent: Anna Weskerna

#### University of Idaho

By Brian Johnson, AVP Facilities

Like other facilities organizations, our workforce is aging, with a great many of our folks eligible for full retirement within ten years. This will translate into over 100 positions to hire and train in the coming years a huge undertaking for the organization.

We are challenged to attract a younger generation of capable trades personnel and managers. The University is the major employer in the small town of Moscow in rural north Idaho. Although Moscow provides a high quality of life, the limited job opportunities in the area often mean the younger workforce leaves the area to find employment. Salary is an important factor impacting our ability to attract and retain a qualified workforce.

The University has made great strides recently in improving salaries, providing an approximate 13% wage increase over the last three years. These increases followed three years of wages stunted by the sluggish state economy. Despite these wage increases, there are some other employers in the area which offer a higher wage for similar skills; thus, the university will remain under pressure to improve wages to compete in the local market.

Our highest turnover is among our lowest paid employees, typically within our custodial workforce. The high turnover leads to high recruitment costs, and an inordinate amount of time and energy devoted to the training of new personnel.

One topic of interest recently is the 'living wage.' The City of Moscow recently bumped up the pay scale for its lowest paid employees to \$10.75 per hour, or \$22,360 annually. One fourth of the UI's Facilities staff is currently paid less than this living wage.

To remain competitive in the local market, the University is considering establishing an equivalent living wage, but must also be prepared to address the compression of wages which will result. The University is now considering its ability to realign and adjust budgets in order to support this living wage measure, and expects to make a decision later this fall.

### Montana Report

Correspondent: Brian Nielson

## Montana State University at Bozeman

By Jonathan Ford, Manager Environmental Services

Through some of my former diatribes, many of our Rocky Mountain Views readers have become aware of MSU-Bozeman's difficulties in hiring entry-level custodians due to the booming Bozeman economy. It doesn't take a genius to understand why we were having trouble. We were offering \$8.87/hr. when the market was more like \$12/hr. with comparable benefits. Compounding the problem, there is only 1.9% unemployment (essentially none). How do you lure someone away from a job that they already have for less money?

Over many years, our low entry wage rate created many long-standing vacancies which we found impossible to fill. Finally, we were able to field only half of the staff considered necessary to provide a severely reduced level of service. To fight back, we started an initiative at the state level that proposed changing the method of setting wage rates. It provided a means to allow adjustments for local market forces and ultimately get away from the "one-size-fits-all" approach that the state had been using since before anyone could remember.

Not unexpectedly, the response of the bureaucratic machinery to the pay proposal was ponderously slow, with the gears grinding on for more than a year. The conditions of the facilities were going downhill at an accelerating pace and attitudes on the crew were getting touchy as more demands were being placed on fewer and fewer folks. We had a few people walk off the job in a huff. Hope was running low. It became clear that at a certain breaking point, a zonal assignment system was no longer workable.

Over many years, the concept of team cleaning has been heavily promoted at seminars, conferences and contractor/trade shows across America. In some of the exposure that MSU staff had to the idea, it was presented almost as a panacea for all custodial ills.

As we attended a number of team cleaning presentations over the years, we found ourselves receptive but guarded. We took notes, considered what we could use, discussed it repeatedly, and eventually shelved it for future use when there was a good opportunity. We wanted to try it, but we did not want to upset the apple cart without having a strong need to solve a problem. We didn't feel our system was broken to the degree that we needed to fix it--just yet anyway.

At the beginning of this last summer, we finally reached that point.

We dusted off the team cleaning concept and used it to form five teams of four. Each team consisted of a light-duty specialist (opening and locking doors, moving trash from offices to the hallways, trash liner replacement, general policing), a vacuum specialist, a rest room specialist and a utility specialist (circulation areas, hard surface floors, door glass, hallway trash collection to the dumpster, etc.). Each team was assigned to clean approximately six of the old area assignments in multiple buildings. An old zone assignment, in our reduced service mode, ranged from 35,000 to 50,000 square feet in size. Team members were expected to rotate through these specialty duties by switching to a new role each week.

General oversight of all five teams was shared between two

line supervisors. There were no team leaders, lead workers or working supervisors assigned to any team. Instead, the teams were asked to decide among themselves who among their members would perform that function and then share the duties through an occasional rotation. Since the swing shift was the crew most decimated by vacancies, that shift was where the team cleaning was applied, leaving the day shift and the graveyard shift in their zonal assignments.

In this way, twenty workers were responsible for the cleaning of 22 buildings, amounting to 778,622 square feet of cleanable space (not gross sq.ft.). The teams were backed up by a float crew of eight to eleven people led by a working supervisor. There was a single remaining zone assignment on the swing shift: that of a "rover" who handled the distant buildings requiring vehicular travel. The float crew was assigned one leftover zonal assignment normally assigned to 1.25 FTE which they handled daily like a team. They provided bodies to cover any absences on the teams. They also heroically did all the floor finishing and as much carpet cleaning as they could manage.

Over the short term of the experiment, here is what we found:

**Workers originally screened and hired for zonal assignments are not necessarily the best choices for being team members.** Many custodial workers choose their line of work because they like to work alone, or are unable to effectively get along with others in close proximity. Some are downright antisocial. If there had been an opportunity to start from scratch and hire good team players, the screening criteria and interview questions would have been quite different.

In our case, as in the case of many organizations switching from a zone system to team cleaning, the members of our teams were successful survivors of a completely different screening and selection system which required different attributes. Nearly all of the participants in the teams were hired for their ability to work alone, organize their tasks and create their own work plan within their isolated zonal assignment, not how they functioned as a team member. Therefore, and not surprisingly, we immediately had conflicts between people on the teams. For example, some workers were too eager to take charge without authority given to them. Sometimes this resulted in complaints from the other team members, or in power struggles within the team. On other teams, no one wanted to be a leader and the team languished while they demanded hand-holding from their line supervisor.

While some teams energized each other and members worked harder because their work was suddenly on display for the rest of the team, other teams were pulled down by the "laggards". For example, some workers who normally would exhibit a good work ethic became so concerned that they were going to be taken advantage of by the one or two non-performers on their team that they would actually wait for the slow ones to catch up just to check on them. This lowered the productivity of the whole team. People refused to speak to one another, supervisors were spending hours refereeing various tearful disputes, and some people had to be separated. We realized additional training might have lessened some of this discord, but the switch to team cleaning happened as the result of a sudden walk-off of three workers which tipped our zone system over the edge, so we hadn't enough resources to get the training done on a timely basis.

**Teams tend to attract a lot of positive attention from the clients.** We are not sure whether this happened because a) there was a significant disruption of the client's work by the arrival of a larger number of people hustling and bustling around, or b) the clients were very much aware of our desperate plight (I had kept the campus well informed) and were offering words of encouragement, or c) it was just something different that attracted attention. We do know that despite the fact that our experiment took place during a time of light summer workload, we were still wretchedly understaffed, even for team cleaning. Despite a few bright spots where the level of cleanliness actually improved, in general, the condition of the facilities continued to go downhill. Whatever the reason for the positive reaction of building users, this effect might be an important selling point for team cleaning, since client perception is almost more important than reality.

**There is less accountability with team cleaning than with zonal assignments.** Although true believers in team cleaning will say the opposite, we found that when people came up short on their assignments, they were quick to point the finger at other team members or the team method itself as the cause of the problem. This was even with a clear delineation of their individual tasks. Unless there was a supervisory witness (remember, there was no official lead-worker on the team with any kind of authority), there was never a strong case. With a classic zone assignment, if something is not done, there is only one person who could be responsible. This makes it much more difficult to off-load the blame to someone else.

**There is less sense of individual ownership pertaining to the work and the facilities with team cleaning compared to zonal assignments.** With a team whose assignments or duties are changing weekly, it is harder for the individual worker to feel solely responsible for the outcome. The results of the team cleaning effort must be shared. There must be a change in the identification of the worker from that of the individual to that of the team. This can certainly happen with good teams and can be a powerful effect, but it takes time to develop the synergy between team members that results in a team identity. Such a change is no small trick, but the U.S. military has got it down to a science using the boot camp approach. In boot camp there is total control over the individual's environment, the team members are young and malleable, and they are put through the stress of breaking down the team member's individual identity and replacing it with a team identity. We, on the other hand, do not have those tools available to us. We have only limited control of the environment, have workers of all ages, and we can go only so far in imposing the team identity. Some workers are just not adaptable to the new format.

**The security function of the custodial workforce is compromised with team cleaning.** When fully staffed under the zone assignment system, we have a uniformed person with a photo I.D. present at all times in the building during evening hours, extending until the end of most student activity. This uniformed presence of a person representing the University's interests in the building has a tremendous damping effect on those who would get into mischief or worse. With team cleaning, custodians are moving through so fast that they are in each building for only a portion of the eight hour evening shift. Doors that are unlocked or propped open by students after the custodians have passed through and have locked them (this is very common) will likely remain unsecured throughout the night. Similarly,

after-hours classes that require locking and unlocking of doors for user access cause problems, particularly when the access or lock-up needs occur after the team has already passed through and has moved on to other buildings. Simply put, there is less building monitoring and less security, and the multiple return-trips to buildings already serviced to lock and unlock doors according to academic schedules decreases productivity.

**There is greater safety for the worker using team cleaning.** Team members can look after each other in case someone hurts themselves, and if there happens to be some trouble with numbers of students, a group of custodians is a greater deterrent than a single worker. However, we wonder if the more leg work required of the teams as they cover more floor space and travel in between more buildings might increase exposure to fatigue-type injuries and slip/falls in the winter.

Around mid-summer, the pay initiative was finally approved and the entry wage rate went to \$11.13 per hour. Since then, we have filled over half of the vacancies and new applicants have continued to appear. We have dissolved all but one of the five teams and returned the workers to zonal assignments.

Although we have ended the team cleaning approach for some of the reasons cited above, we have not rejected team cleaning. There is no question that team cleaning is a good idea that works under the right circumstances. As always, the uncertainty factor that can put a good idea's outcome in doubt originates in the personalities and character of the workers on the teams. Next time, we want to try it under a less stressful staffing situation and hand-pick the team members for their "team player" capabilities.

Our experience with team cleaning was undoubtedly influenced by the fact that we approached it as a temporary measure. This is a far cry from "burning the ships" so that there was no chance of return to the zonal system. What we learned about team cleaning and the attitudes of the people involved were probably much different from that resulting from a total commitment to the new process.

An interesting example of this was the way the workers self-adjusted to the team cleaning concept. Initially, we purposely matched the teams and their assignments to buildings the team members had worked in under the zone system. This was to provide some continuity, specific building knowledge and familiarity to the teams. Some of the internal team discord mentioned above resulted from the team not cleaning a team member's old zone assignment the way they thought it should have been cleaned. Individual team members still "owned" their old zone assignments! It would have taken time to break down that individualized work identity. Because they knew that our team cleaning measure was only temporary, they were not about to let their area deteriorate and then be left alone with a big clean-up when they were reinstated to their zone assignment. What happened is that the teams gradually changed their approach from a pure team cleaning sweep of the entire assignment to a hybrid system in which members would individually clean their old zone assignment to their liking and then meet as a team at a pre-arranged time to clean the neutral or shared territory in their team assignment. The supervisors were watching this closely, and as they saw this unauthorized change gradually take place they saw the discord lessen and the buildings get cleaned better, so they let it continue. The result was that a sort of equilibrium was reached in which there was a better outcome with the hybrid than either the pure zone system or the pure team cleaning

system.

When we institute team cleaning again, we would like to insert a working supervisor or lead worker to the mix so that there is clearly someone in charge who can provide feedback on team members' performance and make team decisions. Although custodians can learn to be leaders, most of them are just not oriented that way or have not had a chance. The extra leadworker position would be a perfect proving ground for new leaders and supervisors, and it would eliminate some the confusion from lack of clear direction on the moment-by-moment questions that arise.

Team cleaning helped us through a tough patch quite well. Just that fact that we went to team cleaning when the zone system became unworkable implies that team cleaning is probably more efficient, and we want to see what happens if we take five individual zones worth of building space and assign a hand-picked team of five custodians to it. Then we would have a good comparison.

It is unlikely that we could ever fill our entire crew with good team players, and because of their use patterns, some buildings are better cleaned with a zonal approach while others lend themselves to team cleaning. Therefore, we expect to improve our efficiency and lower our costs in the future by using a combination of the two approaches. Based on our experience plus a little bit of extrapolating, the next time we implement team cleaning, we will:

- Hand-pick the team members for team compatibility,
- Have someone on the team clearly in charge,
- Assign the teams to buildings with little or no scheduled after-hours activity requiring locking and unlocking doors, or to such buildings at a time after the activity ceases,
- Provide training on how to work on a team without assuming that everyone can be remade into a team player through more training - some will never change,
- Help develop team identities through team names, competitions, etc.,
- Strike a balance to attain the minimum necessary training to produce the best possible value or outcome for the cost of the training - without getting caught in the trap of training for trainings' sake.

## Utah Report

Correspondent: Brian Nielson

## Utah State University

By Darrel Hart, Associate VP for Facilities

Utah State University facilities organization has been working on the broader issue of involvement for some time and have implemented a system of career ladders that seems to be working so far. This took some time to develop and we are still working on it as we go. We collaborated with our campus HR office to develop a spread sheet which has several groups across the top and various levels (we call them tracks) down the left side.

There are three separate spread sheets - one with three levels named Entry, Intermediate, and Senior for our non-exempt people who are filling roles in custodial and similar areas. One for the skilled crafts and trades that has five levels - Entry, Intermediate, Working, Senior, and Lead.

Finally, there is also group for exempt employees that also has five levels with the same names. Within each group there are tracks associated with one's official assignment. Example: Custodian is track 1T on the three level system, an electrician is track 6 on the non exempt five level system, and an engineer is track 16 on the exempt five level system.

Each block within each level and each system provides a target salary for that individual. We say target because we have been unable to reach the target amounts so far. When we started several years ago, the gap between target and actual for the entire organization was \$750,000 but at least it provided something to shoot for and it gave individuals an idea as to the future.

It was particularly helpful in career planning for professionals and technicians. In order to move to the right (read make more money), the individual and his supervisor planned what training, certifications, or activities the individual could partake in with the overall intent of helping the individual reach their potential. In order for a craftsman to reach the next available level, they have to pass a written and practical exam. The shop supervisors have developed written exams and in some cases utilized state exams for this purpose.

This has proven to be very beneficial to both the individual and the organization as it pushes the organization into a mode of continual learning. In addition, as one increases in level the expectations continue to grow. Technicians have the opportunity to accept responsibility roles within the work team such as Safety Technician, Planner, Scheduler, PM Coordinator, etc. depending on the needs of the work team. So as a technician grows within the organization they continue to build their skill set and ability to accept more responsible assignments.

In order to make this even more complicated, we decided to rotate work team leadership periodically, generally between three and five years depending on the needs of the organization. These leaders, called foremen, move out of their positions when their time is up and into a different role within the work team or possible into a different assignment altogether. They maintain their salary and become part of the senior leadership within the work team. The overall idea is that each work team of about 12-15 technicians will have 2-3 senior technicians that guide the overall direction of the shop. About half of our shops have now rotated once so it has been interesting; of course, this was never done before so it is a huge change of mindset for our people.

In the old days, one became a foreman and kept that position for the remainder of his career. At some point he also picked an assistant foreman who became foreman eventually and so on. The problem is that this limits growth for others particularly in the case of a relatively young foreman. The moment we implemented this change, the atmosphere in the shop changed. Everyone realized that if they ever wanted to compete for the foreman role someday, they would have to work together and get along as a team since there were members of the work team on the selection committee.

When there is an open foreman position, it is advertised within all of the Operations Directorate. Anyone can complete. Several members of the work team who are not interested are asked to sit on the committee along with the manager, and HR Specialist. The Operations Director and the AVP would then review the team's recommendation to make the decision.

Overall, the process seems to be working for USU and we plan to continue along this direction.

**Joseph A. Metzger, Editor**  
**University Services**  
**Arizona State University**  
**P.O. Box 875112**  
**Tempe, AZ 85287-5112**



**Newsletter of the Rocky Mountain  
Education Facilities Higher Education  
Facilities Officers (RMA)**

The ROCKY MOUNTAIN ASSOCIATION OF PHYSICAL PLANT ADMINISTRATORS OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES was organized in February of 1953 for the purpose of promoting the common interest in the planning, maintenance and operation of physical plants of Universities and Colleges in the Rocky Mountain Region: to foster a professional spirit among those engaged in this work; and to support and supplement the activities of its parent organization, the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers (APPA). The Rocky Mountain Region encompasses the states of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming and in Canada the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories.

**REGIONAL OFFICERS 2005-2006**

President  
First Vice President  
Second Vice President  
Secretary/Treasurer  
Newsletter Editor  
Historian  
Senior Representative  
Junior Representative  
Awards and Recognition Committee  
Membership Committee  
Information & Research Committee  
Professional Affairs Committee  
Educational Programs Committee

**Eakle Barfield**  
**Mary Vosevich**  
**Kevin Hansen**  
**John P. Morris**  
**Joseph Metzger**  
**Darrel Buffaloe**  
**Mark Shively**  
**Tommy Moss**  
**George Stumpf**  
**Nancy Hurt**  
**Lorenzo Cotton**  
**Dave Button**  
**Shari Philpot**

Montana State University (Billings)  
University of New Mexico  
Weber State University  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
Arizona State University  
Idaho State University  
University of Wyoming  
Colorado State University  
University of Colorado  
Colorado State University  
Pima Community College  
University of Regina  
University of Colorado at Boulder

**FUTURE MEETINGS**

2007 Annual Meeting  
2008 Annual Meeting

Albuquerque, NM  
Ogden, UT

University of New Mexico  
Webber State University