



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

I. Program/Service Information

Name of Program or Services:

Facilities, Maintenance

Personnel Responsible for Evaluation:

Larry Thompson, Director of Facilities and Operations

Date of Evaluation:

October/November 2004

Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

To ascertain the quality, timeliness and overall department's ability to meet the needs of the various departments/buildings with regards to repairs, improvements and building maintenance.

Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP Standards:

Information gathered would help the department in maintaining facilities that are healthful, adequate in size, well maintained and appropriate to house the educational programs of the district (MISP Standard 8.9 and checklist 8.9.1 and 8.9.2).

Demographic Description of Program:

Location(s)

All district owned buildings and leased properties that house Special School District programs.

Number of staff

Director
Manager
Twelve Maintenance Staff
14 total



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Participants

45 survey questionnaires were sent out and 35 were returned.

Surveys were sent to all Principals, Assistant Principals, various Department Heads, Program Directors and Administrators that work with Maintenance and have knowledge of building needs.

Length of program/service

Semi annual survey that will alternate with a similar survey which will ascertain the quality of services provided by our Custodial Services.

II. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

SSD staff: Jerry Rudolph, Maintenance Manager
Principals, Assistant Principals, Department Heads,
Program Directors

Agency: Dan Ehlenbeck, Consultant, Access Management Group

III. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered:

Staff perception
Assessment statistics
Other: Completed Work orders

IV. Data Collection Methodology:

Questionnaire/Survey
Document review

V. Results

Time spent on program evaluation

Approximately 32 hours



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Strengths of program/service

Obvious strengths of the program include Leadership which had an Average score of 4.5 with a rating of 5 being “strongly agree”.

Communications with staff is also an identified strength with an average score of 4.45.

Service provided was rated at 4.32.

The Department had an overall rating of 4.24.

Concerns regarding program/service

Although there were three concerns identified (ratings below 4), all three are related and deal with the ability of maintenance staff to stay focused on the task at hand (score of 3.53), quality of work (score of 3.86) and technical proficiency (score of 3.69).

These above scores that fell between the “Moderate” and “Agree” ratings can be attributed to several factors:

1. The Department has been working short staffed for most of 2003 and all of 2004. Since July of 2004 there were five vacancies that needed to be filled by various skilled workers.
2. Positions in the past have been filled with individuals whose skill levels did not match the requirements of the position which affected the quality of the work performed.
3. Being short staffed caused workers to be pulled from job to job depending on the urgency of the work orders received. It was difficult to keep workers at one site yet alone focused on one task at a time.

Recommendations regarding program/service

The Director needs to develop new Job Descriptions for each level of worker in the Department that will list the various skills and experience necessary to effectively carry out the requirements of the position.



Standard Program and Service Evaluation Template

(Board of Education Approved on June 1, 2004)

Recommendations regarding program/service (continued)

Fill all of the vacant positions with qualified individuals whose skill level and experience fits both the need and job requirements of the position.

Assign workers with various skill levels to a specific building or area and keep them there for the majority of their time on the job.

VI. Action Plan for Recommendations as A Result of Program Evaluation

Person responsible to champion action plan

Larry Thompson, Director of Facilities and Operations

Timeframe for reporting updates to Board of Education

New Job Descriptions completed by December 1, 2004

All vacancies filled by qualified individuals by January 1, 2005

Staff assigned to a specific area or building by March 1, 2005

Update report on progress to the Board of Education in June of 2005

Date: _____
Signature of Administrator Responsible for Chairing Evaluation
