



# FACILITIES Maintenance Standard Program Evaluation

---

## Program Evaluation Question(s)

Does the District provide adequate maintenance services to maintain all educational facilities in a clean, safe and orderly state according to 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle Missouri School Improvement Program (MISP) standard 8.10?

### I. Program/Service Information

1. Name of Program or Services: Facilities, Maintenance

2. Personnel Responsible for Evaluation and Program (list):

Larry Thompson, Director of Facilities and Operations  
Jerry Rudolph, Maintenance Manager

3. Demographic Description of Program:

Location(s)

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

Number of staff

Estimated number of staff involved in program evaluation is approximately 35.

Participants

Principles, Assistant Principals, Department Heads, Program Directors, Maintenance staff and individuals that work with maintenance who have knowledge of building needs.

Length of program/service:

Annual

4. Date of Evaluation (Year/Duration):

October 2005-October 2006

5. Goal/Objective of Program/Services:

To ascertain the quality, timeliness and the overall department's ability to meet the maintenance needs of the District.

6. Brief description of relationship between program goals, CSIP and MSIP

Standards:

Information gathered would help the department to maintain facilities that are healthful, adequate in size, well maintained and appropriate to house the educational programs of the District (MISP Standard 8.10).



# FACILITIES Maintenance Standard Program Evaluation

---

## II. Evaluation Criteria for Programs/Services Offered (check type utilized)

The evaluation procedures and the criteria are used to evaluate program goals and objectives. What data are you going to use to answer your evaluation questions?

Outside Building Inspections X

Internal Building Inspections X

Questionnaire/Survey X

Work Order Reviews X

Capital Improvements X

## III. Description of Stakeholders Engagement in Program Evaluation:

Kevin Hoffman, Senior Loss Prevention Consultant, Arthur J. Gallagher & Co

Christopher Byrne, Environmental Specialist, Sitex Environmental Inc.

School Principals/Assistant Principals/Secretarial & Support Staff

Program Directors

Executive Directors

Department Heads

Maintenance Staff

Jerry Rudolph, Maintenance Manager, Special School District

Larry Thompson, Director of Facilities and Operations, Special School District



# FACILITIES Maintenance Standard Program Evaluation

---

## IV. Results

Describe the results by using percentage, means, and other measurements.

### 1. Strengths of program/service

The summation of all questionnaires showed an increase in all areas of the program. There were no ratings that fell below 4 (agree) with a rating of 5 the highest possible score (strongly agree). The highest ranked category was leadership with ratings of 4.97 and 4.81. Maintenance staff was ranked high as being courteous and respectful when interacting with students and staff with ratings of 4.65 and 4.66 respectively.

Communication with the schools was also a strength noted at a rating of 4.57. The three noted areas of concern from the last survey (quality of work, technical competency and efficiency) improved on average by .43 to ratings of 4.28, 4.09 and 4.00 respectively.

Overall service provided increased to a rating of 4.52 from 4.24 two years ago. The main reason(s) for the increase in overall satisfaction with the maintenance program at the District was the implementation of the three recommendations from the last program evaluation.

### 2. Concerns regarding program/service

The most favorable responses came from the Technical Education Schools, Administrators and Directors. There were four areas that fell below a rating of 4 in the Special Education Schools. Although the overall service provided by the department was rated at 3.9 by the Special Education Schools, quality of work, skill level and time management basically remained unchanged from two years ago. The Department needs to work on improving the ratings in these areas with the Special Education Schools.

### 3. Recommendations regarding program/services

Improve the quality of services provided by Maintenance to the Special Education Schools to a rating of 4 or better. Increase the skill levels of the Maintenance staff assigned to the Special Education Schools. Improve on the efficiency of time rating or staying focused on projects until completed.