

To: EDUCATION RESOURCES SUB-COMMITTEE		Subject: SCHOOL CLEANING CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REVIEW
From: DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION & DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES		
Date: 25 July 2005	Ref: GP/CR	

1. SUMMARY

1.1 This report describes the performance of the school-cleaning contract from 1 April 2005 to 24 June 2005.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The education (resources) sub-committee is recommended:

- (a) to note the performance of the school-cleaning contract for 1 April 2005 to 24 June 2005.
- (b) to request the submission of regular performance review reports to future meetings of the sub-committee.

Christine Fallock

Members wishing further information about this report should contact:

Michael O'Neill, Director of Education, on 01236 812337 or
 Murdo MacIver, Head of Service, on 01236 812269
 Paul Jukes, Director of Community Services, on 0141 304 1931 or
 Graham Patrick, Head of Facility Support Services, on 0141 304 1869

NORTH LANARKSHIRE COUNCIL : EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

School Cleaning Contract - Performance Review

Joint Report by the Director of Education & Director of Community Services

1. Background

1.1 The education (resources) sub-committee has called for regular reports on the performance of school contracts. This report is part of that process and covers the period from 1 April 2005 to 24 June 2005.

2. Financial Performance

2.1 The financial performance of the school cleaning contract for 1 April 2005 to 24 June 2005 is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Budget Analysis Period 1- 3

Classification	BUDGET Period 1 – 3	ACTUAL Period 1 – 3	VARIANCE Period 1 – 3
Cleaning Services	£1,155,131	£1,175,600	(£20,469)

2.2. The explanation for the variance from the projected budget expenditure is as follows:-

- Additional cleaning associated with vandalism, flood damage and office cleaning during holiday periods were arranged.
- Additional cleaning associated with building works have caused an overspend in primary and secondary schools. However most costs have been reallocated to capital projects by the education department.
- The budgets for Cumbernauld/St Andrew's primary schools do not adequately reflect the cost of cleaning.
- The additional costs associated with cleaning new nursery classes at Balmalloch, Tollbrae, Condorrat, St Margaret of Scotland primary schools have not yet been included in the budget allocations.

2.3 Additional cleaning costs are expected to result in budget overspend at the end of the year.

2.4 The savings associated with the reduction in cleaning services to Glengowan/St Mary's (£15,329) and St Timothys/St James (£11,241) will be part of the transferable budgets which will partly offset the Education 2010 PPP Project affordability gap.

2.5 The projected outturn for 2005/2006 is shown in table 2.

Table 2 : Outturn 2005 / 2006

Classification	Annual Budget	Forecast Outturn	VARIANCE
Cleaning Services	£5,242,016	£5,333,745	(£91,729)

3. Quality Performance

- 3.1 The result of the service delivery questionnaire for the period from 1 March 2005 to 31 May 2005 is detailed in Tables 3 - 5. A further breakdown is included in Appendices 1 - 4.
- 3.2 The results are based on a return of 130 questionnaires by the due date from the 191 questionnaires issued to head teachers. Overall the level of satisfaction with the service among those making a return is very high (93%).
- 3.3 Where comments are received, investigations are carried out and action is taken to resolve the issues.

Table 3 : Comment on Service Standard

Is the Standard of Cleaning	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor
	45	62	21	1

Table 4 : Comment on Relative Performance

Do you feel the standard of service provided to you has	Improved	Deteriorated	Remained the Same
	11	7	110

Table 5 : Comment on Building Cleaning Service Delivery

QUESTIONS	YES	NO
Are the cleaning staff polite and helpful?	129	0
Is the standard of the basic clean meeting your requirements?	121	8

Have you requested any additional cleaning in the last three months?	45	84
If you answer YES to the above question were these additional requirements carried out to your satisfaction?	45	0
Have you met the area manager within the last three months?	76	49

4. Recommendations

The education (resources) sub-committee is recommended to:

- (1) approve the report on the performance of the school cleaning contract for the period 1 April 2005 to 24 June 2005.
- (2) request the submission of regular performance review reports to future meetings of the sub-committee.

APPENDIX 1

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Number Of Questionnaires - 130

Number of Questionnaires Returned - 91

Table 1 : Comment on Service Standard

Is the Standard of cleaning	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor
	32	46	13	0

Table 2 : Comment on Relative Performance

Do you feel the standard of service provided to you has	Improved	Deteriorated	Remained the Same
	6	3	82

Table 3 : Comment on Building Cleaning Service Delivery

QUESTIONS	YES	NO
Are the cleaning staff polite and helpful?	91	0
Is the standard of the basic clean meeting your requirements?	89	2
Have you requested any additional cleaning in the last three months?	30	60
If you answer YES to the above question were these additional requirements carried out to your satisfaction?	30	0
Have you met the area manager within the last three months?	52	36

APPENDIX 2

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Number Of Questionnaires - 26

Number of Questionnaires Returned - 21

Table 1 : Comment on Service Standard

Is the Standard of cleaning	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor
	5	9	5	1

Table 2 : Comment on Relative Performance

Do you feel the standard of service provided to you has	Improved	Deteriorated	Remained the Same
	1	3	16

Table 3 : Comment on Building Cleaning Service Delivery

QUESTIONS	YES	NO
Are the cleaning staff polite and helpful?	20	0
Is the standard of the basic clean meeting your requirements?	16	4
Have you requested any additional cleaning in the last three months?	14	7
If you answer YES to the above question were these additional requirements carried out to your satisfaction?	14	0
Have you met the area manager within the last three months?	15	6

APPENDIX 3

SPECIAL SCHOOLS

Number Of Questionnaires - 11

Number Of Questionnaires Returned - 6

Table 1 : Comment on Service Standard

Is the Standard of cleaning	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor
	3	3	0	0

Table 2 : Comment on Relative Performance

Do you feel the standard of service provided to you has	Improved	Deteriorated	Remained the Same
	1	0	5

Table 3 : Comment on Building Cleaning Service Delivery

QUESTIONS	YES	NO
Are the cleaning staff polite and helpful?	6	0
Is the standard of the basic clean meeting your requirements?	6	0
Have you requested any additional cleaning in the last three months?	0	6
If you answer YES to the above question were these additional requirements carried out to your satisfaction?	0	0
Have you met the area manager within the last three months?	2	4

APPENDIX 4

NURSERY SCHOOLS

Number Of Questionnaires - 24

Number Of Questionnaires Returned - 12

Table 1 : Comment on Service Standard

Is the Standard of cleaning	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor
	5	4	3	0

Table 2 : Comment on Relative Performance

Do you feel the standard of service provided to you has	Improved	Deteriorated	Remained the Same
	3	1	8

Table 3 : Comment on Building Cleaning Service Delivery

QUESTIONS	YES	NO
Are the cleaning staff polite and helpful?	12	0
Is the standard of the basic clean meeting your requirements?	10	2
Have you requested any additional cleaning in the last three months?	1	11
If you answer YES to the above question were these additional requirements carried out to your satisfaction?	1	0
Have you met the area manager within the last three months?	7	5