

To: Education Resources Sub Committee		Subject: Grounds Maintenance Contract Performance Review
From: Director of Education Director of Community Services		
Date: November 2006	Ref:MM/KF	

Summary

This report covers the regular monitoring of the grounds maintenance contract for the period April 2006 to November 2006.

Recommendations

The education (resources) sub committee is recommended to:

- a) note the performance of the grounds maintenance contract for the period April 2006 to November 2006.
- b) request the submission of regular performance review reports to future meetings of the committee



Members wishing further information about this paper should contact:

Michael O'Neil, Director of Education, on 01236 812336 or
 Murdo Maciver, Head of Education Provision, on 01236 812269
 Paul Jukes, Director of Community Services, on 0141 304 1875
 Kenneth Wilson, Head of Land Services, on 0141 304 1909

NORTH LANARKSHIRE COUNCIL: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ground Maintenance Contract: Performance Review

Joint report by Director of Education and Director of Community Services

1 Background

This report covers the period from April 2006 to November 2006.

2 Finance

- 2.1 Routine ground maintenance for schools and educational properties is carried out to an agreed programme over the year. Routine work includes grass cutting, weed killing, sports pitch maintenance and flower and shrub bed maintenance.

In addition to the programmed work, non-routine works are carried out in response to requests from the department of education and at the discretion of community services. Non routine work includes the removal of deleterious material, the renovation of grassed sport pitches and arboricultural work.

- 2.2 The financial position up to period 8 is as follows.

	Budget	Actual	Variance
Programmed Work	£385,435	£385,435	0%
Non-Routine	£18,590	£18,590	0%
Total	£404,025	£404,025	0%

- 2.3 The out-turn position for the year is expected to be in accordance with the annual budget detailed below.

	Budget
Programmed Work	£770,870
Non-Routine	£37,181
Total	£808,051

The budget is subject to adjustments associated with the PPP schools programme.

3. Service Provision

- 3.1 Community services use the service delivery questionnaire to evaluate the quality of service provided to educational establishments.

These questionnaires are sent out to educational establishments 3 times per annum. A freepost envelope is included to encourage head teachers to complete and return the form. The questionnaire contains 11 standard questions with an area for additional comments if applicable. The most recent questionnaire covered the period April 2006 – September 2006.

The specific objectives of the questionnaire are as follows.

- To gather information on the quality and standard of service provided by the grounds maintenance and estates section.

- To gather information in relation to any additional or non-routine works requested and carried out.
 - To gather information on complaint handling.
- 3.2 Of the 151 questionnaires sent out 101 were returned, giving a response rate of 66.80%. The returned questionnaires were analysed using the SPSS software package as detailed in Appendix 1.
- 3.3 The main negative comments received on the service delivery questionnaire referred to the current frequency of grass cutting and the failure to lift arisings after completion of grass cutting operations. Head teachers felt that an increase in the grass cutting frequency and the removal of arisings would be beneficial to the quality and appearance of the school grounds.
- 3.4 The next stage in the service delivery questionnaire process will involve local management targeting the dissatisfied head teachers to discuss their dissatisfaction with the service and resolve problems.
- 3.5 All routine work up to period 8 is in line with the current work schedules. This has been achieved due to the extremely good weather over the summer period and the reduction in sickness absence within grounds maintenance and estates section, which has freed up additional manpower to address routine work.

4. Schools Projects/Initiatives

- 4.1 Members of staff have continued to support a number of schools with ground design. The Ranger Service from Countryside and Landscape also visit schools to advise on ECO gardens and conservation issues.

Recommendations

The education (resources) sub committee is recommended to:

- a) note the performance of the grounds maintenance contract for the period April 2006 to November 2006.
- b) request the submission of regular performance review reports to future meetings of the committee.

3.2.1 Is the current standard of grounds maintenance meeting your requirements?

Response	Narrative
84 (83.17%)	Grounds Maintenance requirements are being met.
11 (10.89%)	Grounds Maintenance requirements not being met.
6 (5.94%)	No response.

3.2.2 Please rate the quality of grounds maintenance provision.

Response	Narrative
8 (7.92%)	Quality of grounds maintenance – Excellent.
64 (63.60%)	Quality of grounds maintenance – Good.
27 (26.73%)	Quality of grounds maintenance – Adequate.
2 (1.99%)	Poor.

3.2.3 Do you feel the current standard of maintenance has improved?

Response	Narrative
10 (9.90%)	Grounds maintenance service has improved.
80 (79.20%)	Grounds maintenance service has remained the same.
9 (8.91%)	Grounds maintenance service has deteriorated.
2 (1.99%)	No Response.

3.2.4 Are grounds maintenance staff polite and helpful?

Response	Narrative
92 (91.08%)	Thought staff were polite and helpful.
1 (0.99%)	Did not think staff were polite and helpful.
8 (7.93%)	No response.

3.2.5 Have any additional grounds maintenance operations been requested during this period?

Response	Narrative
34 (33.66%)	Did request additional work.
65 (64.36%)	Did not request additional work.
2 (1.98%)	No response.

3.2.6 Were these additional works carried out to your satisfaction?

Response	Narrative
23 (67.64%)	Work carried out to satisfactory standard.
7 (20.59%)	Work not carried out to satisfactory standard.
4 (11.77%)	No response.

3.2.7 Have you met the grounds maintenance management during this period?

Response	Narrative
13 (12.87%)	Have met with local grounds maintenance management.
84 (83.16%)	Have not met with local grounds maintenance management.
4 (3.97%)	No response.

3.2.8 Have you had a reason to complain about the grounds maintenance service during this period?

Response	Narrative
11 (10.89%)	Have had reason to complain about the service.
86 (85.14%)	Have not had reason to complain about the service.
4 (3.97%)	No response.

3.2.9 If you answered Yes to the above question, how do you feel your complaint was handled?

Response	Narrative
7 (63.63%)	Felt their complaint was handled satisfactorily.
3 (27.27%)	Felt their complaint was handled unsatisfactorily
1 (9.10%)	No response.

3.2.10 If you have answered poorly to question 9, why did you feel it was handled poorly?

- 3 respondents felt that their complaint was handled in an unsatisfactory manner and commented as follows.
- Complaint never dealt with.
- Staff members car was scratched and the staff were unsympathetic.
- Requests need to be made repeatedly. If a complaint is raised with the staff there is little or no communication from senior management.