2013-2014 STANDARDS-BASED CAPITAL OUTLAY AWARDS

Maintenance Program Status Report

| | | | | | | | 1 | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | | | Current Maint Only | |
| | | Last PM Plan | | | | Avg FMAR | Avg FMAR | _ | Staffing % Level | |
| | | Update (reqd. | MD Score | PMD Score | UD Score | Score 2011 | | Score 2013 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| District | PM Plan Status | Annually) | Q1 2013 | Q1 2013 | Q1 2013 | (sample Q4) | (sample Q4) | Q2 | ASU FTE) | Comments |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.5 but not 5.3. PM Plan past due (3/6/12): must provide updated plan that is executable with a |
| Alamogordo | Outdated | 3/6/2012 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2 | 80.15 | No Data | 63.18 | | demonstrated improvement of seven (7) points. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.5 but not 5.3. PM plan in development, due 7-27-13: must provide updated plan that is executable with a |
| Albuquerque | Current | 7/27/2012 | 2.5 | 2 | 3 | 72.6 | 19.35 | 62.62 | 120.34 | demonstrated improvement of eight (8) points. Recommend Team walkthrough self-inspections. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.3, but not to 22-24-5.5. Historically consistent performer in maintenance not capturing energy or utility |
| | | | | | | | | | | data, non-user of Utility Direct. Business office and Supt. have been informed. Must improve maintenance performance by six (6) |
| Belen | Current | 10/1/2012 | 2.5 | 2 | 1.5 | 77.06 | 73.83 | 63.72 | 96.49 | points. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Not performing to 22-24-5.3 & 22-24-5.5. Historically good performer with recent staffing changes and significant performance |
| | | | | | | | | | | decline, and current data indicates poor performance. Recommend re-establishing Maintenace programs with performance |
| Central | Outdated | 4/13/2012 | 2 | 1.75 | 2 | 71.49 | 61.91 | 48.83 | 181.24 | metrics, and providing an updated PM plan (past due 4-12-13) that is executable with a demonstrated improvement of 22 points. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.3 and 22-24-5.5. Recommend improved FIMS use by capturing all costs (Labor, Materials, and Contract |
| Deming | Current | 5/9/2013 | 1.75 | 2 | 2 | No Data | No Data | No Data | 107.77 | costs). FMAR data currently not available. |
| Farmington | Current | 10/22/2012 | 2.75 | 2 | 2.5 | 78.22 | 81.91 | 72.28 | 113.21 | Top Performing district with several best practices identified. Performing to 22-24-5.3 and 22-24-5.5. |
| Gadsden | Current | 10/18/2012 | 2.75 | 1.75 | 2.75 | 74.01 | 73.5 | No Data | 107.95 | Consistently performing to 22-24-5.3 and 22-24-5.5. Most recent scores in the satisfactory range. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.3, but not to 22-24-5.5. Prior performer with decline in both maintenance and reporting. Current FMARs |
| | | | | | | | | | | indicate Poor Performance. Must improve FMAR scores by 23 points. Recommend site-based maintenance due to distance |
| Gallup | Current | 1/22/2013 | 2.25 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 77.3 | 52.24 | 47.47 | 113.25 | between sites, and re-consideration of fundamental maintenance approach. |
| ' | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.5 and 22-24-5.3. Several opportunities for improvement identified, and should improve FMAR scores by |
| Grants | Current | 3/13/2013 | 2.25 | 1.5 | 2 | 58.64 | 73.44 | 65.89 | 41.64 | four (4) points. Recommend enhancing PM program and measurement. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.5, but not to 22-24-5.3. Must provide an updated PM plan that is executable. Current FMAR data is not |
| Hobbs | Outdated | 9/1/2009 | 2 | 1.75 | 2 | No Data | No Data | No Data | 86.21 | available. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.5 but not 5.3. PM plan past due (7/1/12): must provide an updated plan that is executable with a two (2) |
| Las Cruces | Outdated | 7/1/2011 | 1.75 | 2 | 2 | 78.82 | No Data | 68.90 | 110.00 | point score improvement. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.5 but not 5.3. PM plan past due (7/1/12): must provide an updated plan that is executable with a |
| Las Vegas City | Outdated | 6/8/2012 | 1.75 | 1.5 | 2 | No Data | 43.16 | 65.80 | 123.00 | demonstrated improvement of five (5) points. |
| , | | | | | | | | | | Not performing to 22-24-5.3 or 22-24-5.5. Must provide an updated PM plan that is executable, and improve FIMS use. FMAR not |
| Lordsburg | Outdated | 9/30/2009 | 1.5 | 2 | 1.5 | No Data | No Data | No Data | 100.00 | currently available. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.5 and 22-24-5.3. Recommend enhancing PM program and measurement. Several opportunities for |
| Los Lunas | Current | 7/1/2013 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2 | No Data | No Data | 63.07 | 1.07 | improvement identified, and must improve scores by seven (7) points. |
| Mesa Vista | Current | 7/16/2012 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2 | No Data | 71.04 | No Data | 0.81 | Performing to 22-24-5.3, but not to 22-24-5.5. Recent change in leadership. |
| | Garrent | 7,10,2012 | | | _ | | 7 2.0 . | | 0.01 | Performing to 22-24-5.3 and 22-24-5.5. Recommend enhancing PM program to include capturing of all costs in FIMS system (labor, |
| NMSBVI | Current | 11/14/2012 | 1.75 | 2 | 2 | 81.08 | No Data | No Data | 2.09 | materials, contract). |
| | | ,_,_,, | | _ | _ | 02.00 | | | | Performing to 22-24-5.3 and 22-24-5.5. Recommend enhancing PM program to include capturing of all costs in FIMS system (labor, |
| Pecos | Outdated | 6/1/2012 | 1.75 | 2 | 0.5 | No Data | No Data | 70.17 | No Data | materials, contract). |
| | | -, , - | _ | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Not performing to 22-24-5.3 or 5.5. Historic non-performer that needs substantial (34pt) performance improvement. Recommend |
| Reserve | Outdated | 5/1/2012 | 1 | 1 | 2 | No Data | 6.32 | 36.63 | No Data | embracing preventative maintenance and using the tools provided. Current FMARs indicate Poor performance. |
| Roswell | Current | 10/15/2012 | 2.75 | 2.25 | 2.75 | 75.8 (2010) | 77.92 | 72.90 | 1.16 | Top Performing district, several best practices identified. Performing to 22-24-5.3 and 22-24-5.5. |
| Silver | Outdated | 10/24/2011 | 1 | 1.75 | N/A | No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | Performing to 22-24-5.5 but not 5.3. PM plan past due (10/24/11): must provide an updated plan that is executable. |
| Silver - Aldo | Non-existent | 10/24/2011 | 2.23 | 1./3 | IN/A | INO Dala | INO Data | INO Dala | INO Data | Not performing to Statutes 22-24-5.3 or 22-24-5.5. Must provide an updated PM plan that is executable with a demonstrated |
| Leopold Charter | In Development | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No Data | No Data | 30.24 | No Data | improvement of 40 points. |
| Ecopoia Charter | in Development | IN/A | IN/A | IN/A | IN/A | INO Data | NO Data | 30.24 | | Performing to 22-24-5.3, but not to 22-24-5.5. Must improve FMAR scores by 7 points. Current FMARs indicate Marginal |
| Tularosa | Current | 3/12/2013 | 1.75 | 1.5 | 1.5 | No Data | No Data | 63.91 | | Performance. |
| i uiai USa | Current | 3/12/2013 | 1./3 | 1.5 | 1.3 | INO Data | INO Data | 03.31 | | Not performing to Statutes 22-24-5.3 or 22-24-5.5. Current FMARs indicate Poorly Performance. Must provide an updated PM plan |
| West Las Vegas | Outdated | 5/16/2012 | 1.75 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 62.56 | 69.73 | 56.75 | | that is executable, with a demonstrated improvement of 14 points. |
| AACSULAS AERAS | Julianca | 3/10/2012 | 1./3 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 02.30 | 09.73 | 30.73 | 0.30 | and is exceedable, with a demonstrated improvement of 14 points. |
| | | | 1 | | | | <u> </u> | | | |
| <u>Legend</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| PSCOC PM Plannii | ng guidelines, approv | val 22-24-5.3 | Current | Outdated | | FMAR Scoring | | | | Staffing Level based on national benchmark study, American School and University (ASU), 2009 |
| PSCOC FIMS use & participation 22-24-5.5 | | | User | Non User | | Ove | rall School | Mainten | ance Rating | ACII Benchmark (Median) |
| | | | | | Outstanding 90.1% to 100% | | | ASU Benchmark (Median) | | |
| FIMS Modules FIMS Scoring | | | Description | | | | | | 1% to 90% | SF maintained per full-time custodial worker 32100.0 |
| MD-Work Order System 0 to 1.5 | | 0 to 1.5 | Non-user or implementation stage | | | | Satisfactory 70.1% | | | SF maintained per full-time maintenance worker 92074.0 |
| PMD-PM work order Scheduling tool 1.75 to 1.99 | | | Program development | | | Marginal 60.1 to 70 | | | | Acres maintained per full-time grounds worker 31.0 |
| UD-Utility Use and costing tool 2.0 to 3.0 Data Analysis and performing stage | | | | | | | | | Notes Traintained per fair affic grounds worker 51.0 | |
| 2.0 to 3.0 Data Analysis and performing stage | | | | | | | | | | |