Eva	aluator	Name: Ar	drew Geldmacher		Role: Dire	ctor of Transportation
				General	Information	
G	rant Na	ime			Contract Amount	\$7,125.00
P	artner/	Partner	Baltazar Velez		Date of Service(s)	September 1, 2024 thru June 30, 2025, SY2
S	chool S	te(s)				
Exp	o o olain: <u>S</u>	YES (if ye NO (if no N/A BDI-Cristina	e quotes for vendo s, please list vendo , please explain) Cespedes, SBDI-Jonatha	ors below) an Sharpe, SBDI-I	Baltazar Velez n to our Districts mission,	/vision/strategic plan?
						ted and critical training increasing
stu	dent safe	ty while being	transported.			
	main o	To provid To provid To provid To help t To conne To help t	rt mental and emo	population of upport to the uctional suppractices. In other resoulum and activition	schools. ort. rces. ties for the district, school	ol or classroom.
4.	Were		ed goal(s) and obj	ectives reache	ed?	
	0	YES NO (if no N/A	, please explain)			
Ex	olain: _					
	0	YES NO (if no	deliver on the expo		ent and outcomes?	

Explain:					
7. Did this partner proviYESNO (if no, pleaton)N/A		eedback and su	pport?		
Explain:					
8. Please complete the \ following areas:	/endor/Partne	r Assessment C	riteria scale belo	w and rank this	partner on the
	Vend	dor/Partner Ass	essment Criteria		
Criterion	(1) Ineffective	(2) Somewhat Ineffective	(3) Somewhat Effective	(4) Effective	(5) Highly Effective
Preparation: Provides high-quality services to meet goals				X	
Competency: Knowledge of craft					X
Flexibility: Willingness to change or compromise			X		
Consistency: Schedule & routine					X
Organization: Structured, orderly, &	Section 1				X

6. Did this partner supply appropriate materials and supplies necessary to accomplish goals and

Please indicate specifically how the vendor/partner impacted student achievement, leadership
development or district operations. Note: Please provide documentation and evidence of impact of
vendor/partner services.

Χ

X

Revised 6.3.24

efficient use of time management

Professionalism:

Interactions are cordial & respectful

Overall Experience with partner

outcomes?
• YES

o N/A

o NO (if no, please explain)

	sion with a constant	t professional approa	ich. He makes sure t	hat every monitor that	at attends his traini
ssions understands the mat	erial covered and re	efuses to sign trainir	g certificate for any n	nonitors that fail to p	articipate in the
andated training.					
. Use the space below	to provide any	additional feed	back you think w	ould be helpful:	
		A			
	_ ^ _	/)			
nature of Evaluator	Coldma	chor		Date: 01/02/2025	
gnature of Evaluator _	Coldma	cher		Date: 01/02/2025	
gnature of Evaluator _	Coldma	cher		Date: 01/02/2025	
gnature of Evaluator _	<u>Czeldma</u>	chez		Date: 01/02/2025	
gnature of Evaluator _	0		EW ONLY ****	Date: 01/02/2025	
gnature of Evaluator _	****	* FOR PEER REVI	EW ONLY ****	Date: 01/02/2025	
gnature of Evaluator _	***** Vende	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer	EW ONLY **** Review Criteria		(5)
gnature of Evaluator _	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI	EW ONLY ****	(4)	(5) Highly
	***** Vende	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2)	Review Criteria		
	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
Criterion	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
Criterion Impact:	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation	***** Vend	* FOR PEER REVI or/Partner Peer (2) Somewhat	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat	(4)	Highly
Criterion Impact: Based on artifacts/evidence/ evaluation Overall Experience	Vendo (1) Ineffective	FFOR PEER REVIOUS PARTIES OF PEER (2) Somewhat Ineffective	Review Criteria (3) Somewhat Effective	(4)	Highly Effective