

**STATE ALLOCATION BOARD**

1130 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
<http://www.dgs.ca.gov/opsc>



**Date:** May 21, 2007

**To:** Interested Parties

**Subject:** **NOTICE OF THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

Notice is hereby provided that the State Allocation Board Implementation Committee will hold a meeting on **Friday**, June 1, 2007 from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. in the Legislative Office Building located at 1020 "N" Street, Room 100, Sacramento, California.

The Implementation Committee's proposed agenda is as follows:

1. Convene Meeting
2. Permanent Evaluation Instrument  
*Discussion on the proposed school facility inspection and evaluation instrument including the rating criteria for determining the conditions of schools as required by Chapter 704, Statutes of 2006 (Assembly Bill 607 – Goldberg)*
3. Consideration of adding a Construction Management Representative to the Implementation Committee

Any interested person may present public testimony or comments at this meeting regarding the issues scheduled for discussion. Any public input regarding unscheduled issues should be presented in writing, which may then be scheduled for a future meeting. For additional information, please contact Carrie Richter at (916) 445-3159.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mavonne Garrity".

MAVONNE GARRITY, Chairperson  
State Allocation Board Implementation Committee

MG:cr

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Pending Items List  
June 1, 2007

---

A. Future Items

- Chapter 35, Statutes of 2006 (Assembly Bill 127-Nunez and Perata)  
*Discussion on the implementation of the seismic mitigation provisions of Proposition 1D.*
- Grant Adequacy  
*Discussion on the cost and project scope data to be collected on the "Project Information Worksheet" in order to analyze the adequacy of the grants.*
- Site Sale Proceeds  
*Discussion on proposed regulatory amendments regarding proceeds from the sale of a site funded in whole or part with State funds.*

B. Suspended Items

- Alternative Education Loading Standards and Funding  
*Discussion on the loading standards and adequacy of the funding provided for continuation high, community day, and county community day schools under the School Facility Program.*

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
June 1, 2007

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL

PURPOSE

To present a draft of the permanent school facility inspection and evaluation instrument including the rating criteria for determining the conditions of a school as required by Chapter 704, Statutes of 2006 [Assembly Bill (AB) 607 – Goldberg].

BACKGROUND

As part of the settlement agreement in the case of *Williams vs. California*, the Governor and Legislature implemented several accountability and performance measures for ensuring that all California school children have equal access to adequate school facilities and these facilities are maintained in good repair. The term “good repair” had consistently been used in various school facility sections of the Education Code (EC); however, this was the first time it has been defined in statute.

Senate Bill 550 (Chapter 900, Statutes of 2004 - Vasconcellos) required the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) to develop an Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI) to define good repair for school facilities. This visual inspection tool, adopted by the State Allocation Board (SAB) in January 2005, has been used by school districts and county offices of education (COEs) in assessing schools with respect to cleanliness, safety and functionality. Next, pursuant to EC Section 17002, the OPSC with assistance of a stakeholder Workgroup, drafted the Good Repair Report which made recommendations to the Governor and Legislature regarding options for State standards as an alternative to the IEI. These recommendations became the foundation for the statutory definition of good repair identified in AB 607.

In turn, the IEI definitions adopted by AB 607 expanded the good repair standards to include the overall cleanliness of school facilities. In addition, AB 607 required the OPSC to add a rating system to evaluate each component and a method to provide for an overall summary of the conditions at each school. This last provision is required to be implemented by July 1, 2007.

DISCUSSION

**Workgroup for the Development of the Permanent Evaluation Instrument**

To assist in development of the permanent evaluation instrument, the OPSC formed a workgroup of experts and practitioners from COEs and school districts across the State as well as public school health advocates. The following individuals contributed a great amount of knowledge, expertise, time and effort to this project. The OPSC extends its appreciation to all of the following:

Mr. Brooks Allen  
Attorney  
American Civil Liberties Union

Mr. Chris Cox  
Program Manager  
Maintenance, Operations, and Transportation  
San Bernardino County Supt. of Schools

Mr. Bryan Ehm  
Facilities Planning Coordinator  
San Diego County Office of Education

Ms. Vinceena Kelly, AIA  
Regionalized Business Services Coordinator  
Division of Business Advisory Services  
Los Angeles County Office of Education

Mr. Carlos Rivera  
Education Research and Evaluation Consultant  
Policy & Evaluation Division  
California Department of Education

Ms. Deborah Moore  
Executive Director  
Green Schools Initiative

Mr. Bill Savidge  
Vice-Chair  
Coalition for Adequate School Housing  
Engineering Officer  
West Contra Costa Unified School District

Ms. Mamie Starr  
Director, Operations/Support Services  
San Joaquin County Office of Education

Ms. Toni Stein, Ph.D.  
Air Pollution Research Specialist  
Department of Health Services

Mr. Fred Yeager  
Assistant Director  
School Facilities Planning Division  
California Department of Education

In addition, the OPSC would like to acknowledge and thank the staff from the Los Angeles COE, San Joaquin COE, Lodi Unified School District, and Central Elementary School District. They participated in field testing the draft inspection tool and provided valuable feedback to the Workgroup.

### **Workgroup Activities**

The first task of the Workgroup was to develop a list of desirable criteria to be contained in the permanent instrument. In summary, the goal of the Workgroup was to develop an inspection tool with the following characteristics:

- Simple to use in the field
- Designed to be used as a visual inspection by a variety of individuals with some familiarity with school facilities
- Affords clear and easy transfer of information into the School Accountability Report Card (SARC)
- As objective as possible
- Compliant with statutory provisions
- Utilizes language that contains no double negatives
- Balanced in regards to appropriately assessing the conditions of schools while being mindful of users' needs and skill levels
- Accompanied by information on references and definition of terms
- Designed to be integrated with maintenance, work order and budgeting systems of school districts

Most of these desirable characteristics were captured in the final draft of the inspection tool. In addition, Workgroup participants expressed interest in future development of an accompanying guidebook for facilities maintenance based on the Good Repair Standard. The integration with maintenance systems was another desirable characteristic that can be undertaken at the local school district or COE level.

Next, the group evaluated the good repair criteria outlined in law and contained in the IEI. The group noted that, although all of the criteria define clean, safe and functional school facilities, some of the facility conditions are most critical to the health and safety of pupils and staff. For

example, some deficiencies can yield the facility unusable, such as structural damage or severe sewer backup, while other deficiencies contribute to a substandard learning environment but do not present serious health or safety concerns. The group identified such facility conditions that are critical to the health and safety of pupils and staff based on the items specifically identified in EC Section 17592.72(c) for purposes of Emergency Repair Program funding. When incorporated into the Good Repair Standard, these items constitute “extreme deficiencies” and indicate that the particular system/component failed to meet the standard of good repair at the school site being evaluated. These items require immediate attention and, if left unmitigated, could cause severe and immediate injury, illness or death of the occupants.

The Workgroup arranged the criteria identified by AB 607 and contained in the revised IEI into a Good Repair Standard with 15 categories of building systems and components, as listed below:

1. Gas leaks
2. Mechanical Systems
3. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences (Interior and exterior)
4. Interior Surfaces (Floors, Ceilings, Walls, and Window Casings)
5. Hazardous Materials (Interior and Exterior)
6. Structural Damage
7. Fire Safety
8. Electrical (Interior and Exterior)
9. Pest/Vermin Infestation
10. Drinking Fountains (Inside and Outside)
11. Restrooms
12. Sewer
13. Playground/School Grounds
14. Roofs
15. Overall Cleanliness

Statute requires that each of these categories be evaluated on the scale of good, fair, and poor. With the goals of simplicity and adaptability in mind, the group developed a Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) that rates each of the 15 categories on a percentage basis. By determining the percentage of good repair, the school size and/or the number of areas inspected becomes less of a defining factor.

Further, in order for the ratio to accurately reflect the scope of any deficiencies, the tool requires the user to identify any of the 15 items that are non-applicable to each individual space. For example, if there are only eight drinking fountains on the site, two of which are in need of repair, the percentage of drinking fountains in good repair should be 75 percent (six divided by eight). If there was no consideration for non-applicable systems/components, and there were 30 areas evaluated at the school, two deficient drinking fountains would account for only six percent of the site areas (two divided by 30) and the school would be 93% (28 divided by 30) compliant with good repair standards as compared to the true 75 percent ratio.

AB 607 also requires the development of an overall school facility scoring system on the scale of exemplary, good, fair or poor. Although the Workgroup considered several rating schemes, the final draft of the tool contains a simple and straightforward averaging method of percentage ratings of the 15 systems and components. Included in the average percentage method are two main considerations. First, any system/component that was found to contain an extreme deficiency, as defined by the Good Repair Standard, yields a zero percentage ratio for the percentage of good repair. Secondly, an individual evaluator may reduce the overall score by one or more grades if there is a deficiency or a series of deficiencies on a site that are beyond the typical facility conditions considered in the Good Repair Criteria, or the extent of any

conditions are beyond the considerations of the tool, or the re-occurrence of any deficiencies from inspection to inspection is frequent and unacceptable.

Field testing of the draft evaluation tool was the final step in the development of the FIT. Six different school sites were inspected using the draft FIT. Testers highlighted the need for a tool that is easily understood and easy to use at on-site inspections, rating that is simple to calculate and easy to understand, and a format that allows for maximum flexibility, comments and feedback. In response to testing and testers' comments, the tool was further modified and adapted to users' needs. The draft of the FIT is being presented to the Committee in the form of an example, which reflects inspection findings at one of the test school sites.

### **Considerations pro and con:**

#### *Pro:*

- The instrument is easy to use with the system for ranking of components and scoring the facility that is uncomplicated and easily applied.
- The instrument produced understandable and reasonable results during testing at various school sites.
- Although the rating and scoring is limited to the grading specified in law, the percentage marks allow for additional grading within the definitions of exemplary, good, fair, and poor. The overall facility score can serve as a meaningful measure for improvement of facility conditions.
- The tool provides a means to identify needed repairs by specified space and system type.
- The proposed instrument provides a meaningful measure of individual school sites, whether good or bad, and allows for school districts to easily transfer the information to the SARC.

#### *Con:*

- The structure of the tool does not allow for an evaluation of the grade of a deficiency within individual areas. As an example, a classroom with one broken window is rated the same as a classroom with three broken windows.

In considering this aspect, the Workgroup determined that it may be difficult to evaluate the scope of each specific problem within an area or space, such as the extent of damage to interior surfaces for example. This could also lead to an overly complicated rating scheme. The proposed evaluation tool gets the deficiency noted and brings attention of site administrators to the problem at hand. Once the problem is noted, it can be further evaluated by site administrators as to its scope and severity.

- The scoring system allows a school with one or two systems with poor rating to receive a good overall school score.

A fine balance of the evaluation mechanism consists of considerations for overrating the schools with a small number of significant problems and underrating the schools with a large number of relatively minor problems. Overall, the law does not make a distinction between the importance of various school components as all the items identified in statute are equally important for maintaining school facilities in good repair. Therefore, the tool allows for a simple straight average of conditions, while the clause regarding the downgrading of a score at the discretion of the evaluator allows for a reasonable rating of a school with extraordinary deficiencies.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Present the FIT to the next available SAB meeting for adoption.

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL (FIT):  
General Information and User Instructions  
DRAFT

General Information

This inspection tool has been developed by the Office of Public School Construction to determine if a school facility is in "good repair" as defined by Education Code (EC) Section 17002(d)(1) and to rate that facility pursuant to EC Section 17002(d)(2). The tool is designed to identify areas of a schools site that are in need of repair based upon a visual inspection to the site.

Good repair is defined to mean that the facility is maintained in a manner that ensures that it is clean, safe, and functional. As part of the school accountability report card, school districts and county offices of education are required to make specified assessments of school conditions including the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities and needed maintenance to ensure good repair. In addition, beginning with the 2005/2006 fiscal year, school districts and county offices of education must certify that a facility inspection system has been established to ensure that each of its facilities is maintained in good repair in order to participate in the School Facility Program and the Deferred Maintenance Program. This tool is intended to assist school districts and county offices of education in that determination.

County superintendents are required to annually visit the schools in the county of his or her office as determined by EC Section 1240. Further, EC Section 1240(c)(2)(l), states the priority objective of the visits made shall be to determine the status of the condition of a facility that poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff as defined in district policy, or as defined by EC Section 17592.72(c) and the accuracy of data reported on the school accountability report card with the respect to the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities, including good repair as required by EC Sections 17014, 17032.5, 17070.75, and 17089. This tool is also intended to assist county offices of education in performing these functions.

The EC also allows individual entities to adopt a local evaluation instrument to be used in lieu of FIT provided the local instrument meets the criteria specified in EC Section 17002(d) and as implemented in FIT. Any evaluation instrument adopted by the local educational agency for purpose of determining whether a school facility is maintained in good repair may include any number of additional items and details but must minimally include the criteria and rating scheme contained in the FIT.

User Instructions

The FIT is comprised of three parts.

**Part I**, the Good Repair Standard, outlines the school facility systems and components, as specified in EC Section 17002(d)(1), that should be considered in the inspection of a school facility to ensure it is maintained in the manner that assures it is clean, safe and functional. Each of the 15 sections in the Good Repair Standard provides a description of a minimum standard of good repair. Each section also provides examples of clean, safe and functional conditions. The list of examples is not exhaustive. If an evaluator notes a condition that is not mentioned in the examples but constitutes a deficiency, the evaluator can note such deficiency in the applicable category as "other."

Some of the conditions cited in the Good Repair Standard represent items that are critical to the health and safety of pupils and staff. These items require immediate attention and, if left unmitigated, could cause severe and immediate injury, illness or death of the occupants. They constitute extreme deficiencies and indicate that the particular category evaluated failed to meet the standard of good repair at that school site. They are identified as underlined text followed by an (X) on the Good Repair Standard. If the underlined statement is not true, then this is an extreme deficiency (and marked as an “X” on the Evaluation Detail) resulting in a “poor” rating for the applicable category. It is important to note that the list of extreme deficiencies noted in the Good Repair Standard is not exhaustive. Any other deficiency not included in the criteria but meeting the definition above can be noted by the evaluator and result in poor rating.

**Part II**, the Evaluation Detail, is a site inspection template to be used to evaluate the areas of a school on a category by category basis. The design of the inspection template allows for the determination of the scope of conditions across campus. In evaluating each area or space, the user should review each of the 15 categories identified in the Good Repair Standard and make a determination of whether a particular area is in good repair. Once the determination is made, it should be recorded on the Evaluation Detail, as follows:

<b>✓</b>	<u>No Deficiency</u> Good Repair: Insert a check mark if all statements in the Good Repair Standard are true, and there is no indication of a deficiency in the category.
<b>D</b>	<u>Deficiency</u> : Mark "D" if one or more statement in the Good Repair Standard for that category is not true, or if there is other clear evidence of the need for repair.
<b>X</b>	<u>Extreme Deficiency</u> : Indicate "X" if the area has a deficiency that is considered an "Extreme Deficiency" in the Good Repair Standard.
<b>NA</b>	<u>Not Applicable</u> : If the Good Repair Standard category does not exist in the area evaluated, mark "NA".

Below are suggested methods for evaluating various systems and areas:

- Gas (Section 1) and sewer (Section 12) are major building systems that may span the entire school campus but may not be evident as applicable building systems in each classroom or common areas. However, because a deficiency in either of these systems could become evident and present a health and safety threat anywhere on campus, the user should not mark “NA” and should instead include an evaluation of these systems in each building space.
- Roofs (Section 14) can be easily evaluated on stand alone areas, such as portable classrooms. For permanent buildings containing several areas being evaluated, roofs should be considered as parts of individual areas in order to accurately account for a scope of any roofing deficiency. For example, a building containing 10 classrooms contains damaged gutters on one side of the building, spanning across five classrooms. Therefore, an evaluator should mark five classrooms as deficient in the roof category (Section 14) and the other five classrooms as in good repair, assuming there are no other visible deficiencies related to roofing.
- Section 15, Overall Cleanliness, is intended to be used to evaluate the cleanliness of the space. For example, a user should note a deficiency due to dirty surfaces in Section 15, rather than Section 4, Interior Surfaces. At the same time, the user should note such deficiency only in Section 15 in order to avoid accounting for such deficiency twice, i.e. in two sections.

- The tool is designed to evaluate stand-alone restrooms as separate areas. However, restrooms contained within other spaces, such as a kindergarten classroom or a library, can be evaluated as part of that area under Section 11. If the area evaluated does not contain a restroom, Section 11 should be marked “NA.”
- Drinking fountains can exist within individual classrooms or areas, right outside of classrooms or restrooms or other areas, or as stand alone on playgrounds and sports fields. If a drinking fountain or a set of fountains is located inside a building or immediately outside the area being evaluated, it should be included in the evaluation of that area under Section 10. If a fountain is located on the school grounds, it should be evaluated as part of that outside space. If there is no drinking fountain in the area evaluated, Section 10 should be marked “NA.”
- Playgrounds/School Grounds, section 13, can be also evaluated as separate areas by dividing a campus into sections with defined borders. In this case, several sections of the good repair criteria would not apply to the evaluation, as they do not exist outside of physical building areas, such as structural damage (Section 6) and fire safety (Section 7), for example.

**Part III** includes the Category Totals and Ranking, the Overall Rating, and a section for Comments and Rating Explanation.

Once the inspector completes the site inspection, he or she must determine the number of areas evaluated. The inspector must also count all of the spaces deemed in good repair, or deficient, extremely deficient, or not applicable under each of the 15 sections. Next, the evaluator determines the condition of each category taking the ratio of the number of areas deemed in good repair to the number of areas being evaluated (after subtracting non-applicable spaces from the total number of areas evaluated). If any of the 15 categories received a rating of extreme deficiency, the ratio (i.e., the percentage of good repair) for that section should default to zero.

Next, the overall school site score is determined by computing the average percentage rating of 15 categories (i.e., the total of all percentages divided by 15). Finally the School Rating is determined by applying the Percentage Range in the table provided in Part II to the average percentage calculated, taking into consideration the Rating Description provided in the same table.

\*Although the FIT is designed to evaluate each school site within reasonable range of facility conditions, it is possible that an evaluator may identify critical facility conditions that result in a rating that does not reflect the urgency and severity of those deficiencies and/or does not match the rating’s Description in Part II. In such instances, the evaluator may reduce the resulting school score by one or more grade categories and describe the reasons for the reduction in the space provided for Comments and Rating Explanation.

# Facility Inspection Tool

## PART I: GOOD REPAIR STANDARD

### DRAFT

(X): If underlined statement is not true, then this is an extreme deficiency (marked as an "X") on the Evaluation Detail and results in a "poor" rating for the applicable category.

#### 1. Gas Leaks

Gas systems and pipes appear safe, functional, and free of leaks. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- There is no odor that would indicate a gas leak. (X)
- Gas pipes are not broken and appear to be in good working order. (X)
- Other:

#### 2. Mechanical Systems

Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems (HVAC) as applicable are functional and unobstructed. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- The HVAC system is operable. (X)
- The facilities are ventilated (via mechanical or natural ventilation).
- The ventilation units are unobstructed and vents and grills are without evidence of excessive dirt or dust.
- There appears to be an adequate air supply to all classrooms, work spaces, and facilities (i.e. no strong odor is present, air is not stuffy).
- Interior temperatures appear to be maintained within normally accepted ranges.
- The ventilation units are not generating any excessive noise or vibrations.
- Other:

#### 3. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences (Interior and exterior)

Conditions that pose a safety and/or security risk are not evident. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- There is no exposed broken glass accessible to pupils and staff. (X)
- Exterior doors and gates are functioning and do not pose a security risk. (X)
- Windows are intact and free of cracks.
- Windows are functional and open, close, and lock as designed, unless there is a valid reason they should not function as designed.
- Doors are intact.
- Doors are functional and open, close, and lock as designed, unless there is a valid reason they should not function as designed.
- Gates and fences appear to be functional.
- Gates and fences are intact and free of holes and other conditions that could present a safety hazard to pupils, staff, or others.
- Other:

#### 4. Interior Surfaces (Floors, Ceilings, Walls, and Window Casings)

Interior surfaces appear to be clean, safe, and functional. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Walls are free of hazards from tears and holes.
- Flooring is free of hazards from torn carpeting, missing floor tiles, holes.
- Ceiling is free of hazards from missing ceiling tiles and holes.
- There is no evidence of water damage (e.g. no condensation, dampness, staining, warping, peeling, mineral deposits, etc.)
- Other:

#### 5. Hazardous Materials (Interior and Exterior)

There does not appear to be evidence of hazardous materials that may pose a threat to pupils or staff. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Hazardous chemicals, chemical waste, and flammable materials are stored properly (e.g. locked and labeled properly). (X)
- Paint is not peeling, chipping, or cracking.
- There does not appear to be damaged tiles or other circumstances that may indicate asbestos exposure.
- Surfaces (including floors, ceilings, walls, window casings, HVAC grills) appear to be free of mildew, mold odor and visible mold.
- Other

#### 6. Structural Damage

There does not appear to be structural damage that has created or could create hazardous or uninhabitable conditions. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Severe cracks are not evident. (X)
- Ceilings & floors are not sloping or sagging beyond their intended design. (X)
- Posts, beams, supports for portable classrooms, ramps, and other structural building members appear to be intact, secure and functional as designed. (X)
- There is no visible evidence of severe cracks, dry rot, mold, or damage that undermines the structural components. (X)
- Other:

#### 7. Fire Safety

The fire equipment and emergency systems appear to be functioning properly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- The fire sprinklers appear to be in working order (e.g., there are no missing or damaged sprinkler heads). (X)
- Emergency alarms appear to be functional. (X)
- Emergency exit signs function as designed, exits are unobstructed. (X)
- Fire extinguishers are current and placed in all required areas.
- Fire alarms pull stations are clearly visible.
- Other:

#### 8. Electrical (Interior and Exterior)

1. There is no evidence that any portion of the school has a power failure. (X)  
2. Electrical systems, components, and equipment appear to be working properly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- There are no exposed electrical wires. Electrical equipment is properly covered and secured from pupil access. (X)
- Outlets, access panels, switch plates, junction boxes and fixtures are properly covered and secured from pupil access.
- Other

3. Lighting appears to be adequate and working properly, including exterior lights. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Lighting appears to be adequate.
- Lighting is not flickering.
- There is no unusual hum or noise from the light fixtures.
- Other

#### 9. Pest/Vermin Infestation

Pest or vermin infestation are not evident. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- There is no evidence of a major pest or vermin infestation. (X)
- There are no holes in the walls, floors, or ceilings.
- Rodent droppings or insect skins are not evident.
- Odor caused by a pest or vermin infestation is not evident.
- There are no live rodents observed.
- Other

#### 10. Drinking Fountains (Inside and Outside)

Drinking fountains appear to be accessible and functioning as intended. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Drinking fountains are accessible.
- Water pressure is adequate.
- A leak is not evident.
- There is no moss, mold, or excessive staining on the fixtures.
- The water is clear and without unusual taste or odor.
- Other

#### 11. Restrooms

Restrooms in the vicinity of the area being evaluated appear to be accessible during school hours, clean, functional and in compliance with SB 892 (EC Section 35292.5). The following are examples of compliance with SB 892:

- Restrooms are maintained and cleaned regularly.
- Restrooms are fully operational.
- Restrooms are stocked with toilet paper, soap, and paper towels.
- Restrooms are open during school hours.
- Other

#### 12. Sewer

Sewer line stoppage is not evident. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- There are no obvious signs of flooding caused by sewer line back-up in the facilities or on the school grounds. (X)
- The sanitary system controls odors as designed.
- Other

#### 13. Playground/School Grounds

The playground equipment and school grounds in the vicinity of the area being evaluated appear to be clean, safe, and functional. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Significant cracks, trip hazards, holes and deterioration are not found.
- Open "S" hooks, protruding bolt ends, and sharp points/edges are not found in the playground equipment.
- Seating, tables, and equipment are functional and free of significant cracks.
- There are no signs of drainage problems, such as flooded areas, eroded soil, water damage to asphalt, or clogged storm drain inlets.
- Other

#### 14. Roofs (observed from the ground, inside/outside the building)

Roof systems appear to be functioning properly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Roofs, gutters, roof drains, and down spouts are free of visible damage.
- Roofs, gutters, roof drains, and down spouts are intact.
- Other:

#### 15. Overall Cleanliness

School grounds, buildings, common areas, and individual rooms appear to have been cleaned regularly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- Area(s) evaluated is free of accumulated refuse, dirt, and grime.
- Area(s) evaluated is free of unabated graffiti.
- Restrooms, drinking fountains, and food preparation or serving areas appear to have been cleaned each day that school is in session.
- Other:

PART II:  
EVALUATION DETAIL

Date: 5.16.07	School Name: XYZ Middle
------------------	----------------------------

Systems Area	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	Gas Leaks	Mech/ HVAC	Win/Doors Gates/ Fences	Interior Surfaces	Hazardous Material	Structural damage	Fire Safety	Electrical	Pest/ Vermin Infestation	Drinking Fountains	Restroom	Sewer	Roofs	Playground School Grounds	Overall Cleanliness
CR 1	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	D
Comments: 15: very dirty floor															
CR 4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments:															
CR 8	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments: 4: portable wall ripped, base cap missing (several sections) B: unsafe wiring NE corner															
CR 9	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments: 7: no fire extinguisher															
CR 13	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	D
Comments: 7: no fire extinguisher 15: dirty walls															
Multi-Purpose Room	✓	✓	D	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	D	NA	✓
Comments: 4: non-functioning doors (stage area), loose wall board 14: roof leaks around stage area															
Kitchen	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments: 4: hairline cracks in the floor, 9: evidence of roach infestation															
Staff Lounge	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	D
Comments: 15: area dirty															
CR 23	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments: 4: stained & broken ceiling tiles															

Facility Inspection Tool  
DRAFT

PART II:  
EVALUATION DETAIL

Date: 5.16.07	School Name: XY2 Middle
------------------	----------------------------

Systems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Area	Gas Leaks	Mech/ HVAC	Win/Doors Gates/ Fences	Interior Surfaces	Hazardous Material	Structural damage	Fire Safety	Electrical	Pest/ Vermin Infestation	Drinking Fountains	Restroom	Sewer	Roofs	Playground School Grounds	Overall Cleanliness
CR15	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments:	4: hole in a ceiling tile, hole in a wall														
CR 27	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	D
Comments:	4: peeling wall covering, 8: exposed el. wire (hanging from ceiling) 15: stained carpet <sup>walked</sup>														
CR30	✓	✓	✓	D	D	✓	✓	D	✓	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments:	4: sagging ceiling tiles 5: peeling paint outside, mold inside (bottom rear wall), 7: missing switch plate														
Library	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	D	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments:	10: no water from drinking fountain														
Office	✓	✓	✓	D	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓	✓	✓	NA	✓
Comments:	4: frayed carpet by restroom														
Grounds (Front campus)	✓	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	X	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	✓	✓
Comments:	8: exposed electrical wires outside portable CR 33														
Grounds (back campus)	✓	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	✓	✓	NA	✓	NA	✓	✓
Comments:															
Comments:															
Comments:															

Facility Inspection Tool  
DRAFT

SCHOOL DISTRICT/COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION <b>XYZ Unified</b>		COUNTY <b>XYZ</b>	
SCHOOL SITE <b>XYZ Middle</b>		SCHOOL TYPE (GRADE LEVELS) <b>Middle (7-8)</b>	NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS ON SITE <b>33</b>
INSPECTOR NAME	INSPECTOR TITLE	NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE (IF APPLICABLE)	

**PART III:**

**CATEGORY TOTALS AND RANKING**

Total # Areas Evaluated	Category Totals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
		Gas Leaks	Mech/HVAC	Win/Doors/Gates/Fences	Interior Surfaces	Hazardous Material	Structural damage	Fire Safety	Electrical	Pest/Verm/Infestation	Drinking Fountains	Restroom	Sewer	Roofs	Playground School Grounds	Overall Cleanliness
	# of "✓"s:	16	14	13	6	13	14	12	11	15	5	3	16	13	2	12
	# of "D" s:			1	8	1		2	2		1			1		4
16	# of "X" s:								2	1						
	# of "N/A" s:		2	2	2	2	2	2	1		10	13		2	14	
% of System in Good Repair # of "✓"s divided by (Total Areas - "N/A" s)		100	100	93	43	93	100	86	0	0	83	100	100	93	100	75
Rank: (Circle one)	Good= 85-97.99%	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
	Fair= 67-84.99%	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
	Poor= 0-66.99%	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor

Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a "poor" ranking for that category and a zero for % of Good Repair.

**OVERALL RATING**

<b>Determine average percentage of 15 categories above</b>	<b>77.73%</b>	<b>School Rating *</b>	<b>FAIR</b>
--	---------------	------------------------	-------------

\* For School Rating, apply the Percentage Range below to the average percentage determined above, taking into account the rating Description below.

Percentage Range	Description	Rating
98% - 100%	The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.	<b>Exemplary</b>
85% - 97.99%	The school is maintained in good repair with a number of non-critical deficiencies noted. These deficiencies are isolated, and/or resulting from minor wear and tear, and/or in the process of being mitigated.	<b>Good</b>
67% - 84.99%	The school is not in good repair. Some deficiencies noted are critical and/or widespread. Repairs and/or additional maintenance are necessary in several areas of the school site.	<b>Fair</b>
0 - 66.99%	The school facilities are in poor condition. Deficiencies of various degrees have been noted throughout the site. Major repairs and maintenance are necessary throughout campus.	<b>Poor</b>

**COMMENTS AND RATING EXPLANATION:**

---



---



---

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
June 1, 2007

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVE

PURPOSE

To consider a request from the Association of California Construction Managers to include a Construction Management representative on the State Allocation Board Implementation Committee (Committee).

BACKGROUND

The following excerpt was contained in a report of the Executive Officer at the State Allocation Board (SAB) meeting of September 25, 1991:

*"The Committee was formed in 1986 in order to assist the State Allocation Board (SAB) in implementing the many program changes mandated by legislation. The primary responsibility of the Committee is to review new legislation impacting school facility construction and related programs governed by the SAB. The Committee develops policy recommendations for consideration by the SAB. The Committee also examines established guidelines and procedures to accommodate legislative requirements as well as Board policy and reviews and recommends on other issues at the direction of the SAB.*

*"The composition of [the] Committee [consists of] representatives from industry groups and the educational community.*

*"Office of Local Assistance [currently, the Office of Public School Construction] provides support for the Committee. This support includes note-taking, discussion papers and final policy write-ups for SAB consideration."*

The September 25, 1991 item listed the following 13 Committee members:

*California Association of School Business Officials  
California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance  
California Council, American Institute of Architects  
Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH)  
Council of Educational Facilities Planners, International  
California County Superintendents Association  
Department of Education (CDE)  
Department of Finance (DOF)  
Legislative Analyst Office (LAO)  
Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)  
Office of Local Assistance (currently OPSC)  
SAB  
Small School District Association*

Currently, the Committee consists of 15 representatives including:

American Institute of Architects  
California Association of School Business Officers  
California Building Industry Association  
California County Superintendents Association  
CASH  
CDE  
Council for Educational Facility Planners, International  
Division of the State Architect  
DOF  
LAUSD  
OPSC  
SAB  
Small School Districts Association  
State Building Construction Trades Council  
Suburban School Districts

## DISCUSSION

### Who Makes the Decision?

The numerous changes to the Committee representation came about in an unclear manner. Other than Board items found for the November, 1986, and the September, 1991, SAB meetings, staff found only one record of an official approval for a change to the Committee composition. In a letter from the SAB chair to the Implementation Committee chair dated December 6, 2002, the appointment of a State Building Trades Council representative was made. The recollection of former Committee chairs is that the other representative changes were approved either by the SAB or by the Committee Chair in consultation with OPSC and Committee members.

The Committee has no consistent formal process for consideration of adding or removing representatives of the Committee. Therefore, the Committee chair shall integrate past practices by considering the approval of the additional representative, in consultation with OPSC and the Committee members, and ask the SAB to ratify the decision at the June, 2007 SAB meeting.

### What will a Construction Management Representative bring to the Committee?

The following information was provided by a representative of the Association of Construction Managers:

*"So how is the CM perspective different?"*

*"First, the mission of ACCM members is to ensure that projects are delivered on time and on budget. The compensation of agency construction management is unaffected by change orders and design changes. Second, the scope of service and experience is much broader than other members. ACCM members have extensive backgrounds in construction and design firms and have managed multiple millions of construction in the school context. This differs from school district members whose experience may be limited to a single district or design professionals who have a narrower scope of expertise. Third, the rising of the CM industry demonstrates that the service is a necessary value added in the modern school construction environment. The rise of the CM industry is reflected both by the creation of CM as a major in a variety of higher education institutions and the increase in C.A.S.H. from 25 members to 80 members*

*in six years. Fourth, the role of CMs includes oversight of architect services and plans. The [I]mplementation [C]ommittee would benefit from having a professional voice that provides collaborative balance to the design side of the team. In fact, including a CM would help the Implementation Committee to reflect the range of professional services that districts rely on every day."*