

ADVISORY ACTIONS

ISSUE NO. 04

from the State Allocation Board
meetings held on August 24 and
September 28, 2005

INSIDE

State Relocatable Classroom Program Phase-Out	2
The School Facility Program Fund 35	2
Update on Buildings in the Footprint of a Construction Project	2
Topping Out	3
New School Openings	3
Career Technical Education Requirements	4
Furniture and Equipment	4
Facilities Inspection System	5
Labor Compliance Program Requirements	5
Financial Hardship Projects	6
Update for October CBEDS	6
Deadline On the Use of Specific Non-Field Act Relocatables ...	6
Proposition Funds Put to Work	7
Status of Funds	7

State Allocation Board Implementation Committee

OPSC Reminders

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD MEETINGS*

- November—No Meeting Scheduled
- Thursday, December 15, 2005

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETINGS*

- Friday, December 2, 2005

ENROLLMENT UPDATES

Districts submitting funding requests to the OPSC after October 31st will need to submit a revised Enrollment Certification/Projection, Form SAB 50-01, reporting the 2005–2006 CBEDS.

WILLIAMS SETTLEMENT LEGISLATION

School Facilities Needs Assessment Grant Program:

- Web-Based Needs Assessment Report (Form SAB 60-01) one for each eligible school due January 1, 2006.

School Facilities Inspection System:

- All LEAs participating in the SFP and DMP must establish a school facilities inspection system regardless of if the district or county has a decile 1–3 school.

INTEREST EARNED REPORT (FORM SAB 180)

- Due quarterly (March 31, June 30, September 30 and December 31) from each county for all districts that earned interest from the Leroy F. Greene Lease-Purchase Program.



from the desk of Luisa Park, Executive Officer

On September 29, 2004, Governor Schwarzenegger signed several laws to carry out the settlement reached in the *Williams vs. California* lawsuit, among them, three directly affecting school facilities: Senate Bill 6 (Chapter 899 – Alpert), Senate Bill 550 (Chapter 900 – Vasconcellos), and Assembly Bill 1550 (Chapter 901 – Daucher). The Office of Public School Construction's (OPSC) role in the Williams Settlement is to assist schools in adequately assessing their facility needs and in conducting necessary emergency repairs, including health, safety and fire code hazards, through the implementation and administration of the School Facility Needs Assessment Grant Program and the Emergency Repair Program. By January 1, 2006, applicants participating in the School Facility Needs Assessment Grant Program must submit the Needs Assessment Report using the On-Line Needs Assessment Submittal Program. Additionally, school districts are encouraged to apply for funding under the Emergency Repair Program. This program has \$201 million in available funding for the 2005/2006 fiscal year, as well as a minimum of \$100 million annually for the next seven fiscal years. A commitment has been made to provide valuable taxpayers dollars to fix our schools. It is our sincere hope and we highly recommend that eligible school districts access these funds to enable the success of this program and to provide clean, safe, and functional facilities that our children equally deserve. Your OPSC Project Manager is pleased to serve you if you need assistance in identifying eligible projects and completing applications for submittal.

The 2005 Budget Act provides approximately \$267 million in funding for basic apportionments under the Deferred Maintenance Program for the 2004/2005 fiscal year. The annual basic apportionment funding item is scheduled for the December 2005 Board. The OPSC encourages school districts to submit their 2005/2006 five-year plan of maintenance needs prior to June 30, 2006 for the purpose of receiving basic apportionment funding for next year's deferred maintenance funding cycle.

In closing, I look forward to working together to meet the continuous challenges we face in providing the school facilities needed for the children of California.

Emergency Repair Program Now Accepting Applications!

BY LINDSAY E KEYES, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

We are pleased to announce that the first Emergency Repair Program application approval was granted by the State Allocation Board at its September meeting. The district was apportioned \$16,725 for the reimbursement of expenditures to repair and reroute an existing water main connecting to a kitchen area. Several more applications are being processed and we anticipate they will be presented to the Board for approval in the near future.

As you may know, the Emergency Repair Program regulations became effective on May 31, 2005, and Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) Staff are available to assist your school district with its applications for Emergency Repair Program funding. There is now \$201 million available to the Emergency Repair Program: \$5 million was provided by Senate Bill 6 (Chapter 899, Statutes of 2004, Alpert), and \$196 million was allocated under the Budget Act for Fiscal Year 2005/2006.

If you have questions about eligible projects or you would like assistance with completing a request for reimbursement funding, please contact your OPSC Project Manager.

State Relocatable Classroom Program Phase-Out

BY LIZ CHEYNE, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

Beginning in June 2005, the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) presented an item to the State Allocation Board (SAB) that addressed the State Relocatable Classroom Program. The item detailed the current condition of the fleet and several options on how to proceed with the Program. At the August 24, 2005 SAB meeting, the SAB approved a complete phase out of the Program. The SAB directed the OPSC to develop a plan to implement the phase-out and report back at a future SAB meeting. The OPSC is developing a plan that will allow districts to purchase certain State Relocatables with no or minimal impact to districts' new construction eligibility. The OPSC will present this plan to the SAB at the October 26, 2005 SAB meeting.

Look for complete details and a description of this plan in the October SAB item and the next issue of *Advisory Actions*. For further information, please contact Liz Cheyne at 916.323.2636 or by e-mail at lcheyne@dgs.ca.gov.

The School Facility Program Fund 35

BY NOÉ VALADEZ, OPSC AUDIT SUPERVISOR

When the School Facility Program (SFP) became law, Education Code Section 17070.43 established the School Facility Fund (Fund 35). The State's share of any SFP project is deposited into Fund 35 after approval of the apportionment by the State Allocation Board and subsequent release of funds. The district's share of the project may be deposited into Fund 35 as well, although it is not necessary. The funds deposited into this fund can only be applied towards the expenditures authorized in Education Code Section 17072.35 for new construction projects and 17074.25 for modernization projects.

The types of expenditures paid from Fund 35 are specific to the construction of the facility, including soft costs associated with the project. The costs associated with furniture and equipment are also considered part of the project and may be capitalized as part of the facility being constructed. Administrative costs such as district personnel salaries cannot be paid from Fund 35, with two exceptions: 1) force account labor authorized in law; and, 2) SFP project assistance. The project assistance apportionment is provided to school districts with less than 2500 average daily attendance in order to assist with providing sufficient staffing to administer the construction project.

If you have specific questions regarding Fund 35, please contact your County Office of Education Accounting Section.

Update on Buildings in the Footprint of a Construction Project

BY RICHARD SHEFFIELD, OPSC SUPERVISOR

Recently, the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) has been made aware that School Facility Program (SFP) bond funds cannot be used to move State Relocatable classrooms. Therefore, the OPSC has updated its policy regarding the relocation of portables which lie in the footprint of a SFP project.

Districts can no longer request SFP funds to relocate a State Relocatable classroom that is part of a SFP project. However, districts will be able to request that these classrooms be moved under the State Relocatable Classroom Program (SRCP), and the cost to move and place the State Relocatable classroom will be funded under the SRCP.

Under the SRCP the district can request to move a State Relocatable classroom that is part of a SFP project to a permanent location at the existing site or to another district-owned site. The district is responsible for the cost associated with the site preparation, electrical hook-up, plumbing connection, DSA plan checking, insurance, and maintenance. In addition, the district is responsible for obtaining the architectural and on-site inspection services needed to place the State Relocatable classrooms.

In order to assist the OPSC in determining if the school district is eligible for this new service, the Division of the State Architect (DSA) approved plans must identify the relocatable classrooms on the school site plot plan by indicating whether the relocatable classroom is district-owned, district-leased, or a State Relocatable Classroom. In addition, please provide the OPSC building number on the plans. The SRCP will not move buildings that are owned or leased by a district, and districts should continue to request site development funds from the SFP for these buildings.

To request a State Relocatable Classroom be moved, the district will be required to send a letter to the SRCP Project Manager that includes the date the building will be ready to move. If you need more information on the relocation of portables, please contact Liz Cheyne, Project Manager, at 916.323.2636 or your OPSC Project Manager.



Topping Out

BY SHELLEY NISHIKAWA, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

Congratulations to the Tahoe-Truckee Unified School District as they begin the next phase of construction at the North Tahoe Middle/High School. The District hosted a “Topping Out Ceremony” on July 28, 2005, for the North Tahoe Middle/High School reconstruction project. The ceremony served to commemorate the successful completion of the structural steel component of the project and to thank all those who have been an integral part of this construction venture. Guests were given the opportunity to sign the beam and make their mark in history before the crane lifted the final beam to the awaiting ironworkers.

What is “topping out”? The topping out ceremony started in Northern Europe when villagers placed a live pine tree on the top of a house or barn that was under construction. The tree was believed to bring good luck. When the tree was placed on the roof, the homeowner hosted a celebration for all of the villagers who had helped in the construction. In modern times, immediately following the placement of the final piece of structural steel framework of a building, a flag is also hoisted to the top of the structure.

In the Fall of 2002, the residents of North Lake Tahoe approved Measure J to rebuild the classroom wings of North Tahoe High School/Middle School. Also, the District has participated in State funding programs utilizing the New Construction, Modernization and Joint Use provisions for construction and modification to the facilities at this site. In addition to 91,000 square feet of new facilities, this project includes an enlarged auditorium for performing arts, new music rooms, enlarged media/tech center, state of the art classrooms and a focus on classroom comfort, day lighting, improved circulation and outdoor gathering space. To date, over 5,000 cubic yards of concrete and over 100 tons of steel have already been placed. After the initial phase of the project is completed in June 2006, a part of the existing school, about 75,000 square feet, will be demolished and 40,000 square feet will be modernized including the construction of new exterior plazas. The entire project is scheduled for completion in the spring of 2007.



New School Openings

BY CHRISTINE SANCHEZ, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

The Office of Public School Construction would like to congratulate the following districts for their new school dedication ceremonies:

SCHOOL DISTRICT	COUNTY	PROJECT	DEDICATION DATE
Poway Unified	San Diego	Oak Valley Middle School	July 2005
Lake Elsinore Unified	Riverside	Lakeside High School	August 2005
Richland	Kern	Sequoia Elementary School	August 2005
Lodi Unified	San Joaquin	Ellerth E. Larson Elementary School	September 2005
Los Angeles Unified	Los Angeles	North Hollywood Elementary #3	September 2005
San Bernardino City	San Bernardino	Roger Anton Elementary School	September 2005

To help us highlight your celebrations, please reference the table above for the necessary data, and submit the information with your project’s School Facility Program application number to the Office of Public School Construction, attention **New School Dedications and Groundbreakings**.

Career Technical Education Requirements

BY LINDSAY E KEYES, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

School districts are required to consult with the local career technical education advisory committee (CTEAC) and consider the need for vocational and career technical facilities for certain types of projects. As reported in the article "Spotlight on the Application for Funding Certifications: Career Technical Educational Facilities" (2005 *Advisory Actions* newsletter, Issue Number 3), we are in the process of modifying the application review and audit procedures to ensure that the school districts are in compliance with the career technical education (CTE) requirements.

The proposed changes and a list of acceptable evidence of compliance were identified in the Career Technical Education Report presented to the State Allocation Board at its August meeting. The following steps, including the modification suggested by the Board, will be implemented for applicable projects:

1. Proof of compliance with Education Code Section 17070.95 will be requested at the time the application for funding is accepted by the Office of Public School Construction *beginning December 1, 2005. Applications received between November 1 through 30, 2005, will be requested to provide proof of compliance in a 15-day letter.*
2. For funding applications received prior to the implementation of this process, provided that the application was submitted after the statute became effective, proof of compliance will be requested during the audit of the project.

Evidence of compliance may include any of the following:

- Minutes from a public meeting by the school district's governing board documenting the discussion with the local CTEAC regarding the local CTE facility needs assessment. The minutes must specify the recommendation by the CTEAC and the action agreed to by the school district.
- Minutes from the meeting with the local CTEAC regarding the local CTE facility needs assessment. The minutes must specify the recommendation by the CTEAC and the action agreed to by the school district.
- Letter from the local CTEAC to the school district that identifies the local CTE facility needs assessment and the subject of the discussion.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact your OPSC Project Manager for more information.

Furniture and Equipment

BY BRYAN BREAKS, OPSC AUDIT SUPERVISOR

Furniture and equipment is a vital part of any building project regardless of whether a project is financed with local funds or State funds. The spirit of the full and final grant amount concept of the School Facility Program (SFP) provides funds for the purchase of furniture and equipment with the SFP Grant. It is up to the local school district to determine the amount of money to use within their SFP grant for furniture and equipment.

There are certain criteria that must be met in order to determine whether or not an item is considered furniture and equipment or operational supplies. Furniture is generally used for classroom facilities such as chairs, desks, tables, etc. However, the term equipment can be ambiguous. Equipment generally meets the following criteria:

1. Does not lose its original shape or appearance with use.
2. Is not used up with normal usage and has a service life of more than one year.
3. Is not easily broken, damaged or lost in normal use.
4. Usually more feasible to repair than to replace it with an entirely new item.
5. The cost of such item is above the capitalization threshold of the school district.

Books for equipping a new library or major acquisitions of books for expanding existing libraries may be purchased under the furniture and equipment category. However, the purchase of text books for classroom use is considered an operational expense.

To clarify a furniture and equipment expenditure, there are resources available for reference, such as the California Department of Education's accounting practices, State Accounting Manual and your County Office of Education's Accounting Office.

Facilities Inspection System:

All school districts and county offices of education must have one in place if participating in the School Facility or Deferred Maintenance Program!

BY ELIZABETH DEARSTYNE, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

Education Code (EC) Section 17070.75(e) requires that school districts or county offices of education participating in the School Facility Program or Deferred Maintenance Program establish a Facilities Inspection System (FIS) after July 1, 2005. The requirements of the FIS are not defined in law other than requiring that the system should ensure that each school of the district or county is maintained in good repair. The design of the FIS should be determined at the local level. The one exception is for the school sites that will perform a needs assessment because the site was identified as being in deciles 1–3 on the 2003 Academic Performance Index and was newly constructed prior to January 1, 2000. The needs assessments conducted at these school sites are to be the baseline for the FIS (EC Section 17592.70(d)(3)).

The Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI) is the current definition of “good repair” and measures if a school facility is maintained in a manner that assures it is clean, safe, and functional. Thirteen components of a school facility are evaluated as part of the IEI. The following chart provides guidance on the various possible uses of the IEI:

ENTITY	USE
School Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing the school facility section of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) for all district schools • Establishing a FIS after July 1, 2005 for all schools, if participating in the SFP or DMP to ensure each school is maintained in “good repair”
County Offices of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completing the school facility section of the SARC for all schools • Establishing a FIS after July 1, 2005 for all county operated schools, if participating in the SFP or DMP • Oversight responsibilities at deciles 1-3 schools

For additional information regarding the changes to the SARC template, please visit the California Department of Education’s Web site at www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sa/.

If you have any questions on any of the requirements for the Williams settlement, please contact your OPSC Project Manager for assistance.

Labor Compliance Program Requirements—Making it less laborious!

BY LEA LONGERO, OPSC AUDITOR

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1506, Chapter 868, Statutes of 2002, Labor Code Section 1771.7 changed the existing labor compliance law to apply to School Facility Program (SFP) projects that meet *both* of the requirements below:

1. Projects apportioned with either Propositions 47 or 55 funds (i.e., apportioned *on or after December 18, 2002*), and
2. The Notice to Proceed for the construction phase of the project is issued *on or after April 1, 2003*. (Work performed during the design and preconstruction phases of construction, including, but not limited to, inspection and land surveying work, does not constitute the commencement of the project.)

As a result of this law, districts are required to initiate and enforce, or contract with a third party to initiate and enforce, a Labor Compliance Program (LCP) that *has been approved by the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR)* pursuant to Labor Code Section 1771.7. All costs incurred to initiate and maintain the LCP must be reported *by project* on the Expenditure Worksheet located on the OPSC Web site at <http://www.opsc.dgs.ca.gov/SAB+Forms/Default.htm>.

To assist districts, the worksheet has been updated to include a LCP column.

Upon commencement of the SFP close out audit, the OPSC will notify all districts to submit a copy of the initial DIR letter approving their LCP. During the audit process, districts may be required to submit additional documentation to substantiate their LCP compliance.

Important Note: Please be reminded that by signing the Application for Funding form, the District Representative is certifying that the district has complied with the LCP requirements.

If you have questions about LCP compliance requirements, please contact your OPSC Project Manager. If you have LCP audit questions, please contact Lea Longero at 916.445.8095 or lea.longero@dgs.ca.gov.

UPDATE: SURVEY OF SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM

Financial Hardship Projects

BY LINDSAY E KEYES, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

A survey was conducted earlier this year by the Office of Public School Construction, in conjunction with the Coalition for Adequate School Housing, to gain information on the number of financial hardship school districts that have eliminated minimum essential facilities, such as gymnasiums, multipurpose rooms, or administration buildings, from their projects because of high bids. Due to the limited number of responses to the initial survey, a follow-up survey was conducted to gain information from those districts that did not respond to the first survey. A report summarizing the final results was presented to the State Allocation Board at its September 2005 meeting.

Although the responses from the survey indicated that the bid climate may not be a pervasive problem affecting financial hardship school districts throughout the State, concerns continue to be raised regarding the adequacy of the School Facility Program grants. The Office of Public School Construction is organizing an ad hoc committee to address the issue of grant adequacy. Look out for a report of the committee's findings at a future State Allocation Board meeting!

Update for October CBEDS

BY JAN MOSS, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

REMINDER! It's that time of year again! Time to update your CBEDS enrollment data.

Enrollment reporting for purposes of establishing or updating eligibility in the School Facility Program (SFP) is based on the latest California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) information. School districts are required to report their current CBEDS enrollment to the California Department of Education (CDE) in the month of October each year. The OPSC will only accept SFP funding applications after November 1st based on current year CBEDS information. Once a district submits its CBEDS information to the CDE, this data must be utilized to update its eligibility prior to submittal of a SFP funding application, pursuant to Regulation Sections 1859.51(e) and 1859.61(c).

Therefore, timely submittal of the latest CBEDS data will ensure accurate and current eligibility projections, which will expedite future funding applications. If you have any questions regarding how or when to report changes to your district's enrollment, please contact your OPSC Project Manager.

REMINDER:

Deadline On the Use of Specific Non-Field Act Relocatables

BY ELIZABETH DEARSTYNE, OPSC PROJECT MANAGER

This article is to provide a general reminder to those school districts housing students in non-Field Act relocatable classrooms of the specifics of Education Code (EC) Section 17280. Statute permits relocatable classrooms, meeting the eligibility criteria listed below, to be used as a school building until September 30, 2007, if the buildings were retrofitted by August 31, 2002, according to prescribed requirements of the Division of the State Architect (DSA). For specific information on retrofitting requirements, please visit the DSA's Web site at www.dsa.dgs.ca.gov.

Eligibility Criteria:

- The relocatable building was manufactured and in use for classroom purposes on or before May 1, 2000, and bears a commercial coach insignia of approval from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
- The relocatable building is a single story structure with not more than 2,160 square feet of interior floor area when all sections are joined together.
- The relocatable building was constructed after December 19, 1979.

Please ensure that if your school district is using a HCD relocatable classroom as a school building that all of the above conditions have been met. Additionally, your school board is required to adopt a resolution by October 30, 2007 certifying that the relocatable building is no longer being used as a school building as of September 30, 2007.

With September 30, 2007 just two years away and quickly approaching, it is imperative to plan accordingly to meet your classroom housing needs. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact your OPSC Project Manager.

EXCLUSIVE OF THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2005 SAB AGENDA

Proposition Funds Put to Work

PROGRAM	BOND ALLOCATION	APPORTIONED	RELEASED/CONTRACTED
PROPOSITION 55			
New Construction	\$ 4,960,000,000	\$ 337,630,482	\$ 196,040,759
Modernization	2,250,000,000	1,242,860,775	718,440,536
Charter School	300,000,000	276,810,763	3,011,715
Critically Overcrowded Schools	2,440,000,000	1,887,970,777	0
Joint Use	50,000,000	16,750,515	622,264
Total Proposition 55	\$ 10,000,000,000	\$ 3,762,023,312	\$ 918,115,274
PROPOSITION 47			
New Construction	\$ 6,250,000,000	\$ 6,153,000,639	\$ 5,963,801
Modernization	3,300,000,000	3,293,338,113	3,255,022,794
Charter School	100,000,000	97,034,156	0
Critically Overcrowded Schools	1,700,000,000	1,681,404,400	16,324,182
Joint Use	50,000,000	49,917,000	16,313,971
Total Proposition 47	\$ 11,400,000,000	\$ 11,274,694,308	\$ 9,251,252,748
Grand Total	\$ 21,400,000,000	\$ 15,036,717,620	\$ 10,169,368,022

AS OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2005

Status of Funds

PROGRAM	BALANCE AVAILABLE
PROPOSITION 55	
New Construction	\$ 4,458.4
Energy	13.8
Small High School	20.0
Modernization	843.0
Energy	5.8
Small High School	5.0
Critically Overcrowded Schools	
15% COS Unrestricted Fund Available	283.0
	269.0
Charter School	
DTSC/Relocation	13.1
Hazardous Material	2.6
Joint Use	33.2
Total Proposition 55	\$ 5,946.9
PROPOSITION 47	
New Construction	\$ 5.4
Charter School	0.5
Energy	1.1
Modernization	7.5
Energy	2.4
Critically Overcrowded Schools	
Reserved	18.6
Joint Use	0.0
Total Proposition 47	\$ 35.5
Grand Total	\$ 5,982.4

The SAB funded \$1,914,377.35 for the Deferred Maintenance Program.

Note: Amount shown are in millions of dollars.

Office of Public School Construction
1130 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814



STATE ALLOCATION BOARD'S

Implementation Committee

MAVONNE GARRITY, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER, STATE ALLOCATION BOARD

At the previous meetings...

The following topic was discussed at the State Allocation Board (SAB) Implementation Committee meeting on October 7th, 2005.

SENATE BILL 550 GOOD REPAIR STANDARDS REPORT

The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) presented a draft of the "Good Repair Report: Options for a Permanent State Standard" which must be submitted to the Governor and Legislature no later than December 31, 2005, in accordance with Education Code Section 17002. The report discusses options for state standards as an alternative to the Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI), as required by the Statute.

This report is a culmination of one year of research and discussion, which began in September of 2004 with the development of the IEI as a definition of good repair for school facilities in California. The OPSC was required to develop this tool pursuant to the Senate Bill 550 (Vasconcellos), Chapter 900, Statutes of 2004, which was a result of a settlement in the case of *Williams, et al vs. State of California*.

The IEI was thoroughly discussed at the SAB Implementation Committee meetings in November 2004, December 2004 and January 2005. It went through several generations as a result of the feedback from a variety of school facility stakeholders. In November 2004, Staff was able to use the tool in a practical setting. This experience led to further refinement of the IEI, which has now been in use by school districts and county offices of education for over nine months.

In addition to the IEI, the OPSC reviewed the tools and standards developed by 10 other states and entities. Furthermore, to assist in preparation of this report and the development of options for final state standards, the OPSC formed a workgroup of school facility experts and practitioners. The primary goal of the group was to explore a multitude of practical options for State school facility standards. Input from the workgroup served as the foundation of the report that was presented to the Implementation Committee at the October 2005 meeting.

The draft report includes an analysis of six aspects to be considered when developing the permanent state standard of good repair, as follows:

- the facility components to be evaluated
- level of detail to be included in statute
- the format of the standards
- the need for a ranking and/or scoring mechanism
- enforcement of the standards, and
- how the standards impact the other components of the Williams settlement.

Discussion at the Implementation Committee centered around the first four bullets.

In regard to the facility components to be evaluated, the report suggests that the list of items contained in the IEI should be used in addition to parking lot surfaces, walkways, site drainage, and exterior lighting. Audience members supported these suggestions and encouraged the OPSC to emphasize the overall cleanliness of the campus, including graffiti, in the development of a permanent standard.

The Implementation Committee also considered the level of detail to be included in the standards which is directly related to the level of expertise of the evaluators. Audience members noted that an explicitly detailed statutory description may not be useful in the long run as it may be difficult to modify. Participants noted that, while some school districts may lack the resources to contract for expert services to perform the evaluations, a completely observational evaluation by an untrained individual may not provide an adequate and meaningful evaluation of a facility. In order to strike a balance between the various concerns in this area, the OPSC plans to recommend that standards be moderately detailed and provided in a narrative description in statute.

Lastly, there were discussions regarding the need for a statewide evaluation tool, whether mandatory or voluntary, containing a ranking and/or scoring mechanism. The representative of the plaintiffs in the Williams case favored a development of a uniform tool that would allow for comparison of school facilities and statewide data collection on the condition of California schools. Many supported this opinion and would appreciate if a tool such as the IEI was provided for districts that do not have the resources to develop local assessment instruments. Many have found the IEI to be helpful not only in evaluating facilities but also as a vehicle for improvement of school conditions. The OPSC agreed to further consider this issue prior to finalizing the report.

A copy of the draft "Good Repair Report: Options for a Permanent State Standard" can be found on the OPSC Web site in the Implementation Committee Meeting section.

The final report will be presented to the SAB on December 7, 2005, with subsequent submission to the Governor and Legislature by December 31, 2005, as prescribed by Statute.

The members of the SAB Implementation Committee, the Good Repair workgroup participants and other school facility stakeholders made a valuable contribution to the development of this report.

Watch for...

The following topic will be discussed at a future Implementation Committee meeting. You may log onto the OPSC Web Site at www.opsc.ca/gov/SAB/Imp_Calendar.htm to view the agenda for the next committee meeting and determine when items of interest are scheduled.

ASSEMBLY BILL 491 (GOLDBERG)

Discussion on the implementation of this bill which was signed by the Governor on October 7, 2005. For the actual bill text, please visit the Web site: <http://info.sen.ca.gov>

The next meeting...

The next SAB Implementation Committee meeting will be held on Friday, December 2, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. at the East End Complex, 1500 Capitol Avenue, Rooms 72.149B & 72.151A in Sacramento.