

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 27, 2009

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To request adoption of revisions to the Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) to ensure school facilities are in good repair.

BACKGROUND

Senate Bill 550 (Chapter 900, Statutes of 2004 - Vasconcellos) established the good repair standard in response to the settlement agreement in the case of *Williams vs. California*. A school facility in good repair was defined as "maintained in a manner that assures that it is clean, safe, and functional as determined pursuant to an interim evaluation instrument developed by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC)." Subsequent legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 607 (Chapter 704, Statutes of 2006 – Goldberg) provided the statutory definition of good repair and required the OPSC to develop a permanent evaluation instrument for school facilities to incorporate a component ranking and facility scoring. The permanent evaluation instrument, the FIT, was approved by the SAB in June 2007.

The FIT is intended to be a visual inspection tool to be used by school officials, county offices of education (COE), students, teachers, and parents to aid in ensuring that all California school children have access to clean, safe, and functional school facilities. The FIT includes 15 components and a rating system to evaluate each component, and a mechanism to determine the overall condition of the school.

AUTHORITY

EC Section 17002(d), amended as a result of AB 607, directs the OPSC on or before July 1, 2007 to develop a permanent school facility inspection and evaluation instrument that evaluates facility components on a scale of "good," "fair," or "poor," and provides an overall summary of the conditions at each school on a scale of "exemplary," "good," "fair," or "poor."

DESCRIPTION

The existing structure of the FIT includes 15 categories which match the components of good repair identified in statute. To improve the scoring system, the revised FIT groups the 15 categories into eight sections. The revised FIT changes the weighting that the various categories of facility components have on the overall score. Under the proposed method, categories with deficiencies that tend to occur more often are weighted more heavily, thus having greater influence on the overall rating. The existing structure of the FIT also includes percentage scales that are used to determine category rankings and overall scoring. The revised FIT adjusts the percentage scales to eliminate situations in which schools with notable deficiencies are able to receive a "good" or "exemplary" rating.

STAFF COMMENTS

To assist in the development of the FIT and maximize the opportunity for user input on the rating and scoring system, the OPSC formed a workgroup of experts and practitioners from COEs and school districts across the State as well as public school health advocates.

(Continued on Page Two)

STAFF COMMENTS (cont.)

The workgroup developed a list of the characteristics necessary for a user-friendly and functional evaluation tool. Among these desired characteristics are the following: a tool that is easily understood and easy to use at on-site inspections; a rating system that is simple to calculate and easy to understand and interpret; and a format that allows for maximum flexibility, comments and feedback. The FIT can be used by schools to complete the school facility section the School Accountability Report Card and by COEs who have oversight responsibilities at Academic Performance Index deciles 1-3 schools in their county, and are required by EC Section 1240 to annually inspect these schools.

A provision in the FIT provides an opportunity for the individual inspector to downgrade the school's rating when the scoring calculation indicates a rating that does not accurately reflect the urgency and severity of the deficiencies revealed during the inspection. This provision and application of the FIT in the field highlighted an inherent positive bias in the overall scoring system, compared to site conditions noted by evaluators. Significant pressure is put on the inspector in situations where the score needs to be downgraded due to the scoring calculation providing a good rating, while the inspection reveals a less than good rating. This may lead to conflict, defeating the purpose of the inspection as the method to improve school facility conditions. Thus, it became apparent that the structure of the tool and the ranking and scoring parameters need to be adjusted to align the evaluation results with realistic expectations of what constitutes good, fair, or poor facility conditions.

The workgroup reconvened in the fall of 2008 to consider adjustments to the FIT to accommodate the concerns described above. The proposed revisions were discussed by the group and tested against actual inspection evaluations in order to align the scoring system and ranking calculations to the site conditions noted by evaluators. The OPSC presented its proposals to the SAB Implementation Committee at the May 1, 2009 meeting. During these discussions, Committee and audience members supported the proposed revisions with no objections and indicated that reporting school conditions more accurately will help to improve communication of school site needs. A July 1, 2009 effective date will ensure that a revised FIT will be available to school districts and COEs for the 2009/10 Fiscal Year.

By more accurately presenting the condition of a school site, the revised FIT will help provide incentive for facility improvements to bring schools to a true condition of good repair. The proposed revisions to the FIT will more accurately identify the state of repair that a school site is in, ensuring that the settlement agreement in the case of *Williams vs. California* is upheld, and that all California school children have equal access to adequate school facilities that are maintained in good repair.

OPTIONS

The following options are presented for the Board's consideration:

1. Adopt the proposed revisions to the FIT as shown on the Attachment.
2. Take no action.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends Option 1.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) 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 the facility pursuant to EC Section 17002(d)(2). The tool is designed to identify areas of a school site that are in need of repair based upon a visual inspection of the site. In addition, the EC specifies the tool should not be used to require capital enhancements beyond the standards to which the facility was designed and constructed.

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)(I), 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 the FIT provided the local instrument meets the criteria specified in EC Section 17002(d) and as implemented in the 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 but must minimally include the criteria and rating scheme contained in the FIT.

USER INSTRUCTIONS

The FIT is comprised of three parts as follows:

Part I, 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 a 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 for various school facility categories. 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. Any deficiencies in 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 building system evaluated failed to meet the standard of good repair at that school site. These critical conditions are identified with underlined text followed by an (X) on the Good Repair Standard. If the underlined statement is not true, then there is an extreme deficiency (to be 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 generate a poor rating.

Part II, 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:

✓	No Deficiency - 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 specific category.
D	Deficiency: Mark "D" if one or more statement(s) in the Good Repair Standard for the specific category is not true, or if there is other clear evidence of the need for repair.
X	Extreme Deficiency: Indicate "X" if the area has a deficiency that is considered an "Extreme Deficiency" in the Good Repair Standard or there is a condition that qualifies as an extreme deficiency but is not noted in the Good Repair Standard.
NA	Not Applicable: If the Good Repair Standard category (building system or component) does not exist in the area evaluated, mark "NA".

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL**SCHOOL FACILITY CONDITIONS EVALUATION**

(NEW 06/07 REV 05/09)

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 for stand alone areas, such as portable classrooms. For permanent buildings containing several areas to be 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 10 classroom building 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.

- **Overall Cleanliness** (Section 15), is intended to be used to evaluate the cleanliness of each space. For example, a user should note a deficiency due to dirty surfaces in **Overall Cleanliness** Section 15, rather than **Interior Surfaces** (Section 4). At the same time, the user should note such deficiency only in **Overall Cleanliness** 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 **Restrooms** Section 14. If the area evaluated does not contain a restroom, **Restrooms** Section 14 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 fixtures 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 **Drinking Fountains** 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, **Drinking Fountains** Section 10 should be marked "NA."

- **Playgrounds/School Grounds** (Section 13), should be 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 total the number of areas evaluated. The inspector must also count all of the spaces deemed in good repair, deficient, extremely deficient, or not applicable under each of the 15 sections. Next, the evaluator must determine the condition of each category section by 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 sections received a rating of extreme deficiency, the ratio (i.e., the percentage of good repair) for that section and the category the section is in should default to zero. The total percent per category (A through H) is determined by the total of all percentages of systems in good repair divided by the number of sections in that category. For example, to determine the total percent for the Structural category, add the percentages for the Structural Damage and Roof sections and divide the result by two.

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

*Although the FIT is designed to evaluate each school site within a reasonable range of facility conditions, it is possible that an evaluator may identify critical facility conditions that result in an Overall School Rating that does not reflect the urgency and severity of those deficiencies and/or does not match the rating's Description in Part III. 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.

When completing Part III of the FIT, the instructor should note the date and time of the inspection as well as weather conditions and any other pertinent inspection information in the specific areas provided and utilize the Comments and Rating Explanation Section if needed.

PART I: GOOD REPAIR STANDARD

(X): If underlined statement is not true, then this is an extreme deficiency (marked as an "X") on the Evaluation Detail resulting 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:

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

- a. The HVAC system is operable. (X)
- b. The facilities are ventilated (via mechanical or natural ventilation).
- c. The ventilation units are unobstructed and vents and grills are without evidence of excessive dirt or dust.
- d. 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)
- e. Interior temperatures appear to be maintained within normally accepted ranges.
- f. The ventilation units are not generating any excessive noise or vibrations.
- g. 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:

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

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

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

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

7. Fire Safety

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

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

PART I: GOOD REPAIR STANDARD

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

Gas Leaks

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

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

Mechanical Systems

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

- a. The HVAC system is operable. (X)
- b. The facilities are ventilated (via mechanical or natural ventilation).
- c. The ventilation units are unobstructed and vents and grills are without evidence of excessive dirt or dust.
- d. 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)
- e. Interior temperatures appear to be maintained within normally accepted ranges.
- f. The ventilation units are not generating any excessive noise or vibrations.
- g. Other

Sewer

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

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

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:

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

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:

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

Pest/Vermin Infestation

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

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

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:

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

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

- a. Lighting appears to be adequate.
- b. Lighting is not flickering.
- c. There is no unusual hum or noise from the light fixtures.
- d. 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:~~
- a. ~~There are no exposed electrical wires. Electrical equipment is properly covered and secured from pupil access. (X)~~
 - b. ~~Outlets, access panels, switch plates, junction boxes and fixtures are properly covered and secured from pupil access.~~
 - c. ~~Other~~
3. ~~Lighting appears to be adequate and working properly, including exterior lights. Examples include but are not limited to the following:~~

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

9. Pest/Vermin Infestation

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

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

- a. ~~Drinking fountains are accessible.~~
- b. ~~Water pressure is adequate.~~
- c. ~~A leak is not evident.~~
- d. ~~There is no moss, mold, or excessive staining on the fixtures.~~
- e. ~~The water is clear and without unusual taste or odor.~~
- f. ~~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:~~

- a. ~~Restrooms are maintained and cleaned regularly.~~
- b. ~~Restrooms are fully operational.~~
- c. ~~Restrooms are stocked with toilet paper, soap, and paper towels.~~
- d. ~~Restrooms are open during school hours.~~
- e. ~~Other~~

12. Sewer

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

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

13. 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:~~

- a. ~~Roofs, gutters, roof drains, and down spouts are free of visible damage.~~
- b. ~~Roofs, gutters, roof drains, and down spouts are intact.~~
- c. ~~Other~~

14. 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:~~

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

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

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL**SCHOOL FACILITY CONDITIONS EVALUATION**

(NEW 06/07)

Page 4 of 6

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:

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

Sinks/Fountains (Inside and Outside)

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

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

Fire Safety

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

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

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:

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

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:

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

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:

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

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:

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

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:

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

PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL

Date of Inspection: _____

School Name: _____

CATEGORY AREA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
	GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	WINDOWS/ DOORS/GATES/ FENCES	INTERIOR SURFACES	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	FIRE SAFETY	ELECTRICAL	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	DRINKING FOUNTAINS	RESTROOM	SEWER	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/S SCHOOL GROUNDS	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	
	COMMENTS:															
	COMMENTS:															
	COMMENTS:															
	COMMENTS:															
	COMMENTS:															
	COMMENTS:															
	COMMENTS:															

Marks: **✓** = Good Repair (When filling up the electronic version, please use **ctrl+G**); **D** = Deficiency; **X** = Extreme Deficiency; **NA** = Not Applicable
 Use additional sheets as necessary.

PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL

Date of Inspection: _____

School Name: _____

CATEGORY AREA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOM	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/S CHOOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/ FENCES
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															
COMMENTS:															

Marks: ✓ = Good Repair (When filling up the electronic version, please use **ctrl+G**); **D** = Deficiency; **X** = Extreme Deficiency; **NA** = Not Applicable
 Use additional sheets as necessary.

SCHOOL DISTRICT/COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION		COUNTY	
SCHOOL SITE	SCHOOL TYPE (GRADE LEVELS)	NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS ON SITE	
INSPECTOR'S NAME	INSPECTOR'S TITLE	NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ACCOMPANYING THE INSPECTOR(S) (IF APPLICABLE)	
TIME OF INSPECTION	WEATHER CONDITION AT TIME OF INSPECTION		

PART III: CATEGORY TOTALS AND RANKING

TOTAL NUMBER OF AREAS EVALUATED	CATEGORY TOTALS	SECTION 1	SECTION 2	SECTION 3	SECTION 4	SECTION 5	SECTION 6	SECTION 7	SECTION 8	SECTION 9	SECTION 10	SECTION 11	SECTION 12	SECTION 13	SECTION 14	SECTION 15
		GAS-LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	WINDOWS/DOORS/GATES/FENCES	INTERIOR SURFACES	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	FIRE SAFETY	ELECTRICAL	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	DRINKING FOUNTAINS	RESTROOMS	SEWER	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/SCHOOL GROUNDS	OVERALL CLEANLINESS
↓	Number of "✓"s:															
	Number of "D" s:															
	Number of "X" s:															
	Number of N/A s:															
Percent of System in Good Repair Number of "✓" s divided by (Total Areas - "NA" s)																
Rank (Circle one) Good = 85%-100% Fair = 67%-84.99% Poor = 0%-66.99%		GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR	GOOD FAIR POOR

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

OVERALL RATING:

DETERMINE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF 15 CATEGORIES ABOVE →	SCHOOL RATING* →
---	------------------

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

PERCENTAGE	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.	Exemplary
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.	Good
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.	Fair
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 the campus.	Poor

COMMENTS AND RATING EXPLANATION:

SCHOOL DISTRICT/COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION		COUNTY	
SCHOOL SITE		SCHOOL TYPE (GRADE LEVELS)	NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS ON SITE
INSPECTOR'S NAME	INSPECTOR'S TITLE	NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ACCOMPANYING THE INSPECTOR(S) (IF APPLICABLE)	
TIME OF INSPECTION	WEATHER CONDITION AT TIME OF INSPECTION		

PART III: CATEGORY TOTALS AND RANKING

TOTAL NUMBER OF AREAS EVALUATED	CATEGORY TOTALS	A. SYSTEMS			B. INTERIOR	C. CLEANLINESS		D. ELECTRICAL	E. RESTROOMS/FOUNTAINS		F. SAFETY		G. STRUCTURAL		H. EXTERNAL	
		GAS LEAKS	MECH/HVAC	SEWER	INTERIOR SURFACES	OVERALL CLEANLINESS	PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	ELECTRICAL	RESTROOMS	SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	FIRE SAFETY	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	ROOFS	PLAYGROUND/ SCHOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
↓	Number of "✓"s:															
	Number of "D" s:															
	Number of "X" s:															
	Number of N/As:															
Percent of System in Good Repair Number of "✓"s divided by (Total Areas - "NA"s)*																
Total Percent per Category (average of above)*																
Rank (Circle one) GOOD = 90%-100% FAIR = 75%-89.99% POOR = 0%-74.99%			GOOD FAIR POOR		GOOD FAIR POOR		GOOD FAIR POOR		GOOD FAIR POOR		GOOD FAIR POOR		GOOD FAIR POOR		GOOD FAIR POOR	

*Note: An extreme deficiency in any area automatically results in a "poor" ranking for that category and a zero for "Total Percent per Category".

OVERALL RATING: DETERMINE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF 8 CATEGORIES ABOVE → SCHOOL RATING** →

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

PERCENTAGE	DESCRIPTION	RATING
99%-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.	EXEMPLARY
90%-98.99%	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.	GOOD
75%-89.99%	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.	FAIR
0%-74.99%	The school facilities are in poor condition. Deficiencies of various degrees have been noted throughout the site. Major repairs and maintenance are necessary throughout the campus.	POOR

COMMENTS AND RATING EXPLANATION:
