

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION STAKEHOLDER MEETING  
January 20, 2021

Proposed Revision to the Facility Inspection Tool

PURPOSE

To discuss the Office of Public School Construction's (OPSC) updated, proposed revisions to the Facility Inspection Tool (FIT).

BACKGROUND

Senate Bill (SB) 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*, which enshrined the right to "clean, safe and functional" school facilities for California students. 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...."

The FIT is 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 current FIT includes eight sections with 15 categories and a rating system to evaluate each facilities component, and a mechanism to determine the overall condition of the school.

SB 129 (Chapter 69, Budget Act of 2021 – Skinner) requires the OPSC to consult with stakeholders and consider current standards for school facilities, including, but not limited to, the Association of Physical Plant Administrator's (APPA) Operational Guidelines for Educational Facilities, and both local and state public health guidance and standards. The Board is required to adopt an updated Facility Inspection Tool prior to June 30, 2022, for use beginning July 1, 2022.

This item is to continue the discussion as well as to address comments and concerns raised during, and since, the first stakeholder meeting held on November 30, 2021. A copy of OPSC's agenda item for the first meeting can be found here:

<https://www.dgs.ca.gov/OPSC/Resources/Page-Content/Office-of-Public-School-Construction-Resources-List-Folder/State-Allocation-Board-Agendas>

During the November 30, 2021 stakeholder meeting, OPSC staff and stakeholders discussed OPSC's initial proposal and the concepts within this item being discussed today. The meeting was recorded and can be viewed here:

<https://youtu.be/YBP912RtgWM>

AUTHORITY

See Attachment A.

## DESCRIPTION

The existing structure of the FIT (Attachment B) includes groupings of the 15 categories into eight sections. A workgroup of experts 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 for the user with the ability to provide comments, and feedback. The FIT weights the various categories of facility components which impacts the overall score. Categories with deficiencies that tend to occur more often are weighted more heavily, thus having greater influence on the overall rating. Since 2009, the FIT structure uses percentage scales to determine category rankings and overall scoring but includes methodology to eliminate situations in which schools with notable deficiencies can receive a “good” or “exemplary” rating.

“Good repair”, as defined by Education Code (EC) Section 17002(d)(1), means “the facility is maintained in a manner that assures 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 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.

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS***Feedback Provided During the November 30, 2021 Stakeholder Meeting***

OPSC has summarized each concept discussed and is providing an explanation for OPSC's decision to include or omit each of the concepts from the current proposed changes shown on Attachment C (all current proposals are highlighted in yellow and/or double-underlined).

<b>Topic</b>	<b>OPSC's Feedback</b>
<p>Part I. Good Repair Standard Page 3 of 7 – It was recommended that the instructions for Overall Cleanliness be amended as follows: School grounds, buildings, common areas, <u>surfaces</u>, <u>high touch areas</u>, <u>exterior grounds</u>, and individual rooms appear to have been cleaned regularly.</p> <p>Additionally, it was recommended that Restrooms, drinking fountains, <u>workspaces</u>, and food preparation or serving areas appear to have been cleaned and sanitized each day that school is in session.</p>	<p>OPSC has included “surfaces” but not “high touch surfaces” or “workspaces” in our recommendation because “surfaces” is inclusive of both high touch areas and workspaces.</p> <p>“Exterior Grounds” has been excluded unless a definition of what could be well-defined as being considered clean for exterior space is created. Considerations would need to address the weather at the time of the evaluation and types evaluation areas (playgrounds, exterior seating areas, walkways, etc.)</p>
<p>Part I. Good Repair Standard Page 3 of 7 - Overall Cleanliness – It was recommended a separate attachment be used to further evaluate the cleanliness of each area, and that Custodial rooms and equipment be included. OPSC has also received feedback that an additional attachment was not necessary and cleanliness as a whole could be determined without the detail.</p> <p>Additionally, it was recommended that Restrooms, drinking fountains, workspaces, and food preparation or serving areas appear to have been cleaned <u>and sanitized</u> each day that school is in session.</p>	<p>On Attachment C, OPSC has further refined an example of how this could be accomplished by adding Part IIb. Cleanliness Detail Page 6 of 7. This expands on the proposal presented during the last meeting and combines like-kind categories. The form could be optional for use in completing the overall evaluation.</p> <p>OPSC has not included two recommended categories for “Custodial Rooms Clean/Organized” and “Custodial Equipment in Good Repair”. Custodial Rooms can already be included as either part of a building evaluation or as an individually reviewed area.</p> <p>OPSC has not included “disinfected” or “sanitized” as these cannot be visually determined.</p> <p>OPSC has removed “working lights” from the cleanliness section as it's already included in electrical.</p>

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS (cont.)

Topic	OPSC's Feedback
Part I. Good Repair Standard Page 3 of 7 – Electrical (Interior and Exterior) – It was recommended to include “outlets”.	OPSC has not included the addition as “outlets” are a component of the electrical system.
Part I. Good Repair Standard Page 4 of 7 – It was recommended that under Restrooms, bullet “a” be updated to “Restrooms are maintained and cleaned <u>daily</u> .”  It was also recommended to include “menstrual products” as a result of AB 367.	OPSC has not included the recommendation for “daily” cleaning. An inspector would be unable to perform a visual inspection occurring at a point in time and determine whether the restrooms are cleaned daily. The inspector would need to revisit the site daily to make this point in time determination.  OPSC has included the recommendation to include “menstrual products”.
Part IIb. Cleanliness Detail Page 6 of 7 – Area Characteristics – It was recommended to include a column on the Evaluation Detail with “Area Characteristics”. This was to provide the reader with information such as the grade level of students served, traffic volume, usage, etc.	OPSC agrees that this information provide the reader perspective on the ratings categories. It can be reasoned that high traffic areas and large spaces require more effort to maintain. OPSC proposes to add a column for this information on the Cleanliness Detail instead of the Evaluation Detail. These characteristics would have less impact to the overall systems in a facility such as gas leaks, mechanical systems, electrical, and roofs.
Part III. Totals and Ranking - Page 7 of 7 – Stakeholders have provided feedback that the maintenance staff are generally assigned to multiple school sites or work at the district level where required, whereas custodial staff are generally assigned only at the school site level.	OPSC proposes to capture both the number of maintenance and custodial staff assigned to the site to provide the reader perspective. While APPA’s Operation Guidelines for Educational Facilities has a prescriptive approach that correlates facility size to the number of staff, OPSC does not propose to include these calculations on the FIT. SB 129 only requires OPSC to consider the standards in the APPA guidelines when updating the FIT and it does not require school districts to adopt the APPA as a standard.
Part III. Totals and Ranking - Page 7 of 7 – OPSC previously proposed the inclusion of area square footage and the use of the current “Site Square Footage” definition under the School Facility Program.	Based on stakeholder feedback, OPSC recognizes the challenges an inspector would have in calculating the square footage during a visual walkthrough. However, OPSC does believe that school district could work with the inspector for the first inspection to provide estimated square footages for each area. The square footage information provides perspective to readers of the FIT.  Based on stakeholder recommendation, OPSC has also included total estimated site square footage, estimated building volume (in cubic feet) and total restroom count.

## DISCUSSION

OPSC is asking for stakeholder feedback on updated proposed changes and welcomes new feedback and recommendations. Below are specific questions OPSC is requesting feedback on:

1. Part 1. Good Repair Standard – Instructions for Overall Cleanliness:
  - a. Items #7 & #11 - Should this verification of hot/cold water from the bathroom faucets be checked?
  - b. Do the instructions in #1 through #15 provide sufficient detail for the inspector?
  - c. OPSC is seeking feedback on making Part IIb Cleanliness Detail optional for completion of Part IIa Evaluation Detail as it relates to the column 5 for the Overall Cleanliness category within Part IIa.
  
2. Part IIb. Cleanliness Detail – Does the form contain a sufficient breakdown of categories for review?
  - a. OPSC is considering placing questions regarding the number of maintenance and custodial staff on this page instead of the final Evaluation Report page.
  - b. “15. Landscaping - Area is mowed. Plants are trimmed and maintained.” Should this be included in order to determine if a school is “clean, safe and functional”?
  
3. One proposal suggested ranking each component using the traditional letter grade system familiar to many. After the meeting, OPSC received additional verbal feedback that such a system may be desirable. OPSC has not included this recommendation yet, as it requires the user to perform an additional step to convert the score from good, fair, and poor to a letter grade. Further, statute requires the use of exemplary, good, fair and poor ratings; therefore, it would require the user to convert the letter grade back to the required nomenclature. OPSC would like more feedback on this proposal.

## CLOSING REMARKS/NEXT STEPS

OPSC will review all feedback and schedule a third meeting to review an updated proposal for consideration. Once scheduled, OPSC will notify all interested parties through our email notification system. If you would like to subscribe to our email list, please visit this link:

[https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CADGS/subscriber/topics?qsp=CADGS\\_4](https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CADGS/subscriber/topics?qsp=CADGS_4)

Any stakeholder wishing to provide feedback should email [OPSCCommunications@dgs.ca.gov](mailto:OPSCCommunications@dgs.ca.gov) by end of day, February 4, 2022.

## ATTACHMENT A

### AUTHORITY

#### **Education Code (EC) Section 1240**

The county superintendent of schools shall do all of the following:

(a) Superintend the schools of that county.

(b) Maintain responsibility for the fiscal oversight of each school district in that county pursuant to the authority granted by this code.

(c) (1) Visit and examine each school in the county at reasonable intervals to observe its operation and to learn of its problems. The county superintendent of schools annually may present a report of the state of the schools in the county, and of the county office of education, including, but not limited to, observations from visiting the schools, to the board of education and the board of supervisors of the county.

(2) (A) For fiscal years 2004–05 to 2006–07, inclusive, to the extent that funds are appropriated for purposes of this paragraph, the county superintendent, or their designee, annually shall submit a report, at a regularly scheduled November board meeting, to the governing board of each school district under their jurisdiction, the county board of education of the county, and the board of supervisors of the county describing the state of the schools in the county or of the county office of education that are ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, of the 2003 base Academic Performance Index (API), as described in subdivision (b) of Section 17592.70, and shall include, among other things, observations from visiting the schools and determinations for each school regarding the status of all of the circumstances listed in subparagraph (I) and teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies. As a condition for receipt of funds, the county superintendent, or their designee, shall use a standardized template to report the circumstances listed in subparagraph (I) and teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies, unless the current annual report being used by the county superintendent, or their designee, already includes those details for each school.

(B) Commencing with the 2007–08 fiscal year, the county superintendent, or their designee, annually shall submit a report, at a regularly scheduled November board meeting, to the governing board of each school district under their jurisdiction, the county board of education of the county, and the board of supervisors of the county describing the state of the schools in the county or of the county office of education that are ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, of the 2006 base API, pursuant to former Section 52056, as that section read on June 30, 2013. The annual report shall include the determinations for each school made by the county superintendent, or their designee, regarding the status of all of the circumstances listed in subparagraph (I) and teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies, and the county superintendent, or their designee, shall use a standardized template to report the circumstances listed in subparagraph (I) and teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies, unless the current annual report being used by the county superintendent, or their designee, already includes those details with the same level of specificity that is otherwise required by this subdivision. For purposes of this section, schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, on the 2006 base API shall include schools determined by the department to meet either of the following:

(i) The school meets all of the following criteria:

(I) Does not have a valid base API score for 2006.

(II) Is operating in fiscal year 2007–08 and was operating in fiscal year 2006–07 during the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program testing period.

(III) Has a valid base API score for 2005 that was ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, in that year.

(ii) The school has an estimated base API score for 2006 that would be in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive.

(C) The department shall estimate an API score for any school meeting the criteria of subclauses (I) and (II) of clause (i) of subparagraph (B) and not meeting the criteria of subclause (III) of clause (i) of subparagraph (B), using available test scores and weighting or corrective factors it deems appropriate. The department shall post the API scores on its internet website on or before May 1.

(D) For purposes of this section, references to schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, on the 2006 base API shall exclude schools operated by county offices of education pursuant to Section 56140, as determined by the department.

(E) (i) Commencing with the 2010–11 fiscal year and every third year thereafter, the Superintendent shall identify a list of schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, of the API for which the county superintendent, or their designee, annually shall submit a report, at a regularly scheduled November board meeting, to the governing board of each school district under their jurisdiction, the county board of education of the county, and the board of supervisors of the county that describes the state of the schools in the county or of the county office of education that are ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, of the base API, as defined in clause (ii).

(ii) For the 2010–11 fiscal year, the list of schools ranked in deciles 1 to 3, inclusive, of the base API shall be updated using the criteria set forth in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B), subparagraph (C), and subparagraph (D), as applied to the 2009 base API and thereafter shall be updated every third year using the criteria set forth in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B), subparagraph (C), and subparagraph (D), as applied to the base API of the year preceding the third year consistent with clause (i).

(iii) The annual report shall include the determinations for each school made by the county superintendent, or their designee, regarding the status of all of the circumstances listed in subparagraph (I) and teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies, and the county superintendent, or their designee, shall use a standardized template to report the circumstances listed in subparagraph (I) and teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies, unless the current annual report being used by the county superintendent, or their designee, already includes those details with the same level of specificity that is otherwise required by this subdivision.

(F) The county superintendent of the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Del Norte, Mariposa, Plumas, and Sierra, and the City and County of San Francisco shall contract with another county office of education or an independent auditor to conduct the required visits and make all reports required by this paragraph.

(G) On a quarterly basis, the county superintendent, or their designee, shall report the results of the visits and reviews conducted that quarter to the governing board of the school district at a regularly scheduled meeting held in accordance with public notification requirements. The results of the visits and reviews shall include the determinations of the county superintendent, or their designee, for each school regarding the status of all of the circumstances listed in subparagraph (I) and teacher misassignments and teacher vacancies. If the county superintendent, or their designee, conducts no visits or reviews in a quarter, the quarterly report shall report that fact.

(H) The visits made pursuant to this paragraph shall be conducted at least annually and shall meet the following criteria:

- (i) Minimize disruption to the operation of the school.
- (ii) Be performed by individuals who meet the requirements of Section 45125.1.
- (iii) Consist of not less than 25 percent unannounced visits in each county. During unannounced visits in each county, the county superintendent shall not demand access to documents or specific school personnel. Unannounced visits shall only be used to observe the condition of school repair and maintenance, and the sufficiency of instructional materials, as defined by Section 60119.
- (l) The priority objective of the visits made pursuant to this paragraph shall be to determine the status of all of the following circumstances:
  - (i) Sufficient textbooks, as defined in Section 60119 and as specified in subdivision (i).
  - (ii) The condition of a facility that poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff, as described in school district policy or paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of Section 17592.72.
  - (iii) The accuracy of data reported on the school accountability report card with respect to the availability of sufficient textbooks and instructional materials, as defined by Section 60119, and the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities, including good repair, as required by Sections 17014, 17032.5, 17070.75, and 17089.
- (J) The county superintendent may make the status determinations described in subparagraph (l) during a single visit or multiple visits. In determining whether to make a single visit or multiple visits for this purpose, the county superintendent shall take into consideration factors such as cost-effectiveness, disruption to the schoolsite, deadlines, and the availability of qualified reviewers.
- (K) If the county superintendent determines that the condition of a facility poses an emergency or urgent threat to the health or safety of pupils or staff as described in school district policy or paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of Section 17592.72, or is not in good repair, as specified in subdivision (d) of Section 17002 and required by Sections 17014, 17032.5, 17070.75, and 17089, the county superintendent, among other things, may do any of the following:
  - (i) Return to the school to verify repairs.
  - (ii) Prepare a report that specifically identifies and documents the areas or instances of noncompliance if the school district has not provided evidence of successful repairs within 30 days of the visit of the county superintendent or, for major projects, has not provided evidence that the repairs will be conducted in a timely manner. The report may be provided to the governing board of the school district. If the report is provided to the school district, it shall be presented at a regularly scheduled meeting held in accordance with public notification requirements. The county superintendent shall post the report on the internet website of the county superintendent. The report shall be removed from the internet website when the county superintendent verifies the repairs have been completed.

...



## EC Section 17002

The following terms wherever used or referred to in this chapter, shall have the following meanings, respectively, unless a different meaning appears from the context:

(a) "Apportionment" means a reservation of funds necessary to finance the cost of any project approved by the board for lease to an applicant school district.

(b) "Board" means the State Allocation Board.

(c) "Cost of project" includes, but is not limited to, the cost of all real estate property rights, and easements acquired, and the cost of developing the site and streets and utilities immediately adjacent thereto, the cost of construction, reconstruction, or modernization of buildings and the furnishing and equipping, including the purchase of educational technology hardware, of those buildings, the supporting wiring and cabling, and the technological modernization of existing buildings to support that hardware, the cost of plans, specifications, surveys, and estimates of costs, and other expenses that are necessary or incidental to the financing of the project. For purposes of this section, "educational technology hardware" includes, but is not limited to, computers, telephones, televisions, and video recording equipment.

(d) (1) "Good repair" means the facility is maintained in a manner that assures that it is clean, safe, and functional as determined pursuant to a school facility inspection and evaluation instrument developed by the Office of Public School Construction and approved by the board or a local evaluation instrument that meets the same criteria. Until the school facility inspection and evaluation instrument is approved by the board, "good repair" means the facility is maintained in a manner that assures that it is clean, safe, and functional as determined by the interim evaluation instrument developed by the Office of Public School Construction or a local evaluation instrument that meets the same criteria as the interim evaluation instrument. The school facility inspection and evaluation instrument and local evaluation instruments that meet the minimum criteria of this subdivision shall not require capital enhancements beyond the standards to which the facility was designed and constructed. In order to provide that school facilities are reviewed to be clean, safe, and functional, the school facility inspection and evaluation instrument and local evaluation instruments shall include at least the following criteria:

(A) Gas systems and pipes appear and smell safe, functional, and free of leaks.

(B) Mechanical systems, including heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning systems, satisfy the following:

(i) Are functional and unobstructed.

(ii) Appear to supply adequate amount of air to all classrooms, work spaces, and facilities.

(iii) Maintain interior temperatures within normally acceptable ranges.

(C) Doors and windows are intact, functional, and open, close, and lock as designed, unless there is a valid reason they should not function as designed.

(D) Fences and gates are intact, functional, and free of holes and other conditions that could present a safety hazard to pupils, staff, or others. Locks and other security hardware function as designed.

(E) Interior surfaces, including walls, floors, and ceilings, are free of safety hazards from tears, holes, missing floor and ceiling tiles, torn carpet, water damage, or other cause. Ceiling tiles are intact. Surfaces display no evidence of mold or mildew.

(F) Hazardous and flammable materials are stored properly. No evidence of peeling, chipping, or cracking paint is apparent. No indicators of mold, mildew, or asbestos exposure are evident. There is no apparent evidence of hazardous materials that may pose a threat to the health and safety of pupils or staff.

- (G) Structures, including posts, beams, supports for portable classrooms and ramps, and other structural building members appear intact, secure, and functional as designed. Ceilings and floors are not sloping or sagging beyond their intended design. There is no visible evidence of severe cracks, dry rot, mold, or damage that undermines structural components.
- (H) Fire sprinklers, fire extinguishers, emergency alarm systems, and all emergency equipment and systems appear to be functioning properly. Fire alarm pull stations are clearly visible. Fire extinguishers are current and placed in all required areas, including every classroom and assembly area. Emergency exits are clearly marked and unobstructed.
- (I) Electrical systems, components, and equipment, including switches, junction boxes, panels, wiring, outlets, and light fixtures, are securely enclosed, properly covered and guarded from pupil access, and appear to be working properly.
- (J) Lighting appears to be adequate and working properly. Lights do not flicker, dim, or malfunction, and there is no unusual hum or noise from light fixtures. Exterior lights onsite appear to be working properly.
- (K) No visible or odorous indicators of pest or vermin infestation are evident.
- (L) Interior and exterior drinking fountains are functional, accessible, and free of leaks. Drinking fountain water pressure is adequate. Fountain water is clear and without unusual taste or odor, and moss, mold, or excessive staining is not evident.
- (M) Restrooms and restroom fixtures satisfy the following:
- (i) Are functional.
  - (ii) Appear to be maintained and stocked with supplies regularly.
  - (iii) Appear to be accessible to pupils during the schoolday.
  - (iv) Appear to be in compliance with Section 35292.5.
- (N) The sanitary sewer system controls odor as designed, displays no signs of stoppage, backup, or flooding, in the facilities or on school grounds, and appears to be functioning properly.
- (O) Roofs, gutters, roof drains, and downspouts appear to be functioning properly and are free of visible damage and evidence of disrepair when observed from the ground inside and outside the building.
- (P) The school grounds do not exhibit signs of drainage problems, such as visible evidence of flooded areas, eroded soil, water damage to asphalt playgrounds or parking areas, or clogged storm drain inlets.
- (Q) Playground equipment and exterior fixtures, seating, tables, and equipment are functional and free of significant cracks, trip hazards, holes, deterioration that affects functionality or safety, and other health and safety hazards.
- (R) School grounds, fields, walkways, and parking lot surfaces are free of significant cracks, trip hazards, holes, deterioration that affects functionality or safety, and other health and safety hazards.
- (S) Overall cleanliness of the school grounds, buildings, common areas, and individual rooms demonstrates that all areas appear to have been cleaned regularly and are free of accumulated refuse and unabated graffiti. Restrooms, drinking fountains, and food preparation or serving areas appear to have been cleaned each day that the school is in session.
- (2) (A) On or before January 1, 2007, the Office of Public School Construction shall develop the school facility inspection and evaluation instrument and instructions for users. The school facility inspection and evaluation instrument and local evaluation instruments that meet the minimum criteria of this subdivision shall include a system that will evaluate each facility, based on the criteria listed in paragraph (1), on a scale of "good," "fair," or "poor," as developed by the Office of Public School Construction, and provide an overall summary of the conditions at each school on a scale of "exemplary," "good," "fair," or "poor."

(B) On or before July 1, 2007, the Office of Public School Construction, in consultation with county offices of education, shall define objective criteria for determining the overall summary of the conditions of schools.

(C) For purposes of this paragraph, “users” means local educational agencies that participate in either of the programs established pursuant to this chapter, Chapter 12.5 (commencing with Section 17070.10), or Section 17582.

(e) “Lease” includes a lease with an option to purchase.

(f) “Project” means the facility being constructed or acquired by the state for rental to the applicant school district and may include the reconstruction or modernization of existing buildings, construction of new buildings, the grading and development of sites, acquisition of sites therefor and any easements or rights-of-way pertinent thereto or necessary for its full use including the development of streets and utilities.

(g) “Property” includes all property, real, personal or mixed, tangible or intangible, or any interest therein necessary or desirable for carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

*(Amended by Stats. 2009, Ch. 88, Sec. 20. (AB 176) Effective January 1, 2010.)*

**Senate Bill (SB) 129 (Chapter 69, Budget Act of 2021 – Skinner)**

(a) The Office of Public School Construction shall consult with stakeholders such as local educational agency facilities staff, classified employees providing custodial services, certificated employees, local and state public health officials, and other experts in clean, safe, and functional school facilities. The Office of Public School Construction shall consider current standards for school facilities, including, but not limited to, the Association of Physical Plant Administrator’s Operational Guidelines for Educational Facilities and both local and state public health guidance and standards.

(c) The State Allocation Board shall adopt an updated Facility Inspection Tool prior to June 30, 2022, for use beginning July 1, 2022.

**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)(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 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:

<b>OK</b>	<b>No Deficiency - Good Repair:</b> Mark "OK" if all statements in the Good Repair Standard are true, and there is no indication of a deficiency in the specific category.
<b>D</b>	<b>Deficiency:</b> 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.
<b>X</b>	<b>Extreme Deficiency:</b> 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.
<b>NA</b>	<b>Not Applicable:</b> If the Good Repair Standard category (building system or component) does not exist in the area evaluated, mark “NA”.

Below are suggested methods for evaluating various systems and areas:

- **Gas and Sewer** 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** 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 and the other five classrooms as in good repair, assuming there are no other visible deficiencies related to roofing.
- **Overall Cleanliness** 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, rather than **Interior Surfaces**. At the same time, the user should note such deficiency only in Overall Cleanliness 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. If the area evaluated does not contain a restroom, Restrooms 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. 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 should be marked "NA."
- **Playgrounds/School Grounds**, 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** and **Fire Safety**, 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 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 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 eight categories (i.e., the total of all percentages divided by 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.

### 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

**FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL**

## Current Facility Inspection Tool (Rev. 05/09)

**SCHOOL FACILITY CONDITIONS EVALUATION**

(REV 05/09)

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:*

- 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

**Sinks/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

**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

**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

**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

**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

**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

**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

**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/SCHOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
	COMMENTS:														
	COMMENTS:														
	COMMENTS:														
	COMMENTS:														
	COMMENTS:														
	COMMENTS:														
	COMMENTS:														

Marks: **OK** = Good Repair; **D** = Deficiency; **X** = Extreme Deficiency; **NA** = Not Applicable  
 Use additional Area Lines 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** (round all calculations to two decimal places)

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 "OK"s:															
	Number of "D"s:															
	Number of "X"s:															
	Number of N/As:															
Percent of System in Good Repair Number of "OK"s divided by (Total Areas - "NA"s)*																
<b>Total Percent per Category (average of above)*</b>																
<b>Rank (Circle one)</b> GOOD = 90%-100% FAIR = 75%-89.99% POOR = 0%-74.99%																

\*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:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**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)(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 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:

<b>OK</b>	<b>No Deficiency - Good Repair:</b> Mark "OK" if all statements in the Good Repair Standard are true, and there is no indication of a deficiency in the specific category.
<b>D</b>	<b>Deficiency:</b> 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.
<b>X</b>	<b>Extreme Deficiency:</b> 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.
<b>NA</b>	<b>Not Applicable:</b> If the Good Repair Standard category (building system or component) does not exist in the area evaluated, mark “NA”.

Below are suggested methods for evaluating various systems and areas:

- **Gas and Sewer** 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** 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 and the other five classrooms as in good repair, assuming there are no other visible deficiencies related to roofing.
- **Overall Cleanliness** 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, rather than **Interior Surfaces**. At the same time, the user should note such deficiency only in Overall Cleanliness 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. If the area evaluated does not contain a restroom, Restrooms 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. 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 should be marked "NA."
- **Playgrounds/School Grounds**, 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** and **Fire Safety**, 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 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 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 eight categories (i.e., the total of all percentages divided by 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 inspector 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.

When completing Part III of the FIT, the school district should be provided the opportunity to provide comments 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.

### 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, surfaces, and individual rooms appear to have been cleaned regularly. Examples include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Areas(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

- a. Restrooms, drinking fountains, and food preparation or serving areas appear to have been cleaned each day that school is in session.
- b. An area should appear to be clean with minimal dirt, dust, or buildup. Floors and carpets should appear to have been swept or cleaned within the last week. Light fixtures and all bulbs are working properly. Facilities area adequately stocked and odor free. (OK)
- c. An area marked as "Deficiency" would appear to not have been cleaned in the last two weeks and carpet may look dull, matted, or stained. Corners of the room may have a recognizable amount of dirt or grime buildup. Floors do not appear to have been swept or vacuumed in two weeks. Some light fixtures are dirty and fewer than five percent of the bulbs have burned out. Daily trash has not been taken out. (D)
- d. An area marked as having an "Extreme Deficiency" would appear to be dirty, dingy, or scuffed with an evident buildup of dust, dirt, stains, or trash. Floors have not been swept or vacuumed in over two weeks. Light fixtures are dirty and more than five percent of the bulbs have burned out. There is trash overflow and the area being evaluated has a foul odor. (X)
- e. Area(s) evaluated is free of unabated graffiti.
- f. Other

Part IIb (Optional) - The Cleanliness Detail worksheet may be used to evaluate the Overall Cleanliness of each area. Based on Part IIb, use the following to complete Part IIa:

- a. If 75.0 percent or more of the review is "Yes", the area should be rated clean (OK).
- b. If 50 - 74.9 percent of the review is "Yes", the area should be rated "Deficient (D)".
- c. If 49.9 percent or less of the review is "Yes", the area should be rated Extreme Deficiency (X)

1. Floors swept, vacuumed, and/or mopped. Free of spots stains, and build up.
2. Walls and Doors free of spots and grime.
3. Desk and Counters clean.
4. Furniture dusted and clean.
5. Baseboards and window sills dusted and clean.
6. Light fixtures clean.
7. Sink clean and drains working properly.
8. Trash cans are empty and clean. The ground is free of trash. Floors and furniture are free
9. Windows are free from damage, clean, and in working condition.
10. Water fountains, including handles/buttons, are clean and in working condition.
11. Toilets and bathroom sinks are clean and in working condition.
12. Mirrors and Hand Dryers are clean, intact, and in working condition.
13. Bathroom supplies are stocked and in working condition.
14. Area is free of graffiti.
15. Landscaping - Area is mowed. Plants are trimmed and maintained.

### Pest/Vermin Infestation

Pest or vermin infestation are not evident.

- 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.
  - 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.
  - 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

### 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) and AB 367 (EC Section 35292.6). The following are examples of compliance with SB 892 and AB 367:

- a. Restrooms are maintained and cleaned regularly.
- b. Restrooms are fully operational.
- c. Restrooms are stocked with toilet paper, menstrual products, 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.

- 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

- 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

- 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

- 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.

- 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

- 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.

- 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

ATTACHMENT C

**PART IIa: EVALUATION DETAIL**

Date of Inspection: \_\_\_\_\_

School Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Building / Area Name	Estimated Square Footage	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/SCHOOL GROUNDS	WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/FENCES
		COMMENTS:														
		<i>District's Plan to Address:</i>														
		<i>Deficiency Noted in Prior Year?</i>														
		COMMENTS:														
		COMMENTS:														
		COMMENTS:														
		COMMENTS:														
		COMMENTS:														
		COMMENTS:														

Marks: **OK** = Good Repair; **D** = Deficiency; **X** = Extreme Deficiency; **NA** = Not Applicable  
 Use additional Area Lines as necessary.

**PART IIb: CLEANLINESS DETAIL**

Date of Inspection: \_\_\_\_\_

School Name: \_\_\_\_\_

NUMBER OF MAINTENANCE STAFF ASSIGNED TO SITE: \_\_\_\_\_

NUMBER OF CUSTODIAL STAFF ASSIGNED TO SITE: \_\_\_\_\_

Building / Area Name	Area Characteristics (Grade level served, events, traffic volume, public usage, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Rating
		Floors	Walls & Doors	Desks & Counters	Furniture	Baseboards /Window Sill	Light Fixtures	Sinks	Trash / Refuse	Windows	Water Fountains	Toilets	Mirrors & Hand Dryers	Bathroom Supplies	Graffiti	Landscaping	
																	#DIV/0!
		COMMENTS:															
	District's Plan to Address:																
	Deficiency Noted in Prior Year?																
																	#DIV/0!
		COMMENTS:															
																	#DIV/0!
		COMMENTS:															
																	#DIV/0!
		COMMENTS:															
																	#DIV/0!
		COMMENTS:															
																	#DIV/0!
		COMMENTS:															
																	#DIV/0!
		COMMENTS:															

Use additional Area Lines as necessary.

SCHOOL DISTRICT/COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION		COUNTY	
SCHOOL SITE		SCHOOL TYPE (GRADE LEVELS)	NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS ON SITE: NUMBER OF RESTROOMS ON SITE:
INSPECTOR'S NAME	INSPECTOR'S TITLE	NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ACCOMPANYING THE INSPECTOR(S) (IF APPLICABLE)	
TOTAL ESTIMATED BUILDING VOLUME (CUBIC FEET):	TIME OF INSPECTION	SITE ENROLLMENT	
TOTAL ESTIMATED SITE SQUARE FOOTAGE / ACREAGE:	WEATHER CONDITION AT TIME OF INSPECTION		
TOTAL ESTIMATED BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE:			

**PART III: CATEGORY TOTALS AND RANKING** (round all calculations to two decimal places)

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 "OK"s:																
Number of "D"s:																
Number of "X"s:																
Number of N/As:																
Percent of System in Good Repair Number of "OK"s divided by (Total Areas - "NA"s)*																
<b>Total Percent per Category (average of above)*</b>																
<b>Rank (Circle one)</b> GOOD = 90%-100% FAIR = 75%-89.99% POOR = 0%-74.99%																

\*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

**INSPECTOR'S COMMENTS AND RATING EXPLANATION:**

**DISTRICT'S RESPONSES TO REPORT:**