

# **FACILITIES MANAGEMENT**

## **Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

The Facilities Management and Planning Division has made some progress since the last review in addressing the recommendations in the Assessment and Recovery Plan. Most of the progress has occurred with respect to planning for changes and documenting policies and procedures. The Facilities Division also has been actively involved in restructuring to address the district's budget shortfalls.

Among the major changes that have occurred since the September 2003 review was the elimination of approximately 70 custodial positions; identification of five school sites for potential closure at the end of the 2003-04 school year; reallocation of general fund resources from facilities to other district needs; and shifting to a results-based budgeting approach, giving principals responsibility for allocating resources for maintenance and operations.

Custodial staff reductions were made based on industry standards for the ratio of custodians to building square footage. The five schools that were selected for closure were selected based on their small enrollment, low educational performance, and proximity to other schools. The district estimates that the closure of these proposed sites would result in a savings of \$2 million as a result of reductions in maintenance, operations, and staffing costs. The proposal has been met with concern from the community, board members, and school site staff. However, the district's financial problems necessitate the consideration of dramatic changes such as staff reduction and building closures.

The Facilities Division staff is working diligently to meet the district's facilities and maintenance needs with fewer resources. Division managers understand that they must develop processes and policies to allow staff to work more efficiently, but must also mandate that all staff members do their jobs well. Consequently, the division is working to develop custodial and inspection standards that site teams can use to guide their work; providing principals with control over site resources and holding them accountable for the appearance and cleanliness of their sites; and modifying staff evaluation criteria and procedures.

Although the Facilities Division is making important improvements, the condition of the district's facilities remains poor. For example, at more than one-half of the sites visited for this review, bathrooms were unclean and without toilet paper, exterior and interior spaces suffered from vandalism, and fire safety equipment was damaged or missing. Facilities Division staff continue to work in a reactive mode and appear unable to catch up with the wear, tear, and damage that is inflicted on the buildings and grounds of the district's facilities. The Facilities Division is doing a reasonable job addressing most of the district's maintenance needs. However, Facilities Division staff alone can not make the district's buildings clean, safe and productive learning environments.

A significant amount of the district's maintenance funding goes towards repairing preventable damage. Attention must be given to developing and implementing proactive measures to prevent vandalism and graffiti and to ensure that collective bargaining agreements permit staff to be held accountable for meeting meaningful job and performance standards. Unless and until such actions are taken, the district will be hampered in its efforts to improve its facilities to ensure that all students in the district are welcomed by safe, clean and productive learning environments, and will continue to expend limited resources on preventable repairs.

The following are priority areas for the Facilities Department to address and will require the support of the State Administrator, the executive cabinet and the school board to fully address these areas.

**Develop a comprehensive Graffiti and Vandalism Abatement Plan and approach.**

This plan must include participation from local law enforcement, Executive Directors, principals, students, custodians, maintenance staff, parents, and community members. The plan should be proactive and outline procedures, consequences, and specific responsibilities for all involved parties. It will necessitate campuswide beautification and pride-building activities, as well as increased supervision in “problem areas.” The district may consider implementing a pilot at one or two schools to test various approaches and develop models for success.

**Update the Facilities Master Plan.** In the absence of an up-to-date Facilities Master Plan, the district lacks a blueprint for guiding facility decisions. The plan must include priorities, time lines, costs, and suggested funding sources for all projects. Guidelines or “rules” for how projects are to be prioritized and approved must be developed. This should include a ranking system that assigns scores to both individual projects and entire school sites. The plan also should be coordinated with the district's deferred maintenance plan.

**Update evaluation instruments and implement maintenance and custodial standards.** The district maintains custodial cleaning standards, but they are not currently followed or enforced. The district needs to develop an evaluation instrument and process that is linked to performance standards. Collective bargaining agreements should be renegotiated to allow for their use. The staff must also be trained on how to meet the standards and supervisors trained on how to use the standards to evaluate employees. Similar standards and evaluation processes are also needed for the staff in the Buildings and Grounds Department.

**Acquire a more sophisticated Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS).** The district should consider replacing the existing CMMS system to support results-based budgeting. The current system does not support the following functions: tying work orders to inventory and payroll (necessary for job costing); identification of areas in need of preventive maintenance; generating work orders based on a preventive maintenance schedule; allowing principals to track the status, time estimates, parts and materials linked to a particular work order; or integrating equipment inventory with equipment life expectancies, costs, and replacement schedules. Investing in a new system will allow the district to allocate resources more appropriately, position itself for preventive maintenance, and support a results-based budgeting process.

## **1.7 School Safety – Installation and Operation of Outside Security Lighting**

---

### **Professional Standard**

Outside lighting is properly placed and monitored regularly to ensure the operability/adequacy of such lighting to ensure safety while activities are in progress in the evening hours. Outside lighting should provide sufficient illumination to allow for the safe passage of students and the public during after-hours activities. Lighting should also provide security personnel with sufficient illumination to observe any illegal activities on campus.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. District lighting is checked and serviced twice annually, when the buildings and grounds staff changes light timers for daylight savings. Buildings and grounds staff members replace all nonfunctional exterior light fixtures that are reported as work orders, although this process can be delayed when dependent on special-order light bulbs. According to the buildings and grounds staff, the school site staff has become accustomed to nonfunctioning lights, and problems with exterior lighting are not always regularly reported. The Director of Buildings and Grounds is working with the Director of Custodial Services to encourage custodians to replace light bulbs that are accessible by a six-to-eight foot ladder.
2. Modernization plans encompass lighting; however these plans do not always include the promotion of vandalism-resistant exterior lighting. The district should consider installing light fixtures that discourage vandalism. For example, mounted exterior lights that reflect light downward and are more difficult to shoot out as are fixtures with protective cages. This is most important for sites that experience regular problems with vandalism.
3. The school site staff and district project managers indicate that many schools lack adequate exterior lighting to ensure safety and security. In some cases, this is due to insufficient lighting. Currently, no resources are budgeted for more outside lighting. At several campuses, exterior lighting has been disabled by vandalism. The district should take action to prevent vandalism (see Standard 1.8). The district also should work with the Oakland Police Department to determine whether night patrols can be modified to increase police presence on campus. Currently, night patrols consist of patrol cars that merely drive by campuses, leaving areas that are not visible from the street largely unsupervised.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	0
September 2003 Rating:	2
March 2004 Self-Rating:	3
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **1.8 School Safety – Graffiti and Vandalism Abatement Plan**

---

### **Professional Standard**

The district has a graffiti and vandalism abatement plan. The district should have a written graffiti and abatement plan that is followed by all district employees. The district provides district employees with sufficient resources to meet the requirements of the abatement plan.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district has made little progress in this area during the past six months. Graffiti and vandalism continue to be significant and demoralizing problems. In February 2004, the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities Planning and Management sent a memorandum to the district's executive cabinet discussing the need to increase site monitoring, but no comprehensive Graffiti and Vandalism Abatement Plan has yet been developed. Attention must be given at the district's highest levels to developing and implementing proactive measures to prevent rampant incidents of graffiti and vandalism. Combating this challenge must become a districtwide responsibility, and will necessitate active participation from executive directors, principals, custodians, teachers, students, parents, and community members. The district staff must work together to develop a plan that outlines procedures, consequences, and specific responsibilities for all involved parties. It should then hold information or training sessions to ensure that all staff members with responsibilities to support the plan clearly understand their roles and responsibilities. For school sites that have consistent problems with graffiti and vandalism, this will include improving supervision in problem areas.
2. The Facilities Division staff is doing a reasonable job at keeping up with most of the district's maintenance needs, but the challenges of addressing graffiti and vandalism are such that staff can only respond in a reactive manner. Until a coordinated effort is made to implement proactive measures, the district will be limited in how much it can improve its facilities. It may also want to consider creating a vandalism fund to ensure that the Facilities Division has adequate resources to address site needs. Additionally, the district should take steps to structure collective bargaining agreements that allow the staff to be held accountable for meeting job and performance standards (see Standards 8.6a and 8.6b). Until such actions are taken, the district will continue to spend precious resources on preventable repair work.
3. The district has not yet implemented an incentive program to reward schools that are able to decrease incidents of graffiti and vandalism. It also should encourage campuswide beautification and pride-building activities. The district may consider implementing a pilot program at one or two schools to test various approaches and develop models for success.
4. Local law enforcement has not yet been consulted to develop a graffiti and vandalism abatement plan. The plan should ensure that after-hours monitoring of school sites includes yard areas that are not visible when police drive by campuses.

**Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	3
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	1

**Implementation Scale:**

## **1.12 School Safety – Inspection and Correction of Unsafe Buildings**

### **Professional Standard**

Building examinations are performed, and required actions are taken by the Governing Board upon report of unsafe conditions [EC 17367].

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. In conjunction with the Oakland Fire Department, the district annually inspects every school site to ensure compliance with fire safety requirements. These inspections are focused on safety and do not encompass all maintenance needs. A staff member from the buildings and grounds department typically accompanies the Fire Inspector and notes additional building maintenance needs. The Director of Custodial Services is also training custodial field supervisors to conduct more thorough building inspections, and is in the process of revising the custodial Site Inspection Form to align with district maintenance and custodial standards. The director expects custodians to inspect sites once or twice a month, and the central office will monitor results. In addition, the district has adopted an Injury Illness Prevention Plan (IIPP) that incorporates facility inspections to be completed by the site administration and custodial staff. Training of the site administration and custodians is required to support the IIPP's implementation. In addition to training, the district must ensure that all custodial, maintenance, and the site staff understand their responsibilities on building inspections. The district's decentralized approach to building inspections is not as thorough as a trained tradesperson's, but if successfully implemented, it will be a substantial improvement from the current practice. The district should evaluate its progress in implementing the IIPP and track what effect the inspection process may have on work-order request volume. If the IIPP does not result in substantial improvements, the district should consider designating an independent inspector to supplement or replace the school-based inspection process. This inspector should be skilled in all trade areas and be able to quickly assess each building to identify maintenance needs.
2. The Director of Buildings and Grounds has documented a prioritization policy for handling work orders and has prepared a handbook to be shared with principals so they understand how their requests are handled (see Standard 8.12). The district should consider acquiring a more sophisticated CMMS that will provide district staff and principals with the capability of checking the status on their work requests (see Standard 8.8).

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	2
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	4

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **1.14 School Safety – Sanitation is Maintained and Fire Hazards are Corrected**

---

### **Professional Standard**

Sanitary, neat, and clean conditions of the school premises exist and the premises are free from conditions that would create a fire hazard [CCR Title 5 Section 633].

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district is currently undergoing comprehensive inspections by the Oakland Fire Department to ensure that sites are free from fire hazards. It is also working to implement regular inspections by custodians and principals (see Standard 1.12). The review team observed that at several middle and high school sites, fire extinguishers and hoses had been removed and alarms had been disabled because of repeat incidents of vandalism. There is still a need to implement new procedures to reduce vandalism (see Standard 1.8). The Custodial Services Department is implementing new bathroom cleaning procedures (see Standard 8.9/8.10), but still needs to implement and enforce custodial cleaning standards (see Standard 8.6a).
2. Not all appropriate personnel have been trained in the topics outlined in the IIPP (see Standard 1.24).

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	4

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **1.16 School Safety – Fire Extinguishers and Inspection Information Available**

---

### **Professional Standard**

Appropriate fire extinguishers exist in each building and current inspection information is available [CCR Title 8 Section 1922(a)].

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district has a contract with a private firm to inspect and refill fire extinguishers annually. Current inspection information is available for all fire extinguishers. Despite these measures, the review team observed at some sites extinguishers that were expired or in need of refilling.
2. The Custodial Services Department plans to implement a system providing for custodial site supervisors to check fire extinguishers, alarm pulls and sensors monthly. These inspections will be recorded on a form and require the signature of the principal. Copies will be kept on site and in the custodial services office. This system has not yet been implemented.
3. Extinguishers are usually serviced or replaced annually and immediately after each use. However, at some sites, vandalism of extinguishers is pervasive. Extinguishers are regularly stolen or discharged, or are removed and hidden by the site staff to prevent these types of incidents. The review team visited several sites where the majority of hoses and extinguishers had been removed. This is a serious safety issue and is outside of the Facilities Division's control. Improving site supervision and preventing vandalism of fire safety equipment should be a high priority for site level and district staff (see Standard 1.8).

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	5
September 2003 Rating:	4
March 2004 Self-Rating:	6
March 2004 Rating:	4

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **1.24 School Safety – Conduct of Periodic Safety Training for Employees**

### **Professional Standard**

The district conducts periodic safety training for employees. District employees should receive periodic training on the safety procedures of the district.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district's Risk Management Department now oversees the Environmental Health and Safety Manager position. The person filling this position is still responsible for implementing a comprehensive safety program throughout the district.
2. The district has adopted an Injury Illness Prevention Plan (IIPP) that requires safety training for all the district staff. The district is still working to ensure that all staff members receive appropriate training. The Environmental Health and Safety Manager is trying to work with principals to ensure compliance, however it does not seem to be a priority at the site level. The district should instruct executive directors and principals to make this safety training and implementation of the IIPP a priority.
3. The Environmental Health and Safety Manager has conducted extensive safety training with buildings and grounds managers with the expectation that the managers will train their own staff. This seems to be occurring with some regularity. The Director of Custodial Services is still working with the Environmental Health and Safety Manager to schedule and implement a comprehensive training plan for custodial staff. The modules on which custodians will be trained have been developed, but training sessions have not yet been initiated. Custodial field supervisors will conduct and oversee most training sessions, and principals will be involved as well.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	2
September 2003 Rating:	3
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**

## 2.1 Facility Planning – Maintenance of a Long-Range Facilities Master Plan

---

### Professional Standard

The district should have a long-range school facilities master plan.

### Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan

1. The district's current Facilities Master Plan was last updated in 2001 and is in need of new revisions. The district has selected an outside consultant to update the plan, a process that will take approximately six to 12 months. As previously recommended, the updated Facilities Master Plan should include:
  - Priorities, time lines, costs, and suggested funding sources for all projects.
  - Guidelines or rules for how projects are to be prioritized and approved. This should include a ranking system that assigns scores to both individual projects and entire school sites.
  - An accounting for projects that may be completed in multiple steps over several years as additional funding becomes available. Facility improvement projects for each individual school should be sequenced and planned so that each project builds on the other toward a final goal. This will prevent one from requiring that another be demolished because of lack of foresight and staged planning.
  - A meaningful public involvement component. The current plan is to involve the Citizen's Oversight Committee that was originally assembled to oversee bond spending (see Standard 2.4).
2. The district is also working to develop general, prototypical educational specifications at all school levels. A model for educational specifications at the elementary school level has already been completed, and the district is working with an outside consultant to develop similar plans for middle and high schools.

### Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented

January 2000 Rating:	4
September 2003 Rating:	2
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	3

### Implementation Scale:

## **2.4 Facility Planning – Existence of a District Facility Planning Committee**

---

### **Professional Standard**

The district has created a Citizens Oversight Committee to ensure the appropriateness of expenditures related to the recent passage of the district's local school bond measure. In essence, this committee will function as an advisory/facility planning type of committee.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. A Citizens Oversight Committee once more has been formed and has met several times since the last review period. At this time the committee is primarily charged with overseeing projects related to bond expenditures, however, there are plans for its involvement in the master planning process. The district has not yet documented goals and objectives for the Citizens Oversight Committee, and should do so. It is important for the committee to be well informed of the scope of its responsibilities.
2. The Citizens Oversight Committee is currently made up of school board members and their appointed representatives. In the future, the district should solicit a broad representation of staff and community members to serve on this committee. It should include representatives from various regions within the district, as well as a cross-section of ethnic and economic backgrounds, including parents of students at different grade levels.
3. The Citizens Oversight Committee members are currently chosen by the school board. In the future, committee representatives should be recommended by the Assistant Superintendent of Facilities Management and Planning and/or the Director of Facilities and selected by the State Administrator/Superintendent.
4. The Assistant Superintendent of Facilities Management and Planning is currently coordinating committee activities. This responsibility could eventually be passed on to the Director of Facilities if the district decides this would be helpful.

### **Standard Implemented: Not Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	0
March 2004 Self-Rating:	3
March 2004 Rating:	4

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **2.6 Facility Planning – Implementation of an Annual Capital Planning Budget**

---

### **Professional Standard**

The district should develop and implement an annual capital planning budget.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The Facilities Department has established an annual capital budget to manage available cash on-hand and future revenues. This allows the department to track expenditures and ensure that they do not exceed available funds. The Facilities Management and Planning Division has not yet developed and documented a policy for prioritizing deferred maintenance and modernization needs on a districtwide basis. It is expected that this will be included in the updated Facilities Master Plan (see Standard 2.1).
2. The capital construction and renovation projects budget has not yet been coordinated with the deferred maintenance projects budget. While some deferred maintenance projects have been included in capital planning, the district has not yet developed a systematic approach to integrating the two planning and funding processes. Implementation of deferred maintenance projects should be consistent with the Facilities Master Plan (see Standard 2.1).

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	2
March 2004 Self-Rating:	6
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **2.17 Facility Planning – Priorities and Scheduling of Projects**

---

**This standard has been added since the 2000 report.**

### **Professional Standard**

The district has established and utilizes an organized methodology of prioritizing and scheduling projects.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district has not yet identified and documented a methodology for prioritizing and scheduling projects. It is expected that this will be included in the updated Facilities Master Plan. As recommended previously, this procedure should be written in a manner that limits special interests from influencing funding decisions and requires strict adherence by the school board (see Standard 2.1).
2. The district has continued to focus on projects that can provide state matching dollars and leverage bond funds. Following the existing Facilities Master Plan, last updated in 2001, the Facilities Department prepared a list of 18 modernization projects with the eligibility to generate \$17.4 million in state funding.
3. The Facilities Department prioritized and modified existing board-approved projects to a list of 15, which the State Administrator has approved for initiation. These include renovation and demolition projects. The district should continue to pay attention to buildings that need minor maintenance because they can become increasingly costly and problematic in the future.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	5
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **2.18 Facility Planning – Equity of Distribution of Facility Funding**

---

**This standard has been added since the 2000 report.**

### **Professional Standard**

The district should distribute facility funding in an equitable manner to all communities served and to all school levels.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district has not yet documented a procedure for prioritizing and distributing facility funding. It is still working from the 2001 version of the Facilities Master Plan and a list of board-approved projects. To ensure equity, the district still needs a documented policy on how funding distribution decisions will be made. It is expected that this will be included in the updated Facilities Master Plan (see Standard 2.1).
2. The district is working to develop general, prototypical educational specifications at all school levels. A model for educational specifications at the elementary school level has already been completed, and the district is working with an outside consultant to develop similar plans for middle and high schools. Prototypical educational specifications will ensure equity across school sites.
3. The district has continued to focus on projects that can provide state matching dollars and leverage bond funds. Following the existing Facilities Master Plan, last updated in 2001, the Facilities Department prepared a list of 18 modernization projects with the eligibility to generate \$17.4 million in state funding.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	5
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**

### **3.10 Facilities Improvement and Modernization – Plan for Maintenance and Modernization Exists**

---

#### **Professional Standard**

The district maintains a plan for the maintenance and modernization of its facilities [EC 17366].

#### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district has prepared a Deferred Maintenance Plan that is valid through fiscal year 2005-06. All current deferred maintenance projects are referenced in the existing Facilities Master Plan (2001). The district is currently in the process of updating the Facilities Master Plan. As recommended, the Facilities Master Plan should identify, prioritize, and coordinate all modernization projects, deferred maintenance projects, and all other projects (see Standard 2.1). The district also should ensure that deferred maintenance funds are used properly and not redirected to inappropriate applications.
2. The Facilities Department has developed districtwide design standards to guide construction projects. Representatives from the department of buildings and grounds were involved in modifying these standards to ensure that ongoing facility maintenance is a consideration in all construction and modernization plans.

#### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	3

#### **Implementation Scale:**

### **3.12 Facilities Improvement and Modernization – Deferred Maintenance Projects are Actively Managed**

---

#### **Professional Standard**

The district actively manages the deferred maintenance projects. The district should review the five-year Deferred Maintenance Plan annually to remove any completed projects and include any newly eligible projects. The district should also verify that the expenses performed during the year were included in the state-approved five-year Deferred Maintenance Plan.

#### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The Director of Facilities and the Director of Buildings and Grounds have discussed the status of current deferred maintenance planning, but the division has not yet established a clear system for managing and funding deferred maintenance projects. This system should include a procedure for clearly identifying major maintenance items and including them in the project prioritization process.
2. The current Deferred Maintenance Plan is valid through fiscal year 2005-06. The plan is reviewed annually. Currently, the Director of Buildings and Grounds is updating the plan for the current year and projecting through fiscal year 2007-08.
3. The Director of Buildings and Grounds is responsible for annually updating the Deferred Maintenance Plan.
4. The Director of Buildings and Grounds has not yet presented the updated report to the Facilities Committee for review and approval. This should be accomplished annually.

#### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	5
March 2004 Rating:	5

#### **Implementation Scale:**

## **6.3 Special Education Facilities – Adequacy for Instructional Program Needs**

---

### **Professional Standard**

The district provides facilities for its special education programs that provide appropriate learning environments in relation to educational program needs.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. A review of district plans and interviews with the staff including, the Director of Special Education and the Director of Facilities, indicate that in general, the district's facilities adequately meet the needs of its special education programs. This is especially true at newer and modernized facilities. At some older sites, special education classrooms are still removed from mainstream facilities. The district is working to update and improve these conditions.
2. The Director of Special Education has been actively involved in Site Utilization Committee meetings. The director and representatives from the department should also be included in the updating of the Facilities Master Plan to ensure that it addresses the needs of special education students.
3. The district is working to address the needs of special education students who have not traditionally been accommodated within district facilities. It is investigating the possibility of using as special education sites (including an autism center) the campuses of schools projected to close in fall 2004. It is also negotiating with the county office of education regarding a possible restructuring of some sites. These actions would decrease the district's costly dependence on outsourcing students with serious disabilities.
4. The district's educational specifications show that new construction and modernization projects integrate spaces for meeting the needs of special education students. The district should conduct a review of post-occupancy data to ensure that the number and size of those spaces is appropriate.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	2
September 2003 Rating:	3
March 2004 Self-Rating:	5
March 2004 Rating:	4

### **Implementation Scale:**

### **8.3 Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – Tracking Energy Consumption**

---

**This standard has been added since the 2000 report.**

#### **Professional Standard**

Create and maintain a system to track utility costs and consumption, and to report on the success of the district’s energy program.

#### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. At the time of the last review in August 2003, the district had no means of tracking utility usage or attributing usage and costs to specific sites. Since then, the district has made great strides towards implementing such a system. Actions taken as of February 2004 include:
  - Producing a report that summarized facility energy use and costs for 127 sites.
  - Researching and evaluating energy management software options that can help track and monitor utility usage. The district should select and implement software that can track usage at the site level and should ensure that adequate support is allocated for successful implementation, including appropriate staffing and funding levels.
  - Preparing to pilot an energy education curriculum at one elementary school site. The district should work towards districtwide implementation.
  - Preparing to conduct comprehensive energy audits at 10 school sites.
  - Utilizing grant and city/county funding options to initiate an energy program.
2. The district has identified an energy management software package that seems to meet its needs, but there are several concerns that need to be addressed before a final decision is made, including how utility information will be uploaded/entered into the software. The Director of Buildings and Grounds is researching several options for effective implementation.
3. The district would benefit from developing procedures to regularly review usage trends, as well as policies for follow-up actions. These could include incentives for sites that show effective or improving practices, and enhanced education for sites that show need for improvement.

#### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

September 2003 Rating:	0
March 2004 Self-Rating:	3
March 2004 Rating:	2

#### **Implementation Scale:**

## **8.5 Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – Adequate Maintenance Records and Inventories**

---

### **Professional Standard**

Adequate maintenance records and reports are kept, including a complete inventory of supplies, materials, tools, and equipment. All employees required to perform maintenance on school sites should be provided with adequate supplies, equipment, and training to perform maintenance tasks in a timely and professional manner. Included in the training is how to inventory supplies and equipment and when to order or replenish them.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. Safety training is overseen by the Risk Management Department, now located within the Business Division. It appears that many maintenance staff members have been trained in common safety practices. The Custodial Services Department is still working to implement a training curriculum, and school site custodians report that they have not received recent training (see Standard 1.24).
2. The Buildings and Grounds Department has moved to a drop-shipment purchasing system, where supplies are purchased when needed and charged to each project. As a result, few supplies are stored in the district warehouse, and no comprehensive inventory is necessary. Similarly, no central inventory of custodial supplies exists, as these supplies are now purchased at the site level.
3. The State Administrator recently approved a \$200,000 expenditure to purchase new maintenance equipment for the district. The Buildings and Grounds Department has completed maintenance for: district vehicles (including life expectancy), district elevators, department equipment, and employee tools. An inventory of district equipment by site is in progress. The Director of Buildings and Grounds should ensure that these inventories are updated annually.
4. The State Administrator recently approved a \$300,000 expenditure to purchase new custodial equipment for the district. The Custodial Services Department does not currently have an accurate inventory of what equipment the district has or where it is located. The department is preparing to implement a check-off form for all supervising custodians accepting promotions or taking transfers. This would create an inventory of all supplies and equipment in the custodial closet when a supervising custodian enters a school site, to be compared with what exists when that custodian prepares to leave. This check-off form should be implemented immediately at all school sites, even if there is no planned promotion or transfer. This would give the district a baseline inventory of its custodial equipment.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating: 2  
September 2003 Rating: 1

March 2004 Self-Rating: 3  
March 2004 Rating: 3

**Implementation Scale:**

## **8.6a Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – Procedures for Evaluation of Custodial Staff**

---

### **Professional Standard**

Procedures are in place for evaluating the work quality of custodial staff. The quality of the work performed by the custodial staff should be evaluated regularly using a board-adopted procedure that delineates the areas of evaluation and the types of work to be evaluated.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The Custodial Services Department has been occupied with layoffs and reassignments for most of the fall semester, so no significant progress has been made on this standard. The existing evaluation process is antiquated, is not tied to performance standards, and is not performed regularly. The district should implement an evaluation system that includes clear standards and rubrics for assessing the performance of custodial staff. Evaluation forms should be revised so that they relate to the district's custodial cleaning standards, and should be reviewed with the staff before the evaluation period so that expectations are understood. To support results-based decision-making, principals should be trained in custodial evaluation criteria. Evaluations should be conducted annually, reviewed by the Field Supervisor and principal, and kept on file either within the Custodial Services Department or in the personnel office.
2. Custodial cleaning standards and custodial policies and procedures handbooks have been distributed, but are not being utilized. Until they are tied to evaluations, it is likely that this will continue to be the case. Field supervisors' observation rounds should include a check to ensure that appropriate standards and procedures are being followed. When they are not, disciplinary action should be taken.
3. Promotions are still based on seniority. The district should work with AFSCME, the custodial collective bargaining group, to negotiate promotion criteria that include a merit-based component. This will also involve consideration of changes resulting from the soon-to-be-implemented decision-making process, which is site based. Attendance and performance should be factors in promotion decisions.
4. The Custodial Services Department has not had the opportunity or resources to implement a comprehensive training program, but plans are underway to do accomplish this. As recommended previously, custodial training sessions should provide supervisory personnel with the appropriate knowledge, skills, and abilities to evaluate employees. Custodial field supervisors should mentor, advise, and monitor the evaluation process at each site (see Standard 1.24).
5. The district has not yet formed a custodial advisory committee, but it should still consider forming such a group. The committee would be composed of principals, field supervisors, head custodians, and union representatives to provide advice on matters related to the provision of custodial services. The Custodial Advisory

Committee would make recommendations on an effective evaluation system that is based on firsthand knowledge of the work being performed.

**Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	3
March 2004 Rating:	1

**Implementation Scale:**

## **8.6b Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – Procedures for Evaluation of Maintenance Staff**

---

### **Professional Standard**

Procedures are in place for evaluating the work quality of maintenance staff. The quality of the work performed by the maintenance staff should be evaluated regularly using a board-adopted procedure that delineates the areas of evaluation and the types of work to be evaluated.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The Director of Buildings and Grounds and his managers are working to develop maintenance standards. In the future, these standards will correspond to a rubric and link to a revised evaluation form. Currently, the department staff is evaluated using the existing district form. The department should continue to develop and implement performance standards, and ensure that they are well communicated to the maintenance staff throughout the district. As recommended previously, these standards should be used to create evaluation forms that are appropriate for the trades and professions within the Buildings and Grounds Department. Evaluation forms should be reviewed with the staff before the evaluation period so that expectations are understood. The standards-based evaluation forms should, at a minimum, include the following elements;
  - Evaluation of general work habits
  - Evaluation of specific trade skills
  - Recommendations for specific needed improvements
  - A proposed improvement plan agreed to by the evaluator and the staff member
  - Staff comments
2. In November 2003, buildings and grounds managers were trained to evaluate the employees they supervise. The department director also sent the managers a memorandum outlining criteria to consider when evaluating, including attendance, interpersonal skills, work ethic, and disciplinary records.
3. The Buildings and Grounds Department is working to comply with the evaluation schedule established by the Human Resources Division. Evaluations are conducted annually, reviewed by the appropriate supervisor, and kept on file either within the department or in the personnel office.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	2
September 2003 Rating:	0
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **8.8 Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – Implementation of a Preventative Maintenance Plan**

---

### **Professional Standard**

The district has an effective preventive maintenance program. The district should have a written preventive maintenance program that is scheduled and followed by the maintenance staff. This program should include verification of the completion of work by the supervisor of the maintenance staff.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. This district has not yet developed or documented a written preventative maintenance plan that includes the number and types of equipment. As recommended previously, the comprehensive plan should include the tasks to be completed, the responsible staff position, and the schedule for completion. The plan also should include procedures for tracking repairs to specific pieces of equipment.
2. The district maintains a CMMS (Computerized Maintenance Management System) with relatively minimal capabilities. As recommended previously, the district should consider allocating the funding to acquire a more sophisticated system, with the capacity to track work orders that tie into inventory and payroll. This will help identify areas in need of preventative maintenance, as well as areas of priorities. The CMMS should automatically generate preventative maintenance work orders based on a preventative maintenance schedule. These should become priority work orders if the district is to move toward a more proactive maintenance system. A more developed system also would allow principals to track the status, time estimates, parts and materials linked to a particular work order. This is an increasingly important need as the district moves to results-based site budgeting and oversight. Without such a system, the district will be unable to accurately determine the cost of jobs, eliminating the possibility of charging sites directly for the labor and materials they receive.
3. The Director of Buildings and Grounds has not yet had the opportunity to prepare an annual report that projects anticipated equipment repairs and replacements five to 10 years into the future. The report should identify projected costs and other necessary resources with a clear plan for making the identified improvements.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	3
March 2004 Rating:	1

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **8.9/8.10 Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – All Buildings, Grounds and Bathrooms are Maintained**

---

**This standard has been reworded/combined since 2000.**

### **Professional Standard**

Toilet facilities are adequate and maintained. All buildings and grounds are maintained [CCR Title 5 Section 631].

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The department of buildings and grounds is working to develop maintenance standards. Once established, it should ensure that they are well communicated to and implemented by maintenance staff throughout the district (see Standard 8.6b).
2. The Custodial Services Department recently has implemented a policy of conducting bathroom inspections three times each day. Site custodians are expected to complete an inspection check-off form for each student restroom, obtain the principal's signature, and fax the form to the department at the end of each week. The Director of Custodial Services then reviews the forms and files disciplinary letters for site supervisors who do not submit them as required. The department hopes that over time, this process will become systematic and require less oversight. This policy demands a significant amount of time from the director and custodians. However, feedback from custodians and on-site observations indicate that this system is merely a bureaucratic exercise that does not affect restroom cleanliness. The review team observed unclean and unsanitary restroom conditions at several campuses, and custodians reported that the check-off forms have not caused them to appreciably change their routines. The district should reconsider this procedure and evaluate whether it is having enough of a measurable affect on restroom facilities to justify its continuation.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	2

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **8.11 Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – Implementation of a Planned Program Maintenance System**

---

### **Professional Standard**

The district has implemented a Planned Program Maintenance System. The district should have a written Planned Program Maintenance System that includes an inventory of all facilities and equipment that will require maintenance and replacement. This program should include purchase prices, anticipated life expectancies, anticipated replacement time lines, and budgetary resources necessary to maintain the facilities.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The buildings and grounds staff is currently in the process of identifying and tagging all items of value within the district. The identification includes the serial number and type of equipment, but does not demarcate age and repair history. That research and documentation will need to take place once the initial identification is complete.
2. This list is being entered into a separate database because the current CMMS does not have the capacity to maintain this type of information. The district also should account for the projected life expectancy and replacement costs of the equipment. The district should consider allocating the funding to acquire a more sophisticated CMMS system that can integrate inventory with life expectancies, costs and replacement schedules (see Standard 8.8).
3. The Director of Buildings and Grounds does not yet prepare an annual report that projects needed equipment repairs and replacements for 10 years. This report should identify projected costs and necessary budget resources.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	3
March 2004 Rating:	1

### **Implementation Scale**

## **8.12 Facilities Maintenance and Custodial – Assignment of Work Orders**

---

**This standard has been added since the 2000 report.**

### **Professional Standard**

The district has a documented process for assigning routine work orders on a priority basis.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The Director of Buildings and Grounds has documented a prioritization policy for handling work orders. Requests that relate to the health and safety of a site are given highest priority. The Director of Buildings and Grounds has prepared an updated handbook that will soon be shared with school sites so they understand how their requests are handled.
2. The company that was contracted to provide the computerized work-request system conducted districtwide training on the system several years ago when it was first introduced to schools. The district's work control department now conducts individual training sessions for new staff as needed.
3. The district should consider allocating the funding to acquire a more sophisticated CMMS that will provide district staff and principals the capability to check the status on their work requests (see Standard 8.8).
4. The district should enhance the current documented work order policy to provide the staff with detailed examples of the type of orders that fall into each level of priority. This will standardize the procedures and facilitate the training of new work control specialists.
5. The district should ensure that the updated Handbook for the Buildings and Grounds Department is distributed to principals and administrative assistants. The director and/or coordinator of buildings and grounds should call and/or visit school sites to answer any questions principals and administrative staff may have about the process.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

September 2003 Rating:	1
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	4

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **9.6 Instructional Program Issues – Plan to Maintain Equality/Equity of District Facilities**

---

### **Professional Standard**

The district has developed and maintains a plan to ensure equality and equity of its facilities throughout the district [EC 35293].

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The district is in the process of contracting with an outside firm to update the Facilities Master Plan (see Standard 2.1). This will include a districtwide assessment of modernization needs. In the meantime, the district is utilizing the 2001 version of the master plan and the list of board-approved projects. The district should be commended for its recent efforts to focus on modernization projects that maximize the potential for state matching funds (see Standard 2.17).
2. As noted elsewhere in this report, the district does not currently have a documented policy to guide decisions regarding prioritization of facilities projects. This will be a vital part of the updated Facilities Master Plan. Until a system is developed, documented and implemented, there will be no way to ensure that facilities decisions are made equitably. The Facilities Master Plan should include a ranking system that prioritizes projects, and decisions on project funding should be based on need, not location or political interests.
3. In the past, the school board used inconsistent criteria for prioritizing and approving projects, which led to inequitable distribution of resources. To ensure equity and unbiased decision-making, the district should consider revising board policy to stipulate how facilities projects should be prioritized. The decision-making process should be based on need, and guided by the ranking system to be outlined in the Facilities Master Plan.
4. Facilities funding will become an issue for the district as the needs exceed available bond and modernization funds. The district should research all potential funding sources, including the possibility of an additional bond in the future.
5. The Citizens Oversight Committee has been re-established, and it will be charged with reviewing the Facilities Master Plan and assisting with prioritizing future projects to ensure equity and equality throughout the district. This committee currently consists of school board members and their representatives. Eventually the Assistant Superintendent and/or Director of Facilities should select community members to serve (see Standard 2.4).

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	1
September 2003 Rating:	2
March 2004 Self-Rating:	5

March 2004 Rating: 3

**Implementation Scale:**

## **10.2 Community Use of Facilities – Compliance with Civic Center Act for Community Use**

---

### **Professional Standard**

Education Code Section 38130 establishes terms and conditions of school facility use by community organizations, in the process requiring establishment of both “direct cost” and “fair market” rental rates, specifying what groups have which priorities and fee schedules.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. The Director of Custodial Services is now charged with overseeing civic center, or community use, of district facilities. Rental rates have not been adjusted for many years, and the district is just beginning to review the fee schedule. As recommended in 2000, the district should ensure that a survey is conducted of similar facilities available for rent in the Oakland area in order to establish current fair-market rental rates. The district also should research the current direct costs to the district that are associated with the use of facilities. If deemed appropriate, revised and approved charges should be published.
2. The district has several joint facilities use agreements pertaining to several individual properties and partners. The policies established in these agreements are often not enforced and are in need of updating. The district should examine these policies, modify them as necessary, and implement procedures to ensure that they are enforced. The district may want to consider forming a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) with the city of Oakland and other partners to oversee joint use projects.
3. As recommended in 2000, the district should establish a biannual schedule for review of civic center policies, procedures and forms, including fees and charges. The district should consider assigning this task to an individual other than the Director of Custodial Services, given his many other responsibilities.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	5
September 2003 Rating:	3
March 2004 Self-Rating:	6
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**

## **11.3 Communication – Communication of District Standards and Plans**

### **Professional Standard**

The district should provide clear and comprehensive communication to the staff of its standards and plans.

### **Progress on Implementing the Recommendations of the Recovery Plan**

1. Custodial cleaning standards have not yet been linked to annual evaluations. Maintenance standards are still in the development stage, although a handbook outlining buildings and grounds procedures has been updated. As recommended previously, the district should finalize and implement standards for the custodial and maintenance staff and provide feedback on job performance through annual evaluations. Evaluation forms should be reviewed with the staff before the evaluation period so that expectations are understood (see Standards 8.6a and 8.6b).
2. The custodial and maintenance staff has not yet been adequately trained to implement standards. Supervisors should conduct regular check-in sessions with staff members to ensure they understand what is expected of them and are implementing standards as required.
3. The State Administrator has initiated a monthly districtwide staff newsletter entitled *Staff Connections* that includes some facilities-related issues. The Facilities Division also has a quarterly internal newsletter. The division and/or individual departments should consider distributing more frequent correspondence to alert staff as to plans and developments. This could also provide an opportunity to build morale by highlighting division staff and departments for noteworthy accomplishments.

### **Standard Implemented: Partially Implemented**

January 2000 Rating:	0
September 2003 Rating:	2
March 2004 Self-Rating:	4
March 2004 Rating:	3

### **Implementation Scale:**