GENERAL INFORMATION

The Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) has been developed by the Office of Public School Construction to determine if a school facility is in “good repair” as defined by Education Code (EC) Section 17002(d)(1) and to rate the facility pursuant to EC Section 17002(d)(2). The tool is designed to identify areas of a school site that are in need of repair based upon a visual inspection of the site. In addition, the EC specifies the tool should not be used to require capital enhancements beyond the standards to which the facility was designed and constructed.

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

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

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

USER INSTRUCTIONS

The FIT is comprised of three parts as follows:

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

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

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

OK	**No Deficiency - Good Repair:** Mark "OK" if all statements in the Good Repair Standard are true, and there is no indication of a deficiency in the specific category.
D	**Deficiency:** Mark “D” if one or more statement(s) in the Good Repair Standard for the specific category is not true, or if there is other clear evidence of the need for repair.
X	**Extreme Deficiency**: Indicate “X” if the area has a deficiency that is considered an “Extreme Deficiency” in the Good Repair Standard or there is a condition that qualifies as an extreme deficiency but is not noted in the Good Repair Standard.
NA	**Not Applicable:** If the Good Repair Standard category (building system or

NA	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.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) has been developed by the Office of Public School Construction to determine if a school facility is in “good repair” as defined by Education Code (EC) Section 17002(d)(1) and to rate the facility pursuant to EC Section 17002(d)(2). The tool is designed to identify areas of a school site that are in need of repair based upon a visual inspection of the site. In addition, the EC specifies the tool should not be used to require capital enhancements beyond the standards to which the facility was designed and constructed.

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

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

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

USER INSTRUCTIONS

The FIT is comprised of three parts as follows:

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

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

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

OK	**No Deficiency - Good Repair:** Mark "OK" if all statements in the Good Repair Standard are true, and there is no indication of a deficiency in the specific category.
D	**Deficiency:** Mark “D” if one or more statement(s) in the Good Repair Standard for the specific category is not true, or if there is other clear evidence of the need for repair.
X	**Extreme Deficiency**: Indicate “X” if the area has a deficiency that is considered an “Extreme Deficiency” in the Good Repair Standard or there is a condition that qualifies as an extreme deficiency but is not noted in the Good Repair Standard.
NA	**Not Applicable:** If the Good Repair Standard category (building system or

NA	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. HVAC Was Checked, New thermostats, New filters installed,
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

Restrooms

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

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

Sinks/Fountains (Inside and Outside)

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

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

Fire Safety

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

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

Hazardous Materials (Interior and Exterior)

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

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

Structural Damage

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

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

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

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

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

Playground/School Grounds

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

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

Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences (Interior and exterior)

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

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

PART II: EVALUATION DETAIL Date of Inspection: 12/24/24 School Name: Dunham School District

CATEGORY / AREA	1 GAS LEAKS	2 MECH/HVAC	3 SEWER	4 INTERIOR SURFACES	5 OVERALL CLEANLINESS	6 PEST/VERMIN INFESTATION	7 ELECTRICAL	8 RESTROOM	9 SINKS/ FOUNTAINS	10 FIRE SAFETY	11 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	12 STRUCTURAL DAMAGE	13 ROOFS	14 PLAYGROUND/ SCHOOL GROUNDS	15 WINDOWS/ DOORS/ GATES/ FENCES
Learning Center	OK	D	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Learning Center was checked out By IES for HVAC. Air test performed and air quality was good. Cabinets are being repaired. Pest management has been brought in and all is good. Fire alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
Library	OK	D	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Library was checked out By IES for HVAC. Air test performed and air quality was good. Pest management has been brought in and all is good. Fire alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
Tk/k	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	D
	COMMENTS:	Playground was repaired new irrigation and drainage was put in. All bathrooms are in order. Kindergarten Window was leaking and will be repaired. Fire alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024. Gutter repaired above Kindergarten summer 2024.													
Bathrooms	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Bathrooms are all working. Septic was cleaned out in December.													
1st	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Fire alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
2nd	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Fire,alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
3rd	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Fire, alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
4th	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Fire, alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
5th/6th	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Fire, alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
Office	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Fire, alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													
Community Room	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	NA	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK
	COMMENTS:	Fire, alarms/ Locks were fixed over summer 2024													

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	
Dunham School District		Sonoma	
SCHOOL SITE		**SCHOOL TYPE (GRADE LEVELS)**	**NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS ON SITE**
Dunham Elementary		Tk - 6	11
INSPECTOR'S NAME	**INSPECTOR'S TITLE**	**NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ACCOMPANYING THE INSPECTOR(S) (IF APPLICABLE)**	
Ani Larson	Superintendent/Principal	Maggie Vasquez	
TIME OF INSPECTION	**WEATHER CONDITION AT TIME OF INSPECTION**		
Morning	Sunny, Winter		

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:	11	9	11	11	11	10	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Number of "D"s:	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Number of "X"s:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Number of N/As:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of System in Good Repair Number of "OK"s divided by (Total Areas - "NA"s)*		100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	99.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	Good 100%	Good 100%	Good 100%	Good 100%
Total Percent per Category (average of above)*		98.00%			100.00%	99.00%		100.00%	100.00%		100.00%		Good 100%		Good 100%	
Rank (Circle one) GOOD = 90%-100% FAIR = 75%-89.99% POOR = 0%-74.99%		Good 100%			Good 100%	Good 99%		Good 100%	Good 100%		Good 100%		Good 100%		Good 100%	

*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** →	95.00%	**SCHOOL RATING**** →	Exemplary

**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:

Dunham Elementary is in **good repair**, with consistent maintenance efforts over the last school year ensuring a safe and functional environment for students and staff. Recent Repairs and Updates **Gutters:** Repaired in 2024 **Parking Lot:** Received a slurry coat