

Fairfax County School Board
Operational Expectation and Goal Monitoring Report
 A = acceptable condition U = unacceptable condition

FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES
 Period Covered: 2006 – 2007

A. **Facilities:** The Superintendent will provide the necessary infrastructure to support instruction and operations and maintain safe, healthful, and up-to-date classrooms and work environments that support the instructional program. The Superintendent will:

1. Ensure that facilities are clean, sanitary, and safe.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

Instruction cannot occur successfully unless school buildings are clean and free of hazards that can cause illness or injury to students, staff, or visitors. Custodians play a critical role to ensure that buildings are safe and clean.

Indicator 1.a.

All custodians will be trained to ensure they possess the knowledge necessary to conduct cleaning operations consistent with FCPS procedures and requirements.

Custodial Training Summary Statistics (Basic Custodial Skills)					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
# Eligible Custodians	1241				
# Custodians Trained	1203				
% Custodians Trained	96.9%				
# Eligible Supervisory Staff	266				
# Supervisory Staff Trained	266				
% Supervisory Staff Trained	100%				

**The goal is that all new custodians will receive the Basic Custodial Skills training within 120 days of hiring.*

Commentary: The Basic Custodial Skills training course instructs all new FCPS custodians on basic custodial cleaning procedures, the proper application of cleaning chemicals, operation of basic equipment (vacuums, buffers, mopping systems, etc.), and employee safety.

Analysis: At the time of the monitoring report 41 custodians needed formal Basic Skills training. Those custodians that have not been trained are new employees. Facilities Management is working with school-based custodial supervisors to schedule training for those new employees.

Certified Custodian Course (English or ESOL) - Breakdown					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
# Eligible Supervisory Staff	266				
# Supervisory Staff Trained	237				
% Supervisory Staff Trained	89.1%				

**The goal is to instruct 100% of the supervisory custodial staff in advanced techniques and supervisory skills.*

Commentary: Certified Custodian courses are required for all custodial supervisors and are open to custodians seeking career development/promotional opportunities. The course instructs employees on advanced cleaning procedures, individual time management skills, creating employee work schedules, and how to deal with a variety of personnel issues. Upon completion of the course students are required to demonstrate expertise in three cleaning areas.

Analysis: At the time of the monitoring report 29 supervisors required Certified Custodian training. Facilities Management is identifying specific individuals that require training and are working with principals to schedule training sessions.

Indicator 1.b.

Plant Operations staff will evaluate annually school cleanliness and provide findings to each principal and the cluster assistant superintendent.

Annual School Cleanliness Evaluation Summary Report					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Total # of Facilities		184			
# Facilities Inspected		82			
# Facilities Not Inspected		102			
Completion Percentage		44.5%			

**44.5% represents the Year To Date completion percentage.*

Grades:	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
90 – 100 (Excellent)		0			
75 – 89 (Very Good)		43			
60 – 74 (Satisfactory)		36			
45 – 59 (Needs Improvement)		3			
0 – 44 (Poor)		0			

**The goal is that no schools receive a score lower than 60.*

Commentary: Previous (form-based) custodial inspection criteria has been updated and incorporated into an electronic format. This is the first fiscal year numerical grades will be assigned to specific activities/conditions. Inspection criteria and grade weights are updated once a year (next year's inspection criteria will include a new recycling component). Yearly inspections begin after the start of school.

Analysis: Facilities Management staff is pleased with the general condition of facilities and custodial support. The new inspection process has “raised the bar” resulting in lower initial scores at some sites. Classroom and public areas generally receive higher than average scores; while “back of the house” (e.g. custodial storage areas) have been graded lower, thus lowering a school’s overall grade. Inspection activities are on schedule and will be completed by the end of this fiscal year. Of 184 sites under the inspection program, 82 have been inspected as of 12/21/07. An interim report of those sites inspected to date is provided in the summary report above.

Indicator 1.c.

Annually analyze trends on worker’s compensation claims and student injuries.

Annual Worker’s Compensation and Student Injuries Summary Report					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
# Worker’s Compensation Claims	1397				
# Student Injuries	1365				

**The goal is to ensure that no facility-related injuries/claims are a result of facilities problems.*

Employee Accidents (by cause of injury)		
Cause of Injury	FY 07	
	# Accidents	%
Assault	242	17.32%
Fall	573	41.02%
Lifting	160	11.45%
Machinery	23	1.65%
Medical	85	6.08%
Miscellaneous	29	2.08%
Sports	7	0.50%
Struck	241	17.25%
Vehicle	37	2.65%
Total Accidents	1397	100.00%

Student Accidents (by cause of injury)		
Cause of Injury	FY 07	
	# Accidents	%
Horseplay	32	2.34%
Miscellaneous	233	17.07%
Struck by or against/Caught in, under or between	423	30.99%
Slip or Fall	616	45.13%
Over-Exertion or Strain	20	1.47%
Irritation or Soreness/ Exposure /Contact with hot, cold, chemical, electrical	23	1.68%
Assault/Attack/Fighting	18	1.32%
Total Accidents	1365	100.00 %

Commentary: Worker's Compensation injury reports are provided by the Department of Human Resources. Student injury reports are provided by the Department of Financial Services. Injury data is summarized in major categories and analyzed by Facilities Management staff to determine if corrective measures can be taken to prevent further injuries. Facilities Management staff will investigate whether data relevant to preventable accidents can be determined.

Analysis: The FY 2007 results have not revealed any significant facility-related causes for injuries where preventive measures can be taken. The FY 2008 data will be compared with previous data to identify trends and opportunities for improvement. Employee and student accident injury information is summarized in the charts below.

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments:

2. Use a preventive maintenance program to enable facilities to reach their intended life cycles.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

The department will implement a preventive maintenance program that provides manufacturer recommended procedures are accomplished at specified time/use intervals. Such a program will extend the useful life of building systems and reduce equipment downtime that can negatively impact instructional and athletic programs.

Indicator 2.a.

Facilities Management will create and maintain a staffing/resource master plan to identify needs required to implement an effective preventive maintenance program.

Facilities Management Staffing Summary Statistics					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Required Positions	647	655			
Current Position Count	404	403			
Position Shortage	243	252			
Current Staffing Level %	62.4%	61.5%			

** Staffing calculations are for building support operations and do not include custodial or grounds staffing needs.*

Commentary: As shown in indicator 2.b, below, facilities management is not currently performing proper levels of preventive maintenance on building assets. (See indicator 2.c. for a listing of building assets.) Staffing limitations require that facilities management focus its resources on reactive maintenance activities so that instructional programs are not negatively impacted. Long term, the failure to perform preventive maintenance has serious consequences both operational and fiscal. Premature equipment failure will require greater and greater investments in replacement expenditures. To implement an effective preventive maintenance program, additional staffing is required as presented to the School Board in 2006. It is difficult to calculate the exact requirements but two standards were considered. The first is a recommended staffing formula prepared by the State of Florida. The other is the standard used by Fairfax County for its governmental buildings that is based largely on Federal GSA standards. These two standards are the only known standards that were found to be useful. In both cases, the standards determined that FCPS facilities management is understaffed by the numbers indicated above.

Analysis: Current building trades and support positions are insufficient to provide full maintenance and administrative/engineering support for school facilities. Trade position shortages, in particular, dramatically affect the school system’s ability to protect facility assets through effective preventive maintenance activities. The cost to fund the positions indicated in indicator 2.a., is approximately \$22 million per year. While this investment cannot be shown to have immediate or short term returns on investment, it will ensure the protection of the approximately \$6 billion in facility assets owned by the School Board and will reduce greatly the occurrences of facility related negative impacts on instructional programs from such incidents as air-conditioning/heating system failures and roof leaks.

Indicator 2.b.

Data will be reported annually on the number of required preventive maintenance work orders and the number of completed preventive maintenance work orders.

<i>Preventive Maintenance Work Order Summary Report</i>					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Required PM Work Orders	13,110				
Completed PM Work Orders	5,512				
Percent of Completed PM Work Orders	42%				

Commentary: Facilities Management has a formal preventive maintenance process in place. Preventive maintenance work orders are created so available staff can perform proactive maintenance activities to assure assets reach the end of their expected life-cycle.

Analysis: Work order statistics reveal a significant backlog of 2.4 years in preventive maintenance activities. Work order histories and equipment replacement activities confirm that there are a growing number of facility assets that are failing before the expected end of their life-cycle.

Indicator 2.c.

An infrastructure asset management system will be implemented to manage the replacement of assets based on age, life-expectancy and condition assessments. An asset management system is being developed and will be phased in over several years. The following chart indicates the completion dates for inventory and condition assessments.

Asset Management Progress Summary Report					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Air Compressors		3/1/08			
Bleacher System, Exterior		6/1/08			
Bleacher Systems, Interior		6/1/08			
Bleacher System, Portable		6/1/08			
Boiler		Complete			
Burner		Complete			
Chiller	Complete				
Cooling Tower	Complete				
Elevators		6/1/08			
Energy Management System			10/1/08		
Flooring, Systems			7/1/08		
Generators, Emergency		1/1/08			
Hardscape					1/1/11
HVAC (AHUs and UVs)				1/1/10	
Handicapped Equipment		1/1/08			
Kitchen Equipment					9/1/10
Lockers				9/1/09	
Lighting, Gymnasiums		Complete			
Playground Equipment				9/1/09	
Pumps				1/1/10	
Irrigation Systems				7/1/09	
Painting (Exterior)			11/1/08		
Painting (Whole Facility)			11/1/08		
Roof Sections					7/1/10
Rooftop HVAC Units				10/1/09	
Switchgear, Electrical			3/1/09		
Storm Water Management Systems			7/1/08		
Tennis Courts			7/1/08		
Tank Monitoring Systems		1/30/08			
Transformers, Power		4/1/08			
Tracks			7/1/08		
Underground Storage Tanks		Complete			

** Target completion dates are shown for each category as we are completing these condition assessments.*

Commentary: As limited staff time permits, major facility assets are inventoried and integrated into the department's maintenance management software application. Preventive maintenance work orders and work order histories are tied to specific assets so they can be better managed on a site-by-site and system-wide basis.

Analysis: Facilities Management efforts to catalog, inventory and manage, major assets is on-schedule. Current data confirms that 1) some assets are failing prematurely due to insufficient preventive maintenance activities/trades staffing, and, 2) there is a need to increase infrastructure (bond and major-maintenance) funds to replace assets as they reach the end of their expected life-cycle.

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments: The performance of the Superintendent is unacceptable due to a lack of resources to complete the task.

3. Provide for public use of facilities as long as student safety, student functions, and the instructional program are not compromised and use guidelines are administered consistently.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

FCPS staff work with county parks and recreation to create the framework of community use that will maximize the opportunities for the community to use our buildings and fields without impacting negatively school system programs. Technology will be implemented to reduce community use management workload on schools and to improve services to community members by allowing online reservations.

Indicator 3.a.

Data will be reported annually on community use by school and by school level (elementary, middle, and high).

County Parks and Recreation and FCPS Community Use Events					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
# of Applications	4,000				
County Recreation (athletic field / gymnasiums)	250,000 Users				
County Parks (classes, RecPac)	31,000 Users				
Religious/Cultural Organizations on Annual Contract	4,940				
Community Use Elementary Schools	84,588				
Community Use Middle Schools	26,924				
Community Use High Schools	17,948				
Total Events	129,460				

Commentary: These data would suggest that our buildings are heavily utilized by members of the community. We don't know, however, whether this is an appropriate indicator to show that we are meeting the needs of the community.

Indicator 3.b.

The number and percent of events scheduled through the on-line scheduling system.

On-Line Scheduling Statistics					
	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
Number of Events	66,019				
% of Events Scheduled	51%				

Commentary: The FY07 numbers reflect that all high and middle schools, as well as 32 elementary schools, are currently using the on-line scheduling system (FS Direct). The final 105 elementary schools have come online this fiscal year, therefore, the number and percentage of events will increase. The goal is to have 100% of scheduling done online to reduce scheduling conflicts and improve the ease of scheduling.

Indicator 3.c.

The approximate cost to FCPS (including wear and tear on facilities) of community use.

Cost of Community Use					
	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011
Utilities and Building Maintenance	\$4,475,683				
Custodian Allocation	\$3,896,702				
Community Use Office Staff (5.50 positions)	\$451,660				
Total Cost	\$8,824,045				
Revenue	\$4,459,271				
Net Cost of Community Use	\$4,364,774				

Commentary: There are over 3,000 available community use hours per facility per year; actual usage varies by school and by school level. Every effort is being made to make our buildings available for use by community members.

Analysis: While this is a great program, there is a net cost to the school system as indicated above. Staff is examining fee structures to determine if additional revenues could be generated to offset the impact of the net cost.

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments:

4. Identify grade configurations and school attendance boundaries that assure reasonable balance of student enrollment, wise use of resources, and sound instructional practices.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

With the current student enrollment trends, we will have existing school capacity necessary to meet most of our needs but that this might require that we change current attendance boundaries to align capacity with enrollment. We also need to consider carefully the placement of programs such as gifted and talented, special needs, etc., to ensure that such placement take into consideration current and projected school capacities.

Indicator 4.a.

Monitor schools annually for short and long term capacity levels (below, at, or above) and include recommended solutions in the CIP. (Refer to the FY 2009-2013 CIP)

Commentary: Generally, the 2009-13 CIP noted the growing capacity deficit at the elementary school level throughout the County. To address this issue, the CIP cash flow was adjusted to advance the renovation for many elementary schools which will provide for some additional capacity. It was further noted that recommendations and best practices outlined in the recently completed consultant study on FCPS school capacity be considered, including the provision of additional flex space classrooms to better accommodate changing programs and memberships within schools.

Indicator 4.b.

Monitor and report accuracy of one year projections by school and five-year county-wide total projections.

Accuracy of Projections					
Total Membership					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
Actual Enrollment	163,593	165,439			
One-Year Projection	164,725	164,490			
# Difference	-1,132	949			
% Difference	-0.69%	0.57%			

Actual Enrollment	163,593	165,439			
Five-Year Projection	175,560	177,282			
# Difference	-11,967	-11,843			
% Difference	-7.32%	-7.16%			

**Actual enrollments as of September 30 each year but Special Program projections are for various points in time throughout the school year.*

Accuracy of Projections <i>General Education and Gifted and Talented</i>					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
Actual Enrollment	148,341	149,803			
One-Year Projection	148,809	147,857			
# Difference	-468	1,946			
% Difference	-0.32%	1.30%			

Actual Enrollment	148,341	149,803			
Five-Year Projection	158,261	158,680			
# Difference	-9,920	-8,877			
% Difference	-6.69%	-5.93%			

**Actual Enrollment as of September 30 each year.*

Accuracy of Projections <i>Special Education, FECEP, ESOL Trans and Alternative Programs</i>					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
Actual Enrollment	15,252	15,636			
One-Year Projection	15,916	16,633			
# Difference	-664	-997			
% Difference	-4.35%	-6.38%			

Actual Enrollment	15,252	15,636			
Five-Year Projection	17,299	18,602			
# Difference	-2,047	-2,966			
% Difference	-13.42%	-18.97%			

**Actual enrollments as of September 30 each year but Special Program projections are for various points in time throughout the school year.*

Details by schools and clusters are shown in attachment A 4 b.

Commentary: The goal for one year projections is to be within 1% of actual enrollment and for five year projections, to be within 5% of actual enrollment. Facilities Planning Services will be incorporating projection work for Gifted and Talented, Special Education, and other special programs over the next year in an effort to begin the consolidation of all projections within Facilities Planning. Facilities Planning has added a demographer to 1) implement the centralization of the enrollment forecasts in Facilities Planning; 2) align the target dates for all enrollment projections versus the current multiple dates; and, 3) undertake research to better understand the factors impacting enrollments relative to projections as may be warranted. Facilities Planning is working to enrich forecasting data with a systematic approach and utilizing additional data sources in order to complement the current historical projection model.

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments: There is a need for long-term strategic planning for special populations.

5. Establish a cycle of renovation and new construction that provides classroom capacity consistent with instructional programs and community and neighborhood needs.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

Develop and implement a capital improvement program based upon building and capacity assessments within the available amount of funds for capital programs. The capital improvement program must address capacity enhancements, renovations, and infrastructure requirements to include the Americans with Disabilities Act mandates.

Indicator 5.a.

Annually update and produce CIP. (Refer to the 2009-2013 Capital Improvement Program).

Commentary: Cash flow limits preclude our ability to complete renovations and to build new capacity in a more timely manner.

Indicator 5.b.

Implement CIP on time and on budget. (See attachment A.5.b)

Commentary: All major capital projects which occurred over the past five years have been delivered on time and within the budget. In fact, the Glasgow MS Replacement project will be completed eight months ahead of the original project schedule. The Lake Braddock SS renovation was completed six months earlier than anticipated.

Because of the manner in which projects are listed within the CIP, school construction costs are projected as many as five years in advance. The extended time in which the costs are listed creates a significant risk factor for FCPS because construction costs fluctuate based upon regional, national and international factors. FCPS experienced construction cost increases of more than 80% between 2005 and 2006. These increases necessitated the need to seek additional funding in the 2007 Bond Referendum for construction listed in the 2005 Bond. Therefore, each year the CIP will require cost modification using the latest cost data available to FTS.

Indicator 5.c.

Report annually on ADA facilities modification requests from employees, students or citizens.

ADA Expenditures						
Project Type	FY2007		FY2008		FY2009	
	Cost	# of Projects	Cost	# of Projects	Cost	# of Projects
Ramps, Paths and Parking	\$222,081	28				
Door and Door Openers	\$29,374	10				
Bathroom Accommodations	\$30,040	8				
Playgrounds, Gates and Landscaping	\$34,932	4				
Braille Signage	\$4,685	1				
Room and Clinic Accommodations	\$2,233	2				
Total	\$323,346	53				

Commentary: The chart above outlines both the number of ADA facilities modification requests and the nature of those requests. These expenses do not include ADA funding included as a part of all new construction and renovation projects. At such time as schools are built or renovated, they are brought up to current ADA standards. Such expenses are not specifically tracked but certainly amount to a significant percentage of construction costs. No students or citizens are denied access to FCPS facilities due to ADA requirements.

Indicator 5.d.

Update plan for prioritizing alteration of non-compliant ADA facilities and for monitoring ADA compliance by FCPS contractors; report annually on progress in the CIP.

Commentary: The existing ADA Transition Plan is currently under review by FTS. The ADA Manager from Design and Construction will survey all school buildings which are not within the current renovation queue in order to develop a priority list of projects and modifications to be completed each year utilizing the ADA funding contained in the CIP. Each year a portion of these funds are used to alter existing facilities for students or staff members with unique requirements; ensuring that no user is denied the appropriate access to our facilities.

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments:

B. Transportation: The Superintendent will assure the transportation of all students in a safe and timely manner, to instructional programs for which they are eligible or that meet their needs, in a cost-effective manner.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

School bus transportation is the safest means to get students to and from schools or other sites. Students need to arrive at their destinations on time so that instructional time is not lost. The bus transportation system needs to be designed and implemented to ensure that students arrive on-time and safely. It also means that bus routes need to be kept as short as possible to encourage ridership.

Indicator 1.a.

Report on provided transportation that is legally required and that which is provided by School Board policy or practice. (See Attachment B.1.a.)

Commentary: The school system provides both mandated and non-mandated transportation for a number of different programs at many of our schools. The attached chart shows this information. In many cases it is not possible to capture and report specific costs as many bus runs are integrated, i.e. they serve several programs on the same run.

Indicator 1.b.

Report on ratio of preventable accidents to total miles driven.

<i>Preventable Accidents</i>					
	SY 06-07	SY07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
Miles	18,613,232				
Preventable Accidents	218				
Mileage interval between accidents	85,381				

Commentary: Preventable accidents are contacts between one of our buses and some object, vehicle, or person, that result in any damage or injury, no matter how minor or "inconsequential". The current goal is to ensure that there is no decrease in the mileage intervals between preventable accidents. FTS recently participated with the Council of Great City Schools benchmarking effort that will provide us with national standards for preventable accidents; a revised goal will be established once that data is received and analyzed.

Indicator 1.c.

Report on late bus arrivals as a percentage of total bus arrivals. After a baseline is established, the goals should be to reduce this percentage each year.

Bus Arrivals					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
# Bus Arrivals	N/A	101,874			
# on Time	N/A	99,268			
% on Time	N/A	97.4%			

**Actual year-to-date values based on the BARC (Bus Arrival Report Card) system pilot program.*

***The goal is to show improvement from the base year in the percentage of on time arrivals.*

Commentary: On time arrivals are important to student achievement as instructional time can be lost when students are late. Historically there has been no means by which to reliably capture and report bus arrivals. The optimum solution is to install GPS systems in each bus and we are currently evaluating potential systems and plan to award a contract in the near future. Complete implementation of GPS will require an initial investment of approximately \$1.5 million and annual recurring costs of \$150,000. It is our intent to phase in GPS implementation as funds are found within existing budgets or as funds are made available to the department. As an interim solution, the department developed an online reporting system that schools have been requested to use. This system is user friendly and only requires that schools report late arrivals. The data shown above is that which has been reported year-to-date by schools participating in the program.

Analysis: Transportation is improving on time arrivals primarily due to the improvement in the availability of bus drivers. The current driver shortage of approximately 40 is a huge improvement from two years ago when the shortage was approaching 170 drivers. With sufficient numbers of drivers, supervisors are able to identify and address bus runs that arrival late on a recurring basis. In some cases, the only solution is to add bus runs and this necessitates that there are drivers to assign to such runs. Because we stress safety over being on time, we have no expectation that 100 percent of buses will arrive on time. We do accept the importance of timely arrivals and the need to show continuous improvement.

Indicator 1.d.

Report cost per student for general education and special education students.

Cost per Student					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
Regular Ed	\$329				
Special Ed on Dedicated Buses	\$5,860				

**The goal is to keep the cost per student as low as possible.*

Commentary: Several studies conducted the past number of years, to include the most recent MPS study, have indicated that we operate a cost effective transportation system as compared to other large systems in the country. We look forward to obtaining the results this spring of the survey conducted by the Council of Great City Schools (in which we participated) so that we can benchmark our data to that of other large school systems.

Analysis: Transportation does not totally control the factors that influence costs so it is not possible to commit to reducing future costs. Programmatic decisions made by the School Board or program location decisions made by other departments have a great an impact on services. Federal mandates such as McKinney-Vento and No Child Left Behind also affect costs significantly. Transportation has made every effort to be as efficient as possible by consolidating bus stops, by moving bus stops to more central locations, by declining requests from parents for enhanced services, and by acquiring school buses that operate efficiently.

Indicator 1.e.

Average age of school bus fleet. (See Attachment B.1.e.1.)

Commentary: As indicated in the attached chart, we have made great progress in achieving this goal. The number of buses over 12 years of age is projected to decline through FY 2010 but then will begin to increase absent an increase in funding. This is due to the fact that bus costs are increasing significantly as a result of higher materials costs and to emission improvements.

Analysis: The current state of the school bus fleet is greatly improved over the past several years thanks for support from the Superintendent and the School Board. Newer buses are less costly to operate, produce far less harmful emissions, and offer many safety/operational enhancements. (See Attachments B.1.e.2. and B.1.e.3.)

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments:

C. Safety and Security and Emergency Preparedness: The Superintendent will provide physical security and safety programs that ensure the protection of students, staff members, visitors, and FCPS property.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

Security staff will work with schools to provide physical security 24/7. Measures such as door access technology, visitor control procedures, safety inspections, and fire and tornado drills will be implemented as appropriate to enhance safety and security.

Indicator 1.a.

Fire and Security alarm systems will be in place and monitored 24/7 at all FCPS owned buildings.

Commentary: There are fire and intrusion alarm systems in all FCPS buildings. These systems are monitored 24/7 by staff in the Office of Safety and Security.

Indicator 1.b.

Fire and tornado drills will be conducted and documented as required by regulation.

Fire Drill Compliance					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
# of Compliant Schools	192				
# of Non-Compliant Schools	0				
% of Compliant Schools	100%				

Tornado Drills Compliance					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
# of Compliant Schools	101				
# of Non-Compliant Schools	91				
% of Compliant Schools	53%				

**Fire and tornado drills are conducted at all schools*

Commentary: There may be more schools that have completed their drills and simply not submitted the documentation. OSS continues to work with schools to improve compliance by reminding administrators to transmit the documentation.

Indicator 1.c.

Door access devices will be installed in all elementary and middle schools.

Door Access Project Status					
	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10	FY 10-11
# of Schools Completed	78	126			
# of Schools Not Completed	78	30			
% of Schools Completed	50%	81%	100%		

Commentary: This project will be completed by the end of the 2008-09 school year.

Indicator 1.d.

Safety audits will be done at each school annually and corrective action will be taken to address findings.

Safety Audits					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
% of Schools that Received a Safety Audit	100%				
# of Work Orders Submitted for Corrective Action	142				

Commentary: All safety deficiencies noted during annual inspections are corrected immediately by ensuring the completion of necessary work orders.

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments:

2. Ensure that updated emergency management plans are in place, that key personnel receive training as appropriate, and that a collaborative and effective working relationship is maintained with local, state, and federal emergency management representatives.

Superintendent: A U

School Board: A U

Reasonable Interpretation:

Emergency preparedness begins with developing and maintaining up-to-date crisis plans, both at the district and individual school levels. Crisis planning needs to be done collaboratively with the county, state, and region. Key personnel within the school system need to receive appropriate training to ensure they understand their role in a crisis and that they are capable of fulfilling their crisis management responsibilities.

Indicator 2.a.

The FCPS system-wide emergency operations plan will be updated and tested annually.

Emergency Operations Plan					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
System-Wide Plan Updated	Yes				

Commentary: The system-wide emergency operations plan describes the procedures, terminology and responsibilities that are involved with mobilizing the school division to manage large scale emergencies and to fulfill its obligations contained in the Fairfax County Emergency Operations Plan. Annual updates are required to ensure compliance with procedural changes and to incorporate administrative modifications.

Indicator 2.b.

FCPS staff will participate in Fairfax County and regional emergency management coordinating groups.

Fairfax County and Regional Exercises					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
Participation in EMCC/Regional Exercises	Yes				

Commentary: The participation in exercises with the Fairfax County Emergency Management Coordinating Committee, and other relevant regional exercises, are necessary to ensure the capabilities contained in the system-wide plan are achievable and sustainable.

Indicator 2.c.

FTS will ensure that individual school crisis plans are updated annually and tested periodically.

Emergency Management					
	SY 06-07	SY 07-08	SY 08-09	SY 09-10	SY 10-11
All School Crisis Plans Updated	Yes				
# of Table Top Exercises Conducted	84				

Commentary: Table top exercises are conducted by safety and security staff according to a schedule that provides a facilitated exercise for each high and middle school every other year and for elementary schools every three years. Exercises are also provided outside this schedule upon request.

Indicator 2.d.

All security staff will be State certified.

Security Staff Certified					
	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
All Security Staff Certified	Yes				

Commentary: Virginia requires that all school security personnel receive state approved training when initially employed and periodic in-service training to maintain their certification from the Department of Criminal Justice Services. Safety and security staff provides this training throughout the year to ensure compliance.

Superintendent Statement of Condition:

Board Comments:

The School board voted to accept the Superintendent's Operational Expectations Monitoring Report for Facilities and Transportation Services at the January 14, 2008, work session as follows:

Motion: The School Board accepts the Facilities and Transportation Services Monitoring Report and finds that each indicator is in compliance except that A.2 was unacceptable, and that the performance of the Superintendent is unacceptable due to a lack of resources to complete the task.

Summary Statement of the Superintendent:

Summary Statement of the Board:

Areas for Improvement:

Areas of Commendation:

Goals(s) for Facilities and Transportation Services for School Year:

Date for Re-Monitoring: