

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

**FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES**  
Period Covered: 2007 – 2008 (except as noted)

**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. The goal is that all new custodians will receive the Basic Custodial Skills training within 120 days of hiring. The goal is to instruct 100% of the supervisory custodial staff in advanced techniques and supervisory skills.

**Indicator 1.b.**

Plant Operations staff will evaluate annually school cleanliness and provide findings to each principal and the cluster assistant superintendent. The goal is that no schools receive a score lower than 60.

**Indicator 1.c.**

Annually analyze trends on worker's compensation claims and student injuries. The goal is to ensure that no facility-related injuries/claims are a result of facilities problems.

**Superintendent Statement of Condition:**

**A.1.a.1. 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.

**A.1.a.1. Analysis:** At the time of the monitoring report, all custodians were trained in basic skills.

<b><i>Custodial Training Summary Statistics (Basic Custodial Skills)</i></b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b># Eligible Custodians</b>	1,241	1,242	1,225		
<b># Custodians Trained</b>	1,203	1,072	1,225		
<b>% Custodians Trained</b>	96.9%	86.3%	100%		
<b># Eligible Supervisory Staff</b>	266	264	268		
<b># Supervisory Staff Trained</b>	266	260	268		
<b>% Supervisory Staff Trained</b>	100%	98.5%	100%		

**A.1.a.2. 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.

**A.1.a.2. Analysis:** At the time of the monitoring report, 42 supervisors required Certified Custodian training. Facilities Management is identifying specific individuals that require training and are working with principals to schedule training sessions.

<b><i>Certified Custodian Course (English or ESOL)</i></b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b># Eligible Custodians</b>	1,241	1,242	1,225		
<b># Custodians Trained</b>	310	331	382		
<b>% Custodians Trained</b>	25%	26.7%	31.2%		

<b># Eligible Supervisory Staff</b>	266	264	268		
<b># Supervisory Staff Trained</b>	237	223	226		
<b>% Supervisory Staff Trained</b>	89.1%	84.5%	84.3%		

**A.1.b. Commentary:** Inspection criteria and grade weights are updated once a year (this year's inspection criteria includes a new recycling component). Yearly inspections begin after the start of school.

**A.1.b. 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. All inspections for the current fiscal year have been completed. The number of inspected sites has been expanded to 199 facilities.

<b>Annual School Cleanliness Evaluation Summary Report</b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b>Total # of Facilities</b>		182	199		
<b># Facilities Inspected</b>		182	199		
<b># Facilities Not Inspected</b>		0	0		
<b>Completion Percentage</b>		100%	100%		

<b>Highest Grade</b>		95	91		
<b>Lowest Grade</b>		51	64		
<b>Average Grade</b>		76	77		

<b>Grades:</b>	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b>90 – 100 (Excellent)</b>		3	1		
<b>75 – 89 (Very Good)</b>		113	141		
<b>60 – 74 (Satisfactory)</b>		62	57		
<b>45 – 59 (Needs Improvement)</b>		4	0		
<b>0 – 44 (Poor)</b>		0	0		

*\*Inspection program started mid-year 2007. First year of complete data begins 2008.*

*\*\* Our goal is to have all schools rated satisfactory or above.*

**A.1.c. 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.

**A.1.c. Analysis:** The FY 2008 results have not revealed any significant facility-related causes for injuries where preventive measures can be taken. Corrective measures have been taken where appropriate.

<b>Annual Worker’s Compensation and Student Injuries Summary Report</b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b># Worker’s Compensation Claims</b>	1397	1,401			
<b># Student Injuries</b>	1365	1,160			

<b>Employee Accidents (by cause of injury)</b>					
<b>Cause of Injury</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>		<b>FY 2008</b>		<b>Facility Related / Preventable</b>
	<b># Accidents</b>	<b>%</b>	<b># Accidents</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Assault/Combative Behavior</b>	242	17.32%	215	15.35%	0
<b>Fall</b>	573	41.02%	537	38.33%	16
<b>Lifting</b>	160	11.45%	119	8.49%	0
<b>Machinery</b>	23	1.65%	4	0.29%	0
<b>Medical</b>	85	6.08%	46	3.28%	2
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	29	2.08%	168	11.99%	4
<b>Sports</b>	7	0.50%	13	0.93%	0
<b>Struck by/Against Objects</b>	241	17.25%	267	19.06%	15
<b>Vehicle</b>	37	2.65%	32	2.28%	0
<b>Total Accidents</b>	<b>1,397</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>37</b>

<b>Student Accidents (by cause of injury)</b>					
<b>Cause of Injury</b>	<b>FY 2007</b>		<b>FY 2008</b>		<b>Facility Related / Preventable</b>
	<b># Accidents</b>	<b>%</b>	<b># Accidents</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Horseplay</b>	32	2.34%	61	5.26%	1
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	233	17.07%	177	15.26%	1
<b>Struck by or against/Caught in, under or between</b>	423	30.99%	325	28.02%	9
<b>Slip or Fall</b>	616	45.13%	553	47.67%	10
<b>Over-Exertion or Strain</b>	20	1.47%	13	1.12%	0
<b>Irritation or Soreness/ Exposure /Contact with hot,cold,chemical,electrical</b>	23	1.68%	23	1.98%	1
<b>Assault/Attack/Fighting</b>	18	1.32%	8	0.69%	0
<b>Total Accidents</b>	<b>1,365</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,160</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>22</b>

**Board Comments:** See Summary Statement of the Board

**2. Develop and annually report on a master plan required to implement an effective preventive maintenance program.**

**Superintendent:** A  U

**School Board:** A  U

**Reasonable Interpretation:**

The department will implement a preventive maintenance program that ensures 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.

**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.

**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.

**Superintendent Statement of Condition:**

**A.2.a. Commentary:** As shown in indicator 2.b., Facilities Management is not currently performing proper levels of preventive maintenance on building assets. (See Indicator 2.c. for a listing of building assets.) The current staffing shortage of 261 positions equates to \$22,312,145, of which \$4,834,414 is for “one time” costs for equipment and the balance of \$17,477,731 is for recurring costs, such as salaries. Current 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 operationally and fiscally. 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. Standards determined that FCPS Facilities Management is understaffed by the numbers indicated above.

**A.2.a. 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.

<b>Facilities Management Staffing Summary Statistics</b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b>Required Positions</b>	647	649	664		
<b>Current Position Count</b>	404	404	403		
<b>Position Shortage</b>	243	245	261		
<b>Current Staffing Level %</b>	62.4%	62.2%	60.7%		

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

**A.2.b. 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 ensure assets reach the end of their expected life-cycle.

**A.2.b. Analysis:** Work order statistics reveal a significant backlog of 2.7 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. The current fiscal year increase in work order volume is due to internal work processes and cyclical schedule variations.

<b>Preventive Maintenance Work Order Summary Report</b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b>Current (printed) Incomplete PM Work Orders</b>	5,210	7,340	7,882		
<b>Incomplete PM Work Orders in Machine Queue</b>	7,900	19,398	19,432		
<b>True PM Work Order Backlog</b>	13,110	26,738	27,314		
<b>PM Work Orders Completed</b>	5,512	11,984	10,157		
<b>Percent of Completed PM Work Orders</b>	42%	45%	37%		
<b>Assumed Backlog (Years)</b>	2.4	2.2	2.7		

**A.2.c. 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.

**A.2.c. Analysis:** The Office of 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.

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

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

**Board Comments:** The Board agreed with the Superintendent's unsatisfactory rating caused by a staffing shortage of 261 positions.

**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 members work with Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) and Community and Recreation Services (CRS) to create the framework and manage the processes that will maximize opportunities for community of use our buildings and athletic fields without negatively impacting school system instructional programs. An online scheduling system, FSDirect, has been implemented to reduce community use workload on schools and to improve services to community members by allowing online reservations.

In addition, two new system interfaces have been successfully launched so that facility scheduling and funds management are handled more efficiently. In August 2008, the FSDirect System became interfaced with FAMIS, our financial accounting system; and in October 2008, staff completed a second interface between FSDirect and Fairfax County's athletic facilities scheduling system. Services to the community will be further improved when FSDirect can be made accessible directly to community members who will input their own facility scheduling requests, thus further reducing the burden on the individual school staff members who currently receive use requests from the community and must enter the reservations into FSDirect.

**Indicator 3.a.**

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

**Indicator 3.b.**

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

**Indicator 3.c.**

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

**Superintendent Statement of Condition:**

**A.3.a. Commentary:** These data would suggest that our buildings are heavily utilized by members of the community. The numbers below reflect community events, such as religious and cultural, as well as uses that are sponsored by Fairfax County agencies, such as FCPA, CRS, and the 161 FCPS facilities that are used for polling places by the Electoral Board.

<b>FCPS Community Use Events</b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b>Community Use Elementary Schools</b>	84,588	102,697	115,916		
<b>Community Use Middle Schools</b>	26,924	25,170	40,424		
<b>Community Use High Schools</b>	17,948	19,746	25,690		
<b>Total Events</b>	<b>129,460</b>	<b>147,613</b>	<b>182,030</b>		

**A.3.b. Commentary:** In FY2007 our numbers reflected that all high and middle schools, as well as 32 elementary schools, were trained and fully able to use FS Direct, the on-line scheduling system. The final 105 elementary schools were trained this past year, therefore, 100% of schools have been trained, however, we do not currently have the ability to determine the actual percentage of total events that are scheduled through the online system. The goal is to ensure that 100% of scheduling is done online to reduce scheduling conflicts and improve the ease of scheduling. We are continuing to work with school staff to promote use of the online system and to encourage its use.

<b>On-Line Scheduling Statistics</b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b>Number of Events</b>	66,019	234,100	251,387		
<b>% of Events Scheduled</b>	51%	95%	97%		

**A.3.c. Commentary:** There are over 3,300 available community use hours per facility per year; actual usage varies by school and by school level. In comparison, our facilities are used approximately 30% more for community use than they are used for instructional use during the school year (53 hours of community use weekly vs. 37.5 hours of instructional use). Every effort is being made to make our buildings available for use by community members.

**A.3.c. Analysis:** While this is a great program, there is a net cost to the school system as indicated above. In 2007 staff examined the fee structures and rental fees charged by surrounding jurisdictions to determine if additional revenues could be generated to offset the impact of the net cost to FCPS for use of its facilities. Staff was able to identify some areas where our fees were not sufficiently in line with what our neighbors charged, therefore, we implemented some changes that should result in additional revenues that will serve to partially offset the impact of the net cost.

<b>Net Cost of Community Use</b>					
	<b>FY2007</b>	<b>FY2008</b>	<b>FY2009</b>	<b>FY2010</b>	<b>FY2011</b>
<b>Utilities and Building Maintenance</b>	\$4,475,683	\$4,457,910	\$4,623,736		
<b>Custodial Allocation</b>	\$3,896,702	\$3,974,616	\$4,024,789		
<b>Community Use Office Staff (5.0 positions)</b>	\$451,660	\$469,476	\$493,784		
<b>Total Use Costs</b>	\$8,824,045	\$8,902,002	\$9,142,309		
<b>Revenues</b>	\$4,459,271	\$4,472,026	\$4,763,368*		
<b>Net Cost of Community Use</b>	\$4,364,774	\$4,429,976	\$4,378,941		

\*Projected

**Board Comments:** See Summary Statement of the Board

**4. (Prior version) Identify ~~grade configurations and school attendance boundaries that assure reasonable balance of student enrollment, wise use of resources, and sound instructional practices.~~ See note below regarding new approved language.**

**Superintendent:** A  U

**School Board:** A  U

**Note:** In February 2009, the School Board approved the following Operational Expectation #4: Establish and regularly update a Facilities Comprehensive Plan, organized by regional areas, which reflects School Board policy and guides decision making to ensure sound instructional practices; a reasonable balance of capacity utilization; and wise, efficient, and environmentally-responsible use of resources.

However, the School Board has not yet approved the Reasonable Interpretation and indicators for the Facilities Comprehensive Plan Operational Expectation. A Comprehensive Planning Development Committee has been formed; this committee has met several times and will in the future make a recommendation to the School Board. The Reasonable Interpretation and Indicators below pertain to the original Operational Expectation, to include the updated Accuracy of Projections data.

**Reasonable Interpretation:**

With the current student enrollment trends, it is becoming increasingly difficult to continue to meet capacity needs. The CIP was approved to include capacity enhancements at multiple schools where deficits could not be readily addressed through boundary or program changes. We also need to continue to carefully monitor the placement of programs such as gifted and talented, special needs, etc., to ensure that such placement and/or new programs takes 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.

**Indicator 4.b.**

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

**Superintendent Statement of Condition:**

**A.4.a. 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 fund building additions at eight elementary schools and one middle school which will create 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.

**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.

<b>Accuracy of Projections</b>					
<b>Total Membership</b>					
	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b>Actual Enrollment</b>	163,593	165,439	169,125		
<b>One-Year Projection</b>	164,725	164,490	167,302		
<b># Difference</b>	-1,132	949	1,823		
<b>% Difference</b>	-0.69%	0.57%	1.08%		

<b>Actual Enrollment</b>	163,593	165,439	169,125		
<b>Five-Year Projection</b>	175,560	177,282	175,268		
<b># Difference</b>	-11,967	-11,843	-6,143		
<b>% Difference</b>	-7.32%	-7.16%	-3.63%		

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

<b>Accuracy of Projections</b> <i>General Education and Gifted and Talented</i>					
	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b>Actual Enrollment</b>	148,341	149,803	152,365		
<b>One-Year Projection</b>	148,809	147,857	150,407		
<b># Difference</b>	-468	1,946	1,958		
<b>% Difference</b>	-0.32%	1.30%	1.28%		

<b>Actual Enrollment</b>	148,341	149,803	152,365		
<b>Five-Year Projection</b>	158,261	158,680	156,298		
<b># Difference</b>	-9,920	-8,877	-3,933		
<b>% Difference</b>	-6.69%	-5.93%	-2.58%		

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

<b>Accuracy of Projections</b> <i>Special Education, FECEP, ESOL Trans and Alternative Programs</i>					
	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b>Actual Enrollment</b>	15,252	15,636	16,760		
<b>One-Year Projection</b>	15,916	16,633	16,895		
<b># Difference</b>	-664	-997	-135		
<b>% Difference</b>	-4.35%	-6.38%	-0.81%		

<b>Actual Enrollment</b>	15,252	15,636	16,760		
<b>Five-Year Projection</b>	17,299	18,602	18,970		
<b># Difference</b>	-2,047	-2,966	-2,210		
<b>% Difference</b>	-13.42%	-18.97%	-13.19%		

*\*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.

**Board Comments:** See Summary Statements of the Board

**5. Establish a Capital Improvement Program of major maintenance, renovation, and new construction which ensures that classroom capacity and infrastructure meet instructional program and community use needs and which endeavors to be equitable across the county.**

**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 CIP: <http://www.fcps.edu/fts/cipbook2010-2014.pdf>)

**Indicator 5.b.**

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

**Indicator 5.c.**

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.

**Superintendent Statement of Condition:**

**A.5.a. Commentary:** Cash flow limits preclude our ability to complete renovations and to build new capacity in a more timely manner.

**A.5.b. Commentary:** All major capital projects which occurred over the past five years have been delivered on time and within the budget (with one exception). In fact, the Glasgow MS Replacement project was 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.

**A.5.c. Commentary:** The ADA Expenditures chart 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.

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.

<b>ADA Expenditures</b>						
<b>Project Type</b>	<b>FY2007</b>		<b>FY2008</b>		<b>FY2009</b>	
	<b>Cost</b>	<b># of Projects</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b># of Projects</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b># of Projects</b>
<b>Ramps, Paths and Parking</b>	\$222,081	28	\$395,124	113		
<b>Door and Door Openers</b>	\$29,374	10	\$20,694	6		
<b>Bathroom Accommodations</b>	\$30,040	8	\$18,283	4		
<b>Playgrounds, Gates and Landscaping</b>	\$34,932	4	\$67,496	9		
<b>Braille Signage</b>	\$4,685	1	\$4,000	1		
<b>Room and Clinic Accommodations</b>	\$2,233	2	\$252,339	48		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$323,345</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>\$757,936</b>	<b>181</b>		

\* The figures for FY2009 will be available in late July.

**Board Comments:** See Summary Statement of the Board

**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 B.1.**

Report on provided transportation that is legally required and that which is provided by School Board policy or practice.

**Indicator B.2.**

Report on ratio of preventable accidents to total miles driven.

**Indicator B.3.**

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.

#### **Indicator B.4.**

Report cost per student for general education and special education students. The goal is to keep the cost per student as low as possible.

#### **Indicator B.5.**

Average age of school bus fleet.

#### **Superintendent Statement of Condition:**

**B.1. 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. (See Attachment B.1.)

**B.2. Commentary:** As measured by FCPS transportation, 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", that could have been prevented by our driver. The current goal is to ensure that there is no decrease in the mileage intervals between preventable accidents. While the number of preventable accidents did increase with the commensurate decrease in mileage interval over the previous year, both reflect improvement over the base year.

**CGCS:** While FTS planned to participate with the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS) benchmarking effort to establish national standards for preventable accidents, CGCS has determined that such benchmarking is not possible. Every school system defines accidents according to their own needs, and they are unable to gain concurrence.

The definition originally proposed by CGCS required that we assess accident rates differently. *Any contact between a school bus and any person, other vehicle, or object that results in any vehicle having to be towed from the scene; or that results in any injury or complaint of injury, of any severity, as a result of any collision or movement of the bus, including acceleration or deceleration.* Note that this definition focuses on outcome rather than cause.

We began tracking vehicles towed from an accident scene, which is a critical element in the CGCS assessment, in the middle of the 07-08 school year. According to the proposed definition, the final miles per accident range from CGCS was 16,726 – 138,276. When calculated using the "historical" CGCS definition, "mileage interval between accidents" for 07-08 for those tracked by FCPS, would be 477,262. (See Attachment B.2.)

<b>Preventable Accidents</b>					
	<b>SY 05-06</b>	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>
<b>Miles</b>	18,591,336	18,613,232	18,373,490		
<b>Preventable Accidents</b>	266	218	238		
<b>FCPS mileage interval between accidents – using CGCS proposed definition</b>	69,892	85,381	77,200		
<b>FCPS mileage interval between accidents – using CGCS “historical” definition</b>			477,262		
<b>CGCS by “historical” definition</b>			16,726 – 138,276		

*\*FCPS figures for 08-09 will not be available until all investigations have been completed.*

**B.3. Commentary:** On time arrivals are important to student achievement as instructional time can be lost when students are late. Historically there have 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 in the Bus Arrivals chart are that which have been reported year-to-date by schools participating in the program.

**B.3. Analysis:** Transportation is improving on arrival times primarily due to the improvement in the availability of bus drivers. The current driver shortage is minimal, a huge improvement from three years ago when the shortage was approaching 170 drivers. With sufficient numbers of drivers, supervisors are able to identify and address bus runs that arrive 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.

<b>Bus Arrivals</b>								
	<b>SY 07-08</b>		<b>SY 08-09</b>		<b>SY 09-10</b>		<b>SY 10-11</b>	
	<b>BARC</b>	<b>GPS</b>	<b>BARC</b>	<b>GPS</b>	<b>BARC</b>	<b>GPS</b>	<b>BARC</b>	<b>GPS</b>
<b># Bus Arrivals</b>	783,018	71,089	846,987					
<b># on Time</b>	776,778	68,379	833,223					
<b>% on Time</b>	99.2%	96.2%	<b>98.3%</b>					

*\*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.*

**B.4. Commentary:** Several studies conducted over 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. The CGCS most recent survey demonstrates that their participating schools’ low cost is \$372 and the high cost is \$5,259, per student, with a median of \$1,120 per student. The discussion notes, “An economy of scale does not seem to exist. Both the smallest and largest operations are represented at both ends of the scale.” (See Attachment B.4.)

**B.4. 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 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.

<b>Cost per Student</b>						
	<b>SY 05-06</b>	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b>Regular Ed</b>	\$329	\$365	\$357	NA		
<b>Special Ed on Dedicated Buses</b>	\$5,860	\$6,541	\$7,857	NA		
<b>FCPS Average</b>	\$533	\$586	\$601	NA		
<b>CGCS Average</b>			\$372 - \$5,259			

\* SY08-09 data will not be available until July-August 2009.

**B.5. Commentary:** The average age of the school bus fleet will be 7.2 years in FY 2010. This average age increases to 9.8 years in 2015 if we continue to only purchase about 47 buses per year and if the size of the bus fleet remains constant. Under these same assumptions, the percentage of the fleet that exceeds the School Board's replacement age policy (12 years) grows from 4.3 percent in 2010 to 33.5 percent in 2015. (See Attachment B.5.).

**CGCS:** The Council of Great City Schools has established data for the weighted average age of the fleet. Their data for FY07 shows a range of 3.7 years to 9.9 years (except in California where more expensive buses are purchased to have a 40 year life span and show a range of 10.4 - 20.4). The weighted average age for FCPS buses after the FY09 purchases have been received and old buses surveyed is 7.3 years. (See Attachment B.5.a.).

**B. 5. Analysis:** The current state of the school bus fleet is greatly improved over the past several years thanks to the 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.5.b. and B.5.c.)

The Council of Great City Schools (CGCS) Spring 2008 report, "Managing for Results in America's Great City Schools," can be seen in its entirety at:  
[http://www.cgcs.org/publications/KPI\\_Report2.pdf](http://www.cgcs.org/publications/KPI_Report2.pdf).

**Board Comments:** See Summary Statement of the Board

**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.**

**1. 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:**

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.

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 1.a.**

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

**Indicator 1.b.**

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

**Indicator 1.c.**

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

**Indicator 1.d.**

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

**Indicator 1.e.**

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

**Indicator 1.f.**

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

**Indicator 1.g.**

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

**Indicator 1.h.**

All security staff will be State certified.

**Superintendent Statement of Condition:**

**C.1.a. 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.

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

**C.1.b. Commentary:** OSS worked with schools to improve compliance by reminding administrators to utilize the online reporting application for tornado drill reporting.

<b>Tornado Drill Compliance</b>					
	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b># of Compliant Schools</b>	101	188	191		
<b># of Non-Compliant Schools</b>	91	04	01		
<b>% of Compliant Schools</b>	53%	98%	99.5%		

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

**C.1.c. Commentary:** This project will be completed by the end of the 2008-09 school year.

<b>Door Access Project Status</b>					
	<b>FY 06-07</b>	<b>FY 07-08</b>	<b>FY 08-09</b>	<b>FY 09-10</b>	<b>FY 10-11</b>
<b># of Schools Completed</b>	78	126	156		
<b># of Schools Not Completed</b>	78	30	0		
<b>% of Schools Completed</b>	50%	81%	100%		

**C.1.d. Commentary:** All safety deficiencies noted during annual inspections are corrected immediately by ensuring the completion of necessary work orders.

<b>Safety Audits</b>					
	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b>% of Schools that Received a Safety Audit</b>	100%	100%	100%		
<b># of Work Orders Submitted for Corrective Action</b>	142	156	93		

**C.1.e. 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.

<b>Emergency Operations Plan</b>					
	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b>System-Wide Plan Updated</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes		

**C.1.f. 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.

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

**C.1.g. 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.

<b>Emergency Management</b>					
	<b>SY 06-07</b>	<b>SY 07-08</b>	<b>SY 08-09</b>	<b>SY 09-10</b>	<b>SY 10-11</b>
<b>All School Crisis Plans Updated</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes		
<b># of Table Top Exercises Conducted</b>	84	80	79		

**C.1.h. 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.

<b>Security Staff Certified</b>					
	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11
<b>All Security Staff Certified</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes		

**Board Comments:**

**Summary Statement of the Superintendent:**

**Summary Statement of the Board:**

The School Board voted to accept the Monitoring Report for Facilities and Transportation Services at the July 13, 2009, work session as follows:

**Mrs. Smith moved, and Mrs. Wilson seconded, that the School Board accept the Facilities and Transportation Monitoring Report and finds that each indicator is acceptable and further commend the Department of Facilities and Transportation Services for operational expectation A.5. and an exemplary report.**

***[Clerk’s Note: The Superintendent and the Board agreed that operational expectation #2 was unacceptable due to a shortage of 261 positions.]***

**Areas for Improvement:**

**Areas of Commendation:**

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

**Date for Re-Monitoring:** July 2010