Maintenance of Maryland's Public School Buildings

STATE OF MARYLAND
PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

December 8, 2010

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS

Martin O'Malley, Governor
Peter Franchot, Comptroller
Nancy K. Kopp, Treasurer

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Nancy S. Grasmick, State Superintendent of Schools
Alvin C. Collins, Secretary, Maryland Department of General Services
Richard E. Hall, Secretary, Maryland Department of Planning
Timothy Maloney, Member of the Public
Fred Puddester, Member of the Public

David G. Lever, Executive Director

Public School Construction Program
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201-2595
410-767-0617

The following individuals within the Public School Construction Program have made dedicated contributions of time and effort to the Maintenance Inspection Program and the development of this annual report:

Joan Schaefer, AIA, Deputy Director, Maintenance Inspection Program Manager
Donn Grove, Maintenance Inspector - Lead
Anthony Lassiter, Maintenance Inspector
Helen McCall, Administrative Aide
Shariece Marine, Administrative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PUBLIC SCHOOL MAINTENANCE IN MARYLAND

A. BACKGROUND

The Board of Public Works (BPW) and the Interagency Committee on School Construction (IAC), the entity established by the BPW to administer the Public School Construction Program (PSCP), have a strong interest in the proper maintenance of Maryland's public school facilities. For all types of facilities, the useful life of the structure is greatly extended through corrective maintenance activities that address existing deficiencies and through a preventive maintenance program that protects against new deficiencies. Good maintenance defers the need for repairs and major renovation, and reduces the cost of renovation when it is eventually needed. Regular maintenance ensures that buildings will remain operational, even under adverse weather conditions.

Most important, a well maintained facility protects the health and safety of building occupants, and in the case of schools, studies have shown that there is a positive relationship between the quality of a school facility and the quality of the educational activity that takes place within it.[1] A recent study of elementary schools in New York City found that "the conditions of school buildings predicted both attendance and academic achievement after controlling for other possible predictors like SES [socioeconomic status], ethnicity, school size, and teacher quality."[2] The study found that school attendance mediates between building condition and academic achievement: a building in poor condition can generate direct barriers to learning by imposing distracting discomforts or by creating health problems, particularly those related to indoor air quality; it can negatively affect the social interaction among children, parents, and teachers that is crucial to education; and it can have a demoralizing effect by conveying "to students, parents and teachers unworthiness and abandonment," affecting the self-concept of youths during their formative years.

Good maintenance is the result of a combination of factors. Although material resources are of obvious importance, more significant are the attitudes and skills of the individuals who are involved in school maintenance, from central office administrators and mechanics to school-based staff, including the principal, teachers, building managers and custodians. No single individual plays a more crucial role than the principal, who as the visible leader of the school establishes the culture of the school environment; when he or she clearly indicates that the quality of the school facility is essential to the success of its students, a noticeable attitude of care is generally evident in the cleanliness and routine maintenance of the school, even in community and fiscal circumstances that are discouraging. Support from the central office in the form of adequate budgets, a responsive system for carrying out work orders, and the leadership of the top administrators of the school system, assists the principal in their difficult charge. Regular training of personnel not only develops the skills that are needed to run our technologically advanced modern buildings, it also reinforces the attitudes of daily care and attention that result in superior maintenance. Training must include preventive maitenance, by far the least costly and most effective form of maintenance that exists. Finally, the attitude of the community is critical, because the best efforts at maintaining a quality school can be undone by persistent graffiti and vandalism.

---

1 Lawrence, Barbara Kent: "Save a Penny, Lose a School: The Real Cost of Deferred Maintenance," a Policy Brief for the Rural School and Community Trust, June 2003. Dr. Lawrence summarizes a large body of literature that addresses factors such as days of school lost due to indoor air quality (IAQ) problems; teacher and student morale; teacher absenteeism and retention; and student alertness, concentration, and overall academic performance.

2 Duran-Narucki, Valkiria: "School building condition, school attendance, and academic achievement in New York City public schools: A mediation model" (*Journal of Environmental Psychology* 28 (2008), 278-286)

Established in 1971, the Public School Construction Program has had a long involvement with the maintenance of schools. In the summer of 1973, the BPW directed the IAC to conduct a comprehensive maintenance review of all operating public schools. The results revealed that about 21 percent of the State's 1,259 then-operative schools were in poor or fair condition. To improve upon those findings, comprehensive maintenance guidelines were developed by the IAC and approved by the BPW in 1974. When the *Public School Construction Program Administrative Procedures Guide* (the APG) was approved by the IAC in 1981, it included a section on maintenance. A new APG was issued by the IAC in September 1994, containing a revised Section 800 - Maintenance. It describes the procedures for development of a local Comprehensive Maintenance Plan (CMP), required to be submitted by each of the local education agencies (LEAs) to the IAC and the local governments prior to October 15 of each year. The *Administrative Procedures Guide* specifies how the CMP is to address requirements on the planning, funding, reporting, and compliance monitoring of school maintenance. The requirement to submit an annual CMP is now found in the regulations of the PSCP (COMAR 23.03.02.18).

Parallel to the development of the maintenance procedures, in 1980 the BPW directed the IAC to conduct a full maintenance survey of selected public schools in Maryland. The survey was performed by technical staff assigned to the PSCP by the Department of General Services (DGS). Its initial purpose was to assess the quality of local maintenance programs in approximately 100 school facilities that had benefited from State school construction funding. Subsequently, this survey was authorized to become an annual activity and was expanded to include schools that had not received assistance under the Program. Table A on page 7 below shows the ratings for all inspections made during the thirty fiscal years in which the surveys have been conducted, as well as the percentage of schools associated with each rating. Of the 3,433 school surveys conducted during this period, 1,768 (52%) received the highest rating categories of "Superior" and "Good", while 211 (6%) received ratings of "Not Adequate"; and 35 (1%) received a rating of "Poor". Over the last three years, 22 of the total number of surveys were re-inspections of facilities that had received ratings of "Not Adequate" in the previous year.

The Interagency Committee recognizes that there is a connection between maintenance and capital funding. To the extent that funding is provided to renovate or replace older schools, a school system's backlog of deferred maintenance items is also reduced. It is generally far more economical to address building deficiencies through a comprehensive renovation than through piecemeal attention to individual building systems. Of equal importance, a properly conducted renovation that is based on an educational specification which has been developed with the participation of educators results in a building that is not only efficient and safe, but one that is well suited to support the current educational program. Maryland's General Assembly and Administration have provided $1.93 billion in capital funding between fiscal years 2006 and 2011; it can safely be said that without this funding and the matching contributions of the local governments, the total backlog of deferred maintenance in our schools would be enormously greater than it is today. LEAs repeatedly mention how State-funded systemic renovation and smaller Aging Schools Program (ASP) and Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) projects not only improve the building, but allow their staff to operate in a far more efficient manner. As an example, Charles County Public Schools reported that prior to the mechanical upgrade at Gwynn Elementary School, a central office mechanic spent one-half of every working day at the school ensuring that the system would remain operable; with completion of a recent State-funded systemic renovation at this school, the mechanic's time can be used far more productively.

B. THE MAINTENANCE INSPECTION PROGRAM

In July 2005, the Capital Debt Affordability Committee (CDAC), consisting of the State Treasurer, the Comptroller, the Secretary of the Department of Budget and Management, and the Secretary of Transportation requested the IAC to develop recommendations to ensure that Maryland's large investment in school facilities will be well protected through good maintenance practices. In August 2005 the IAC approved a series of recommendations which are described below:

- The maintenance survey function was transferred from the Department of General Services (DGS) to the PSCP beginning in FY 2007, a recommendation that was approved by the General Assembly in the 2006 session. Subsequently, the PSCP hired two full time school maintenance inspectors with a wide range of experience in the fields of building maintenance, operations and construction. The individuals in these positions are charged with the responsibility of conducting approximately 230 new school surveys in 24 school systems per year, as well as re-inspections of schools surveyed in the prior fiscal year that received ratings of "Not Adequate" or "Poor". They prepare and send the survey reports to the LEAs, monitor the responses, and perform follow-up inspections on those schools which received Poor or Not Adequate ratings. With the addition of these full time inspectors, a goal was established for the PSCP to inspect each school in Maryland once every six years. In FY 2009 and FY 2010, the number of inspections was reduced to 145 (138 new, 7 re-inspections) and 187 (182 new, 5 re-inspections), respectively, due to budget constraints. The target of 230 inspections has been restored for FY 2011, plus three re-inspections; however, two years of reduced inspections has led to a one-year delay in achieving the goal of inspecting every school on a six-year rotation.

- A new maintenance inspection database now provides the ability to compile inspection data into useful reports. In conjunction with consistent inspection and reporting methods, it allows the PSCP to observe changes in the overall maintenance performance of the LEAs, and to identify specific categories where maintenance practices need improvement (see pages 11 and 12). The maintenance inspection information is now a routine component of the PSCP Facilities Inventory database. The Facilities Inventory database contains all pertinent data associated with each school facility in the State, making it an invaluable resource for the analysis of statewide maintenance practices as well as a permanent record of each building.

- For the fourth year, this Annual Report includes a brief evaluation of the maintenance practices of each LEA. This approach highlights specific maintenance issues and furthers the dissemination of maintenance best practices throughout the state.

- In response to a requirement of the General Assembly, the IAC issued "Guidelines for Maintenance of Public School Facilities in Maryland" in May 2008.

In addition to these actions, the IAC continues to strengthen the alignment between the maintenance inspection program and the annual Public School Construction Capital Improvement Program (CIP). For the second year, requests for roof replacement projects are required to include the three most recent roof inspection reports as a threshold condition for project eligibility. IAC staff members have raised questions about several requests that appear to demonstrate premature failure of roofs and mechanical equipment due to poor maintenance. LEAs have been encouraged to enlarge the scope of certain systemic renovation projects in order to address deficiencies such as insufficient electrical power, which manifests in excessive use of extension cords and power strips that overload circuits and generate tripping hazards.

Finally, members of the Interagency Committee raise this subject during the annual meeting in December at which local superintendents and their staff appeal staff recommendations for CIP funding. Because of the prestige and practical importance placed on State funding and the high level of visibility of the entire CIP process, it is anticipated that the consistent linkage of maintenance and CIP funding by the IAC will assist local boards and the governments that support their operating budgets to sustain the staff and other resources needed for effective maintenance programs throughout the state.

C. FUNDING FOR SCHOOL MAINTENANCE

Our overall assessment is that the attention paid to school maintenance by the State since 2005 has led to improved practices and performance among the LEAs. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that considerable more effort is required. In 2003, the Treasurer's Task Force to Study Public School Facilities found that $3.85 billion in local and State funds was required to bring Maryland's public schools to the minimum building and educational standards that would have been in place if they had been constructed in 2003 (adjusted for construction escalation, it is estimated that this cost would approach $5.5 billion if the same survey had been conducted in the summer of 2010).[3] Of the 2003 total, 34% was associated with deficiencies in building and site factors, and 20% with facility corrections needed to support educational programs. Of the $613 million in requests for State funding that have been submitted by the local school systems in the FY 2012 Public School Construction CIP, $359 million (59%) is for work on existing facilities: major renovations, additions, renovations with additions, limited renovations, systemic renovations, open space classroom conversions, or science classroom renovations. An additional $196 million (32%) has been requested to replace school buildings that can no longer be cost-effectively renovated. A full 91% of the FY 2012 request is therefore for work associated with the deficiencies of existing facilities. While a portion of these requested funds is directed at correcting educational faults in older buildings, there is no question that a large portion is also intended to upgrade building conditions that are deficient. Both the Treasurer's study and the FY 2012 CIP submissions indicate that Maryland's existing schools remain in need of considerable attention.

Maryland's school systems have long-established programs that allow them to identify, prioritize and execute projects that address corrective maintenance and preventive maintenance tasks. However, the resources that are applied to maintenance generally fall far below the levels required:

- Of the $1.86 billion in combined State funds that were approved for CIP projects in FY 2006 through FY 2011, 53% ($993 million) was applied to projects that are primarily renovations or replacements/upgrades of systems at existing schools. This level of State funding represents an extraordinary accomplishment, yet the $2.72 billion in capital requests associated with renovation and systemic renovations of existing schools in these six fiscal years indicates the extent of the need.

- At the local level, there has been a national trend toward reducing the percentage of the total operating budget that is applied to the routine maintenance of schools, for example small carpet replacement and painting tasks, minor repairs, and preventive maintenance items. As the cost of utilities and salaries has increased, the funds available for supplies, materials, and contracted services have consistently declined. Preventive

3 Task Force to Study Public School Facilities: *Final Report*, February 2004: p. 182. In addition, since the standards that were used in the survey were minimum standards and the LEAs typically build schools to a standard higher than minimum, the actual costs to correct deficiencies were likely to be higher than estimated in 2003.

maintenance, the most cost-effective type of maintenance activity, is generally under-funded within shrinking maintenance and operation budgets.[4] Many LEAs have eliminated much needed maintenance positions such as roof inspectors. They are also now reducing safety inspections and oversight at the local level, a situation that could create safety issues in schools as they come to depend more on local fire departments to oversee their safety equipment and procedures. These conditions are aggravated by the current economic situation, which has placed stress on operating budgets at all levels of government.

- Trends in maintenance funding may also be measured by comparing the maintenance budget to the cost of correcting deferred backlog items. Unfortunately, as maintenance budgets have remained level or have been reduced in absolute terms, the size of the backlog of uncorrected deficiencies has tended to grow in many jurisdictions.[5] In part this represents the natural aging of building stock, in which new deficiencies are added annually to the prior list of uncorrected deficiencies. Costs of operations also play a role, in that many maintenance activities are labor intensive and are affected by contractual arrangements concerning staff wages and benefits. Costs of materials can be involved; although in the current economy the costs of construction materials are anticipated to increase,[6] the cost of items associated with routine maintenance are reported to be stable. Weather is also a factor to consider, since many maintenance budgets include items like snow removal and gravel and are consequently impacted by storms of unexpected severity such as those of February 2010. Finally, the maintenance rather than the capital budget is generally involved in small-scale building modifications that are needed to address urgent educational needs, for example the construction of pull-out spaces for small-group instruction in areas of high poverty or in schools that have large numbers of students for whom English is not the primary household language. As educational expectations increase with attention to full day kindergarten and pre-kindergarten, special education, and STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), it is likely that demands on maintenance budgets will also intensify.

- The most pressing need in existing schools appears to be funding for mid-size refurbishment and repair projects. Examples include partial replacement of roof, sidewalk and driveway surfaces, correction of hardware deficiencies, and replacement of playground equipment. Too small to be bondable projects within the capital budget but too large to count as routine operating expenses, these projects are unlikely to be carried out at all unless they are funded through programs like Maryland's Aging School Program (ASP). The State provides 100% of funding for projects in this program, with no local match requirement. The combined ASP funding for FY 06 through FY 11 is

---

4 For example, Anne Arundel County Public Schools saw an increase in its total operating budget of approximately 123% in the period 1990-2005, but the maintenance operation budget increased by only approximately 19%. The maintenance portion of the total operating budget consequently declined from about 3.2% in 1990 to about 1.7% in 2005 (Anne Arundel County Public Schools Budget Task Force, Support Services Sub-Group: "Budget Trending Information," February 19, 2004). This experience is not atypical for other school districts (see Lawrence, op. cit.). *American School and University* reported in April 2005 that M&O budgets for school districts declined from 9.55% of overall district expenditures in 1996 to 7.51% of district expenditures in 2005 (*ASU* does not provide detailed information about which facility factors are included in the percentage figure they provide; since some maintenance figures include utility costs and others do not, there can be considerable variance in the value of the percentage figures that are provided from different sources).

5 Anne Arundel County Public Schools reported in October 2010 that, measured as a percentage of the maintenance backlog, total funding for a broad range of maintenance activities has been reduced from 19% in FY 2007 to 9% in FY 2011. This trend results from an absolute reduction of the maintenance budget from $29.8 million to $19.2 million with a concurrent increase in the backlog from $161 million to $205 million.

6 Gilbane Building Company, "Cost Escalation Brief May 2010", p. 5

$63 million. Applications for the FY 11 funding allocation are still in process; however, with an average project size of approximately $70,000, this combined funding may allow as many as 900 projects to move forward. Projects funded through this program are very popular among facility planners, as they often have a large impact on the visual appeal of a school building and on deferring the need for major renovation work.

Despite the local budgetary limitations noted above, as they enter the fifth year of the revised program the PSCP maintenance inspectors report an increased attention to maintenance at the local level, with efforts to secure appropriate personnel, equipment and supplies combined with initiatives to re-structure local programs to ensure that maintenance is carried out efficiently and competently. By focusing on specific aspects of maintenance, for example roof inspections and interior safety conditions, the Interagency Committee on School Construction's Maintenance Inspection program has contributed to perceptible improvements in the quality of school maintenance.

TABLE A: MAINTENANCE SURVEY RESULTS FISCAL YEARS 1981-2010

NUMBER OF SCHOOL SURVEYS PERFORMED WITH AVERAGE RATINGS AND PERCENTAGES

Fiscal Year	Superior/Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor	Total	
1981	13	80	7	0	100	
1982	25	67	8	2	102	
1983	56	33	14	3	106	
1984	59	30	16	7	112	
1985	28	55	20	4	107	
1986	36	40	19	6	101	
1987	41	44	17	3	105	
1988	54	39	10	0	103	
1989	44	38	15	3	100	
1990	60	35	7	1	103	
1991	53	52	4	1	110	
1992	39	56	7	3	105	
1993	45	52	4	0	101	
1994	41	57	6	0	104	
1995	51	54	1	0	106	
1996	46	49	3	1	99	
1997	51	47	4	0	102	
1998	53	45	3	0	101	
1999	46	55	2	0	103	
2000	47	38	0	0	85	
2001	49	54	0	0	103	
2002	73	19	7	1	100	
2003	94	30	0	0	124	
2004	29	5	3	0	37	
2005	65	29	5	0	99	
2006	59	40	1	0	100	
2007	161	62	10	0	233	(1)
2008	151	89	10	0	250	(2)
2009	69	71	5	0	145	(3), (4)
2010	**130**	**54**	**3**	**0**	187	(3), (5)
Total Ratings	1768	1419	211	35	3433	
Total Percentages	**51.50%**	**41.33%**	**6.15%**	**1.02%**	**100%**	

(1) Increase associated with engagement of two full-time inspectors in the Public School Construction Program.
(2) Includes ten (10) resurveys.
(3) Temporary reduction in number of inspections due to budgetary constraints.
(4) Includes seven (7) resurveys.
(5) Includes five (5) resurveys.

II. THE SURVEY: FISCAL YEAR 2010

A. PROCEDURES AND METHODS

- The FY 2010 surveys were conducted by the IAC's two full time maintenance inspectors. The surveys were performed between August 2009 and June 2010.

- 182 public schools were selected to be surveyed from the 24 school systems throughout the state, and five (5) schools that received a rating of "Not Adequate" in FY 2009 were scheduled for re-inspection.

    - In order to update the existing backlog, the choice of the 182 schools to be inspected this year was largely based on the oldest inspection dates in our records. Most of these schools have not been surveyed since 1998 although a few have not been surveyed since as far back as 1991. The number of schools surveyed this year averaged approximately 13% of each LEA's schools; exclusive of five (5) re-inspections.

    - The 182 schools selected in FY 2010 represent approximately 18,237,247 million square feet of public school space. Some of the buildings date back to the early 20th century, while others were recently constructed. Many have received complete renovations, additions or systemic upgrades.

- After selecting the schools to be surveyed, the inspectors notified each local education agency and scheduled a time and date to meet at the facility. The LEA was usually notified one to two weeks prior to the survey date. The facility maintenance representative or a member of the school staff accompanied the inspector to answer questions and assist with access to secured areas.

- During each survey, the inspector examined 35 different components and building systems, such as roofing, HVAC, electrical equipment and parking lots (see Sample Survey Form, p. 19). An evaluation was made for each category by rating the condition, performance, efficiency, preventive maintenance record and life expectancy of the various components and systems. The inspector's comments were recorded on the survey form.

    - Each of the 35 categories was evaluated and given a rating that ranged from "Poor" to "Superior". Each rating was converted to a numerical score and multiplied by a predetermined factor or "weight". These weights were established by the IAC to indicate the impact that a failed or deficient component could have on life safety or health issues in the facility.

Scoring Levels:

- **Point Range** **Nomenclature**
  96 - 100 - Superior
  86 – 95 - Good
  76 – 85 - Adequate
  66 – 75 - Not Adequate
  0 – 65 - Poor
- **Weighting Values and Description**
  1 - Little direct impact on safety and health
  2 - A serious but not immediate impact on safety and/or health.
  3 - A serious and potentially urgent impact on safety and/or health.

- Care is taken during the survey to ensure that the age or demographics of the school do not affect the survey scores. A number of schools were surveyed in which the level of care and commitment by the school maintenance and custodial staff was high, even though the buildings showed signs of age or were in need of renovation. Although some of these buildings were unequal in appearance compared to newer schools, they were nevertheless well maintained and clean.

➢ Beginning in FY 2008, safety equipment and emergency preparedness plans were closely evaluated at each facility, as well as the accessibility of the Asbestos Management Plan that is required under federal legislation to be present in school facilities. In addition, since regulations require that semi-annual roofing inspections are to be completed and kept on file for the life of the building, LEAs were requested to provide the last three (3) roof surveys. At that time, it was found that many of these surveys were not recorded or had not been performed, creating a concern with regards to the warranty issued by the manufacturers. Warranties must be maintained in order to prevent unnecessary and costly premature replacement of the roof systems. These items were not included in the numerical evaluation of the school but were addressed in the final report to the individual LEAs.

➢ After the surveys were completed for all schools selected in a system, a copy of each survey and a cover letter were sent to the school system's superintendent and facilities maintenance director. Any building system that was rated "Poor" or "Not Adequate" required a follow-up response from the LEA stating either that the problem had been repaired or describing the method of corrective action that was planned in the near future. Responses were required from the LEA within 30 days of receipt of the letter and surveys. Any school that scored an average rating of "Not Adequate" or "Poor" was required to be repaired to an acceptable condition within a 90 day period, at which time a re-inspection was performed.

➢ Once the LEA responses are received and recorded, a list is developed of the follow-up inspections that are to be performed in the following year on schools that received scores of "Not Adequate" or "Poor", or in some cases had a larger number of deficiencies than is typically found. This process allows the PSCP to better evaluate the responsiveness and accuracy of the LEAs in the correction of these deficiencies, as well as determine how efficiently the LEAs are monitoring the overall maintenance of their buildings. The PSCP has found that this practice raises the accountability on the part of the LEAs, assisting the IAC to determine if State funds are being used effectively and if the State's investment in Public School Construction is being well protected. In most cases, deficiencies noted in the surveys were corrected by the time the re-inspections took place; exceptions occurred where funds were not available to carry out needed capital projects, notably in Baltimore City.

B. NEW CONSIDERATIONS: SAFETY CONDITIONS

Although not strictly a subject of maintenance, safety is of paramount importance in schools. As attention to maintenance improves among the LEAs, deficiencies in safety conditions have become increasingly apparent, including poor management of computer wiring, resulting in overloading of power strips and creating potential trip hazards; improper storage of materials in electrical closets; improper storage of chemicals, particularly in high schools; blockage of egress points; use of alkyd paints for routine touch-up; absence of ground fault interrupt (GFI) outlets and presence of power cables near water sources; and lack of appropriate signage for evacuation routes and emergency utility cut-offs. Safety inspections are still not being satisfactorily performed at many buildings. Storage on and in front of ventilation equipment is adding to the premature failure of high dollar HVAC equipment and will eventually create indoor air quality issues. And fire extinguishers are not always receiving monthly inspections by school system staff or annual certification by the fire marshal, as required by code.

It should be noted that the issue of wall hangings presents a genuine dilemma to central office and school administrators. The emphasis on student achievement requires a wide array of teaching material, some of which is best presented as graphic wall hangings. In addition, teachers have an understandable desire to personalize their classrooms and to make them warm, inviting, and stimulating environments. These tendencies can, however, lead to excessive coverage of walls, windows and even exit doors with combustible paper materials. Under the current Fire Code, no more than 20% of the walls in a classroom may be covered with combustible materials. A number of LEAs have developed accommodations with the local fire marshal to address this conflict between educational objectives and compliance with an important life safety matter. It is, however, an issue that has been and will continue to be noted by the PSCP Maintenance Inspectors.

Since most of these safety items are related to day-to-day management of the facility by the principal and staff rather than to maintenance or capital projects, the PSCP has addressed its concerns to the superintendents of the school systems (ASBO Conference, May 24, 2010) as well as to the LEA Facility Maintenance Managers (annual fall statewide conferences). As in FY 2010, during the coming year the PSCP Maintenance Inspection Program will place special emphasis on this issue in order to bring it to the attention of school district superintendents, central office staff, and especially the school principals and school-based operations staff.

C. SURVEY RESULTS

FY 2010 Ratings

The specific ratings of schools surveyed in each school district are shown in Table B "FY 2010 Maintenance Survey Results", pages 14-18.

Of the 187 schools surveyed in FY 2010:

- 32 schools were rated as "Superior"
- 98 schools were rated as "Good"
- 54 schools were rated as "Adequate"
- 3 schools were rated as "Not Adequate"
- No schools were rated as "Poor"

Four Year Trends

By inspecting a substantial number of schools over a four year period using a largely consistent inspection methodology, the PSCP has utilized its database to identify building categories that appear to be consistently well maintained as well as those for which maintenance appears to be insufficient. Certain cautions must be stated, however, in the use of the information:

- *Four years may not be sufficient time to indicate trends.* For a number of items, the results vary widely from year to year, probably as an indication that the ratings were affected by the particular schools selected during the year rather than by overall trends.

- *Fire Safety* (Fire & Safety Equipment, category #24). In this area, the PSCP maintenance inspectors have paid increasing attention to the issues of school management, noted under "Safety Conditions" above, that can increase the potential for fire and the propagation of fire and smoke, and can impair the ability of building occupants to escape injury or death during a fire. Originally, this category covered only fire alarm and sprinkler systems, but has been expanded in the last two years of inspections to include items that depend on the management of the building. Once it was decided to include these items in the maintenance survey, the widespread persistence of the problems led to a sharp decline in scores within this category.

- *New vs. Old Condition.* Certain items that are subject to capital improvements and have received infusions of capital funds are likely to receive better ratings than those that have been deferred for capital funding or can only be corrected through the maintenance and repair portion of the local operating budget. The latter area has been persistently underfunded, see Section C, pages 4-6.

With these cautions in mind, the following items appear to be consistently maintained at a "Good" or "Superior" level of quality in the schools surveyed by the PSCP. These items essentially relate to the visual appearance of the building, and since they involve day-to-day custodial attention rather than major investments of funds, they can generally be managed through in-school staff. It is evident that the majority of school principals and staff take considerable pride in the cleanliness and appearance of their schools.

- Exterior Structural Condition and Exterior Building Appearance
- Interior Appearance and Sanitation
- Floors and Walls
- Playground Equipment. (This may reflect the results of ASP and QZAB funding).
- Interior Doors and Hardware

However, the following categories have received consistent ratings of "Not Adequate" or "Poor" during the four years, or the ratings have declined due to increased surveillance by the Maintenance Inspectors. Several of these items are of particular importance because they relate to the safety and health of building occupants, or have a significant impact on the long-term performance and durability of the building.

- Electrical Distribution and Electrical Service Equipment
- Fire & Safety Equipment
- Rooftop Equipment
- Equipment Rooms and Generator
- Ceilings

Ceilings are a particularly vulnerable area of modern buildings: moisture caused by leaking roofs or flashing, by leaking interior mechanical piping, or by condensation on mechanical piping can lead to unsightly stains or sagging of acoustical ceiling tiles, the standard material found throughout institutional and commercial buildings. More worrisome, however, is the possibility that mold will develop quickly in moisture-laden ceiling tiles, with potential health impacts on building occupants. Identifying and correcting the sources of moisture is critical to good building maintenance, and ceiling tiles must be replaced quickly to prevent the development of mold. This is a highly labor-intensive operation, and the persistently high incidence of "Not Adequate" or "Poor" ratings in this category may reflect on the under-staffing that is typical within school systems. In addition, older ceiling tile may be "hot", i.e. it may contain asbestos, requiring expensive and time-consuming special techniques to remove the affected tiles.

Because of the critical role the roof plays in protecting the interior of every building, special attention is paid by the PSCP Maintenance Inspectors to five inspection categories: Gutters and Downspouts, Roof Conditions, Flashing & Gravel Stop, Roof Drains, and Rooftop Equipment. Skylights, although relatively infrequent in public schools, are also an area of concern due to their tendency to develop leaks. In 2008 the Maintenance Inspectors reported that the IAC requirement for school roofs to be inspected twice a year was not consistently performed in some LEAs. As a result, we determined that this would become an area of concern in the inspections during the following years. Since then, we have observed an improvement in certain aspects of this critical area, but the relatively low numbers of Good and Superior ratings indicates that routine maintenance operations performed by the LEAs need to improve, and larger infusions of capital funds into roofs are required.

By identifying areas of persistent deficiency, the maintenance inspection process allows the PSCP inspectors to give focused attention to specific items during their surveys, while the directors of the PSCP and the members of the IAC can bring the issues to the attention of the local superintendents, local government officials, and the Board of Public Works. This is, we believe, one of the most important benefits that the Maintenance Inspection Program provides to the local educational agencies and the local boards of education.

Note:

The following documents are available from the IAC:

1. Section 800 – Maintenance – *Public School Construction Program Administrative Procedures Guide*
2. The Survey Instruments
3. Comar 23.03.02, Administration of the Public School Construction Program
4. *Maintenance of Public School Facilities in Maryland: Initiatives to Ensure That Maryland's Public Schools Are Adequately Maintained* (Report to the Capital Debt Affordability Committee, August 26, 2005)
5. *Guidelines for Maintenance of Public School Facilities in Maryland* (Interagency Committee on School Construction, May 30, 2008)

For copies, please contact:

Ms. Antoinette James
Public School Construction Program
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
(410) 767-0611

TABLE B: FY 2010 MAINTENANCE SURVEY RESULTS

LEA / School Name	PSC #	School Type	Area (Square Feet)	Rating
Allegany (3)				
Beall Elementary	01.002	Elementary	57,290	Superior
South Penn Elementary	01.021	Elementary	65,036	Good
West Side Elementary	01.017	Elementary	49,300	Superior
			171,626	
Anne Arundel (19)				
Annapolis Middle	02.061	Middle	216,000	Good
Bates Middle	02.037	Middle	145,520	Good
Brock Bridge Elementary	02.093	Elementary	73,113	Adequate
Chesapeake Bay Middle	02.009	Middle	343,446	Adequate
Crofton Middle	02.038	Middle	113,000	Good
Crofton Woods Elementary	02.115	Elementary	81,879	Good
Deale Elementary	02.075	Elementary	53,444	Good
Lake Shore Elementary	02.103	Elementary	63,422	Superior
Linthicum Elementary	02.008	Elementary	71,682	Adequate
MacArthur Middle	02.087	Middle	211,620	Good
Millersville Elementary	02.053	Elementary	45,994	Good
Odenton Elementary	02.048	Elementary	71,302	Superior
Old Mill High	02.002	High	283,194	Adequate
Old Mill Middle North	02.001	Middle	159,635	Adequate
Old Mill Middle South	02.133	Middle	159,635	Adequate
Severn River Middle	02.096	Middle	170,000	Adequate
Southern Middle	02.042	Middle	200,102	Good
Southgate Elementary	02.114	Elementary	45,994	Adequate
Tracey's Elementary	02.101	Elementary	56,640	Superior
			2,565,622	
Baltimore City (17)				
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute #403 **(Re-insp.)**	30.185	High	406,853	Adequate
Belmont Elementary #217	30.214	Elementary	71,568	Good
Canton Building #230	30.166	Middle/High	97,568	Not Adequate
Edmondson High School Building #400A **(Re-insp.)**	30.246	High	213,041	Adequate
Eutaw Marshburn Elementary #011	30.267	Elementary	106,878	Adequate
George Washington Elementary #022	30.177	Elementary	40,211	Superior
Harlem Park Building #078 **(Re-insp.)**	30.274	Middle/High	332,952	Adequate
John Eager Howard Elementary #061	30.034	Elementary	82,293	Good
Lockerman-Bundy Elementary #261	30.067	Elementary	48,600	Adequate
Lois T. Murray Special Ed. PK-8 #313	30.154	Special Ed.	20,725	Adequate
Maree G. Farring PK-8 #203	30.159	PreK-8	46,025	Adequate
Northeast Middle #049 **(Re-insp.)**	30.137	Middle	114,900	Good
Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle Building #133 **(Re-insp.)**	30.147	High	122,417	Adequate
Samuel F. B. Morse Elementary #098	30.054	Elementary	63,205	Adequate
Western High Building #407	30.227	High	289,200	Adequate
William Paca Elementary #083	30.042	Elementary	85,700	Good
William Pinderhughes Building #028	30.129	Elementary	34,757	Good
			2,176,893	
Baltimore County (17)				
Catonsville Middle	03.088	Middle	95,235	Good
Deer Park Middle Magnet	03.147	Middle	161,107	Adequate
Dumbarton Middle	03.049	Middle	149,455	Good

TABLE B: FY 2010 MAINTENANCE SURVEY RESULTS

LEA / School Name	PSC #	School Type	Area (Square Feet)	Rating
Baltimore County (continued)				
Halethorpe Elementary	03.005	Elementary	50,355	Adequate
Hereford High	03.094	High	194,883	Adequate
Lansdowne Middle	03.084	Middle	120,700	Good
Norwood Elementary	03.155	Elementary	56,285	Adequate
Oliver Beach Elementary	03.079	Elementary	50,400	Good
Owings Mills High	03.073	Middle	176,810	Good
Padonia Elementary	03.069	Elementary	46,960	Good
Parkville High	03.121	High	273,013	Adequate
Perry Hall Elementary	03.070	Elementary	63,680	Good
Prettyboy Elementary	03.013	Elementary	57,464	Superior
Sandalwood Elementary	03.034	Elementary	76,950	Good
Southwest Academy	03.176	Middle	136,000	Good
Victory Villa Elementary	03.057	Elementary	47,525	Good
Westowne Elementary	03.159	Elementary	58,520	Good
			1,815,342	
Calvert (5)				
Calvert High	04.003	High	138,369	Adequate
Hunting Creek Alternative	04.027	Special Ed.	6,977	Good
Northern Middle	04.006	Middle	88,780	Good
Plum Point Middle	04.017	Middle	101,300	Good
Southern Middle	04.009	Middle	106,260	Superior
			441,686	
Caroline (1)				
Col. Richardson Middle	05.010	Middle	66,600	Superior
			66,600	
Carroll (7)				
Carroll County Career & Technology Center	06.032	Career Tech	112,190	Good
Liberty High	06.019	High	156,000	Good
Mechanicsville Elementary	06.007	Elementary	74,526	Good
Mt. Airy Middle	06.026	Middle	75,800	Good
Northwest Middle	06.002	Middle	113,600	Good
Sandymount Elementary	06.005	Elementary	61,521	Superior
Westminster East Middle	06.004	Middle	120,400	Good
			714,037	
Cecil (5)				
Bohemia Manor Middle/High	07.027	Middle/High	136,024	Good
Cecilton Elementary	07.031	Elementary	35,321	Superior
Holly Hall Elementary	07.037	Elementary	61,711	Superior
Kenmore Elementary	07.021	Elementary	35,225	Good
Leeds Elementary	07.041	Elementary	40,414	Superior
			308,695	
Charles (6)				
Dr. James Craik Elementary	8.001	Elementary	59,000	Superior
Gale-Bailey Elementary	8.029	Elementary	51,422	Good
La Plata High	8.013	High	174,318	Adequate
Maurice J. McDonough High	8.009	High	174,315	Good
Piccowaxen Middle	8.015	Middle	83,032	Superior

TABLE B: FY 2010 MAINTENANCE SURVEY RESULTS

LEA / School Name	PSC #	School Type	Area (Square Feet)	Rating
Charles (continued)				
Westlake High	8.031	High	186,500	Superior
			728,587	
Dorchester (1)				
Dorchester Co.Vo-Tech	09.008	Career Tech	49,600	Adequate
			49,600	
Frederick (11)				
Brunswick Elementary	10.025	Elementary	60,205	Good
Brunswick Middle	10.055	Middle	119,539	Good
Career & Technology Center	10.026	Career Tech	86,681	Good
Emmitsburg Elementary	10.006	Elementary	45,080	Good
Middletown Middle	10.010	Middle	114,974	Good
New Market Middle	10.031	Middle	114,936	Good
Oakdale Elementary	10.062	Elementary	71,706	Superior
Oakdale Middle	10.063	Middle	109,089	Superior
Urbana Elementary	10.022	Elementary	64,133	Good
Walkersville Elementary	10.002	Elementary	54,454	Good
Walkersville Middle	10.045	Middle	119,353	Good
			960,150	
Garrett (3)				
Broad Ford Elementary	11.006	Elementary	54,000	Good
Dennett Road Elementary	11.010	Elementary	48,861	Good
Kitzmiller Elementary	11.018	Elementary	18,865	Good
			121,726	
Harford (8)				
Aberdeen Middle	12.006	Middle	196,800	Adequate
Dublin Elementary	12.027	Elementary	44,385	Superior
Edgewood Middle	12.014	Middle	166,530	Good
Fallston High	12.001	High	233,500	Good
Jarrettsville Elementary	12.017	Elementary	61,275	Superior
Magnolia Middle	12.021	Middle	149,100	Adequate
N. Harford Middle	12.007	Middle	173,728	Superior
Youth's Benefit Elementary	12.011	Elementary	96,616	Good
			1,121,934	
Howard (12)				
Burleigh Manor Middle	13.046	Middle	102,663	Good
Bushy Park Elementary	13.085	Elementary	116,818	Good
Glenelg High	13.061	High	211,415	Good
Hammond Middle	13.076	Middle	86,000	Good
Harpers Choice Middle	13.003	Middle	79,220	Good
Laurel Woods Elementary	13.065	Elementary	60,718	Good
Lisbon Elementary	13.004	Elementary	55,999	Good
Mayfield Woods Middle	13.045	Middle	100,894	Superior
Mount View Middle	13.049	Middle	106,736	Superior
Oakland Mills High	13.002	High	204,578	Good
Oakland Mills Middle	13.008	Middle	81,036	Good
Patuxent Valley Middle	13.041	Middle	98,014	Good
			1,304,091	

TABLE B: FY 2010 MAINTENANCE SURVEY RESULTS

LEA / School Name	PSC #	School Type	Area (Square Feet)	Rating
Kent (1)				
Kent County High	14.007	High	189,626	Superior
			189,626	
Montgomery (24)				
Bradley Hills Elementary	15.145	Elementary	42,368	Good
Broad Acres Elementary	15.035	Elementary	88,922	Good
Burtonsville Elementary	15.052	Elementary	71,349	Adequate
Damascus Elementary	15.103	Elementary	53,239	Adequate
Dr. Martin Luther, Jr. King Middle	15.198	Middle	135,867	Good
Dufief Elementary	15.105	Elementary	59,013	Adequate
Gaithersburg Middle	15.068	Middle	157,694	Adequate
Glenallan Elementary	15.054	Elementary	47,614	Good
John T. Baker Middle	15.182	Middle	120,532	Good
Mark Twain Facility	15.224	Special Ed.	85,400	Good
Neelsville Middle	15.136	Middle	131,432	Good
Olney Elementary	15.093	Elementary	68,755	Good
Paint Branch High	15.211	High	260,680	Adequate
Pine Crest Elementary	15.036	Elementary	53,778	Good
Poolesville Elementary	15.137	Elementary	64,803	Adequate
Redland Middle	15.238	Middle	111,697	Adequate
Ritchie Park Elementary	15.139	Elementary	58,500	Good
Stonegate Elementary	15.252	Elementary	52,468	Good
Washington Grove Elementary	15.146	Elementary	86,266	Superior
Weller Road Elementary	15.061	Elementary	76,296	Good
William Farquhar Middle	15.197	Middle	116,300	Adequate
Wood Acres Elementary	15.060	Elementary	73,138	Good
Woodlin Elementary	15.011	Elementary	60,725	Good
Wyngate Elementary	15.075	Elementary	58,654	Good
			2,135,490	
Prince George's (24)				
Apple Grove Elementary	16.057	Elementary	51,842	Adequate
Arrowhead Elementary	16.074	Elementary	59,923	Good
Avalon Elementary	16.019	Elementary	45,027	Good
Brandywine Elementary	16.088	Elementary	58,155	Good
C. Elizabeth Rieg	16.041	Special Ed.	45,132	Good
Chillum Elementary	16.090	Elementary	44,946	Adequate
Clinton Grove Elementary	16.053	Elementary	44,379	Adequate
Dwight D. Eisenhower Middle	16.008	Middle	139,951	Not Adequate
Eugene Burroughs Middle	16.005	Middle	126,286	Adequate
Friendly High	16.046	High	236,861	Adequate
Glenarden Woods Elementary	16.239	Elementary	52,061	Good
H.B. Owens Science Center	16.034	Science	27,400	Good
James E. Duckworth Special Education	16.042	Special Ed.	41,480	Adequate
John Hanson Elementary/Middle	16.128	Elementary/Middle	110,413	Adequate
Kettering Middle	16.043	Middle	120,800	Good
Largo High	16.011	High	243,581	Adequate
Laurel Elementary	16.009	Elementary	59,444	Good
Laurel High	16.014	High	299,764	Adequate
Northwestern High	16.072	High	355,000	Good

TABLE B: FY 2010 MAINTENANCE SURVEY RESULTS

LEA / School Name	PSC #	School Type	Area (Square Feet)	Rating
Prince George's (continued)				
Oxon Hill High	16.082	High	243,048	Adequate
Patuxent Elementary	16.209	Elementary	58,579	Good
Stephen Decatur Middle	16.143	Middle	120,070	Adequate
Tayac Elementary	16.023	Elementary	47,858	Not Adequate
Thomas Pullen Elementary/Middle	16.122	Elementary/Middle	110,422	Adequate
			2,742,422	
Queen Anne's (2)				
Centreville Middle	17.004	Middle	86,230	Good
Stevensville Middle	17.006	Middle	86,670	Adequate
			172,900	
St. Mary's (4)				
Green Holly Elementary	18.022	Elementary	104,375	Adequate
Leonardtown Middle	18.001	Middle	104,750	Adequate
Oakville Elementary	18.011	Elementary	48,072	Good
Ridge Elementary	18.006	Elementary	32,537	Superior
			289,734	
Somerset (1)				
Princess Anne Elementary	19.010	Elementary	43,774	Adequate
			43,774	
Talbot (1)				
St. Michaels Elementary	20.001	Elementary	80,581	Superior
			80,581	
Washington (8)				
Boonsboro High	21.001	High	140,486	Good
Bester Elementary	21.021	Elementary	67,248	Good
Smithsburg High	21.026	High	116,269	Good
Williamsport Elementary	21.029	Elementary	64,112	Good
Williamsport High	21.031	High	150,139	Good
Old Forge Elementary	21.035	Elementary	40,777	Good
Smithsburg Elementary	21.036	Elementary	48,587	Superior
Potomac Heights Elementary	21.044	Elementary	37,347	Superior
			664,965	
Wicomico (5)				
Bennett Middle	22.021	Middle	129,335	Adequate
Fruitland Intermediate	22.017	Elementary	43,712	Superior
Fruitland Primary	22.016	Elementary	56,308	Superior
Pinehurst Elementary	22.002	Elementary	76,224	Superior
Wicomico Middle	22.015	Middle	135,750	Adequate
			441,329	
Worcester (2)				
Snow Hill Elementary	23.008	Elementary	40,500	Good
Stephen Decatur Middle	23.014	Middle	79,500	Good
			120,000	
Total Number of Schools Inspected: 187	**Total square footage inspected: 19,427,410 square feet**			

PUBLIC SCHOOL INSPECTION REPORT

School Name & PSC Number: _____ Inspection Date(s): _____

Address: _____ Inspector(s): _____

County/City: _____ LEA Rep.: _____

	SITE/ ITEM:	WGT	A SUPERIOR 96-100	B GOOD 86-95	C ADEQUATE 76-85	D NOT ADEQUATE 66-75	E POOR <65	F N/A
1	ROADWAYS & PARKING LOTS	1						
2	SITE APPEARANCE	1						
3	SITE UTILITIES, MARKED & SECURE	2						
4	EXTERIOR BUILDING APPEARANCE	1						
5	PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT	1						
6	EXT. STRUCTURAL CONDITION	3						
7	GUTTERS & DOWNSPOUTS	2						
8	WINDOWS & CAULKING	2						
9	SIDEWALKS	1						
10	ENTRYWAYS & EXTERIOR DOORS	3						
11	ROOF CONDITIONS	3						
12	FLASHING & GRAVEL STOP	2						
13	ROOF DRAINS	2						
14	ROOFTOP EQUIP.(FANS,TOWER,COND)	2						
15	SKYLIGHTS & MONITORS	2						
16	INT. APPEARANCE & SANITATION	2						
17	FLOORS	2						
18	WALLS	1						
19	INTERIOR DOORS & HARDWARE	2						
20	CEILINGS	1						
21	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION	3						
22	ELECTRICAL SERVICE EQUIPMENT	3						
23	LIGHTING - LAMPS / BALLASTS	2						
24	FIRE & SAFETY EQUIPMENT	3						
25	EQUIPMENT ROOMS & GENERATOR	2						
26	BOILERS, WATER HEATERS	3						
27	AIR CONDITIONING (CHILLERS/PUMPS	1						
28	VENTILATION EQUIP. (AHU'S - FANS)	3						
29	FCU'S / RADIATORS/ WALL UNITS	2						
30	STEAM DISTRIBUTION	2						
31	HOT WATER DISTRIBUTION	2						
32	CHILLED WATER DISTRIBUTION	1						
33	PLUMBING / BATHROOM FIXTURES	3						
34	INTERIOR SUB. STRUCTURE	3						
35	VERTICAL CONVEYANCE SYSTEMS	1						
36	TOTAL ITEMS PER CATEGORY	70						
37	FACTOR		95	85	75	65	55	
38	SUBTOTALS							
39	TOTAL SUM (LINE 38)							
40	MAXIMUM POSSIBLE ITEMS EVALUATED							70
41	LESS ITEMS NOT APPLICABLE (36F)							
42	TOTAL ITEMS EVALUATED							70
43	TOTAL SCORE (LINE 39 DIVIDED BY LINE 42)							
44	ADJUSTMENT (Add 5 Points to make percentage equivalent)							+ 5
45	OVERALL RATING (percentage equivalent)					Good		5
46	Asbestos Management Plan: yes no				Emergency Preparedness Plan: yes no			

PUBLIC SCHOOL INSPECTION REPORT - COMMENTS

School Name & LEA Number: _____ **Sq. Footage:** _____

Report Date(s): _____ **Year Const. :** _____

	SITE/ITEM	RATING	COMMENTS	Response Requested
1	ROADWAYS & PARKING LOTS			
	LEA Response:			
2	SITE APPEARANCE			
	LEA Response:			
3	SITE UTILITIES, MARKED & SECURE			
	LEA Response:			
4	EXTERIOR BUILDING APPEARANCE			
	LEA Response:			
5	PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT			
	LEA Response:			
6	EXT. STRUCTURAL CONDITION			
	LEA Response:			
7	GUTTERS & DOWNSPOUTS			
	LEA Response:			
8	WINDOWS & CAULKING			
	LEA Response:			
9	SIDEWALKS			
	LEA Response:			
10	ENTRYWAYS & EXTERIOR DOORS			
	LEA Response:			
11	ROOF CONDITIONS			
	LEA Response:			
12	FLASHING & GRAVEL STOP			
	LEA Response:			
13	ROOF DRAINS			
	LEA Response:			
14	ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT			
	LEA Response:			
15	SKYLIGHTS & MONITORS			
	LEA Response:			
16	INT. APPEARANCE & SANITATION			
	LEA Response:			
17	FLOORS			
	LEA Response:			
18	WALLS			
	LEA Response:			
19	INTERIOR DOORS & HARDWARE			
	LEA Response:			
20	CEILINGS			
	LEA Response:			
21	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION			
	LEA Response:			
22	ELECTRICAL SERVICE EQUIPMENT			
	LEA Response:			
23	LIGHTING - LAMPS/ BALLASTS			
	LEA Response:			
24	FIRE & SAFETY EQUIPMENT			
	LEA Response:			
25	EQUIPMENT ROOMS, GENERATOR			
	LEA Response:			
26	BOILERS, WATER HEATERS			
	LEA Response:			
27	AIR CONDITIONING			
	LEA Response:			
28	VENTILATION EQUIPMENT			
	LEA Response:			
29	FCU'S/RADIATORS/WALL UNITS			
	LEA Response:			
30	STEAM DISTRIBUTION			
	LEA Response:			

PUBLIC SCHOOL INSPECTION REPORT - COMMENTS

School Name & LEA Number: _____ **Sq. Footage:** _____

Report Date(s): _____ **Year Const. :** _____

31	HOT WATER DISTRIBUTION			
	LEA Response:			
32	CHILLED WATER DISTRIBUTION			
	LEA Response:			
33	PLUMBING			
	LEA Response:			
34	INT., SUB., STRUCT.			
	LEA Response:			
35	VERTICAL CONVEYANCE SYSTEM			
	LEA Response:			

FY 2010 MAINTENANCE SURVEY RESULTS: A DISTRICT-BY-DISTRICT OVERVIEW

The following reports provide an overview of maintenance surveys conducted at selected schools in each Maryland public school system. Each report provides general information about the school system, a listing of the schools that were surveyed, and a brief narrative highlighting important aspects of the school system's maintenance program.

Note: The definition of "Adjusted Age" of a school facility, found in the second column of the charts on the following pages, is the averaged age of the total square footage. For the purposes of calculating the Adjusted Age, renovated square footage is generally treated as new. The "original existing square footage" as used in the following pages refers to the date of first construction. This is to demonstrate that our older schools are being retained and are well looked after.

Individual school reports are available on request.
Please contact Ms. Shariece Marine at 410-767-0617.

Allegany County

Three elementary schools were inspected in September 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1940 to 1978 with an adjusted building age ranging from 32 to 34 years. The last inspections performed on these schools were in 2000 and 2001. No major deficiencies were noted during inspections. These buildings appear to have been well maintained throughout the years indicating that extremely good maintenance practices are in place and that the age of a school facility should not be a barrier to superior maintenance quality.

Westside Elementary

- 22 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1983
- 3 schools inspected: 3 Elementary
- Results:
  - ✓2 Superior
  - ✓1 Good
  - ✓0 Adequate
  - ✓0 Not Adequate
  - ✓0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (95.34)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Beall E.	34	Superior	22	7	0	1	0
2. South Penn E.	32	Good	17	15	2	0	0
3. West Side E.	33	Superior	18	12	2	0	0
Totals			57	34	4	1	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			59%	35%	4%	1%	0%

Anne Arundel County

Nineteen schools were inspected in February and March 2010. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1930 to 2010, with an adjusted building age ranging from 1 to 46 years. Comments in three areas stood out in the survey reports for Anne Arundel County this year: preventive maintenance of roofs, electrical distribution and capacity, and certification of fire extinguishers throughout the system.

Although school system roof inspectors are now receiving formal training through a reputable roofing firm, there are signs that additional improvements to preventive maintenance can be made. Anne Arundel County schools can significantly reduce or eliminate the excessive use of power cords and power strips both through good school management and by increasing capital upgrades of electrical service and distribution in older schools. Most importantly, as found in previous surveys of Anne Arundel County schools, fire extinguishers are not receiving annual inspection, certification and service by a licensed provider as required by code, a condition that was first identified in surveys two years ago. Although extinguishers are typically receiving monthly visual inspections by onsite staff, the lack of annual recertification needs to be remedied.

Although three of the nineteen schools surveyed this year are either undergoing a renovation/addition project or have had one in the last two years, the average age of square feet in Anne Arundel's school buildings is currently 30 years and many of its schools are that age or greater. Odenton Elementary School, shown in the photo, was first constructed as a 10,748 square foot school in 1930 and grew through addition/renovation projects in 1961 and 1991 to 71,302 square feet. It is an excellent example of an older well-maintained school in an existing neighborhood, having received a "Superior" rating this year for maintenance.

Odenton Elementary

- 123 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1980
- 19 schools inspected: 9 Elementary, 9 Middle, 1 High
- Results:
  - ✓ 3 Superior
  - ✓ 8 Good
  - ✓ 8 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (87.96)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Annapolis M.	46	Good	9	15	4	2	1
2. Bates M.	31	Good	9	12	4	5	0
3. Brock Bridge E.	40	Adequate	3	18	8	1	1
4. Chesapeake Bay M.	34	Adequate	1	13	10	7	1
5. Crofton M.	26	Good	11	13	4	1	0
6. Crofton Woods E.	35	Good	9	14	5	2	0
7. Deale E.	26	Good	19	7	3	1	1
8. Lake Shore E.	1	Superior	27	5	0	1	0
9. Linthicum E.	39	Adequate	3	12	11	2	2
10. MacArthur M.	43	Good	4	17	8	1	0
11. Millersville E.	45	Good	5	12	9	3	0
12. Odenton E.	19	Superior	20	10	1	0	0
13. Old Mill H.	35	Adequate	1	10	13	7	0
14. Old Mill M. North	35	Adequate	1	12	12	6	0
15. Old Mill M. South	35	Adequate	2	11	12	6	0
16. Severn River M.	36	Adequate	5	11	8	5	0
17. Southern M.	21	Good	18	7	3	4	0
18. Southgate E.	41	Adequate	4	4	18	0	0
19. Tracey's E.	3	Superior	27	2	0	0	0
Totals			178	205	133	54	6
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			31%	36%	23%	9%	1%

Baltimore City

Seventeen schools were inspected in January and March 2010, including five re-inspections that were performed on schools receiving "Not Adequate" ratings in FY 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1926 to 2000 with an adjusted building age ranging from 20 to 48 years. All except three of the schools have an adjusted building age greater than 30 years, with seven having an adjusted building age between 43 and 48 years, representative of the aging infrastructure of Baltimore City Schools.

The re-inspections revealed that most deficiencies had been repaired as reported although larger repairs, equipment replacements, and site work items were deferred due to the lack of sufficient funds. Safety items and vandalism problems plague these schools; more involvement is needed by the administrators, faculty, staff and community members to find a solution to this pernicious problem in order to make the buildings safe for the students and staff that use them.

As Baltimore City Schools continues to evaluate the academic needs of its students through its 2010 Expanding Great Options Program, it is in the process of restructuring programs and relocating schools among its many educational facilities. This presents a challenge in determining where best to concentrate facility improvement efforts; however, improvements have been made over the last few years in identifying needs, correcting identified deficiencies, and implementing preventive maintenance. Baltimore City has the oldest school facility infrastructure in the State.

Belmont Elementary

- 168 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1971
- 17 schools inspected: 8 Elementary, 1 PK-8, 1 Middle, 2 Middle/High, 4 High, 1 Special Ed.
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 5 Good
  - ✓ 10 Adequate
  - ✓ 1 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Adequate (84.73)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Baltimore Polytechnic Institute #403 **(Re-inspection)**	43	Adequate	0	9	21	2	1
2. Belmont E. #217	48	Good	7	14	5	5	0
3. Canton Building #230	28	Not Adequate	0	0	12	11	7
4. Edmondson H. School Bldg. #400A **(Re-inspection)**	48	Adequate	2	8	16	4	1

5. Eutaw Marshburn E. #011	43	Adequate	4	9	13	5	0
6. George Washington E. #022	20	Superior	15	15	0	0	0
7. Harlem Park Building #078 **(Re-inspection)**	47	Adequate	3	14	11	3	1
8. John Eager Howard E. #061	43	Good	8	20	2	2	0
9. Lockerman-Bundy E. #261	32	Adequate	0	11	14	6	0
10. Lois T. Murray Special Ed. PK-8 #313	31	Adequate	4	8	13	3	0
11. Maree G. Farring PK-8 #203	31	Adequate	6	14	5	6	0
12. Northeast M. #049 **(Re-inspection)**	33	Good	2	20	8	1	0
13. Paul Laurence Dunbar M. #133 **(Re-inspection)**	27	Adequate	2	16	10	3	0
14. Samuel F. B. Morse E. #098	31	Adequate	4	11	13	4	0
15. Western High Building #407	43	Adequate	1	13	12	4	0
16. William Paca E. #083	31	Good	7	11	9	2	1
17. William Pinderhughes Building #028	37	Good	2	12	7	1	0
Totals			67	205	171	62	11
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			13%	40%	33%	12%	2%

Baltimore County

Seventeen schools were inspected in June 2010. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1931 to 2010 with an adjusted building age ranging from 2 to 42 years. As reported for the last two years, inspections of Baltimore County schools reveal improper storage of teaching materials, files, furniture and other items in half of the surveyed schools, in some cases blocking emergency egress, as well as equipment stored in mechanical and electrical rooms in violation of code requirements. This suggests a need for additional safety inspections by school system staff and onsite training by facilities personnel.

Nearly all of the surveyed schools are in need of additional electrical outlets in classrooms and computer areas to eliminate the excessive use of multiple electrical powerstrips and extension cords, which present both potential tripping hazards and overloading of electrical circuits. Moreover, this particular deficiency was found in at least four middle schools that had recently received limited renovations, including electrical service upgrades. Given the relatively small cost to correct this serious deficiency, particularly when other upgrades are being performed and when life safety is involved, it will be expected that future limited renovation and renovation projects include an analysis of existing electrical distribution and that upgrades will be made as warranted.

The buildings in this system are receiving a high level of building system replacements and repairs as well as a steady upgrade of major equipment. The surveyed buildings were in good condition overall but would benefit from a concerted effort to address the issues noted above.

Prettyboy Elementary

- 166 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1981
- 17 schools inspected: 9 Elementary, 6 Middle, 2 High
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 11 Good
  - ✓ 5 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (88.91)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Catonsville M.	2	Good	17	8	4	1	0
2. Deer Park M. Magnet	17	Adequate	2	12	10	5	0
3. Dumbarton M.	30	Good	13	7	7	4	0
4. Halethorpe E.	20	Adequate	3	13	7	8	0
5. Hereford H.	18	Adequate	2	18	6	5	0
6. Lansdowne M.	21	Good	10	8	8	3	0
7. Norwood E.	31	Adequate	3	15	7	4	0
8. Oliver Beach E.	29	Good	16	6	5	3	0

9. Owings Mills H.	31	Good	10	18	3	2	0
10. Padonia E.	25	Good	15	11	1	3	0
11. Parkville H.	42	Adequate	3	14	9	7	0
12. Perry Hall E.	20	Good	12	11	5	2	0
13. Prettyboy E.	33	Superior	20	11	1	0	0
14. Sandalwood E.	37	Good	14	6	7	2	1
15. Southwest Academy	2	Good	11	10	6	2	1
16. Victory Villa E.	36	Good	15	12	2	0	0
17. Westowne E.	32	Good	9	13	5	3	0
Totals			175	193	93	54	2
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			34%	37%	18%	10%	0%

Calvert County

Five schools were inspected in November 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1944 to 1996, with an adjusted building age ranging from 18 to 60 years. Consistent with prior year ratings, one of the five surveyed schools received a "Superior" rating. Excellence in overall maintenance and good planning for replacement of systems can be credited for these results. Construction to replace an aging Calvert High School, except for the gymnasium which will remain and be renovated, began in 2010.

Calvert High

- 26 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1988
- 5 schools inspected: 3 Middle, 1 High, 1 Special Education
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 3 Good
  - ✓ 1 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (91.48)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Calvert H.	34	Adequate	1	12	12	6	0
2. Hunting Creek Alternative	60	Good	10	8	11	1	0
3. Northern M.	34	Good	12	16	2	0	0
4. Plum Point M.	18	Good	20	10	1	1	0
5. Southern M.	25	Superior	23	4	2	0	0
Totals			66	50	28	8	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			43%	33%	18%	5%	0%

Caroline County

One school was inspected in January 2010. Original existing square footage at this school dates to 1962, but the facility has an adjusted building age of 3 years due to recent improvements. This building received a complete renovation and an additional 2,200 square foot wellness center addition in 2007. Improvements at that time included a new geothermal heating and cooling system which is operating perfectly. This school is in fine condition except for a few roof leaks which needed attention at the time of the survey. The 11-13 year old roof should receive frequent monitoring and repairs should be made immediately upon detection to prevent any potential damage to this nicely refurbished school.

Colonel Richardson Middle

- 10 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1987
- 1 school inspected: 1 Middle
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 0 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Superior (97.05)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Col. Richardson M.	3	Superior	26	1	1	2	0
Totals			26	1	1	2	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			87%	3%	3%	7%	0%

Carroll County

Seven schools were inspected in October 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1936 to 2007, with an adjusted building age ranging from 15 to 43 years. Schools inspected this fiscal year show the effects of good maintenance, supporting previous State observations of consistent and responsible maintenance practices across the school system. It is evident that the school facilities department places great emphasis on this area. Schools would additionally benefit from increased staff awareness and administrative oversight of proper and safe storage practices and removal of unwanted furniture and equipment, an issue commented on in previous surveys of this and other LEA schools.

Westminster East Middle

- 43 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1988
- 7 schools inspected: 1 Career Tech, 2 Elementary, 1 High, and 3 Middle
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 6 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (92.49)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Carroll County Career & Technology	38	Good	12	15	1	0	0
2. Liberty H.	30	Good	17	14	1	1	0
3. Mechanicsville E.	15	Good	16	13	4	0	0
4. Mt. Airy M.	43	Good	16	6	7	1	0
5. Northwest M.	34	Good	5	15	9	2	0
6. Sandymount E.	18	Superior	27	3	0	0	0
7. Westminster East M.	34	Good	2	18	10	2	0
Totals			95	84	32	6	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			44%	39%	15%	3%	0%

Cecil County

Five schools were inspected in October 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools, including additions, dates from 1939 to 2006, with an adjusted building age ranging from 10 to 39 years. The maintenance, care and upkeep of schools in Cecil County is exceptional, as demonstrated by the "Superior" ratings received by 10 of the 15 schools surveyed over the last 4 years. For each of the 5 schools surveyed this year more than 50% of the square footage is original, dating between 1939 and 1985, with other portions built in 1963 and earlier having received renovations. The survey results are a testament to this school system's commitment to maintaining their investment and providing pleasant, well-kept environments for student learning.

Holly Hall Elementary

- 29 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1987
- 5 schools inspected: 4 Elementary, 1 Middle/High
- Results:
  - ✓ 3 Superior
  - ✓ 2 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Superior (96.04)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Bohemia Manor M/H	15	Good	14	13	2	0	0
2. Cecilton E.	12	Superior	21	9	0	0	0
3. Holly Hall E.	10	Superior	29	2	0	0	0
4. Kenmore E.	24	Good	19	10	1	1	0
5. Leeds E.	39	Superior	21	8	1	0	0
Totals			104	42	4	1	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			69%	28%	3%	1%	0%

Charles County

Six schools were inspected in December 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1969 to 1992 with an adjusted building age ranging from 18 to 36 years. It is commendable that Charles County received a "Superior" rating for three of the six schools inspected. This is also noteworthy because, except for Westlake High School which is 18 years old and the small additions at Gale-Bailey Elementary School, all of the square footage at the surveyed schools is over 30 years old.

However, all schools inspected this year had poorly maintained records for their asbestos management plans. To be in compliance, records must be either updated and/or paperwork must be filed or completed. All schools also needed proper organization of emergency preparedness diagrams and postings as well as safety inspections for the fire prevention equipment and emergency shut off location signage.

This school system has placed great emphasis on building new capacity rather than renovating existing facilities. While it is commendable that the schools are well maintained despite their age, the efficiency and economy of maintenance activities would improve if the capital program were more evenly balanced between new and existing facilities.

Westlake High

- 37 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1988
- 6 schools inspected: 2 Elementary, 1 Middle, and 3 High
- Results:
  - ✓ 3 Superior
  - ✓ 2 Good
  - ✓ 1 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (92.38)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Dr. James Craik E.	36	Superior	24	6	0	0	0
2. Gale-Bailey E.	36	Good	8	14	6	1	0
3. La Plata H.	31	Adequate	4	17	4	4	1
4. Maurice J. McDonough H.	33	Good	7	14	9	3	0
5. Piccowaxen M.	33	Superior	29	1	0	0	0
6. Westlake H.	18	Superior	22	8	0	1	0
Totals			94	60	19	9	1
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			51%	33%	10%	5%	1%

Dorchester County

One school was inspected in September 2009. Original existing square footage at this school, the current Dorchester School of Technology, dates from 1976 with a small amount of area added in 1985, resulting in an adjusted building age of 33 years. This facility is being replaced with the new Dorchester Career and Technology Center, scheduled to open in Fall 2011 on the same site as the existing school and adjacent to Cambridge-South Dorchester High School. Of note, the new school will be the fifth geothermal HVAC installation in Dorchester County, which has been a leader in the use of this cost-effective and eco-friendly technology. This facility will be used for a new purpose once a replacement school on the same site is completed.

Dorchester County Vo-Tech

- 14 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1984
- 1 school inspected: 1 Career Tech
- Results:
  - ✓ 0 Superior
  - ✓ 0 Good
  - ✓ 1 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Adequate (85.26)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Dorchester Co. Vo-Tech	33	Adequate	5	7	13	2	0
Totals			5	7	13	2	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			19%	26%	48%	7%	0%

Frederick County

Eleven schools were inspected in October and November 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1952 to 2006, with an adjusted building age ranging from 8 to 44 years. Noticeable improvements have been made in the last few years in overall maintenance and custodial upkeep of Frederick County schools, particularly in regard to roofs and to testing and certification of fire suppression equipment. Important issues such as clutter and unsafe storage are areas that still need attention at the administration level. This school system consistently submits for State approval a well-conceived and balanced capital improvement plan of new schools and additions to meet their growth needs, as well as renovations and small systemic projects to enhance and maintain their older existing schools. The system demonstrates good planning by identifying specific projects of all types for future years.

Middletown Middle

- 68 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1986
- 11 schools inspected: 5 Elementary, 5 Middle, 1 Career Tech
- Results:
  - ✓ 2 Superior
  - ✓ 9 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (90.93)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Brunswick E.	31	Good	8	16	5	2	0
2. Brunswick M.	14	Good	21	4	3	2	0
3. Career & Technology Ctr.	30	Good	5	19	4	2	0
4. Emmitsburg E.	36	Good	13	11	6	1	0
5. Middletown M.	42	Good	11	16	3	2	1
6. New Market M.	31	Good	18	11	2	1	0
7. Oakdale E.	9	Superior	23	7	0	1	0
8. Oakdale M.	8	Superior	29	1	0	1	0
9. Urbana E.	44	Good	3	19	3	3	0
10. Walkersville E.	36	Good	4	12	13	1	0
11. Walkersville M.	34	Good	6	13	5	6	1
Totals			141	129	44	22	2
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			42%	38%	13%	7%	1%

Garrett County

Three schools were inspected in September 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1923 to 1979 with an adjusted building age ranging from 32 to 54 years. These schools were in good overall condition, although some modernization is needed. Custodial maintenance and onsite upkeep are very good. Of special note, Kitzmiller Elementary School, originally constructed in 1923 with a 1957 addition, is a fine example of an older facility that has been well maintained even when significant capital improvements are needed.

Kitzmiller Elementary

- 16 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1986
- 3 schools inspected: 3 Elementary
- Results:
  - ✓ 0 Superior
  - ✓ 3 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected school: **Good (93.01)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Broad Ford E.	34	Good	13	13	1	1	0
2. Dennett Road E.	32	Good	4	22	3	0	0
3. Kitzmiller E.	54	Good	18	12	0	2	0
Totals			35	47	4	3	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			39%	53%	5%	3%	0%

Harford County

Eight schools were inspected in November and December 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 13 to 69 years with an adjusted building age ranging from 23 to 42 years. The maintenance at the schools inspected this year shows a large improvement from past years. However, schools would benefit in general from greater administrative oversight where excessive storage and safety issues are involved, and safety inspections should be performed more often. One particular item of concern is a structural issue at Magnolia Middle School, where shear cracks in walls and shifting of sections of concrete block have occurred in the Auxiliary Gym. Harford County Public Schools has reported that initial investigation by a structural engineer has determined that the cracks are caused by a lack of vertical control joints in the original construction, but there is no immediate danger to building occupants. Additional engineering is being performed and repairs will be made in summer 2011.

Dublin Elementary

- 53 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1988
- 8 schools inspected: 3 Elementary, 4 Middle, 1 High
- Results:
  - ✓ 3 Superior
  - ✓ 3 Good
  - ✓ 2 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools **Good (90.59)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Aberdeen M.	37	Adequate	4	8	12	5	1
2. Dublin E.	23	Superior	21	10	0	0	0
3. Edgewood M.	40	Good	16	7	6	1	0
4. Fallston H.	33	Good	6	13	8	5	0
5. Jarrettsville E.	33	Superior	26	5	0	1	0
6. Magnolia M.	31	Adequate	3	14	6	3	3
7. N. Harford M.	34	Superior	22	5	2	0	0
8. Youth's Benefit E.	42	Good	7	21	4	1	0
Totals			105	83	38	16	4
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			43%	34%	15%	7%	2%

Howard County

Twelve schools were inspected in February and March 2010. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1958 to 2008 with an adjusted building age ranging from 3 to 33 years. The schools surveyed this year are generally receiving good attention to maintenance. However, most of the schools had stained ceiling tiles in multiple places indicating a present or previous leakage problem, originating from either the roof or an above ceiling HVAC distribution system. One school, Bushy Park Elementary School, exhibited numerous ceiling tile stains as a result of the HVAC equipment; this is significant because this school was built with State funding participation and opened in 2007 as a new school.

Aside from this issue, the Howard County Public School System has many reasons to be proud of its schools. Six of the twelve schools are seventeen years old or more, have never been renovated, or have significant sections of un-renovated square footage, and yet four of the six received "Good" ratings and the other two were rated as "Superior". A capital improvement program that in recent years has achieved a good balance between new schools, major renovations, and systemic renovations is likely to have played a role in this achievement.

Mayfield Woods Elementary

- 73 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1994
- 12 schools inspected: 3 Elementary, 7 Middle, and 2 High
- Results:
  - ✓ 2 Superior
  - ✓ 10 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (92.44)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Burleigh Manor M.	18	Good	14	13	2	3	0
2. Bushy Park E.	3	Good	21	5	3	3	0
3. Glenelg H.	14	Good	9	13	5	6	0
4. Hammond M.	26	Good	10	16	1	1	0
5. Harpers Choice M.	9	Good	4	25	1	0	0
6. Laurel Woods E.	4	Good	12	18	1	0	0
7. Lisbon E.	4	Good	19	6	5	0	0
8. Mayfield Woods M.	19	Superior	24	8	1	0	0
9. Mount View M.	17	Superior	22	10	0	0	0
10. Oakland Mills H.	22	Good	7	13	4	5	2
11. Oakland Mills M.	12	Good	14	13	1	1	0
12. Patuxent Valley M.	21	Good	19	10	0	2	0
Totals			175	150	24	21	2
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			47%	40%	6%	6%	1%

Kent County

One school was inspected in October 2009. Original existing square footage at this school dates from 1971 with an adjusted building age of 21 years as a result of renovations. This school is in very good condition and is extremely well maintained. This building received a phased limited renovation in recent years and appears like new in many areas, demonstrating the effectiveness of a limited renovation project that is well conceived. A study should be conducted to determine if the school would benefit from an upgrade to the electrical system in order to better meet existing and future equipment loads.

Kent County High

- 8 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1977
- 1 school inspected: 1 High
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 0 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Superior (97.05)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Kent County H.	21	Superior	25	3	2	0	0
Totals			25	3	2	0	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			83%	10%	7%	0%	0%

This page is left intentionally blank

Montgomery County

Twenty-four schools were surveyed in April 2010. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1934 to 2009, with an adjusted building age ranging from 8 to 43 years. Half of the surveyed schools have an adjusted building age greater than 30 years.

As in previous years, roofing deficiencies continue to be found, with about half of the surveyed schools receiving "Not Adequate" or "Poor" ratings, averaged between the three roof categories in the survey. A substantial number of surveyed schools also received "Not Adequate" or "Poor" ratings for ceilings, reflecting the number of stained ceiling tiles found in these schools, and indicative of either roof leaks or faulty piping equipment. MCPS initiated a roof inspection training program in the fall of 2008 with its Maintenance Asbestos Abatement Team to perform roof inspections in conjunction with their scheduled visits in the fall and spring of each school year. If this leads to more preventive roof maintenance, it is expected that roof and ceiling ratings will improve as a result. Our inspectors again reported the presence of mold-like discoloration at damaged ceiling tiles in several surveys, indicating that leaks are not yet being addressed in a sufficiently timely manner. We believe that it is essential that any suspected mold growth be addressed immediately upon detection.

It is to the credit of Montgomery County Public Schools that a large number of systemic project requests, usually consisting of roof and HVAC replacement projects, are regularly submitted in the annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and that these projects are placed high on their prioritized list of requested projects.

Broad Acres Elementary

- 209 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1989
- 24 schools inspected: 16 Elementary, 6 Middle, 1 High, 1 Special Ed
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 15 Good
  - ✓ 8 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (87.32)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Bradley Hills E.	26	Good	9	12	8	4	0
2. Broad Acres E.	24	Good	14	11	2	4	0
3. Burtonsville E.	17	Adequate	3	18	4	6	2
4. Damascus E.	31	Adequate	4	11	8	7	1
5. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. M.	15	Good	17	13	0	1	0
6. Dufief E.	35	Adequate	4	9	8	6	3
7. Gaithersburg M.	43	Adequate	5	11	5	8	1

8. Glenallan E.	39	Good	4	14	12	0	0
9. John T. Baker M.	34	Good	14	11	2	4	0
10. Mark Twain Facility	39	Good	10	16	4	1	0
11. Neelsville M.	28	Good	7	13	8	2	0
12. Olney E.	20	Good	6	14	9	2	1
13. Paint Branch H.	35	Adequate	0	8	16	6	2
14. Pine Crest E.	18	Good	14	15	3	0	0
15. Poolesville E.	35	Adequate	2	12	10	6	1
16. Redland M.	39	Adequate	0	15	11	4	0
17. Ritchie Park E.	36	Good	15	10	2	3	2
18. Stonegate E.	34	Good	13	12	3	3	0
19. Washington Grove E.	13	Superior	18	12	0	0	0
20. Weller Road E.	27	Good	11	11	4	3	2
21. William Farquhar M.	41	Adequate	0	8	21	1	1
22. Wood Acres E.	8	Good	19	8	2	4	1
23. Woodlin E.	28	Good	16	14	0	2	1
24. Wyngate E.	14	Good	8	14	5	6	0
Totals			213	292	147	83	18
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			28%	39%	20%	11%	2%

Prince George's County

Twenty-four schools were surveyed in May 2010. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1951 to 2004, with an adjusted building age ranging from 12 to 50 years. All but three of the surveyed schools have an adjusted building age of 30 years or greater, indicative of the aging school infrastructure in Prince George's County.

Roofing conditions appear to be much improved this year, in part due to recent PGCPS roofing inspections and follow-up at the surveyed schools. However, of the schools inspected this year, over half were reported to have deficiencies in each of the following areas: fire extinguishers expired, missing, not mounted properly, or not receiving required 30 day visual inspections; HVAC equipment needing repairs or exhaust fans damaged or missing, causing inadequate ventilation; electrical distribution needing upgrades due to age or inadequacies resulting in excessive use of extension cords and powerstrips, and lack of ground fault interrupt (GFI) safety devices in wet areas; inadequate site utility shut-off signage; aged windows and doors needing replacement; and stained and damaged ceiling tiles needing replacement.

Several of the schools inspected this year are receiving very good custodial care; however, in some instances it appears that the effectiveness of the on-site staff is compromised by the need for additional staffing given the size of the school as well as repairs necessitated by repeated acts of vandalism. Vandalism is a serious problem at four of the five high schools surveyed as well as at one of the middle schools and at an elementary/middle school.

Correction of these widespread deficiencies will require continuous coordination between the maintenance, construction, and operations departments in order to prioritize projects and identify appropriate funding vehicles.

Patuxent Elementary

- 195 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1978
- 24 schools inspected: 10 Elementary, 2 Elementary/Middle, 5 High, 4 Middle, 1 Science, 2 Special Ed.
- Results:
  - ✓ 0 Superior
  - ✓ 10 Good
  - ✓ 12 Adequate
  - ✓ 2 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Adequate (84.99)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Apple Grove E.	39	Adequate	1	16	6	8	0
2. Arrowhead E.	41	Good	11	15	6	0	0
3. Avalon E.	45	Good	7	15	8	0	0
4. Brandywine E.	31	Good	12	15	4	1	0

5. C. Elizabeth Rieg	32	Good	14	9	4	4	0
6. Chillum E.	32	Adequate	7	11	7	6	1
7. Clinton Grove E.	44	Adequate	9	6	8	8	0
8. Dwight D. Eisenhower M.	40	Not Adequate	2	7	7	8	7
9. Eugene Burroughs M.	34	Adequate	8	8	7	7	0
10. Friendly H.	38	Adequate	4	16	3	9	0
11. Glenarden Woods E.	46	Good	7	11	5	5	0
12. H.B. Owens Science Ctr.	32	Good	16	10	1	3	0
13. James E. Duckworth Sp.	32	Adequate	5	11	7	7	0
14. John Hanson E/M	50	Adequate	2	11	9	6	2
15. Kettering M.	32	Good	12	7	7	2	0
16. Largo H.	39	Adequate	5	8	11	6	0
17. Laurel E.	36	Good	9	9	7	5	0
18. Laurel H.	42	Adequate	7	7	8	10	0
19. Northwestern H.	12	Good	9	9	6	5	1
20. Oxon Hill H.	25	Adequate	0	8	12	11	1
21. Patuxent E.	23	Good	10	11	5	3	0
22. Stephen Decatur M.	38	Adequate	6	10	8	3	2
23. Tayac E.	43	Not Adequate	1	4	12	7	7
24. Thomas Pullen E/M	41	Adequate	2	7	13	7	1
Totals			166	241	171	131	22
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			23%	33%	23%	18%	3%

Queen Anne's County

Two schools were inspected in October 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1952 to 1992, with adjusted building ages of 29 and 31 years. This school system is restructuring the custodial department to bring better onsite maintenance and upkeep to the schools. The schools inspected this year would benefit from modernization in order to provide cost effective energy efficiency and a better educational environment. Stevensville Middle School has been requested in the CIP submission for a full renovation.

Centreville Middle

- 14 total active schools in the system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1995
- 2 schools inspected: 2 Middle
- Results:
  - ✓ 0 Superior
  - ✓ 1 Good
  - ✓ 1 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected school: **Good (86.71)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Centreville M.	31	Good	11	10	3	3	1
2. Stevensville M.	29	Adequate	7	10	12	5	1
Totals			18	20	15	8	2
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			29%	32%	24%	13%	3%

St. Mary's County

Four schools were inspected in December 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1956 to 2005 with an adjusted building age ranging from 27 to 36 years. Of the four schools inspected this year, none have ever been fully or completely renovated. One school, Leonardtown Middle School, is currently undergoing a limited renovation that began in the Summer of 2010. Two of the schools surveyed, mostly consisting of square footage built or partially renovated at least 34 years ago, are noteworthy because they appear to clearly benefit from admirable teamwork between the administrative and custodial staff, one school receiving a "Superior" rating and the other a high "Good" score.

Ridge Elementary

- 26 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1994
- 4 schools inspected: 3 Elementary, 1 Middle
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 1 Good
  - ✓ 2 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (89.18)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Green Holly E.	27	Adequate	3	11	14	1	2
2. Leonardtown M.	35	Adequate	2	12	12	4	1
3. Oakville E.	36	Good	15	14	2	1	0
4. Ridge E.	34	Superior	28	3	0	1	0
Totals			48	40	28	7	3
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			38%	32%	22%	6%	2%

Somerset County

One school was inspected in September 2009. Original existing square footage at this school dates from 1929 with additions in 1990 and 1996, resulting in an adjusted building age of 29 years. Princess Anne Elementary School has a very nice exterior appearance; however, as with the school that was inspected last year, the interior showed signs of continuous roof leaks which have caused ceiling and wall damage throughout. These conditions can lead to indoor air quality problems or even structural damage if left unresolved. Additionally, the overall condition and cleanliness of the interior was below the standard typically seen in Maryland schools. Improper storage of materials was found in equipment rooms, classrooms, and hallways. This is an issue that needs to be routinely addressed by all staff as it affects egress and other safety issues, as well as the life and effectiveness of mechanical equipment in classrooms. This school was being upgraded with new boilers and associated equipment during inspection.

Princess Anne Elementary

- 10 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1990
- 1 school inspected: 1 Elementary
- Results:
  - ✓ 0 Superior
  - ✓ 0 Good
  - ✓ 1 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected school: **Adequate (79.48)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Princess Anne E.	29	Adequate	7	3	7	9	3
Totals			7	3	7	9	3
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			24%	10%	24%	31%	10%

Talbot County

One school was inspected in January 2010. Original existing square footage at this school dates back to 1953, with an adjusted building age of 2 years due to a recent renovation. This school complex, consisting of St. Michaels Elementary School and St. Michaels Middle/High School, was renovated in 2008 and re-opened in September 2009. Improvements include a new geothermal heating and cooling system, electronic restroom fixtures, low-e glass, and many other upgrades. This school is beautiful both inside and out, and appears to be truly appreciated by both students and faculty.

St. Michaels Elementary

- 9 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 2000
- 1 school inspected: 1 Elementary
- Results:
  - ✓ 1 Superior
  - ✓ 0 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected school: **Superior (98.62)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. St. Michaels E.	2	Superior	25	4	0	0	0
Totals			25	4	0	0	0
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			86%	14%	0%	0%	0%

Washington County

Eight schools were inspected in November 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1930 to 2003, with an adjusted building age ranging from 7 to 40 years. Schools inspected this year were in good condition. Of special note, an unusual condition exists at Bester Elementary. The 1965 addition attached to the original 1930 school appears to have been built over unstable soils which have caused this portion of the facility to shift and heave over the years, resulting in structural and finish cracks, misalignments of surfaces, and skewed building elements. The maintenance and custodial staff has done a remarkable job in their response to perennially changing conditions, but there appears to be no remedy for the situation. Washington County has requested State support of a project to demolish this portion of the school, build a replacement school and reuse portions of the historical and structurally sound 1930 portion of the facility for other purposes.

Another school requires a structural review due to rusted-out beams, columns, and ceiling joists. The LEA has reported that a structural engineer has been retained to study and make recommendations. Additionally, a repeated deficiency found in the schools that were surveyed was the improper storage of unwanted furniture/classroom items in mechanical rooms and electrical closets, creating unsafe conditions and an impediment for maintenance staff personnel who need immediate access to these confined areas.

Bester Elementary

- 47 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1982
- 8 schools inspected: 5 Elementary, 3 High
- Results:
  - ✓ 2 Superior
  - ✓ 6 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (90.76)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Bester E.	33	Good	7	14	8	3	0
2. Boonsboro H.	35	Good	5	17	5	2	1
3. Old Forge E.	37	Good	9	11	5	5	0
4. Potomac Heights E.	40	Superior	24	4	1	0	0
5. Smithsburg E.	13	Superior	17	14	0	0	0
6. Smithsburg H.	36	Good	8	19	4	2	1
7. Williamsport E.	7	Good	22	9	1	1	0
8. Williamsport H.	38	Good	9	15	6	1	0
Totals			101	103	30	14	2
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			40%	41%	12%	6%	1%

Wicomico County

Five schools were inspected in September 2009. Original square footage at these schools dates from 1931 to 1990, with an adjusted building age ranging from 19 to 44 years. These schools have received complete renovations and additions over the years as well as many equipment upgrades and replacements within the past 10 years. The staff has maintained these schools very well. Wicomico Middle School is in need of a major renovation due to significantly aged infrastructure, and Bennett Middle School is scheduled for replacement once Bennett High School, which is now under construction, has been completed. All schools were very clean and had updated interior finishes. Of special note, three of the five surveyed schools received "Superior" ratings, and all three "Superior" schools have substantial sections dating from 1937 and/or 1955, demonstrating the significance of a good maintenance program applied to older, unrenovated space.

Pinehurst Elementary

- 24 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1984
- 5 schools inspected: 3 Elementary, 2 Middle
- Results:
  - ✓ 3 Superior
  - ✓ 0 Good
  - ✓ 2 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected schools: **Good (91.83)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Bennett M.	44	Adequate	5	15	4	0	7
2. Fruitland Intermediate	19	Superior	7	0	0	0	6
3. Fruitland Primary	33	Superior	10	1	0	0	4
4. Pinehurst E.	25	Superior	5	1	0	0	3
5. Wicomico M.	32	Adequate	12	8	5	1	3
Totals			39	25	9	1	23
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			40%	26%	9%	1%	24%

Worcester County

Two schools were inspected in September 2009. Original existing square footage at these schools dates from 1979 and 1997, reflecting an adjusted building age of 31 and 13 years, respectively. The last inspection performed on Snow Hill Elementary was in 1992 and, although the school has never been fully renovated, it has had several small systemic and Aging School Program (ASP) projects in the last several years and is well maintained. In contrast, Stephen Decatur Middle, an attractive facility that is much newer, would benefit from an improved maintenance program. Of particular concern is the condition of the 13 year old shingle roof which appears to be prematurely failing. Although both schools received a "Good" overall rating, they were at opposite points within the "Good" range.

Stephen Decatur Middle

- 14 total active schools in system
- Avg. Adjusted Age, all schools: 1987
- 2 schools inspected: 1 Elementary, 1 Middle
- Results:
  - ✓ 0 Superior
  - ✓ 2 Good
  - ✓ 0 Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Not Adequate
  - ✓ 0 Poor
- Overall condition of inspected school: **Good (90.73)**

School Name	Adjusted Age	Overall Rating	Rating of Individual Categories (does not include items not rated)				
			Superior	Good	Adequate	Not Adequate	Poor
1. Snow Hill E.	31	Good	19	9	2	1	0
2. Stephen Decatur M.	13	Good	16	4	6	2	4
Totals			35	13	8	3	4
Percentage of Total Ratings for System			55%	21%	13%	5%	6%