



**OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF
EDUCATION**

**FY14 PERFORMANCE
OVERSIGHT RESPONSES**

**COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
COUNCILMEMBER DAVID GROSSO, CHAIRMAN**

**Dr. Amy Maisterra
Interim State Superintendent of Education
Submitted February 11, 2015**

DATA MANAGEMENT AND ASSESSMENT

Q1: On an annual basis, OSSE is required to perform an audit of enrollment for each of the District's public schools. Please provide a copy of the most recently completed audit. Please provide a description on how the audit is conducted including:

- **How the data is collected from each schools and any changes from FY13;**
- **The timeline for collecting the data and performing the audit; and,**
- **A detailed description and the result of OSSE's parallel enrollment audit conducted with SLED.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 1 Attachment – 2014 Enrollment Audit.

DC Code §38-2906 requires an audit to evaluate the accuracy of the fall student enrollment count for all publically funded schools. Specifically, DC Code §38-1804.02 requires an audit of the following

- (1) The number of students, including nonresident students and students with special needs, enrolled in each grade from kindergarten through grade 12 of the District of Columbia public schools and in public charter schools, and the number of students whose tuition for enrollment in other schools is paid for with funds available to the District of Columbia public schools;
- (2) The amount of fees and tuition assessed and collected from the nonresident students described in paragraph (1) of this subsection;
- (3) The number of students, including nonresident students, enrolled in preschool and prekindergarten in the District of Columbia public schools and in public charter schools;
- (4) The amount of fees and tuition assessed and collected from the nonresident students described in paragraph (3) of this subsection;
- (5) The number of full time equivalent adult students enrolled in adult, community, continuing, and vocational education programs in the District of Columbia public schools and in public charter schools;
- (6) The amount of fees and tuition assessed and collected from resident and nonresident adult students described in paragraph (5) of this subsection;
- (7) The number of students, including nonresident students, enrolled in non-grade level programs in District of Columbia public schools and in public charter schools;
- (8) The amount of fees and tuition assessed and collected from nonresident students described in paragraph (7) of this subsection; and
- (9) The number of enrolled students who have dropped out since the date of the previous report.

This process is used to distribute local public education funding. The audit consists of a physical headcount and a certification process that entails verifying the enrollment of the following:

- District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) students
- District of Columbia Public Charter Schools (PCS) students
- DCPS or PCS students who are attending private special education schools or programs (Nonpublic)
- DC foster care students attending schools in surrounding counties and those registered with the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS)

Independent auditors are retained to conduct an examination, which includes a physical head count of the entire student population of the District of Columbia schools, as well as procedures for District of Columbia students enrolled in non-public schools, programs and surrounding county schools.

Preparation for the October 6, 2014 Enrollment Process Deadline

In August and September of each academic year, OSSE works with LEA representatives to collect, verify and update school information. This information includes, but is not limited to, changes to grade levels offered and point of contacts for each LEA. In addition, OSSE provides face-to-face training and technical assistance to all LEA stakeholders and school leadership regarding the residency verification process, changes and updates to the audit timeline, and expectations from the state agency. This year, OSSE provided five training sessions in late August. Over the course of the trainings, we were able to provide updates to the audit process to over 140 LEA stakeholders. The trainings were differentiated to accommodate the following audiences:

- Existing LEAs
- New LEAs
- New School Leadership

In addition to in-person trainings, OSSE also provided webinar presentations regarding documentation updates, compliance with requirements for students in special education, and best practices related to data management.

In SY 2014-2015, OSSE utilized the Statewide Longitudinal Education Database (SLED) system to collect enrollment data. From September 15th to October 6th, OSSE displayed each LEA's roster in SLED and asked the LEAs to review data and resolve any data discrepancies. Most data elements on the rosters were prepopulated with data transferred to SLED in daily feeds from LEA Student Information Systems (SIS) in an effort to reduce administrative burden and human error. A few data elements (such as residency and tuition information) were updated by the LEAs in a secondary data collection system called QuickBase. LEAs were required to resolve data errors and clean student rosters by making corrections in the source system, either the SIS or QuickBase.

On October 6th, OSSE froze the enrollment audit roster, and all data entered in SISs as of October 6th was synchronized with SLED. October 6, 2014 was the last day schools were allowed to enroll students and potentially receive funding for enrollment. LEAs then certified their data and OSSE delivered the finalized audit roster to a third party auditor.

Headcount Process Managed by FS Taylor and Associates

The auditors are responsible for conducting a headcount of students at each school in the District of Columbia. This effort requires that a team of individual auditors visit each school, collect documentation, and verify the enrollment and attendance of each student. Besides the physical headcount, the auditors also examine student records to determine residency status as of October 6th. For the purposes of residency verification, the DC Residency Verification Form or other OSSE designated appropriate alternative document(s) provided by the school are inspected for each student. Furthermore, the supporting residency documentation is also examined for a random sample of 10% of students to confirm residency status. The auditors also assess the amount of non-resident tuition

collected for each non-resident student to ensure all nonresident tuition is being paid and returned to OSSE.

In addition to the enrollment and residency procedures, the auditors also assist OSSE in verifying the number of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students attending the District's public schools as of October 6th. In order to qualify as LEP, students must meet the criteria as established under Public Law 107-110 and adhere to the requirements published in the OSSE Enrollment Audit Handbook (<http://osse.dc.gov/publication/student-enrollment-audit-handbook-guide-leas-and-cbos>). The final evaluation of LEP status is based on the examination of both complete and current LEP documentation and qualifying assessment scores for a sample of LEP students, which were not automatically verified as LEP established by OSSE. Additionally, OSSE collects and verifies data related to students receiving special education services via a verification process aligned with federal requirements. Last, the auditors collect documentation from all nonpublic and surrounding county schools to verify enrollment and residency of DC students.

Upon completion of all site visits, the auditor held resolution meetings with all LEAs (either in person or by phone) to share the results of the headcount with the LEA leader and to allow the LEA an opportunity to provide additional documentation (if necessary) pertaining to student enrollment and residency verification. On December 17, 2014, OSSE released the preliminary results of the general audit and the LEP student sample audit and provided LEAs the opportunity to appeal the reported findings. If an LEA appealed a finding, the auditors reviewed and reconsidered previous audit results based on LEA documentation presented during the desktop and in-person appeals process. The auditor then prepared a post-appeals census-type report to capture all appeal determinations, and delivered it to OSSE. This information was then uploaded to SLED by OSSE.

After the auditor's review of the appeals documentation, OSSE reviewed the appeals and released the updated findings on January 5, 2015. LEAs then had a final opportunity to appear in person at OSSE to appeal these findings on January 15-16, 2015. OSSE convened an enrollment audit panel, comprised of representatives from OSSE and the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME), to review all appeals and make a determination based on the evidence provided. The final audit results were released in early February 2015.

Timeline

Item/Action	Date
Preparation for the October 6 deadline	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OSSE collects and updates LEA, School and Point of Contact information - OSSE and the Auditor conduct training sessions - LEAs update data in SIS, Special Education Data System (SEDS), and the OSSE Enrollment Audit and Child Count QuickBase Tool 	August – October 2014
October 6 Data Certification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data in the Enrollment Audit and Child Count roster in SLED freezes 	October 6, 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LEAs review frozen data available in SLED for accuracy and completeness - Prior to submission of certification, LEAs submit requests for support to the OSSE Support Tool (OST) for any issues 	October 7 – October 8, 2014

not previously identified	
- Certification submission is due to OSSE	October 8, 2014 by 5:00 PM
- Enrollment Audit Head Counts	October 20, 2014 – December 1, 2014
- Audit Resolution Meetings – The Auditor meets with the LEA to share audit results; the LEA has the opportunity to dispute the findings.	December 2, 2014 – December 9, 2014
- Audited data released to LEAs in SLED	December 17, 2014
- LEAs review the findings and submit appeals to OSSE via QuickBase Application	December 23, 2014 at 5:00 PM
- Updated data released to LEAs in SLED	January 6, 2015
- In-Person appeals hearings are conducted at OSSE	January 15 - 16, 2015
- Final Enrollment Audit and Special Education Child Count data released in SLED	February 5, 2015
- Final Enrollment Audit and Special Education Child Count data published	February 2015

OSSE's parallel sample enrollment audit conducted in SLED

In parallel with the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 enrollment audits, OSSE conducted an analysis to assess the feasibility of using a sampling-based methodology to count and verify the number of students in publicly funded schools in the District. Taking a sample-based approach to the enrollment audit would reduce the burden on LEAs by decreasing the number of students being physically audited (without sacrificing data accuracy) while incentivizing long run data quality improvements within LEA data systems. This approach would also reduce the financial cost to the District by reducing the scope of auditor activities.

Sample Audit Methodology

Through the enrollment audit process, schools and LEAs are asked to continuously review data transferred to OSSE via data feeds to verify and resolve data inconsistencies for a predetermined amount of time. During this time, schools and LEAs work with OSSE to update their SIS, resolve errors, and clean up student rosters to be used for the audit.

Currently, a final roster file is produced and transmitted to a third party auditor for the full enrollment audit. Using a sample-based audit, only duplicative student records and a randomly selected ten percent sample from each school would be passed along to the auditor.

Since the full enrollment audit provided all the information necessary to simulate the outcome of a hypothetical sample audit, it was possible to evaluate the expected outcome that would have resulted from a sample audit over the past two years.

School Year 2012-13 Simulation Results

In SY2012-2013, the sample audit methodology predicted a total enrollment of 80,269, a difference of 38 students, or 0.05 percent from the 80,231 census-style audit conducted by the independent auditor. Over each of one hundred sample iterations, 8,758 students were sampled – a combination of the 10

percent random sample and duplicative student records. This resulted in 50 schools of 227 (22 percent) that would be required to undergo a full census-style audit using this methodology.

School Year 2013-14 Simulation Results

The 2013- 2014 sample audit was simulated two hundred times, using a sample of 8,715 students – 314 chosen from duplicative student records, and the rest from a 10 percent random sample of each school. This methodology led to an average estimated enrollment of 83,024 students. Across all iterations, this methodology overestimated total audited enrollment (actually 82,958) by an average of 66 students, or 0.08 percent. The sample methodology iterations varied slightly in performance, with the worst overstating enrollment by 88 students, and the best overstating enrollment by 43 students. On average, approximately 27 out of 217 total schools were required to go through a full census-style audit (down from 50 in SY2012-2013). As a result, an average of 22,651 students total would have had to be audited.

Q2: Please list for each public school the number and percentage of students by Ward in which they reside for SY2012-2013, SY2013-2014, and SY2014-2015 to date.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 2 Attachment – Students by Ward.

Q3: Please provide the Committee with an update on OSSE’s efforts to strengthen its residency fraud program in FY14 and to date in FY15.

RESPONSE:

In FY14 and to date in FY15, OSSE strengthened its residency fraud program by: 1) improving its residency fraud communications portal; 2) streamlining the residency fraud investigation process; 3) procuring a residency fraud investigator; 4) providing further technical assistance and training to LEAs; 5) increasing office capacity; and 6) implementing a process for investigating constituent complaints regarding out-of-state tags. Moving forward, OSSE plans on communicating information through a variety of mediums to the public. More details about each action are provided below.

Improvement of the Residency Fraud Communications Portal

In FY14, OSSE implemented the Student Residency Fraud Prevention Hotline (202-719-6500). Prior to the implementation of this tip line, allegations of residency fraud were directed to one staff member. Callers who now call the tip line are routed into the OSSE call center, which is housed in the OSSE Chief Information Office. The call center is staff by several OSSE customer service representatives and operates five days per week between 7:30 AM and 5:30 PM. Call center representatives use the standard tip reporting form to collect pertinent information such as student’s name, school name, reason for suspected out of state residency, etc. Additionally, residency fraud allegations may be made through the Student Residency Fraud Tips Online form (<http://dcforms.dc.gov/webform/osse-residency-fraud-prevention-form>). This site was designed for the anonymous reporting of residency fraud tips. The public may use either method but does not need to submit the information through both sources. The call center manager oversees both submission formats to ensure that all information is collected accurately.

Once the information is collected through the tip line or the online tip submission form, this information is used to create a ticket. The ticket is then escalated to the residency fraud team for review and to initiate an investigation. Use of the ticket is crucial, as it allows OSSE to keep a record of how many tips are reported, where the students attend school, and other key information. Additionally, this system allows OSSE to maintain quantifiable data for residency fraud tips. As this program has grown, the call center has worked very closely with schools and other agencies to assist with the residency fraud allegations.

In addition to the tip submission process, OSSE conducts a residency verification process during the enrollment audit head count. A random sample of documentation is taken at each school site and if the school cannot pass the sample, an additional sample is taken at the site. In addition, some schools are subject to 100% review of residency documentation if they have major exceptions in the prior years or did not pass the review in the prior year.

Collaboration with DCPS and PCSB to streamline residency fraud investigation process

Prior to the establishment of the Office of Enrollment and Residency, DCPS and the public charter schools conducted independent investigations at the LEA level. With this bifurcated system, there was little consistency in the process for and investigations of residency fraud allegations throughout the District. In February 2014, OSSE assumed responsibility for residency investigations from the Public Charter School Board (PCSB). Since this time, OSSE has streamlined this process and now manages all charter school residency fraud allegations. OSSE, however, is not currently responsible for residency investigations for DCPS, but if OSSE receives a tip for a DCPS student, OSSE investigates this tip after notifying DCPS of the investigation. This reduces duplicity of investigations. Additionally, OSSE has provided guidance to DCPS to ensure that the LEA understands the laws that govern parental due process rights. OSSE will continue to provide state level guidance to DCPS for SY 14/15 and plans to work with DCPS to assume full responsibility for all residency investigations beginning in SY 15/16. Once this occurs, a fully centralized process will exist for all residency fraud investigations.

Procurement of a residency fraud private investigator

As previously mentioned, in February 2014, OSSE assumed responsibility of all charter school residency investigations. OSSE procured the same private investigator, Dinolt Becnel & Wells Investigative Group LLC, which PCSB used for its residency fraud investigations. This allowed for continuity in operations, which resulted in an easier transition of this work to OSSE since this firm already had a solid understanding of the residency verification process. Further the integrity of the investigation process that was started with PCSB was upheld by working with the same firm.

In December 2015, OSSE procured a new private investigator, Dynamic Consulting Services, LLC, to fully meet its needs. Dynamic Consulting Services provides private investigator services in Northern Virginia and the District of Columbia to local and federal government agencies, corporations, non-profit organizations, law firms, and private individuals. The firm is licensed by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services and the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department as a private investigation firm. OSSE organized a 'kick-off' meeting with the private investigator to discuss expectations. Further, OSSE has been in continuous contact with the new private investigator

to ensure that the reports for each case present adequate supporting documentation to make a sound residency determination.

Provision of further technical assistance and training about residency fraud

OSSE is working on a several initiatives to support LEAs by providing differentiated technical assistance and training. In FY14, OSSE established the residency mailbox (osse.residency@dc.gov), which is used to collect and address general questions and concerns about residency verification and residency fraud. This has enabled the streamlining of residency fraud questions to one central location. The new mailbox also provides the Office of Enrollment & Residency with an opportunity to quickly identify critical training and technical assistance needs at the LEA level. Further, OSSE visits schools to address concerns and provide differentiated support to LEAs. During these visits, enrollment and residency staff work with school staff and cover areas including: residency fraud, enrollment, support for homeless students, and acceptable residency documents. These sessions were very well received by the schools' registrars and enabled OSSE to gain a better understanding of some of the issues that registrars must address. OSSE also works with staff to ensure that schools have all of the necessary residency and enrollment resources to continue with their enrollment operations. In an effort to provide technical support to schools, OSSE has provided each school with a mandatory residency fraud poster. Schools, by law, must post these posters in an area where parents may view them. These posters provide information on reporting residency fraud as well as information on the penalty for residency fraud.

Increase in office capacity

At the beginning of FY14, one full-time staff member managed residency verification, enrollment and residency fraud. Currently, four full-time staff members staff the Office of Enrollment and Residency and support the work on a daily basis. In FY15, OSSE hired a full-time state director for the Office of Enrollment and Residency. In the spring of 2015, the Office will hire a full-time staff investigator who will manage and support all residency fraud efforts. The investigator will assist schools and conduct random checks of student residency to decrease residency fraud across the District.

Implementation of a process to investigate constituent complaints regarding out-of-state vehicle tags

A number of constituents have complained about a large number of out-of-state vehicles dropping off students in the morning and picking them up in the afternoon at various schools. In FY15, OSSE developed a standard process of going out to those schools and observing the tags alternating between mornings and afternoons. An increase in staff capacity allowed OSSE to complete this vital work. Based on going to a site on a minimum of three occasions, a determination is made regarding whether the allegations should move to the investigator. School staff are aware of the visits and work with OSSE to schedule observation times.

Planned FY 15 Activities:

- OSSE has drafted a Residency Fraud Handbook, which we are working to publish in early spring, for LEAs and other stakeholders. This document will serve as a standard operating procedure guide (SOP) for the internal office as well as a guiding document for the public. Moreover, this handbook is important to maintaining a consistent and transparent process.

- OSSE has also drafted a Parent's Guide to Residency Requirements brochure. This document contains pertinent information about the residency requirements, the fraud investigation process, and parental due process rights throughout the entire investigation process.
- OSSE will also host its first annual one-day residency institute. The conference will take place on March 25, 2015 and will include LEA stakeholders, other government agencies and constituents. The purpose of this conference is to build overall capacity for understanding residency verification requirements in the District of Columbia. This informative one-day conference will consist of several breakout sessions, which will cover topics such as residency compliance and information on how to complete residency forms. There will also be breakout sessions on the DC Statewide Longitudinal Education Data (SLED) system. Residency fraud and enrollment data as it relates to residency will also be a topic of discussion. Office hours will be scheduled throughout the day of the institute so that LEAs can address questions and concerns with enrollment and residency staff members.
- At the start of the enrollment season, OSSE will have advertisements on local radio stations that discuss what residency fraud is, along with the consequences for committing residency fraud.
- Furthermore, OSSE plans to place advertisements on public Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) buses. This campaign will be launched in the spring of 2015.

Q4: Provide the following data regarding high school graduation, college preparation, application, and enrollment:

- **The 4-year and 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each public high school in the District including subgroup information such as gender, race/ethnicity, economically disadvantage, English language learners, and special education for FY12, FY13, and FY14;**
- **The number and percentage of students in the graduating class of 2012, 2013, 2014 that dropped out for each public high school;**
- **How does OSSE categorize drop outs and students no longer enrolled, and are these students tracked after leaving the public school system?**
- **The total number and percentage of public high school students in the graduating class of 2012, 2013, and 2014 who took a college entrance exam; and,**
- **The total number and percent of students by school that enrolled in a post-secondary school from the graduating class of 2012, 2013, and 2014.**

RESPONSE:

Please see Question 4 Attachment – Milestones and Outcomes.
 Question 4 Attachment - Demographics

The attachment entitled “Question 4 Attachment – Demographics” provides the 4-year and 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each public high school in the District by demographics for the graduating class of SY2011-2012 (2008-2009 9th grade cohort), class of SY2012-2013 (2009-2010 9th grade cohort) and class of SY 2013-2014 (2010-2011 9th grade cohort).. There is agreement between the OSSE and both the charter and DCPS sectors as to graduation numbers. Some demographics (ELL status, Economically Disadvantaged) for the class of SY2013-2014 are still being verified by DCPS.

The attachment entitled “Question 4 Attachment – Milestones and Outcomes” provides milestones and current outcomes for the graduating class of SY2011-2012 (2008-2009 9th grade cohort), class of SY2012-2013 (2009-2010 9th grade cohort) and class of SY 2013-2014 (2010-2011 9th grade cohort). Typically, when reporting the ACGR, OSSE has indicated the number of students in the cohort who remain enrolled along with graduation numbers.

Students who disengaged were calculated by taking the difference between the cohort total and the number of graduates plus the number of currently enrolled students or students with alternative outcomes as detailed below. As can be seen by the data presented in the table, there are several other possible outcomes other than disengaging from school: 1) IDEA certificate of attendance; 2) GED; 3) attendance in a college without earning a HS Diploma. To give a more accurate representation of student outcomes and to more accurately define the disengaged youth population, all “Current Outcomes” for students have been provided.

A student is tracked after leaving the public school system if the school that the student left knows where the student went (e.g. another public or private school). But if the student simply left the school, then previously we did not track that student further. However, beginning with the opening of the ReEngagement Center in the Fall of 2014, OSSE has provided the names of individuals who left the school system without graduating to our ReEngagement Center with the hopes of helping those students get back on track.

Graduates are also divided into two groups in the attachment entitled “Question 4 Attachment – Milestones and Outcomes”: 1) those who received a High School Diploma and have NOT attended college; and 2) those who received a High School Diploma and have attended college. Graduation rates along with the number of students who took a college entrance exam are provided under the “Milestones” section of the tables.

Additionally, students who attend DC Public or Public charter schools after the 8th grade but who DO NOT enroll in a High School Diploma-granting school are typically excluded from cohort assignment and reports of the graduation rate. The attachment entitled “Question 4 Attachment – Milestones and Outcomes” provides data on what is being termed a “State Cohort.” This State Cohort includes student who were: (1) enrolled in K-12 education but were not assigned to a cohort due to entering school after the enrollment audit (historically, calculation of the ACGR has failed to assign highly mobile students to an appropriate cohort); (2) enrolled in a non-public or public school but who were never assigned to a grade (typically, this occurs when a student is on-track to receive an IDEA certificate of completion); or (3) enrolled in adult education. Some individuals who were not present in school for a 9th grade year, return to the DC educational system as an adult. However, according to their age, had they attended 9th grade, they would have belonged to the specified cohort.

Q5: OSSE launched LearnDC.org late in FY13 which contains report cards for each District public school. Please describe how OSSE engaged parents, students, and community members during FY14 and to date in FY15 to increase awareness and use of this website. What additional data points will be incorporated into these report cards going forward? What were the results of a stakeholder survey conducted by OSSE?

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 5 Attachment - OSSE State Report Card Survey Engagement Report
 Question 5 Attachment - LearnDC Feedback Synthesis

OSSE launched LearnDC.org late in FY13 and has continued to add key information for education stakeholders, parents, and community.

OSSE engaged parents, students, and community members during FY14 and to date in FY15 in a number of ways, specifically:

- OSSE staff attended all of the community meetings about new school boundaries held in FY14 and promoted the information on Learn DC and helped parents, students and community members understand how to use it.
- OSSE staff was available during Ed Fest to talk about and show Learn DC to parents, students, and community members and help them understand how to use Learn DC as they considered educational choices for their children and themselves for the next school year.
- OSSE conducted a focus group (summer 2014) with parents to get feedback on the Common Core section of LearnDC.

In FY14, OSSE added the following information to the Profile section of each school: program information about the school (such as athletic offerings and after school programming), updated enrollment and assessment data (2014 DC CAS), school classifications, and midyear entrance and withdrawals. In addition, OSSE provided links to the school specific PDF versions of the Equity Reports that were developed in coordination by OSSE, DCPS, PCSB, and DME for the first time in FY14. Further, OSSE also added information about state level special education annual performance metrics to the state report card. Similar information, at the LEA level, will be added in FY15.

Thus far in FY15, OSSE has created a separate page on the LearnDC site for the second year of Equity Reports, which provide interactive metrics and new information on student test growth by gender. Equity Report metrics include school-level data on: student characteristics (including by race, ethnicity, gender, economic disadvantage, ELL and SPED status), midyear entry and withdrawal, in-seat attendance, discipline (suspensions and expulsions), student achievement, student growth, and graduation rates (four- and five-year).

The elements below are also planned for inclusion in FY15:

- A charter sector report card, similar to the LEA report card currently on the site for DCPS;
- A school-level set of college readiness metrics developed in consultation with LEA stakeholders;
- Improvements and additions to teacher data (at the state, LEA and school level); and
- Additional functionality to allow users to download data for their own use and analysis.

OSSE and DME are also exploring deeper integration between myschooldc.org and learndc.org to make it easier for parents to use the enhanced tools and data on LearnDC as they apply for schools for their children.

Q6: Provide DC CAS scale scores for each DCPS and public charter school disaggregated by grade and by subgroup (race/ethnicity, at-risk, gender, special education and ELL status) for 2012, 2013, and 2014.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 6 Attachment – DCCAS Data Disaggregated

Q7: Provide the results of testing integrity investigations for SY2013-2014.

RESPONSE:

As of February 11, 2015, OSSE is still conducting the investigations for SY 2013-2014. We anticipate release of investigation results during March 2015 and will provide them to the Committee upon their release.

Q8: What is the status of implementing the PARCC Assessment? Please detail OSSE's ability to provide technical assistance to LEAs leading up to the launch of the PARCC Assessment.

RESPONSE:

The District of Columbia has been one of the original governing states of PARCC since 2010. Today, OSSE is deeply involved in the daily work with other states to develop, design, and administer the PARCC. OSSE represents DC on the PARCC consortium Governing Board, the State Leadership committee, and the Test Administration and Systems working group. OSSE also has representation in the following working groups: Accommodations, Accessibility and Fairness, ELA/Literacy, Math, Data Management, Research and Psychometrics, and Formative Assessments in Math, ELA and K-1. OSSE staff members and DC educators with content expertise serve as PARCC item reviewers, and the DC PARCC Educator Leader Cadre gathers educators to receive information and professional development on PARCC so that they can be in-house PARCC experts at their schools.

DC LEAs are currently preparing to administer the PARCC Assessment beginning in March, 2015. PARCC is administered in two parts: the performance based assessment (PBA), which is administered at approximately 75% through the course of the school year, and the end of year assessment (EOY), which is administered at approximately 90% through the course of the school year. Because DC schools have a wide array of calendars and start dates, OSSE allowed schools flexibility to choose testing dates within the following broad windows:

- PBA: March 2 - May 8
- EOY: April 13 - June 5

LEAs also had flexibility to choose whether to administer the PARCC on computers or on paper. This policy allowed LEAs to self-assess whether they had the technology and training capacity to administer PARCC on computers this year. LEAs were asked to choose a testing mode in July 2014. (<http://osse.dc.gov/publication/dc-parcc-testing-mode-memo>). While LEAs were encouraged to use computer-based tests, any LEA could choose paper based testing. Those choosing paper based tests for 2015 were asked to submit readiness plans explaining how they planned to transition to computer based assessments in future years. The readiness plans asked schools to identify specific gaps in their capacity to administer computer based tests so the OSSE could appropriately target support to those

schools. Out of 51 DC LEAs with tested grades, 34 chose to administer on computer, 6 chose a mix of paper and computer, and 11 chose paper. OSSE anticipates computer tests will represent over 90% of DC PARCC tests in Spring 2015.

Students at LEAs are already registered in the PARCC administrative system, manuals for administration are available to schools online, and LEAs have submitted Test Security Plans per D.C. Law 20-27, the “Testing Integrity Act of 2013.” Test Coordinator training for PARCC took place on February 2, 2015 and 3, 2015. At this training, at least one representative from each testing school was required to attend one full day, in-depth training on test administration and test security procedures. Additionally, OSSE has provided ongoing support and updates to schools since the PARCC Field Test in spring 2014, as detailed below. This has included eight trainings and webinars in the fall and summer of 2014, presentations of PARCC workshops to school staff at external meetings such as the FOCUS data conference, Achievement Network’s summer conference, and Fight for Children’s Common Core implementation conference. OSSE has held monthly meetings on assessment administration and policy for LEA assessment coordinators and other stakeholders since July 2014, and held a day-long LEA Institute, “It Takes a City to Knock it Out of the PARCC,” open to all school staff on January 23, 2015.

Further, OSSE plans to offer support and technical assistance to schools before, during and after PARCC tests via several other avenues:

- The PARCC administration vendor, Pearson, offers live customer technical support to schools and LEAs via phone, email and online chat every weekday, from 5:00am-7:00pm. OSSE receives weekly reports of these calls and their timely resolution, and will receive immediate alerts if a call to the PARCC customer support line would impact test security. OSSE staff members also have the ability to intervene and elevate problems within the PARCC customer support structure if we hear of a problem or a delay. This avenue is best for resolving pressing technology questions, or minor questions about test administration, in a timely manner. PARCC also provides a searchable online resource of manuals and documentation at <http://parcc.pearson.com/manuals-training/>.
- At the January 23, 2015 LEA Institute, LEAs were matched with an OSSE staff member to be their “Next Generation Assessment Ambassador” for questions about the PARCC and other DC assessments. Ambassadors provide each LEA with a point of contact at OSSE who can direct their questions appropriately within the organization to individual subject matter experts on the Assessments and Teaching and Learning Teams. Additionally, ambassadors will be available to each LEA in the immediate lead-up to the assessment to make sure they are on track to administer the assessment successfully, to provide individualized support, and to elevate challenges to OSSE Executive Leadership as needed. Ambassadors will not be tasked with Test Integrity monitoring functions for the schools with which they are matched, so that their support role will be clear to schools.
- OSSE has initiated a “feature section” on PARCC readiness in its weekly LEA communication, the LEA Look Forward. This section highlights tips and resources for use with schools and families.
- OSSE has also integrated PARCC overviews into a series of community conversations it is hosting across the city in February.
- During the administration of the PARCC assessments, OSSE will conduct onsite monitoring for test security procedures and test administration fidelity as it has in prior years. Additionally,

OSSE assessment staff will be on-call during testing to troubleshoot any major challenges to test security or test validity in a timely manner.

- In addition to monthly meetings, LEA assessment coordinators are weekly PARCC email administrative bulletins from OSSE with important benchmarks and news for test administration, including reminders and best practices.

Q9: What were the results of administering the PARCC Field Test in spring 2014? Were there any challenges or issues and what steps has OSSE taken to resolve before the administering of PARCC in 2015?

RESPONSE:

In Spring 2014, DC administered the PARCC field test to nearly 7,900 students at 108 schools in 18 LEAs, including DCPS. 7,640 of those students took field tests in a computer based environment and approximately 240 took paper based tests. Participation by LEAs was voluntary, and the PARCC was administered following the 2014 DC CAS Administration.

The field tests served several purposes:

1. Results from the field tests in DC, along with other PARCC consortium states, were used to validate individual items on tests, build test forms for operational testing, conduct research studies on various aspects of the PARCC design and administration, and refine administrative procedures.
2. Field testing gave many school and LEA leaders a preview of what PARCC assessments will be like for their students, and gave them a chance to better prepare for 2015.
3. Feedback from field tests has helped LEAs and OSSE set policies surrounding new assessments and better prepare for the PARCC in spring 2015.

OSSE generated feedback from the field tests through several venues:

1. OSSE staff made site visits to several field testing schools and spoke directly to school test administrators about the field test.
2. PARCC administered student surveys embedded in the field tests, which asked students about their experiences.
3. Test administrators were asked to fill out a survey after field testing on their experience administering the test.
4. OSSE held an in-person feedback session with representatives from LEAs that participated in field testing, which 13 of 18 field testing LEAs attended, and also solicited feedback from LEAs via email.

Subsequently, OSSE published a PARCC field test lessons-learned memo in July 2014, available online: <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/parcc-field-test-dc-lessons-learned>. Challenges discovered during field testing fell into three categories:

- Test preparation for students;
- Technology; and
- Test administration procedures.

With regard to test preparation for students, while there were practice tests and tutorials available to help orient students to the PARCC computer-based testing platform prior to the field test, these tools were recommended, but not required. Thus, they were not introduced to students in many schools, resulting in a "cold" field test for many students.

While schools and LEAs reported that most students were able to use the system successfully, there were some features of the test and its technologically-enhanced items that would have been substantially easier for students to use if they were already familiar with the features prior to testing. In response to this finding, OSSE has integrated resources on student preparation into every component of training and professional development on PARCC administration, has placed links to practice tests at the top of OSSE's PARCC website (<http://osse.dc.gov/service/partnership-assessment-readiness-college-and-careers-parcc>) and has highly recommended that teachers, school administrators, and students use these resources to their fullest extent. OSSE also sent out information on the PARCC through the LEA Look Forward and also provided a flier on assessments for school to provide to each student. OSSE believes that test preparation will be less of a problem during spring 2015 testing, as there has been substantially more time prior to testing to introduce students to the available practice tests and tutorials, and there will not be the competing demands of administering the DC CAS.

As for technology challenges, schools were able to successfully administer PARCC with a wide range of devices and on a wide range of browsers after some initial setup time and technical support from PARCC. Moreover, there were not widespread technology failures during field testing. More training was requested for technology, and schools expressed interest in on-site technology visits to check that their hardware and broadband infrastructure met PARCC specifications. In response, OSSE representatives, led by the OSSE Chief Information Officer, contacted every charter school campus and offered an on-site evaluation of devices and network speed against PARCC specifications in August and September 2014. DCPS campuses were supported in technology readiness by the DC Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO). Schools with technology deficiencies were encouraged to use their per-pupil technology grant funds to fill these gaps. Most needs expressed in these onsite visits revolved around staff training to use PARCC technology in a testing environment, which OSSE plans to address via administrator trainings (which are currently taking place and continue until the beginning of the administration of the test) and PARCC modules currently available for any school online. Also in response to feedback on technology from field testing, OSSE chose to provide LEAs with flexibility in year 1 of PARCC to administer tests on either computer or paper to all or some of their students (<http://osse.dc.gov/publication/dc-parcc-testing-mode-memo>).

In the category of test administration procedures, OSSE has detailed below the concerns that were raised and the steps OSSE has taken to address them:

- Concern: PARCC manuals are much longer than DC CAS manuals and more difficult to understand. OSSE received specific feedback as to how manuals and directions could be better structured.
 - Response: An OSSE staff member served as the co-chair of the multi-state PARCC Test Administration Operational Working Group to revise manuals and test directions for Spring 2015. The revisions make administrative directions clearer and more concise. OSSE also completed a crosswalk between PARCC and DC CAS to identify areas of change that should be emphasized in trainings and communication to schools.
- Concern: The student registration upload process could be cumbersome to school staff.

- Response: For spring 2015 testing, OSSE took the lead on uploading student registration data to the PARCC system to reduce the administrative burden on school staff. LEAs and school staff will have full access to verify, edit, and manage student test registration.
- Concern: Scheduling flexibility for PARCC, which was given in the field test, was valuable for schools and should be maintained in the 2015 operational test.
 - Response: In July 2014, OSSE issued guidance on 2015 PARCC scheduling, which allowed LEAs to choose their own testing dates within broad District-wide testing windows (<http://osse.dc.gov/publication/dc-parcc-2015-testing-window-memo>). This flexibility acknowledged that schools have a wide variety of start dates, class schedules, and curricular calendars.
- Concern: Additional training for school staff will be important for the 2015 operational test.
 - Response: There was no state-offered training prior to the PARCC field tests because of the competing demands of the DC CAS administration. After the field test, OSSE staff designed and piloted an “Introduction to PARCC” training at two LEAs in Summer 2014. Additionally, in fall 2014 OSSE staff offered 6 webinars and in-person trainings on PARCC readiness from administrative and content perspectives. Further, on January 23, 2015, OSSE organized a full-day LEA Institute, “It Takes a City to Knock it Out of the PARCC,” featuring panels and breakout sessions on important administrative and educational aspects of PARCC and other new DC assessments. The LEA institute also focused on how the educational aspects of the assessment tie into implementation of DC’s college and career ready standards. On February 2, 2015 and 3, 2015 OSSE will host full day test coordinator trainings focused on administration of PARCC, as well as test security procedures. A representative from every District public school with tested grades is required to attend. Training and technical support from PARCC are also available via email, chat and phone, and via extensive on-demand training modules focused on test administration. In addition, OSSE staff members have provided ad-hoc one-on-one technical support to schools and LEAs, and will expand this support through OSSE’s “Next Generation Assessments Ambassador” program discussed above.

In addition to the challenges discussed above, the District is navigating issues that have arisen due to the fact that the PARCC assessment is a new multi-state effort and not all aspects of the assessment system, including the contract with the vendor, are under the city’s direct control. Given the scope of the project, as well as the need to accommodate timelines and needs of other states, there have been growing pains, particularly as states adjust to the challenge of collectively overseeing the test contractor and its subcontractors. In order to address the quality and performance concerns that have arisen, a new quality assurance process was introduced in February 2015 with the goal of tackling these concerns throughout the administration of the test and in future years.

Q10: Are there any outstanding technology issue with administering the PARCC Assessment, and if so, what did OSSE do in FY14 and to date in FY15 to address these problems?

RESPONSE:

Technology visits conducted by OSSE representatives to charter schools in August and September of 2014 found that 74 of 82 assessed charter school campuses met the recommended PARCC specifications for computer devices and network capacity, and several more met minimum PARCC specifications. Seven campuses' technology readiness for PARCC could not be determined because of missing information, and no campus was found to be definitively below minimum technology specifications. Additionally, DCPS has been working with OCTO to ensure that its schools are prepared to administer PARCC this spring. In communicating to schools on technology preparation for the PARCC, OSSE, as well as the PARCC consortium, have emphasized that technology purchases should benefit classroom instructional needs first and foremost, and not be solely driven by assessment.

As mentioned in the response to Question 8, OSSE has given schools flexibility to self-assess whether they are ready to administer the PARCC on computers. In their submitted readiness plans, most schools that chose to administer PARCC on paper this year identified student and staff readiness as a bigger barrier than number of computers or broadband connectivity. Students must use skills like typing and formatting on a word processor, using a mathematical equation editor, dragging and dropping, highlighting text, and browsing between multiple texts, in order to successfully navigate the PARCC. If students have not had opportunities to practice these skills in or out of the classroom, PARCC may be difficult for them. Similarly, teachers administering the PARCC must be trained on using PearsonAccessNext to start, pause, and stop tests, and/or administer accommodations to students as needed. In the course of field testing, we found that adults in the room were generally much less comfortable with the test platform and procedures than the students. In order to improve both student and administrator preparation this year, OSSE has made training and readiness resources available well in advance of testing, as well as one-on-one technical assistance for LEAs.

Given that this will be the first year of administration of a computer-based assessment, OSSE expects that technology issues may arise during test administration. To ensure that test administrators are prepared when issues occur, OSSE is conducting test coordinator training, so that school staff will be prepared to respond to and resolve common technical problems. OSSE will also encourage use of the Pearson customer support service for technical support, which prioritizes responses to any school that is actively testing. In guidance documents that will be distributed during testing in the form of FAQs, OSSE will suggest best practices for responding to technical difficulties quickly and with minimal disruptions to students' testing.

Q11: Identify all electronic databases maintained by your agency, including databases relating to special education, student transportation, section 504, early intervention, and student progress. For each database, please provide the following:

- **A detailed description of the information tracked within each system, including all systems used by OSSE to collect data from sub-grantees, whether for compliance and oversight or for monitoring and performance;**
- **Identification of persons who have access to each system, and whether the public can be granted access to all or part of each system;**
- **The age of the system and any scheduled upgrades that are planned; and,**
- **How data is managed across the agency to ensure quality, consistency and accountability.**

RESPONSE:

Data is managed across the agency by a centralized team that reports to the Assistant Superintendent of Data, Accountability, and Research who reports directly to the Superintendent. It is managed through documented processes to track changes, perform error checks, manage security in compliance with the OSSE privacy policy, and ensure reports have validity.

Please see: Question 11 Attachment – 2015 Data Systems Overview Spreadsheet
 Question 11 Attachment – 2015 Data Systems Overview Chart

Q12: Provide an update on how OSSE manages data requests to sub-grantees, including an update on outstanding issues in regards to OSSE's data collection authority.

RESPONSE:

A data collection calendar has been created for LEA data collections which includes the type of data requested and the start and end date of each collection. Normally the collection time period is 30 days. OSSE disseminates this calendar to LEA data groups at OSSE's LEA data meeting and publishes it on OSSE's SLED website. All updates are communicated directly to LEAs and are posted on the SLED main page. Prior to the beginning of each collection, OSSE provides subgrantees with a collection template and guidance materials to assist LEAs with compiling and submitting data. Emails are sent to data specific contacts identified and updated from OSSE's LEA Contacts list. Mid-way through the collection process, emails are sent to LEA data managers reminding them of the collection and the due date. Two days prior to the collection due date another reminder email is sent, also requesting that the LEA point of contacts contact the OSSE data team if support is needed. A day after the collection due date, the check off list is completed and the non-compliant LEAs are contacted via email alerting them that the deadline has passed and that data is due. If a LEA remains non-compliant without contacting OSSE, the Assistant Superintendent for Data, Accountability, and Research works to retrieve the data.

With regard to data collection challenges, OSSE works diligently with LEAs to resolve these issues. At times, OSSE receives pushback from certain LEAs about data collections, most frequently based on expressed privacy concerns (i.e. student and teacher level data) or questions regarding OSSE's authority to collect information (i.e. truancy/discipline data). OSSE also has received incomplete or erroneous data. OSSE works with LEAs to rectify these issues and remains committed to providing technical assistance as needed to obtain requested data.

Moving forward, OSSE plans to include timeliness and completeness of federal data reporting in its new risk-based monitoring approach. While continuing to provide technical assistance, OSSE will also be reviewing the use of progressive sanctions to address longstanding noncompliance, as lack of complete federal reporting by the District places the District's federal grant status in jeopardy.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Q13: OSSE's division of early learning focuses on ensuring that children from birth to kindergarten have access to high quality child development programs that appropriately prepare them to enter school. Please provide data on the capacity, enrollment, and utilization of all infant and pre-kindergarten programs in the District for FY13, FY14, and to date in FY15. Please include a breakdown of capacity, enrollment, and utilization by Ward for infant and pre-kindergarten programs.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 13 Attachment – DEL Capacity, Enrollment, Utilization

Q14: Provide a description and timetable for the launch of a comprehensive Kindergarten Entry Assessment (KEA). Please provide the Committee on the report that was supposed to be issued in January 2014 regarding the pilot of GOLD in 15 schools last fall.

RESPONSE:

The District is moving forward with plans to administer the *Early Development Instrument (EDI)*, a population-based school-readiness measure that covers five domains of early childhood development (physical health and well-being, social competence, emotional maturity, language and cognitive skills, communication skills and general knowledge), which describes how children are developing and has predictive validity in reading and math up to sixth grade. OSSE is contracting with UCLA, Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities to assist with implementation of the EDI in the SY 2014-2015 school year for all classrooms serving 4- year olds across all sectors. The EDI results will present population level data of children's kindergarten readiness across all domains of development overlaid with community assets and other data, including TANF participation, SNAP certification, and homeless data which are factors used in determining the number of students at-risk for academic failure.

OSSE will use the District's 39 neighborhood clusters as the geographic boundaries for displaying the data to inform both local and District wide planning efforts, to make evidence-based decisions when targeting early childhood resources, and to track the impact of early learning policies on child outcomes over time.

OSSE plans to collect the data during the month of May and will work with schools to coordinate data collection around PARCC administration windows as needed. OSSE will incentivize participation in this data collection process in order to ensure full participation across all neighborhood clusters. This collection will provide a much more robust picture than the limited *Teaching Strategies GOLD (GOLD)*TM pilot that resulted in a non-representative sample of schools and students.

Additionally, the District joined the K-3 Formative Assessment Consortium, a North Carolina led, 10 state consortium funded through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education to develop a new K-3 formative assessment system. The tools and all related teacher professional development resources will be available to LEAs free of charge. In FY15, OSSE will work with a committee of the State Early Childhood Development Coordinating Council (SECDCC), including LEA representatives, to

participate in the Consortium activities including the design and development of an implementation and communication plan that ensures key District stakeholders are informed and engaged in the work.

Q15: The District joined with 10 other states to develop an early childhood assessment. Pilots of the assessment were to begin in 2015, with the full assessment being able for full implementation in SY2016-2017. Please provide the Committee with an update on this initiative.

RESPONSE:

OSSE continued its work with the North Carolina led Consortium. To date, the consortium reviewed each consortium states' early learning standards and narrowed down the constructs in the order of importance. Below is a table detailing the activities the consortium has completed to date.

Activity	Leaders & Participants	Date	Status
1. Feedback on proposed process for gathering input on and making decisions about constructs	SRI All states and research partners	June 11, 2014	Completed
2. Principles to guide decision-making Present, discuss, and finalize principles for deciding constructs (e.g., multi-domain, evidence-based, can't assess everything/only have so many "chips", teacher burden, stakeholder supported)	SRI All states and research partners	June 11, 2014	Completed
3. Findings from Standards Analysis	All states and research partners	June 30, 2014	Completed
4. Kick-off call for construct discussions -Present final input gathering process -Share reminder of principles -"Try out" first domain conversation (review analysis and background material for one domain, present possible constructs for consideration, discussion and input)	SRI All states and research partners Expert consultants	July 16, 2014	Completed
5. Domain Discussion calls - Materials sent out 1 week prior to call (Analysis and background materials, and possible constructs for consideration) -Share reminder of principles -Present specific analysis of domain area -Highlight possible constructs for consideration -Input and discussion with states and experts	Research partners lead calls Goal is for all states to have representation on each domain call Expert consultants participate in relevant calls	Aug 1, 2014 Aug 13, 2014 Aug 27, 2014 Sept 12, 2014 Sept 24, 2014 Oct 8, 2014	Completed
6. Finalize constructs (Materials sent at least 1 week prior to in- person meeting including a summary of constructs that emerged as important from domain specific calls & recommendations from research partners)	SRI All states and research partners	Oct 20-22, 2014 in person meeting	Completed

Q16: Provide a list of all licensed child development centers in the District; the corresponding Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) tier for each center; and the amount paid to childcare

providers in FY14 and to date in FY15. What type of trainings and technical assistance does OSSE provide to child development centers? How many of each training or assistance were provided in FY14 and to date in FY15 and is participation mandatory?

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 16 Attachment – QRIS and Payment

The Division of Early Learning (DEL) offers professional development for the early care and education workforce responsible for the care of the District's youngest children. The professional development offered is provided through a cohort of 97 local OSSE Certified Early Childhood Trainers that is inclusive of DEL subject experts and early childhood experts. Partners include the Smithsonian Early Enrichment Center, the U.S. National Zoo and Parks Service, the U.S. Botanical Gardens and Washington Youth Gardens, Wolf Trap, Sitar Arts Teaching Artists, American Psychological Association, ACT Against Violence, Washington Ed Television Association (WETA), and the Districts Departments of Health, Behavioral Health and Human Services.

The DEL employs subject matter experts to lead in the coordination and scope of content to address all relevant needs. Some highlights of professional development topics include Bullying Prevention and Anti-Bias Foundations, Early Literacy, Foundations for Social Emotional Development in Young Children, Early Intervention for Children birth to three and their families, and DC Common Core Early Learning Standards. The DEL is also represented on the vital DC State STEM Council representing 3-5 year olds and the Next Generation Science Standards.

During FY2014 and to date in FY2015, 9,555 early childhood professionals attended 326 training sessions offered through DEL. The DC Common Core Early Learning Standards (DCCCELS) comprised 34 of the training dates, averaging 20 participants in attendance at each session. The DCCCELS professional training is offered to all staff, and is differentiated to address varied levels of experience. All trainings prepare early childhood professionals to teach intentionally and embed best practices for school readiness into their daily routines for teaching and learning. The DCCCELS represent the developmental trajectory of learning beginning with the youngest children in infancy, and progress to toddler and preschool age children. Technical assistance and spontaneous needs for training are also coordinated through scheduled appointments with trainers that are selected based on content requests. Each quarter, DEL publishes an Early Learning Catalog that includes upcoming training dates and is disseminated to the early learning workforce.

All licensed child development staff working in licensed centers or homes are required to annually participate in professional development to be fully compliant with the DC Municipal Regulations 29, Chapter 23. The Professional Development Unit of the DEL offers the core requirements of the DCMR23 licensing regulations that are aligned with health, safety and personal care of young children. Courses such as Prevention of Child Maltreatment and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, First Aid and CPR training are offered monthly and language access contracts ensure teaching occurs in both English and Spanish. The training sessions are primarily free to participants and provide opportunity for completion of the annual required Professional Learning Units (PLUs) in 11 identified Core Knowledge Competency Areas for those maintaining licensure in the Early Learning provider system of care for infants, toddlers, preschool and Pre-K aged children.

Q17: Please provide an updated timeline on the implementation of an enhanced QRIS and describe how this system will improve upon the current QRIS system.

RESPONSE:

“Going for the Gold,” the District’s Quality Rating System, was developed in 2004 and has been primarily used to provide tiered reimbursement rates for licensed child development centers and homes that serve children receiving subsidy. For the past three years, the District has been researching and engaging stakeholders in developing a common approach to measuring the quality of care in our mixed delivery system for early learning (charter schools, DCPS, and CBOs). OSSE is working to revise the current QRIS to develop a common approach to assessing the quality of programs serving children birth to school entry and provide a quality improvement approach that targets resources where they are most needed. The intended outcome from the District’s QRIS strategy is to establish a singular system that 1) rates all early learning programs across all sectors, 2) provides resources and technical assistance that supports all programs in improving outcomes for young children, 3) assists families in making informed decisions about early learning programs for their children, and 4) ensures that quality improvement resources are delivered to the programs with the least capacity and most in need of assistance. A draft framework for rating program quality has been developed in collaboration with national experts in QRIS development. Additionally, this past year, as noted above, DEL collected data using the CLASS™ measure in all pre-k programs in the PCS and CBO sectors and analyzed data on a sample of pre-k programs in DCPS. This is important because early learning programs’ scores on the CLASS™ will factor into the rating of a program’s quality.

In fall of 2015, DEL plans to finalize the QRIS framework and rate a representative sample of programs across all sectors. Further, DEL will collect and analyze CLASS™ data in all early learning and development programs in FY15, including 205 infant and toddler classrooms. The CLASS™ scores from the pre-k programs collected in FY 15 will be used to set baseline scores from which to develop realistic targets for programs to advance on progressively higher levels of quality.

DEL has convened representatives from the PCS, DCPS, and CBO sectors to provide initial feedback on the draft quality rating framework and the State Early Childhood Development Coordinating Council (SECDCC) has formed a committee focused on the District’s QRIS framework. This committee will help inform DEL’s strategy for communicating information about quality ratings to families and the public.

Q18: Please detail outcomes of the Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion Grant Program, the Pre-K Program Assistance Grant Program, and the Pre-K Facilities Improvement Grant Program for FY14 and FY15 to date. For each of these grants, please list each award recipient, the amount awarded, the type and amount of funds used to support the program, and the criteria used to select grant recipients.

RESPONSE:

1) Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion Grant Program

Since 2008, DEL has awarded grants to eligible community-based organizations to enhance classroom quality that will support positive child outcomes in all five domains of development (language and literacy, general knowledge, social competence, emotional maturity, and physical

health). Much of this effort has focused on helping programs meet the high quality standards mandated in the Pre-Kindergarten Enhancement and Expansion Act of 2008. In FY14, DEL awarded nearly \$7.8 million to support 39 high-quality pre-k classrooms (see Table 1 for outcome information). DEL also provided additional technical assistance resources in the amount of \$307,092 in FY14 to Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion grantees in order to keep pace with increases in the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) rate for Pre-K students. Results from FY 14 classroom evaluations demonstrated that CBOs receiving the UPSFF had higher quality classrooms than CBOs only receiving subsidy. Information for award recipients in FY15 including expanded enrollment numbers is included in Table 2. Table 3 contains the criteria used to select grant recipients.

Table 1: Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion Grant Programs, FY 14

Program	Grand Total of Award	Number of Classrooms
Associates for Renewal in Education	\$387,200.00	2
Barbara Chambers CDC	\$774,400.00	4
Big Mama's Children's Center	\$193,600.00	1
Bright Beginnings CDC (1)	\$193,600.00	1
Bright Beginnings, Inc.(2)	\$242,000.00	1
Bright Start Child Care	\$193,600.00	1
Centronia	\$1,016,400.00	5
Dawn to Dusk	\$193,600.00	1
Easter Seals CDC	\$193,600.00	1
Edward C. Mazique	\$193,600.00	1
The Bean Foundation dba Happy Faces Learning Center	\$193,600.00	1
Jubilee Jumpstart	\$193,600.00	1
Kiddie's Kollege, Inc (1)	\$193,600.00	1
Kiddie's Kollege, Inc (2)	\$193,600.00	1
Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Institute	\$193,600.00	1
Martha's Table(1)	\$193,600.00	1
Martha's Table(2)	\$193,600.00	1
Matthews Memorial Child Development Center	\$193,600.00	1
Matthews Memorial Child Development Center (2)	\$193,600.00	1
National Children's Center	\$387,200.00	2
Sunshine Learning Center(1)	\$242,000.00	1
Sunshine Early Learning Center (2)	\$774,400.00	4
Sunshine Early Learning Center (3)	\$193,600.00	1
The Geneva Ivey Day School	\$193,600.00	1
United Planning Organization	\$193,600.00	1
United Planning Organization (2)	\$387,200.00	2
Zena's Child Development Center	\$193,600.00	1
	\$7,889,200.00	40

Table 2: Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion Grant Programs, FY 15 to date

Program	Award Amount	Number of Classrooms
Associates for Renewal in Education	\$370,131.00	2

FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Barbara Chambers CDC	\$1,062,258.00	4
Big Mama's Children's Center	\$236,520.00	1
Bright Beginnings CDC (1)	\$457,310.00	2
Bright Start Child Care	\$192,362.00	1
Centronia	\$1,239,456.00	5
Dawn to Dusk	\$236,899.00	1
Easter Seals CDC	\$238,415.00	1
Edward C. Mazique	\$236,141.00	1
The Bean Foundation dba Happy Faces Learning Center	\$235,762.00	1
Jubilee Jumpstart	\$236,141.00	1
Kiddie's Kollege, Inc (1)	\$458,068.00	2
Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy Institute	\$163,176.00	1
Martha's Table(1)	\$414,668.00	2
Matthews Memorial Child Development Center	\$472,282.00	2
National Children's Center	\$473,419.00	2
Sunshine Learning Center(1)	\$1,417,704.00	6
United Planning Organization	\$686,059.00	3
Zena's Child Development Center	\$235,383.00	1
Total	\$8,604,086.00	39

Table 3: Pre-K Enhancement and Expansion Grant Scoring Criteria

Area	Maximum Points
Need	20 points
Program Objectives/ Work Plan	30 points
Target Areas	10 points
Accreditation	8 points
Experience	10 points
Evaluation	10 points
Budget	10 points
Application Completeness	2 points
Maximum Score	100 Points

- 2) **Pre-K Program Assistance Grant-** this grant was not awarded by OSSE in FY14.
- 3) **Pre-K Facilities Improvement Grant:** The Pre-K Facilities Improvement Grants provide one year grants, up to \$25,000, to support quality improvement efforts in community-based child care programs, including center-based settings and homes. This grant presented providers across the District with an opportunity to address the quality of environments and facilities. Allowable grant activities included projects such as minor facility renovation projects, playground improvements, and the purchase of curricular materials. Grantees were required to submit a program needs assessment and cost analysis. Applications were scored and awarded based on the criteria as outlined in Appendix C. OSSE received 30 grant applicants, 19 of which were awarded totaling \$492,340. Projects spanned from August 2013 to August 2014 with \$179,387 of the total being spent in FY14. Table 5 contains the criteria used to select grant recipients.

Table 4: Pre-K Facilities Improvement Grant Awards in FY14

Award Recipients	Amount Awarded	Purpose	Outcomes to date
IDEAL Child Development	\$25,000	To install 2 ramps to first floor and a new staircase to the second	•Installed 2 ramps to first floor and new staircase to the second floor.

FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Center		floor for easier mobility.	
Barbara Chambers	\$25,000	To create an outdoor play space.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor play space for infants and toddlers installed; and • Safety flooring installed.
Bright Beginnings	\$25,000	To install additional playground and upgrade the existing playground to ensure children are provided a safe and nurturing environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed playground.
Eagle Academy	\$25,000	To install a playground.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed a playground.
Easter Seals	\$25,000	To install new windows; repaint all classrooms; install toddler friendly sinks; create a professional development room for teachers; and purchase a printer, computers (Macbooks); and replace water fountains.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed new windows; • Repainted all classrooms; • Installed toddler friendly sinks; • Created a professional development room for teachers (resource Room); • Purchased a printer, computers (Macbooks); and • Replaced water fountains.
Happy Faces Learning Center	\$25,000	To install a new playground.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed a new playground.
Jubilee Jumpstart	\$25,000	To install playground.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed a playground.
National Children's Center	\$25,000	To replace the flooring in all eighteen early childhood education classrooms, remove carpeting and replace it with vinyl composite tile (VCT) which is much easier to maintain.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated flooring in all eighteen early childhood education classrooms.
Southeast Children's Fund	\$25,000	To replace the roof and install solar panels; to improve the playground structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced the roof; and • Updated playground structure.
CentroNia	\$15,000	To purchase equipment and supplies with their funding. Classroom kitchen equipment (kitchen unit, step-up changing tables, lockers, freezer, refrigerator stove).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchased classroom kitchen equipment (kitchen unite, step-up changing tables, lockers, freezer, refrigerator stove).
Community Educational Research Group	\$25,000	To install new toddler friendly sinks, an updated plumbing system and fixtures as well as to add a drop ceiling; this includes all ceiling anchors, framing work, installation of panels and new light switches. Lastly two gas furnaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed new toddler friendly sinks; • Installed new plumbing system and fixtures; • Added drop ceiling, including all ceiling anchors, framing work, installation of panels and new light switches); and • Two gas furnaces.
Dawn to Dusk	\$25,000	To purchase play units, chairs, storage shelves, sand and water table, step stools, rugs, teaching supplies. Additionally, the funds will be used to paint classrooms and hallways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchased play units, chairs, storage shelves, sand and water table, step stools, rugs, teaching supplies; • Replaced furnishings; and • Painted classrooms and hallways.
Emergent Preparatory Academy –42nd Street	\$25,000	To refurbish classrooms, paint the facility, and replace flooring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refurbished classrooms; • Purchased playground equipment; • Painted facility (interior); and

FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaced flooring.
Emergent Preparatory Academy – Stanton Street	\$25,000	To refurbish classrooms, paint the facility, and replace flooring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refurbished classrooms; • Purchased playground equipment; • Painted facility (interior); and • Replaced flooring.
Shirley Cox (Faces of Hope)	\$6,869	To update the central heating and air, add a fence in the yard for the safety and security of the children when they play outdoors, and purchase classroom equipment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated central heating and air; • Added a fence for yard; and • Purchased equipment (classroom).
Angelique Speight (Ms. P's Unique Daycare)	\$16,640.00	To install security cameras, add a counter space for additional room, recess lighting, a portable ramp, and paint the facility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed security cameras; • Added counter space; • Installed recess lighting; and • Installed portable ramp; and • Painted the inside of facility.
St. Philips CDC	\$25,000.00	To paint, plaster and repair the entire Pre-K floor; purchase and mount bulletin and white boards; repair restrooms and corridor entry, increase the capacity of the playground, enhance the "Pre-K" grow garden; purchase materials for green houses, science projects and reading center, Media Center, audio, visual equipment, iPads, computers, and printers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Pre-K classrooms painted; • Mounted a bulletin and white boards; • Restrooms repaired; • Added mulch to playground; • Created a garden; and • Purchased new iPads and computers.
Supreme Learning Center	\$25,000.00	To renovate the basement; replace the bathroom sinks, fix the existing lighting; paint hallway/classroom; renovate the kitchen.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renovated basement; • Bathroom sinks replaced; • Exit lighting fixed; • Painted hallway/classroom; and • Renovated kitchen and replaced light fixtures.
Little Samaritan Child Development Center	\$25,000.00	To improve/recreate playground. Current playground isn't suitable for the center's population and age range.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved playground by adding a bike track; • Removed tree; • Repaired basketball court; • Installed soft surface; and • Provided wood chipped areas.
Edward Mazique Parent and Child Center	\$25,000.00	To install a surveillance system to assure safety, protection, and accountability for all children and staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed surveillance security system throughout the center.
Kids Corner Daycare Center	\$25,000.00	To update equipment to be in compliant with OSSE's regulation and safety precautions. Also to upgrade and repair the classrooms throughout.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed 8 compliant infant cribs, 3 emergency evacuation kits, patrician Plexiglas wall system, and carpeting/rug in classrooms; • Ordered multi-cultural anti-bias supplies; and • Painted walls.

Table 5: Facility Improvement Grant Scoring Criteria

Area	Maximum Points
------	----------------

Location Identification	10
Reasonableness of Project Scope	30
Public Benefit	5
Project	45
Financial Feasibility	10
Total	100

Q19: Please provide a narrative update of OSSE’s oversight of the Head Start program in the District. At a minimum, please include the following information: how many children are currently enrolled in the District’s head start program and where are the individual programs located in the District?

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 19 Attachment – Headstart Program

Head Start is a federal program that promotes school readiness of low income children through agencies in local communities. In addition to early education services, Head Start programs are required to provide:

- physical, oral, and mental health services for children;
- nutritious meals and snacks and nutrition education for children and their families;
- Parent involvement and engagement including two home visits, two parent teacher conferences, and regular parent meetings; and
- Family partnership agreements that support parents in setting and achieving personal and family goals.

The federal government allocates approximately \$25 million annually in Head Start funding for the District. As shown in Table 3, these resources provide for the availability of Head Start services in all sectors – PCS, DCPS, and CBOs. DCPS is the single largest Head Start provider in the District. Moreover, DCPS is in its fourth year of implementation of its innovative Head Start School-Wide Model (HSSWM), which leverages local dollars along with federal Head Start dollars to guarantee a pre-k experience consistent with the Head Start Program Performance Standards for all children enrolled in all Title I schools. In this manner, DCPS is able to ensure an efficient use of its available funding sources, consistently meet rigorous standards for program quality, and provide children and families with a range of comprehensive health, nutrition, mental health, and family engagement services. The largest provider of Head Start services in the CBO sector is the United Planning Organization (UPO). UPO partners with DCPS, PCS, and other CBOs to expand the supply of Head Start and Early Head Start (EHS) in the city. For example, UPO provides Early Head Start (serving pregnant women and children birth to age three) in several DCPS elementary and high schools. Additionally, UPO partners with PCS and CBOs to either increase the number of pre-k slots in their programs and/or ensure that these programs are able to leverage federal resources to provide Head Start comprehensive services.

September 2013 - July 2014				August 2014		
Grantees	Home-based	EHS	HS	Home-	EHS	HS

FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education

	<i>center</i>	<i>center</i>	<i>based</i>	<i>center</i>	<i>center</i>
DCPS ¹		4,293			5,029
Bright Beginnings, Inc.	13	44	10 (HS) 63 (EHS)	33	51
CentroNia	-	-	-	72	
Educare of Washington, DC ²	56	85		64	102
Edward C. Mazique Parent Child Center	10 (EHS)	72	93	-	-
Kennedy Institute	62 (HS)		2	-	-
Rosemount	120 (HS) 77 (EHS)	39	63	77 (EHS)	39
UPO - AppleTree Early Learning Center PCS Oklahoma			112		-
UPO - AppleTree Early Learning Center PCS – Douglas Knolls			67		49
UPO Apple TREE Early Learning Center PCS Savannah Place			67		49
UPO – Azeeze	16			16	
UPO - Ballou	16			16	
UPO – C.W. Harris	16			16	
UPO - Dunbar	8			8	
UPO – Edgewood	24			24	
UPO – Fredrick Douglass	40			40	
UPO – Luke C. Moore	7			8	
UPO – Marie Reed	16			16	
UPO – Woodson	8			8	
UPO – Anacostia High School	24			24	
UPO – Home Base	40 (EHS)			72	
Spanish Education Center		21		36	
Eagle Academy Charter School		17			-
Healthy Babies			52		
UPO-Atlantic Gardens				24	
UPO-Paradise				16	
Christian Academy				40	
Total	309	355	4,864	346	5,280

Q20: Within the Division of Early Learning is the Policy and Research Unit which is “focused on steering collaborative research to support policy development and recommendations for policy review.” Please provide a list and narrative description of the research that was conducted in FY14 and to date in FY15. In your response, please indicate how this research has directly influenced a policy or policy recommendation.

RESPONSE:

OSSE realigned beginning in the late spring of 2014 to bring focus and support to both the PK-

¹ Includes all Title 1 schools for a total of 58 site0073

² Educare of Washington, DC is a delegate of UPO

Postsecondary continuum and to the agency's research and analysis functions. During the realignment, the Policy and Research Unit in the Division of Early Learning was dissolved and those responsibilities were transferred to the Division of Accountability, Assessment and Research (DAAR), which was expanded to include a policy focus designed to support each OSSE program division with policy and research needs. Therefore, DAAR, in coordination with the Division of Early Learning, conducted the following research in FY14 and to date in FY15:

1. Expansion of Infant/Toddler Care

In FY14 and in FY15 to date, OSSE has identified a need for additional infant and toddler childcare slots throughout the District. Analysis of pre-k enrollment data across all public sectors show enough slots to accommodate all pre-Kindergarten aged children in the District, but still insufficient capacity for approximately 30% of the unserved infant and toddler population. OSSE has conducted on-going geographic analysis to determine areas needing additional capacity for infant and toddler slots. To meet this need, OSSE applied for and received funding to provide additional high quality slots through the Head Start Childcare Partnership grant, which establishes a Quality Improvement Network in these areas.

2. Research Collaboration

OSSE currently maintains relationships with local universities, colleges and research organizations and non-profits, such as the DC Fiscal Policy Institute, DC Action for Children, School Readiness Consulting and Howard University. In FY15, OSSE plans to develop new relationships with research partners within the District that already have extensive knowledge about many of the urban issues impacting early education policy.

3. Head Start Enrollment Collection

OSSE collected student level enrollment data for the first time in 2014 from both Early Head Start and Head Start programming. Collecting and assigning OSSE identifiers to this population will enable a better understanding of who Head Start is reaching and how to better support this sector as well. From a policy perspective, this also allows OSSE to better understanding how federal and local funding streams are affecting early childhood populations and how to improve the delivery of services.

4. ECE Staff Collection

In fall 2014, OSSE completed a statewide collection of staff qualifications and demographics for all those employed in licensed childcare. These data allow OSSE to establish benchmarks for the credentials and experience of early childhood staff and help facilitate OSSE's creation of supports for staff to move along the career lattice. Additionally, analysis of staff qualifications can be examined as an input to determine the impact and relationship to other variables within childcare.

5. Howard University Classroom Quality Evaluation

In FY 2014, OSSE contracted Howard University Center for Urban Progress to conduct various program quality evaluations to determine the level of classroom quality in the District's Child Development Programs. Evaluation results are being used to inform instruction, classroom management and professional development needs. Below are the evaluations done by Howard University:

- Quality of Early Learning and Care Centers: Howard University Center for Urban Progress (HUCUP) conducted a baseline quality assessment of community based child care subsidy

providers. The evaluation included toddler classrooms (ages 18 months – 36 months) and pre-kindergarten classrooms (ages 3 and 4) utilizing the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) – CLASS Toddler and CLASS Pre-K. HUCUP also conducted a baseline quality assessment in family home settings (infants – school aged) utilizing the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale – Revised (FCCERS-R). Observations were conducted across each ward to assess the quality of early childhood classrooms and home settings in the District of Columbia. Additionally, HUCUP administered the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Fourth Edition (PPVT4) and Expressive Vocabulary Test – Second Edition (EVT2) individualized assessments to a sample of 3 and 4 year old children enrolled in the community based child care subsidy centers and homes to gain a baseline of expressive and receptive language outcomes of children early childhood programs in the District of Columbia.

- Pre-k Enhancement and Expansion Classroom Quality Evaluation: HUCUP conducted the Pre-K Expansion and Enhancement classroom quality evaluation utilizing the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS Pre-K) observation tool. Additionally, Howard administered student outcome assessments to a representative sample of pre-k students in CBOs utilizing the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - IV (PPVT4) and Expressive Vocabulary Test – II (EVT2) in the beginning of the year and at the end of the year to measure growth in expressive and receptive language development. The CLASS assessment scores are included in the 2014 Pre-K Report.
- Infants and Toddlers Quality Improvement Initiative Classroom evaluation: HUCUP conducted a post evaluation utilizing the Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale – Revised (ITERS-R) to continue monitoring the quality improvement of the Infant and Toddler Quality Improvement Initiative classrooms during the “full intervention phase” once programs received one year of professional development interventions such as mentor-coaching support and trainings on infant and toddler curriculum and exemplary practices.

6. School Readiness Consulting Pre-k evaluation

OSSE contracted School Readiness Consulting (SRC) to implement classroom observations, analyze results, and prepare a final report to summarize findings to Pre-k classrooms in the Community Based Organization and DC Public Charter Schools. The study aimed to create a baseline understanding of pre-k classroom quality throughout the District. The results from the evaluation will help OSSE create consensus around decisions regarding the quality improvement needs of pre-k programs throughout the District. A subsequent phase of work may build on this baseline study, implementing CLASS observations District-wide to inform a broader quality rating process and communicate this information to early learning stakeholders.

7. Child Care Cost Modeling Study

OSSE has started work on the child care cost modeling initiative to determine where child care reimbursement rates should be set in a manner that provides parents access to quality care as well as help inform the development of family-friendly child care subsidy policies. The reauthorization of the Child Care Development Block Grant allows states to use alternate methods to determine reimbursement rates for child care.

Q21: Provide an update on OSSE’s collaboration with DMH and DBH on the implementation of programs to identify and assist children with behavioral health or developmental problems at

DCPS and at charter schools. What new work was completed in FY14? Please also describe the training made available to LEAs on crisis response and intervention.

RESPONSE:

The following are the primary areas in which OSSE and DBH have collaborated to ensure implementation of programs to identify and assist children with behavioral health or developmental problems at DCPS and at charter schools:

NONVIOLENT CRISIS PREVENTION TRAINING

In FY14, OSSE collaborated with DBH to access Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) grant funding and to certify trainers and deliver training in an evidence-based nonviolent crisis prevention model offered via the Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI). Through this training, participants learn the skills and strategies needed to safely manage assaultive and disruptive behavior.

Objectives of the training include:

- Recognizing behaviors that may be exhibited by an individual in behavioral crisis
- Understanding and applying de-escalation techniques
- Gaining the tools needed to support individuals before, during and after a crisis
- Understanding the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS)
- Understanding the principles of nonviolent crisis intervention in school settings

OSSE is pleased to report that the trainings have included a wide array of stakeholders, including: elementary, middle and high school educators (public schools and nonpublic schools), preschool/early childhood educators, school principals, school psychologists, related service providers, social workers, guidance counselors, OSSE staff, and other government agency staff (e.g. CFSA, DYRS).

In addition, due to a high level of requests for additional behavioral support and crisis response training, as well as trauma informed care training, in 2014, OSSE met with the DC Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA) to explore a possible collaboration that combine the current nonviolent crisis training or find ways to make connections between CPI training and CFSA's Trauma Systems Therapy (TST) training. It is OSSE's belief that such coordination will create a more in-depth training option for those working with children and adolescents who have been exposed to trauma.

Key achievements:

- Since July 2013, OSSE has conducted 20 state-level trainings and certified over 350 educators in CPI;
- OSSE currently holds a cadre of 13 state-level facilitators including a staff from the DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB);
- OSSE has and is scheduled to provide on-site school trainings for LEAs, including two (2) trainings specifically tailored for the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) in February 2015 and April 2015; and
- OSSE is scheduled to host five (5) additional trainings from January 2015- to September 2015 on non-violent crisis prevention and four (4) trainings on Trauma Informed Care.

YOUTH MENTAL HEALTH FIRST AID (YMHFA)

Youth Mental Health First Aid Training is designed to teach parents, family members, caregivers, teachers/ school staff, peers, neighbors, and others, on how to help adolescents (ages 12-18) who experience mental health or addiction challenges. This training is primarily designed for adults who regularly interact with young people. The course introduces common mental health challenges for youth, reviews typical adolescent development, and teaches a 5-step action plan for how to help young people both in crisis and non-crisis situations. Topics covered include anxiety, depression, substance use, disorders in which psychosis may occur, disruptive behavior disorders (including ADHD), and eating disorders.

Upon learning about this opportunity, OSSE collaborated with DBH to provide state level training to District schools/LEAs. OSSE will also continue to collaborate for DBH on this initiative and is planning to provide monthly trainings up through the 2015-2016 SY.

TRAUMA SYSTEM THERAPY (TST)/TRAUMA INFORMED CARE

Trauma System Therapy (TST) is an evidence-based treatment model that provides mental health services and support to children and adolescents with histories of exposure to traumatic events and who experience difficulties regulating their emotions and behaviors (both or either in the community or school).

Through the support of DBH and CFSA, as of today, OSSE, CFSA and DBH have met with the NYU Center on Coordinated Trauma Services in Child Welfare and Mental Health have met to discuss ways in which OSSE can assist schools in accessing this model. OSSE and CFSA have worked collaboratively to assess the viability of the model in DC schools, including having CFSA representatives attend OSSE's CPI Training and OSSE representatives attend CFSA's TST training. On February 19 and 20, 2015, OSSE will be conducting four (4) trainings on trauma informed care.

SYSTEM OF CARE (SOC)

The System of Care (SOC) model is a federally supported framework aimed at helping jurisdictions coordinate and leverage resources to prevent and intervene early to address behavioral health challenges that impact children and families. Through grant funding provided by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA), in 2010, the District of Columbia was granted an opportunity to plan, develop and implement a DC System of Care Model. The funding, a \$5M grant over the course of five years, supports the operation, expansion, and integration of the SOC through the creation of sustainable infrastructure which allows for the delivery of, and access to, services and supports to children and youth with socio-emotional and behavioral concerns. The model also promotes the implementation of systemic changes in policy, financing, services and supports, training and workforce development, and other areas that are necessary for expanding and sustaining the system of care approach. The following are the five focus areas for DC's SOC:

- Improved access to mental health services (Access)
- Family engagement; parent and youth peer support (Peer Support)
- Functional, trauma-informed assessment utilizing the Child Adolescent Assessment Scale (CAFAS) and the Preschool and Early Childhood Functional Assessment (PECFAS)
- Integration of Behavioral Health and Primary Care (DC Collaborative for Mental Health in Pediatric Primary Care)
- Reinvestment strategies to promote sustainability (Reinvestment)

From the initial phase, OSSE has been an active partner at all levels of the planning, development and implementation of DC SOC.

SOC- CAFAS/PECFAS

In effort to support Focus Area #3, the SOC executive committee agreed to implement a single functional trauma-informed assessment tool across all child serving systems. The CAFAS/PECFAS were selected as the instruments. Although OSSE does not have a direct role in the usage of the tool, it has lent support to DBH, DCPS and PCSB on how to introduce the tool within schools (including brainstorming and budget discussions).

As noted on a recent DC site report issued by SAMHSA evaluating this focus area, the following are strengths to this tool: “(1) all major child serving systems will use one unified assessment tool to ensure agencies uniformly use the same measure of progress or behavior in change in any domain, and (2) providers have access to a database to determine whether child, youth, and families are involved in other systems in an effort to decrease the number of times youth, young adults and families must repeat their information.”

SOC- Family Peer Specialist Training

In effort to support Focus Area #5 of the SOC Plan (increasing the availability of natural supports), in summer 2014, OSSE DSE supported DBH’s Peer to Peer Initiative by conducting trainings on aspects of special education helpful for parents to know as they navigate the education system. The OSSE training introduced Family Peer Specialists to the multi-faceted aspects of the District’s educational system including DCPS, OSSE, Charter Schools, and LEAs. Family Peer Specialists learned how to best support parents to ensure their educational needs are met within the school environment. Family Peer Specialists also were introduced to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and became familiar with the supports and services available to children and youth who qualify as eligible for special education services under IDEA.

FULL SERVICE SCHOOL/DC WRAPAROUND MODEL

Since 2008, OSSE and DBH have jointly funded wraparound services to hundreds of students, Currently, serving nine DC middle schools, one high school and one elementary school, this model, DC Wrap, was developed in effort to support students identified by school staff as having significant socio-emotional and/or behavioral challenges. DC Wrap offers a vehicle for linking students and families with community and school-based mental health partners, in order to ensure services and supports are provided to the student and family and ultimately maintain students and families together and prevent more restrictive out-of-home or out-of-school placements.

During SY13-14, DC Wrap served 212 students across DC, a 175% increase from SY08-09. In addition, data from SY13-14 revealed that, of the 98% of the youth who resided in a community setting at the time their enrollment, and during the reporting period, all remained in the community at the conclusion of the SY13-14 reporting period.

Q22: Regarding the DC Early Intervention Program (DC EIP), what is the status of updating the central directory of early intervention services to make it current and complete? Please include a public link to where this directory can be found.

RESPONSE:

The DC EIP Central Directory of Early Intervention Resources is reviewed and updated on an annual basis. The next update is scheduled for May 2015. The directory can be accessed through the following link: <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/central-directory-early-intervention-resources>.

Q23: Describe what OSSE has done in FY14 to increase the number of infants and toddlers receiving Early Intervention services, as mandated by Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Please provide the following details about the Early Intervention Program (DC EIP) during FY14 and FY15, to date:

- Number and percent of referrals, by source (e.g. parent, primary care physician, other medical provider, teacher, child development center, Medicaid MCO, home daycare provider);
- Percent of children evaluated from overall pool of children referred in total and by ward;
- The number and type of evaluations (e.g. psychological evaluation, neurodevelopmental assessment, speech-language evaluation, assistive technology evaluation, medical diagnostic) provided by DC EIP staff and various private contractors;
- Number of children found eligible as a result of the referral;
- Number and percentage of completed screenings that resulted in no recommendation for further evaluation, by referral source, and by Ward;
- Number and percent of children receiving an eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan within 45 days of referral;
- Number and percent of children receiving services within 30 days of receiving the Individualized Family Service Plan;
- The number of children who received particular types of services (e.g. occupational therapy, physical therapy, specialized instruction, assistive technology, psychological services, vision, transportation, respite, and family counseling/training/home visitation);
- Number of children receiving services, by funding source (e.g. Medicaid MCO, Medicaid fee for service, no insurance); and,
- Any child outcome or performance outcomes OSSE collects, by type of service and provider.

RESPONSE:

Number and percent of referrals, by source (e.g. parent, primary care physician, other medical provider, teacher, child development center, Medicaid MCO, home daycare provider):

Table 1: Number and percent of referrals, by course in FY 14 and FY15 to date

-	FY 2014		FY 2015*	
Referral Source	Number	Percent of overall referrals	Number	Percent
CFSA	52	2.8%	13	2.8%

Child Development Centers	124	6.6%	42	8.9%
Clinics	764	40.7%	185	39.3%
Community Based Organizations	66	3.5%	15	3.2%
Hospitals	313	16.7%	65	13.8%
Medicaid MCO	15	0.8%	12	2.5%
Other	41	2.2%	6	1.3%
Other Government Agencies	26	1.4%	4	0.8%
Parent/Family	394	21.0%	111	23.6%
Physician's Offices	83	4.4%	18	3.8%
Totals	1878	100%	471	100%

*October – December 2014

**Not an unduplicated count

Table 2: Percent of children evaluated from overall pool of children referred in total and by ward in FY 14 and FY 15 to date

-	FY14	FY15*
Ward	Percent	Percent
1	10.6%	12.1%
2	3.7%	3.4%
3	5.8%	5.7%
4	17.7%	14.0%
5	12.5%	11.7%
6	10.3%	13.8%
7	15.4%	16.6%
8	22.8%	21.2%
Outside DC	1.2%	1.5%
Totals	100%	100%

*October – December 2014

**Not an unduplicated count

The number and type of evaluations (e.g. psychological evaluation, neurodevelopmental assessment, speech-language evaluation, assistive technology evaluation, medical diagnostic) provided by DC EIP staff and various private contractors:

All evaluations conducted are comprehensive multidisciplinary evaluations (CME) and are done by DC EIP contractors or the Managed Care Organization (MCO) serving the child and families across the District. DC EIP staff does not conduct evaluations. Please refer to Table 2 above for information on the number of evaluations conducted.

Table 3: Number of children found eligible as a result of the referral by FY 14 and FY15 to date:

Year	Number of Children
FY 2014	637
FY 2015 (to date)	170

Number and percentage of completed screenings that resulted in no recommendation for further evaluation, by referral source, and by Ward:

Upon consent of the parents, each child referred to DC EIP receives a comprehensive multidisciplinary evaluation. Due to the Federal Part C Regulations (*34 CFR § 303.320 Screening procedures (optional)*) that require States to declare whether or not they will include screening in the eligibility process, DC EIP has opted not to continue screening individual children upon referral DC EIP continues to support community and governmental agency partners through training and provision of the screening tool in an effort to ensure this resource is provided to parents and caregivers.

Number and percent of children receiving an eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan within 45 days of referral:

OSSE reports annually on the number and percent of children receiving an eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan within 45 days of referral in its Annual Performance Report submitted in February of each year to the USDE and published on the OSSE website upon finalization in April. This data is outlined below:

Table 5: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

Year	Number of Children	Percent of Children
FFY 2012 (July 2012-June 2013)	410	92.3%
FFY 2013 (July 2013-June 2014)*	556	93.1%

* preliminary data submission.

Number and percent of children receiving services within 30 days of receiving the Individualized Family Service Plan:

The number of children who received particular types of services (e.g. occupational therapy, physical therapy, specialized instruction, assistive technology, psychological services, vision, transportation, respite, and family counseling/training/home visitation):

Table 6: Number of children who are receiving services by type of service*

Service	# of children receiving service
Speech/Language Pathology (SLP)	586

Physical Therapy (PT)	402
Occupational Therapy (OT)	300
Special Instruction (SI)	230
Vision Services	25
Hearing Services	25
Parent training	74

*Note that OSSE captures this data as a snapshot of a particular point in time. This data is as of January 23, 2015. A child may receive more than one service.

OSSE reports annually on the number and percent of children receiving services within 30 days of receiving the Individualized Family Service Plan in Indicator 1 of its Annual Performance Report.

Table 7: Percent of infants/toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive identified early intervention (EI) services on their IFSPs within 30 days.

Year	Number of Children	Percent of Children
FFY 2012 (July 2012-June 2013)	363	88.9%
FFY 2013 (July 2013-June 2014)*	568	92.2%

* *preliminary data submission.*

Number of children receiving services, by funding source (e.g. Medicaid MCO, Medicaid fee for service, no insurance):

As of April 2013, the District no longer accepts private insurance to pay for early intervention services. All services are funded entirely by DC EIP, Medicaid Fee for Service, or Medicaid Managed Care Organizations. Please note that these numbers change on a monthly basis as children move in and out of Medicaid

Table 8: Number of children with IFSPs, by funding source*

Payor Source/Insurance	Number of Children
DC EIP	366
Medicaid MCO	429
Fee For Service Medicaid	41
Total	836

* Note that OSSE captures this data as a snapshot of a particular point in time. This data is as of January 23, 2015.

Any child outcome or performance outcomes OSSE collects, by type of service and provider:

The District tracks child outcomes based on Part C federal SPP/APR Indicator 3 which requires the reporting on the 3 OSEP categories:

Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

The District uses the curriculum based assessment tool Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System interactive (AEPSi) to measure progress. The goal of Part C is to work with the child *and* family in order to improve children's functioning in their routines. OSSE does not track progress by individual service or provider. There are several reasons why this level of data collection would not accurately measure the quality of service provided to children receiving Part C services: 1) most children are being served by multiple providers; 2) the varying levels of delays or disabilities makes it difficult to determine an child's developmental trajectory; 3) family involvement (a key cornerstone of early intervention) varies by child; and 4) Medicaid MCOs have their own network of direct service providers.

OSSE has implemented several quality improvement strategies including one on one coaching of providers; ongoing web-based training modules; an Early Intervention Certificate program through Georgetown University; and the requirement that all service providers and service coordinators complete the Early Intervention 101 training module prior to working with Strong Start infants and toddlers. In FY 16 OSSE will initiate additional quality assurance efforts with providers including setting standards for evaluation and report standards, evaluating the efficacy of service delivery through parent surveys and interviews, and building consequences for noncompliance with timelines and deliverables into their contracts.

Q24: Regarding children who exited Part C services in FY14:

- **Number and percent of children who are meeting age-expectations in areas of previous delay at exit;**
- **Number and percent of children eligible for Part B services who have an IEP by age 3;**
- **Number and percent of children eligible for Part B who have a placement to implement their IEP by age 3;**
- **Percent of the time transition conferences that are attended by Part B staff and LEA staff;**
- **Number of children exited by type of placement or services after age 3 (eg, DCPS school, charter school, home, private school, child development center); and,**
- **Percent of children in Part C who are ultimately deemed eligible for Part B (even if Part B eligibility decided after age 3).**

RESPONSE:

Number and percent of children who are meeting age-expectations in areas of previous delay at exit:

DC EIP reports yearly on the number of children who are *no longer eligible for Part C services prior to reaching age 3*. The Program does not track whether or not the child is specifically meeting age-expectations in areas of previous delay at exit.

Children no longer eligible for EI services prior to reaching age 3:

Year	Number of Children	Percent of Children
FFY 2013 (July 2013-June 2014)	78	16.4%

Number and percent of children eligible for Part B services who have an IEP by age 3:

OSSE is required to calculate the number of children eligible for Part B services who receive a smooth and effective transition. In FFY 2013, 270 children were referred from Part C to Part B. According to the Annual Performance Report prepared for the Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), 98.1 percent of children (268) receive smooth and effective transitions, meaning that they were determined eligible for part B and had an IEP implemented by the third birthday. This percentage includes: children who were determined eligible for B and had an IEP implanted by the third birthday (153); children who were evaluated timely but were ineligible for Part B services (51 children); children for whom parental consent prevented a timely evaluation or implementation of services (58 children); and children who were determined eligible for Part C 90 days prior to their third birthday (6 children).

Final Metric calculation	
Indicator 12 measurement	Number and percent of children eligible for Part B services who have an IEP by age 3: Same as APR 2013 Indicator 12.
A: Total number of children referred from C to B	270
B: Number of children referred from C who were found ineligible for B	51
C: Number of children referred from C who were found eligible for B and had IEPs by the 3 rd birthday	153
D: Number of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied	58
E: Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their 3 rd birthday	6
Calculation	98.71

Number and percent of children eligible for Part B who have a placement to implement their IEP by age 3:

Strong Start Early Intervention does not track Part B (special education) data. OSSE's special education data system (SEDS) tracks special education eligibility and timely IEP development by age 3, which is the federally mandated requirement. Location assignments to deliver services are made by each individual LEA.

Percent of the time transition conferences that are attended by Part B staff and LEA staff:

FFY13 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014)			
	Total Children	Number for	Percent staff

	with Conferences	which Part B attended	in attendance
Percent of the time transition conferences that are attended by Part B staff and LEA staff*	269	215	79.9%

FFY14 (July 1, 2014 – December 31, 2014)

	Total Children with Conferences	Number for which Part B attended	Percent staff in attendance
Percent of the time transition conferences that are attended by Part B staff and LEA staff*	188	142	75.5%

Number of children exited by type of placement or services after age 3 (eg, DCPS school, charter school, home, private school, child development center):

This calculation requires a review of individual student records. OSSE is in the process of compiling the final data set, which will be forthcoming.

Percent of children in Part C who are ultimately deemed eligible for Part B (even if Part B eligibility decided after age 3):

219 children of the 270 referred from C to B (81%) were found eligible for B.

Q25: Provide an update on the work of the Early Childhood Development Coordinating Council in FY14 and to date in FY15. At a minimum, please include the following:

- **A list of all members of the Council, including the organization they represent and the length of time they have served on the Council;**
- **A list of the date and time of all meetings in FY14 and to date in FY15;**
- **A narrative description of any action items taken or recommendations made by the Council in FY14 and to date in FY15.**

RESPONSE:

A list of all members of the Council, including the organization they represent and the length of time they have served on the Council:

Please see: Question 25 Attachment – State Early Childhood Development Coordinating Council

A list of the date and time of all meetings in FY14 and to date in FY15:

The State Early Childhood Development Coordinating Council (SECDCC) met October 2013, May 2014, September 2014 and December 2014.

A narrative description of any action items taken or recommendations made by the Council in FY14 and to date in FY15:

In alignment with the District's Early Learning Plan, the SECDCC early learning plan includes six key strategies to advance outcomes for children, families, professionals and communities:

- Enhance the District's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS), *Going for the Gold*,
- Expand Infant & Toddler Capacity and Quality,
- Create Health and Early Childhood Education Linkages,
- Implement Pre-k to 3rd Grade Approaches,
- Develop and Utilize a Comprehensive Early Childhood Data System, and
- Produce Citywide and Neighborhood level School Readiness Data and Maps.

Building upon these six strategies, the SECDCC has established the following committees to move the work forward:

- Quality Rating and Improvement System
- Professional Development
- Health and Well-Being
- Early Childhood Assessment Data
- Communications and Public/Private Partnerships

Each Committee's membership includes staff from District government agencies as well as appointed and non-appointed members of the early learning community. The Quality Rating and Improvement System and Health and Well-being Committees met actively in FY14.

The SECDCC Quality Rating System Committee has been integral in providing feedback on the following activities:

- **Proposed revision to the quality rating framework.** A draft framework for rating program quality has been developed led by the Division of Early Learning (DEL) at OSSE. It provides for a common approach to rating program quality that is relevant for measuring quality across all sectors of the early learning community, and is meaningful for families.
 - Next Steps: Compile and integrate stakeholder feedback and re-convene in February 2015 to review the revised QRIS Framework.
- **Proposed revisions to child care licensing regulations.** DEL at OSSE has developed proposed revisions to licensing regulations for child development facilities. These changes will strengthen the foundation for program quality for all child care facilities in the District, including those that do not receive public funds. Changes to licensing regulations are necessitated by new federal requirements and advances in best practices understanding of quality caregiving for young children.
 - Next Steps: Forward proposed licensing regulations for public comment in January 2015.
- **Submission of a federal grant for Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships.** DEL at OSSE submitted and was awarded a federal grant to supplement local resources for its

Quality Improvement Network initiative. The goals of the grant are to assist infant and toddler providers in the child care subsidy program to benefit from additional resources and sustained quality improvement supports aligned to program ratings. The combined federal and local funds will support three community based hubs to provide comprehensive services and an evidenced-based model of infant and toddler care consistent with federal Early Head Start program standards to child care centers and homes serving infants and toddlers.

Health and Well-Being Committee: The focus of the Health and Well-Being Committee has been on increasing the number of children ages 0-5 who receive early screening for behavioral health concerns and developmental delays in their medical home, and ensuring they are connected to further assessment and care in a coordinated way. The Committee has been building on the recommendations from the Creating Community Solutions Early Intervention and Prevention Team to conduct a broadly-focused public awareness campaign to increase the knowledge and competence of parents, caregivers and providers in identifying emerging mental health concerns in children and the number of children who receive early screening for behavioral concerns and developmental delays.

In addition, members of the Committee have been working with the Home Visiting Council, with technical assistance from Zero to Three, to create a coordinated system of targeted home visitation services with a centralized intake process. This process has included ensuring all home visiting programs operating in the city have a clear understanding of the continuum of services available and the gaps that currently exist.

The committee also provided the following recommendations moving forward:

- Ensure implementation of the Early Learning Data System to support program planning and accountability. Build on the foundation of our existing State Longitudinal Education Data system (SLED) and District of Columbia Access System (DCAS) Release 3.³ A comprehensive quality data system will allow the District to answer critical policy questions about young children's health and educational outcomes, the characteristics of our early learning workforce, and the quality of early learning programs and services including subsidized child care, Pre-K incentive, home visitation, E.P.S.D.T., early intervention and special education.
- Strengthen the infrastructure of OSSE's Division of Early Learning (DEL) to support implementation of new licensing regulations, a Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) and the Early Learning Quality Improvement Hub Network including a strategic communications and engagement plan. Create key messages for diverse audiences to highlight the District's innovative and impactful early childhood investments.
- Maintain and build on current subsidy and facility improvement investments to expand and enhance the quality of care for infants and toddlers in the District.
- Implement the EDI in all pre-k four-year-old classrooms across the city to provide a common set of data on the school readiness of young children that can be used to enhance community level planning, budgeting and decision-making.
- Continue a strong commitment to a mixed delivery system of pre-K.

³ DCAS will be a state-of-the-art health and human services solution that provides the District a new integrated eligibility system for Medicaid, private health insurance and other programs with new case management capabilities that span programs and agencies.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Q26: How many students are homeschooled in the District in FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date?

RESPONSE:

FY13	FY14	FY15 to date
293	325	320 as of 1/26/15

Q27: Provide an update on the oversight OSSE performed in FY14 for private and parochial schools in the District. How many students are enrolled in private and parochial schools in the District in SY13-14 and SY14-15 to date?

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 27 Attachment – Private School Enrollment SY13-14 and SY 14-15

In accordance with 5 DCMR § E2100, OSSE is responsible for overseeing that private schools comply with certain educational requirements, and the regulations require private schools to seek approval from OSSE in order to operate in the District. Specifically, educational institutions, not affiliated with the DCPS or chartered by PCSB, must present evidence satisfactory to the Superintendent that the certain aspects of their instruction are acceptable, including but not limited to, the amount of instruction, character of instruction, and qualifications of staff.

To facilitate collaboration between private and parochial schools and OSSE, OSSE created a Private School Advisory Panel. This panel serves as an advisory body that supports OSSE in carrying out its responsibilities as it pertains to private schools operating in the District. The panel, which has been meeting quarterly since 2013, provides feedback to OSSE on proposed or final regulations that may impact private schools in the DC.

Q28: Please quantify for each LEA the number of homeless youth, foster care youth, TANF eligible, SNAP eligible, and high school students one year older or more than the expected age for grade in which the student is enrolled for SY2011-2012, SY2012-2013, SY2013-2014, and SY2014-2015 to date.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 28 Attachment – At-Risk Students 2011 to present

Q29: Provide the following information regarding DC foster children who are enrolled either in DC or out-of-District (e.g., Maryland) public schools:

- The information that CFSA and OSSE currently share or plan to share regarding the education of students in foster care;
- The number of children referred by CFSA that were screened through the Early Intervention initiative in each of FY14 and FY15 to date, and the screening measures used;

- **The staff members that conduct this screening and how they were trained;**
- **The number of foster children that are currently enrolled in out-of-District public schools and receive general education services only;**
- **The number of foster children that are currently enrolled in out-of-District public schools and receive special education services;**
- **The data OSSE tracks or plans to track regarding foster children enrolled in out-of-District public schools;**
- **The amount that OSSE pays to enroll an individual student in an out-of-District public school. Please break out the answer by school district attended, grade, special education status, and any other relevant factor; and,**
- **The amount that OSSE spent in FY14 and to date in FY15 on special education transportation for children in foster care.**

RESPONSE:

The information that CFSA and OSSE currently share or plan to share regarding the education of students in foster care:

District of Columbia Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA) shares information with OSSE regarding the education of students in foster care who are enrolled in a public school within the District. OSSE also obtains the education information of those students from the actual schools within the District.

As for students in foster care who are enrolled in an out-of-District public school, OSSE has executed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Child and Family Services (CFSA) to share data on a nightly basis between OSSE's Student Longitudinal Data System (SLED) and CFSA's FACES system. The main goal is share educational data, which includes but not limited to enrollment, demographic, specialized education, assessment and postsecondary data. Within SLED and the FACES data systems we will be able to identify all foster children to ensure they are receiving an education within the District of Columbia and in the surrounding counties and states. OSSE is in constant communications with CFSA to enhance the current data that is being shared on a monthly basis between both agencies to ultimately track education outcomes and number of school placement changes for children in foster care.

Please see: Question 29 Attachment – CFSA Data Share

The number of children referred by CFSA that were screened through the Early Intervention initiative in each of FY14 and FY15 to date, and the screening measures used:

OSSE has partnered with two Community Safety Net locations (Mary's Center and Howard University Hospital (HUH)) to conduct developmental screenings for CFSA families whose children remain in the home.

For children who are removed from the home, OSSE receives referrals directly from the Healthy Horizons Clinic at CFSA. The following is the number of children referred to OSSE for FY 14 and FY 15:

	FY 2014		FY 2015*	
Referral Source	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CFSA	52	2.8%	13	2.8%

The staff members that conduct this screening and how they were trained:

Mary's Center and HUH staff are trained in the use of Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) and follow a protocol of either: (a) if the child fails the screening, refer to child Strong Start; or (b) if the child passes the screening, discuss results with the family and refer to other community resources, as appropriate. In both cases the results are shared with the CFSA caseworker.

The number of foster children that are currently enrolled in out-of-District public schools and receive general education services only:

According to tuition invoices from surrounding counties, and through an enrollment verification process with CFSA, there are currently 112 CFSA foster children currently enrolled in out-of-District public schools who received general education services.

The number of foster children that are currently enrolled in out-of-District public schools and receive special education services:

According to tuition invoices from surrounding counties, and through an enrollment verification process with CFSA, there are currently 76 CFSA foster children currently enrolled in out-of-District public schools who receive special education services.

The data OSSE tracks or plans to track regarding foster children enrolled in out-of-District public schools:

Under current agreements, CFSA provides a data feed to the State Longitudinal Education Database (SLED). In addition, CFSA provides a monthly report to OSSE that includes student name, DOB, home address, Uniform Student Identification (USI), residency status, attending school, date of school placement, grade, foster parents (name, address, telephone number, email), and IEP/504 information.

The amount that OSSE pays to enroll an individual student in an out-of-District public school. Please break out the answer by school district attended, grade, special education status, and any other relevant factor:

Prince George's County

- \$206 per day includes all services (Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) codes F and C self-contained classroom), grades 1-6 & 8-12
- \$122.47 per day includes all services (LRE code B pull-out services) grade 1
- \$122.51 per day includes all services (LRE code B pull-out services) grades 10 thru 12
- \$80.70 per day includes all services (LRE codes A and W pull-out services) grades k thru 5, 8
- \$80.77 per day includes all services (LRE codes A and W pull-out services) grades 6, 8, 9 thru 11

Charles County

- \$186 per day includes instruction & speech grades k, 6 & 8
- \$178.95 per day includes instruction only grades 2, 7 thru 9
- \$216.17 per day includes Reg, counseling grade 11
- \$219.94 per day includes Reg, speech, OT grade 5

Fairfax County

- \$188.42 per day instruction grades 7, 11, 12
- \$35.84 Home bound instruction grade 8
- \$24.16 per hour speech
- \$30.42 per hour physical & occupational therapy
- \$27.38 per hour adapted physical education
- \$37.31 per hour Career & Transition services
- \$49.40 per hour Registered Nurse (RN) services
- \$74.10 per hour RN-OT services
- \$60.42 per hour Vision services

The amount that OSSE spent in FY14 and to date in FY15 on special education transportation for children in foster care:

The table below indicates the amount spent on special education transportation for children in foster care in FY14 and to date in FY15 based on foster student attendance and average student cost.

Amount on special education transportation for children in foster care	Student count	Total scheduled round trips	\$
FY14	192	30,093	3,895,829.08
FY15 to date	143	8,795	1,392,612.21
Total			5,288,441.29

Q30: Provide an update on OSSE's efforts to work with the State Board of Education to approve new high school graduation requirements. What is the current timeline for approval?

RESPONSE:

OSSE is working with the State Board of Education to explore the development and implementation of new high school graduation requirements that will ensure all students in the District graduate from high school both college and career ready.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Q31: What programs are offered by OSSE to assist District residents in achieving their high school equivalency? What type of outreach did OSSE complete in FY14 and to date in FY15 to increase awareness about these programs and/or encourage residents to receive their high school equivalency?

RESPONSE:

Within the Division of Postsecondary and Career Education (PSCE), the Office of Adult and Family Education (AFE), the DC ReEngagement Center, and the General Education Development (GED[®]) Program assist District youth and adults in achieving their high school equivalency. Through financial and programmatic support, PSCE creates opportunities for District residents to access adult education opportunities, and attain a high school diploma or equivalent through successfully completing a traditional diploma granting program, the National External Diploma Program (NEDP), or a GED[®] program. PSCE has engaged in frequent outreach with the community to increase awareness about these programs and support residents in receiving their high school equivalency. A summary of activities in FY14 and those to date in FY15 is presented below.

Office of Adult and Family Education

Through the AFE, PSCE funds 18 community-based organizations (CBOs) that provide adult education and academic preparation for adult students regardless of where they fall on the educational continuum. Ten of the 18 CBOs specifically include preparation for adult students to successfully obtain their high school equivalency, either through the GED program or the NEDP. All 18 of these CBOs work directly with adult students to increase their literacy skills, improve their general educational levels, or in some cases master the English language-- all with the goal of equipping adult students with the skills and knowledge to earn their high school credential.

With respect to outreach, AFE promotes and encourages residents to take advantage of adult learning opportunities through a variety of media. OSSE provides the *Guide to Adult and Family Education Services and the Guide to Adult Education Services* (available at: <http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/OSSE%20DOES%20Partnership%20Guide.pdf>) to various District government, public, and private agencies for dissemination to District residents. Additionally, information about adult education programs and services is disseminated to diverse populations of District residents at parent engagement conferences, parent-teacher meetings, community outreach events, job fairs, the Mayor's Summer Target Area outreach events, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency's (CSOSA) Community Resource Day Video Conferences, via OSSE's website, DC Cable Television advertisements and a YouTube video entitled The Adult Learner Story. Additionally, in FY14 the Department of Employment Services (DOES) and OSSE's AFE unit entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to meet the adult literacy, occupational literacy, digital literacy, and postsecondary education and workforce transition needs of District residents connected to DOES's American Job Centers (AJCs). Since that time, DOES and OSSE have been working together to ensure that District residents seeking core, intensive, and/or training services through AJCs have their educational needs assessed and are referred to the appropriate adult education providers for services. More about this partnership is included in response to question #32.

The DC ReEngagement Center

OSSE, with strong support from the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education, the Department of Employment Services, other key partner agencies, Raise DC's Disconnected Youth Change Network, schools, and community-based organizations, established a youth ReEngagement Center to serve as a "single-door" through which youth ages 16-24 who have disengaged from school can reconnect to educational options and other critical services to support their attainment of a high school diploma or GED. The Center opened its doors to the public on October 20, 2014. In alignment with nationwide best practices, the DC ReEngagement Center's core activities include:

- Conducting targeted outreach to a defined list of disengaged youth, as well as engaging walk-ins and referrals;
- Assessing academic status and non-academic needs of youth and using this information to help them develop individualized education plans;
- Identifying "best-fit" educational options;
- Supporting the re-enrollment process (e.g. collecting required documents, accompanying youth on site visits, connecting to resources that will address barriers); and
- Providing ongoing support for at least one year once re-enrolled.

Within its first month of operations, the ReEngagement Center sent 300 letters to youth identified as disengaged through the DC Statewide Longitudinal Education Data System (SLED). As a result of that effort and other targeted outreach efforts, the Reengagement Center, to date, has already interacted with 48 youth, completed 19 intakes, and has successfully enrolled eight youth in educational programs.

The ReEngagement Center continues to focus on its outreach efforts through various outlets. For instance, the ReEngagement Center conducted eight referral protocol trainings with the following direct line staff at agencies that "touch" disengaged youth

- DYRS Social Worker "All Committed Staff" Training
- High Intensity Youth Cluster Meeting (CSOSA, MPD, DYRS, CSS, DCPS)
- Department of Behavioral Health line staff training
- Defense Lawyers Training
- CFSA Office of Wellbeing and Office of Youth Empowerment trainings
- DHS Project PASS staff trainings
- Advocates for Justice in Education staff training
- Healthy Babies Project staff training

ReEngagement Center staff members are also participating in large community events to increase awareness about the services offered by the ReEngagement Center. For example, on January 2, 2015, ReEngagement Center staff attended the ANC Swearing-In Ceremony in order to conduct outreach to new and reelected ANCs. This resulted in Ward 7 ANC Commissioners visiting the ReEngagement Center a few weeks later to discuss how they could best communicate the ReEngagement Center's resources to their communities.

Given the highly mobile student population served by the ReEngagement Center, there has also been an active effort by ReEngagement Center staff to build partnerships with other local non-government organizations that serve this population in order to maximize impact. By educating existing community organizations about the services offered by the ReEngagement Center, the ReEngagement Center can better maximize the number of youth served and support the establishment of a network of providers, including local non-profits, faith-based organizations, and community centers that share best practices. Current partnering organizations include:

- Edgewood Brookland Family Support Collaborative
- Far Southeast Family Strengthening Collaborative
- East River Family Strengthening Collaborative
- Faith based organizations and coalitions of ministers.

Moving forward, the ReEngagement Center plans to continue to work with direct line staff at other agencies and programs that interact with disengaged youth, including informing MPD officers at all seven districts and Youth Divisions at roll calls between January and April 2015 of ReEngagement Center programming.

GED® Testing Program

The GED® Testing Program works closely with both the Office of Adult and Family Education and the DC ReEngagement Center to assist District residents in earning their high school equivalency through the GED®. The GED® Testing Program provides the following services: (1) the administration of the GED® Ready: Official Practice Test and the GED® Test to all eligible residents; (2) one-on-one counseling with test takers who by their test scores demonstrate a need for instructional support; and (3) being a liaison between eligible test takers and local OSSE funded GED® test preparatory programs and individual GED® tutoring.

Outreach and communication by the GED® program office include disseminating information on new updates pertaining to the GED® on an *ad hoc* and individual basis to instructional programs with perceived areas of concern. Additionally, the GED® Testing Program participates in monthly jurisdictional meetings provided by GED® Testing Service regarding procedural changes, new initiatives and best practices in other states and thereafter disseminates the information to programs and both internal and external stakeholders.. The GED® Testing Program conducts outreach through the OSSE website, the LEA Look Forward Bulletin, direct e-mail blasts to programs, Facebook, Twitter and YouTube.

Q32: Provide the Committee with an update on how the changes to the GED test are impacting District residents and what steps OSSE is taking to help District residents strive for their high school equivalency despite the difficulty. In your response, please include how the increase in the price of the new GED is impacting OSSE and program participants.

RESPONSE:

Impact of New GED on District Residents

The new series of GED® Tests began on January 1, 2014 and included the following changes: (1) the new GED® eliminated paper-based GED® Testing and implemented a fully computerized test; (2) the new GED® charges \$120 for the full battery of four subject-tests (@\$30 per test); and (3) the GED® test moved from a Bloom's taxonomy framework to a Depth of Knowledge framework shifting the focus from product or end result to focus on the cognitive and thinking process by aligned the test with the Common Core Standards (CCS).

Changes to the GED® Test instituted in 2014 resulted in lower participation of DC residents. While not definitively determined, the stark increase in pricing for a population with limited incomes may have created an impediment, if not a deterrent, for those seeking to attain the GED® credential. Furthermore, the alignment with the CCS has a major impact on the readiness of test takers to meet the academic demands of the 2014 series test, and the readiness of local GED® preparatory program teachers to provide instruction designed to meet the needs of GED® test takers

Although the final aggregated testing data for the District will not be certified by GED® Testing Services until February 2015, based on the raw data, it is estimated that there was a decrease of approximately 93.8% in the number of examinees that earned their GED® credential in 2014 as compared to 2013. In 2013, there was a dramatic increase from previous years as it was the close out year for the 2002 test series. Comparing the credential recipients in 2014 to 2012 (which was more representative of an average year) the decrease was approximately 87.1%. The decrease in numbers in Washington DC for 2014 is very similar to drops experienced in other jurisdictions. The GED® Testing Services preliminarily reports a drop of 90% nationwide in credentials earned in 2014.

Steps Taking to Promote High School Equivalency in Light of Changes to GED Test:

In response to the rise in the cost of the GED® Test, OSSE partnered with GED® Testing Services in a pilot program where District residents will be able to take the full-battery of tests for \$15 (@\$3.75 per test), compared to the new \$120 fee, effective October 2014. In exchange for the reduced test fee to District residents, GED® Testing Service will be able to use DC's jurisdiction to grant GEDs® to successful test takers who otherwise would likely be unable to sit for the test.⁴, . This change to the cost of testing for District residents has essentially eliminated the challenge initially raised by the new GED® fee.

Further, in response to the implications of a computerized GED® test aligned to the CCS, in FY14 PSCE continued to administer the GED® test to District residents while focusing significant time and attention on preparing for and implementing the transition to the new 2014 GED® Test Series. Conversion to the 2014 GED Test Series and preparation to administer said exam required the establishment and testing of new systems and updating of relevant websites. In general, PSCE strongly encourages all involved in GED® preparation to access the online certification program provided by GED® Testing Services, to download and peruse the 2014 GED® Program Educator Handbook and take advantage of various vendors affording instructor preparation aligned with the 2014 GED® Test Series.

⁴ Absent a jurisdiction partnering with GED® Testing Service most people in the military, the federal bureau of prisons, and citizens from outside the country would not have access to the GED test or its credential.

More specifically, PSCE is reaching out to first time test takers to link them to OSSE-funded GED[®] preparatory programs, encouraging them to first take the GED[®] Ready: Official Practice Test and use the information from their score reports to connect them to GED[®] classes and tutoring services before taking the actual GED[®] Test. Consumer Counselor Services provided by OSSE's GED[®] Testing Program e offers targeted assistance to test takers and GED[®] preparatory staff to understand the differences between the 2002 series GED Test and the 2014 series GED[®] Test and prepare for the anticipated impact of the changes. Orientation to computer based testing, changes in test design, reading level requirements and increased complexity of the test material was a priority for PSCE staff and instructional service providers. The test takers were encouraged to complete the 2002 series test, with counselor's guidance to OSSE funded GED[®] preparatory programs and tutoring services. The number of individuals seeking these services increased in the final six months prior to January 2014.

Additionally, PSCE conducted ongoing communications to and engagement with current AFE subgrantees and adult LEAs regarding updates and information concerning study tools for candidates and orientation of resources and programs for instructors to access and professionally prepare for the challenges the "depth of knowledge" based testing platform presents in both teaching and learning. PSCE has been working with the following entities to transition to the 2014 GED[®] Test Series in these ways:

- Essential Education makes GED[®] Academy software, Computer Essential Software and GED[®] Ready vouchers available to local program providers for students.
- Byte Back offers workshops to adult educators and adult learners on Preparing for the Technology Aspects of the 2014 GED[®].
- The University of the District of Columbia offers professional development to adult educators on the 2014 GED[®].

Also, since PSCE is mandated to administer the GED[®] Test to those who are incarcerated (DOC, CCA-CTF) and to youth participating in the DC National Guard's Capital Guardian Youth Challenge Academy (ChalleNGe), PSCE has configured three mobile computer laboratories for use with off-site testing of candidates in controlled life-space environments. PSCE successfully trained on-site non-instructional staff and credentialed personnel as on-site certified test administrators and registrars.

PSCE, in collaboration with the GED[®] Testing Service, will strive to establish satellite GED[®] testing/instructional centers in every ward of the city, over the next eighteen months, to enable residents to access GED[®] testing and targeted, computer-based GED[®] instruction aligned to the official test. Making these resources readily available throughout the city may afford the District's adult learners more convenient access to resources to successfully prepare for and to sit for the new GED[®] Test.

Finally, in addition to the actions taken to prepare students for the new test, in an effort to encourage nontraditional students to take the new GED[®], OSSE is seeking to create a State Superintendent's Diploma as an alternative path for nontraditional students to obtain a high school diploma. The purpose of the proposed Superintendent's Diploma is to allow students to receive a diploma if they successfully complete the GED[®] or NEDP, are home schooled, or are served by a state-operated school. OSSE considers the Superintendent's Diploma a critical opportunity for thousands of residents who demonstrate mastery of the skills associated with a high school diploma through a non-traditional

pathway to obtain the necessary credential. OSSE plans to continue to pursue the Superintendent's Diploma in the spring.

Q33: Describe any partnerships or collaborations between OSSE and other District agencies or community organizations to provide learning opportunities for District residents that are beyond school age in FY14. How does OSSE promote and encourage residents to take advantage of adult learning opportunities?

RESPONSE:

The Division of Postsecondary and Career Education (PSCE) actively partners with other District agencies and community organizations to promote, encourage, and provide learning opportunities for District residents who are beyond school age. Information about the adult education programs and services is disseminated to diverse populations of District residents at parent engagement conferences, parent-teacher meetings, community outreach events, job fairs, the Mayor's Summer Target Area outreach events, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency's (CSOSA) Community Resource Day video conferences, via OSSE's website, DC Cable Television advertisements and through a YouTube Video (The Adult Learner Story).

Below is a summary of the cross-agency collaboration that has taken place in FY14 and to date in FY15, organized by program office:

Adult and Family Education (AFE)

The Office of Adult and Family Education (AFE) collaborates with several DC government agencies and community based organizations in pursuit of the goals of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). In FY 2014, AFE continued its efforts to collaborate with the DC Department of Employment Services (DOES), the DC Department of Human Services (DHS), Department on Disability Services (DDS), Office of Returning Citizens (ORCA), CSOSA, DC Public Schools (specifically, Roosevelt STAY and Ballou STAY), DC Public Charter Schools (specifically, Briya and Academy of Hope), community based adult education and training providers, the University of the District of Columbia, and other partners to support adult learners' academic achievement and success while they are participating in literacy programs and/or engaged in workforce readiness, job training and postsecondary education transition activities.

On August 14, 2013, DOES and AFE entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to meet the adult literacy, occupational literacy, digital literacy, and postsecondary education and workforce transition needs of District residents connected to DOES' American Job Centers (AJCs). Since that time, DOES and OSSE have been working together to achieve the following objectives:

- **Assessment:** District residents seeking core, intensive, and/or training services through AJCs have their educational needs assessed and are referred to the appropriate adult education providers for services.
- **Screening:** District residents are adequately screened for learning disabilities and proper educational, training, and/or work accommodations ensuring that these customers are successful in their educational, training, and work endeavors.
- **Education & Training:** District residents are provided services enhancing their occupational and digital literacy, numeracy, and workforce skills so that they can earn a

high school diploma or GED and transition to job training, postsecondary education, and/or employment.

The DC ReEngagement Center

The DC ReEngagement Center established several relationships with District agencies and community organizations to ensure that educational opportunities and wrap-around services are provided to youth ages 16-24 who are seeking to complete their high school diploma or equivalent. The following table lists each organization and details the partnership with the ReEngagement Center:

Organization	Partnership
Educational Placements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ReEngagement Center has established partnerships with approximately 30 educational placements including DC Public Schools and DC Public Charter Schools for more traditional classroom placements and over 15 community-based organizations that provide GED and adult basic education programs. Many of these programs offer certifications in workforce development such as construction, barbering, medical assistance, Microsoft certification, and many more meaningful programs in addition to instruction towards a secondary credential.
The Department of Employment Services (DOES)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. DOES provided a brand new space for the ReEngagement Center. 2. ReEngagement Center clients participate in job training and soft skills programs offered by DOES. 3. ReEngagement Center staff have been trained by DOES to connect youth to DOES's Virtual One Stop system (VOS) and employment recruitment events through DOES's Business Services Group 4. DOES refer clients who fit the ReEngagement Center criteria to the ReEngagement Center. 5. Further programmatic collaboration is currently being discussed as part of the Workforce Investment Opportunity Act (WIOA) youth program redesign.
Raise DC's Disconnected Youth Change Network (DYCN)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ReEngagement Center has tapped into the collective expertise of the DYCN (which is comprised of schools, community based organizations, local government agencies, and members of the philanthropic community that specifically focus on serving the District's disconnected youth) to act as the ReEngagement Center's Community Advisory Board. This includes, but is not limited to, supporting the ReEngagement Center through providing feedback on operations and strategies, supporting and encouraging partnerships with professional networks, and getting the word out about the ReEngagement Center's services.
The DC Department of Transportation (DOT)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 84% of youth who have come through the ReEngagement Center to date have identified transportation to an educational placement as a barrier. 2. ReEngagement Center staff have been trained and authorized by DOT as DC One Card administrators and can issue cards to youth who meet the qualifications so that they can ride the bus for free on the "Kids Ride Free" program and can access the school transit subsidy program for discounted metro train fare.
Department of Human Services (DHS)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ReEngagement Center staff have been trained by DHS on the different benefits DHS offers (TANF, SNAP, etc...) and their respective eligibility requirements. ReEngagement Center staff screen youth for these benefits and, when applicable, the ReEngagement Center's staff collect all required documentation, transfers the application to DHS and works with DHS to ensure successful enrollment in the programs. 2. The ReEngagement Center is working with DHS to train their frontline staff so DHS staff can refer youth that meet the ReEngagement Center

*FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education*

	criteria to the ReEngagement Center.
District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)	1. The ReEngagement Center collaborates with DCPS's Student Placement Office on all ReEngagement Center youth who have identified a DCPS school as their preferred school of re-enrollment.
OSSE's Division of Early Childhood Education (ECE)	1. ReEngagement Center staff have been trained by ECE on the childcare voucher program eligibility and have been authorized to determine eligibility and provide childcare vouchers directly to youth. 2. The ReEngagement Center staff have also been trained to use the childcare finder which will allow them to find available childcare slots throughout the city.
The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD)	1. Through the support of Chief Lanier and Assistant Chief Groomes, the ReEngagement Center team has begun training police officers in each police district during roll call about the services provided by the ReEngagement Center. 2. Officers will pass out ReEngagement Center outreach cards to youth on the streets and refer youth that meet the ReEngagement Center criteria to the ReEngagement Center.
Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS)	1. Social workers have been trained about services at the ReEngagement Center during their monthly meetings. 2. The referral process has been formalized so DYRS can make referrals to the ReEngagement Center for both older and post-committed youth.
Superior Court of the District of Columbia	1. The ReEngagement Center is working the family court in the District on providing information to families who may need educational placement support. 2. Staff participated on a panel on January 23, 2014 to provide training to the community about services offered.
ANC's Wards 1-8	1. During the month of January, staff met with ANCs from Ward 7 and Ward 5. 2. Over the coming months, staff will be meeting with the remaining ANCs to ensure that they are informed about the services provided by the ReEngagement Center.
The Young Women's Project	1. The organization will work with the ReEngagement Center to provide group trainings to ReEngagement Center youth on self-advocacy and independence.
Temple of Praise	1. The ReEngagement Center team will speak at several church services about the program and how they can refer youth.

GED[®]

In an effort to actively participate with the larger community of GED[®] preparatory program personnel, OSSE's GED[®] Testing Program regularly participates with the Best Practices Group of DC Adult Educators and the DC Library's adult education services.

Furthermore, the GED[®] Testing Program, through Consumer Counselor Services, is reaching out to first time test takers to link them to AFE-funded GED[®] preparatory programs and adult LEAs, encouraging them to first take the GED[®] Ready: Official Practice Test and use the information from their score reports to connect them to GED[®] classes and tutoring services before taking the actual GED[®] Test.

Additionally, PSCE is mandated to administer the GED[®] Test to those who are incarcerated and youth participating in the DC National Guard's Capital Guardian Youth ChalleNge Academy (ChalleNge). Because the 2014-Series GED[®] is a computer-based test, GED[®] Testing Program partnered with the Department of Corrections, Corrections Corporation of America-Central Treatment Facility and

ChalleNGe to configure three mobile laboratories for use with off-site testing of candidates in these controlled life-space environments. The GED® Testing Program successfully trained on-site non-instructional staff and credentialed personnel as on-site certified test administrators and registrars.

Lastly, in collaboration with GED® Testing Service, the GED® Testing Program will, over the next eighteen months, strive to establish satellite GED® testing/instructional centers in every ward of the city to enable residents to access targeted, computer-based GED® instruction aligned to the official test. Making these resources readily available throughout the city may afford DC's adult learners more convenient access to resources to successfully prepare for and to sit for the GED®.

Q34: Please give a detailed description of the current career and technical education (CTE) landscape in the District including the type of programs available to students and the number of students enrolled in CTE. In your response, please provide an update on the nine CTE academies that were approved by Mayor Gray last year.

RESPONSE:

In FY14, The Division of Postsecondary and Career Education (PSCE) continued its efforts to elevate the importance of career education in Washington, D.C. The Division (1) served 7,990 CTE students in 34 programs of study across eleven priority career sectors; (2) offered Microsoft coursework and certification options for students in 17 schools and one non-profit organization; (3) opened nine career academies at seven schools; (4) provided CTE course offerings to adjudicated youth; (4) exposed students to careers through two STEM conferences and a summer program for middle school students; and (5) offered extensive professional development opportunities for CTE educators.

CTE Snapshot: Programs of Study and Student Participation

In FY14, The Division of Postsecondary and Career Education served 7,990 CTE students across 20 schools, which offered 34 CTE Programs of Study (POS). Fifteen DCPS schools offered twenty-three (23) POS across eleven (11) career clusters. Five (5) public charter schools offered 18POS across 6 career clusters. Programs of study by career cluster are listed below and sorted by DCPS and charter schools.

Priority Career Sectors ⁵ Program of Study Course Offerings in the District of Columbia*		
Program of Study	DCPS	DC Public Charter School
Architecture, Construction and Design		
Architecture and Design	Phelps ACE High School	IDEA PCS
Carpentry	Cardozo Education Campus Phelps ACE High School	
Construction		Youth Build PCS
Electrical	Cardozo Education Campus Phelps ACE High School	

⁵ As part of the CTE Strategic Plan, the CTE Task Force developed a list of nearly seventy Priority Occupations, informed by the Task Force's high-wage and high-demand criteria, as well as the District's economic development priorities. These Priority Occupations were grouped into twelve Priority Career Sectors.

FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education

HVAC	Phelps ACE High School	
Plumbing	Phelps ACE High School	
Welding & Sheet Metal	Phelps ACE High School	
Arts, AV Technology and Communications		
Mass Media & Communications	Ballou High School McKinley Technology HS Wilson High School	
Business Management and Administration		
Business Administration	Coolidge High School Dunbar High School Luke C. Moore High School Roosevelt High School H.D. Woodson High School	
Education and Training		
Child Development Associate		Youth Build PCS
Early Childhood Education	Columbia Heights Educ. Campus Dunbar High School	
Finance		
Finance	Dunbar High School Roosevelt STAY High School Wilson High School	
Health and Medical Sciences		
Allied Health Occupations		Friendship PCS
Biomedical Sciences	Eastern High School Wilson High School	Friendship PCS
Biotechnology	Ballou High School McKinley Technology HS	
Emergency Medical Services	Anacostia High School	Friendship PCS
Health		Washington Math & Sci. PCS
Nursing	Anacostia High School	Friendship PCS
Pharmacy		Friendship PCS
Sports Medicine		Friendship PCS
Hospitality and Tourism		
Culinary Arts	Ballou STAY High School Roosevelt High School Roosevelt STAY High School	
Information Technology		
Computer Science	McKinley Technology HS	Friendship PCS Washington Math & Sci. PCS
Information Technology		Friendship PCS IDEA PCS Maya Angelou PCS Youth Build PCS
Interactive Media	Anacostia High School McKinley Technology HS Wilson High School	
Networking (CISCO)	Dunbar High School McKinley Technology HS Phelps ACE High School	
Network Systems		Washington Math & Sci. PCS
Programming and Software Development		Friendship PCS Washington Math & Sci. PCS
Web and Digital Communications		Maya Angelou PCS Washington Math & Sci. PCS Youth

		Build PCS
Law, Public Safety, Corrections & Security		
Law Enforcement	Anacostia High School	Friendship PCS
Pre-Law		Friendship PCS
Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics		
Engineering (PLTW) –	Cardozo Education Campus Columbia Heights Educ. Campus Dunbar High School McKinley Technology HS Phelps ACE High School Wilson High School	Friendship PCS Washington Math & Sci. PCS
Electro-Mechanical Technology	Cardozo Education Campus	
Renewable Energy	H.D. Woodson High School	
Transportation, Distribution and Logistics		
Automotive Technology	Ballou High School Ballou STAY High School	
*Table represents 11 of the 12 priority sectors for DC. Excludes marketing which is not currently offered.		

In SY2013-2014, the number of participants, concentrators, and completers⁶ each increased from the previous school year. Details are outlined in the table below:

District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools CTE Year in Comparison Snapshot					
2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014	
Participant	7653	Participant	6832	Participant	6891
Concentrator	398	Concentrator	629	Concentrator	758
Completer	304	Completer	327	Completer	341
Total	8355	Total	7788	Total	7990

In SY 2013-2014, the University of the District of Columbia Community College (UDC-CC) served 278 students by offering CTE programs of study across two (2) of the sixteen (16) Career Clusters.

1. Career Cluster: Architecture and Construction

POS: Building Maintenance, Electrical and HVAC

Number of students served: 34

2. Career Cluster: Health Science

POS: Administration and Direct Care

Number of students served: 244

Microsoft Courses

The Office of Career and Technical Education continues to support IT courses in high schools. The initiative responds to the need for providing high school students and adult learners in DC with technical skills to facilitate entry into the workforce. OSSE built the pilot on a proven model of technical education, called Microsoft Information Technology, which incorporates digital literacy for

⁶ A Participant is a student who has completed one (1) course and has enrolled in the second course of a three or four-sequence program of study. A Concentrator is a student who has completed two (2) courses of a three-sequence program of study, or three (3) courses of a four-sequence program of study. A Completer is a student who has completed a three (3) or four (4) sequence program of study.

beginners while providing a continuum of learning opportunities to earn stackable certificates in Microsoft applications. In FY14, schools targeted 390 students to participate in the classes of which 267 Microsoft Certifications were earned. Details are listed in the table below:

Schools offering Microsoft Curriculum and Microsoft Certifications Earned			
School	Number of Microsoft Certificates	School	Number of Microsoft Certificates
Academy of Hope PCS	9	Howard Math & Science Middle School	--
Anacostia High School	--	IDEA PCS	8
Ballou High School	2	Luke C. Moore High School	38
Ballou STAY High School	3	Roosevelt High School	19
Benjamin Banneker High School	95	Roosevelt STAY High School	15
Booker T. Washington PCS	--	The Community College Prep School	1
Coolidge High School	32	Village Academy of Washington	--
Friendship Collegiate PCS	11	YouthBuild PCS	--
H.D. Woodson High School	34	Four Walls (non-profit organization)	
Total Microsoft Certificates Earned			267

In SY 2014-2015, OSSE plans to expand Microsoft IT curriculum offerings to increase Microsoft Powerpoint and Excel certification training opportunities, scale the partnership with Microsoft to include Youth Spark trainings and initiatives, and increase targeted training for teachers and active recruitment of students to participate in the Microsoft Annual Competition.

Career Academies

In FY13, PSCE provided guidance, technical assistance and support to the CTE Task Force in the development of a CTE Strategic Plan. In FY14, the PSCE implemented key aspects of the Strategic Plan through the administration of the CTE Innovation Fund, which was tasked with developing career academies in District high schools, distributing fund testing costs for students taking certification exams, and dispersing funds to the UDC-CC to improve its CTE programming. In July 2014, nine academies completed a year of planning and were deemed “qualified career academies” by the National Academy Foundation (NAF). These academies opened for student enrollment in August 2014 and serve a total of 570 students. The respective schools and academies are:

- Cardozo Education Campus (DCPS) – Academy of Information Technology
- Columbia Heights Education Campus (DCPS) – Academy of Hospitality & Tourism
- Paul Laurence Dunbar High School (DCPS) – Academy of Engineering
- McKinley Technology High School (DCPS) – Academy of Information Technology
- McKinley Technology High School (DCPS) – Academy of Engineering
- Phelps ACE High School (DCPS) – Academy of Engineering
- Woodrow Wilson High School (DCPS) – Academy of Hospitality & Tourism
- Friendship Collegiate Academy (PCS) – Academy of Information Technology
- Friendship Tech Prep High School (PCS) – Academy of Engineering

Additionally, through a grant award entitled the “CTE Certification Program,” OSSE funded testing costs of certification exams for 35 high schools and UDC-CC. Lastly, OSSE awarded UDC-CC

\$500,000 to improve its Hospitality and Tourism program through the development of curriculum within the University's Division of Workforce Development and Lifelong Learning.

The academies, collectively called the DC Career Academy Network (DC-CAN), have established an Executive Advisory Board that is responsible for the overall strategic planning of the NAF career academies in the District of Columbia. The Executive Advisory Board consists of representatives from the business community, including leaders from hospitality (Thomas Penny of Marriot), Information Technology (Marullus Williams of Limbic Systems), and engineering (Lisa Anders of McKissack and McKissack). They are joined by a representative from the Federal City Council, the University of the District of Columbia, Georgetown University, participating LEA leadership, and principals of the school[s]. The Executive Advisory Board meets every other month and has established by-laws. It is committed to ensuring that 100 percent of the students in the academies have paid internships in their fields of study and graduate from high school with a set of college and career ready skills. The DC-CAN has also established industry advisory boards for each of the three fields. The industry advisory boards work closely with the schools to provide advice on curriculum, provide work-based learning opportunities for students and support the schools' individual needs.

Adjudicated Youth

In FY14, PSCE also provided opportunities to adjudicated youth at the New Beginnings Youth Development Facility (New Beginnings). New Beginnings is a secure facility under the administration and guidance of the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS).

Youth that participated in the CTE training opportunities at New Beginnings were able to choose from two CTE programs based on their career interest and aptitude - Culinary Arts and/or Barbering. Each program was 8-12 weeks in length and provided the students with the knowledge and skills of the respective industry and employability skills training. Students that successfully completed the Culinary Arts Training Program earned the industry recognized ServSafe Food Handler's Certification. Students that successfully completed the Barbering Program earned up to 50 hours of training towards the DC Barbering License.

STEM Nontraditional Careers Conferences for Students

In Spring 2014, the Division of Postsecondary and Career Education held two conferences to prepare youth for nontraditional careers at the Kellogg Conference Center at Gallaudet University. The Young Men's College and Career Conference took place on May 22, 2014 and the Young Women's College and Career Conference was held on May 28, 2014.

Approximately 651 ninth through twelfth grade students, 314 young women and 337 young men, from the District attended the conferences. The conferences provided opportunities for youth in the District to explore career options and to learn from experts in their field. Specifically, the conferences offered young men and women in grades eight through the first year of college opportunities to explore a broad range of exciting high-skill, high-wage growth career options. Other goals of the events were to raise the exposure of the District's young men and women to the growing career opportunities on the regional, national, and global labor markets of the future, as well as to reinforce the idea that postsecondary academic and technical skills are essential tools for future career success.

Each conference featured over twenty-five different interactive workshops and multiple exhibits, including presentations by leading men and women in a wide variety of fields—particularly science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Also, various presentations included areas outside of STEM, such as manufacturing, skilled trades, business and industry, and others.

PSCE is currently planning for the upcoming Young Men's and Young Women's Conference 2015 scheduled for Friday, March 13th and Friday, March 20th, respectively.

Career Exposure Program for Middle School Students

In the summer of 2014, DC Public Schools and OSSE piloted DC Meets Washington (DCMW), a college and career exposure initiative for middle school students in the District. Participating students at selected schools explored high growth career areas in the District through hands-on activities, field trips, and visits from representatives in target fields. Selected DC Meets Washington career areas included IT, Engineering and Construction, Hospitality, and Government. In the afternoon, students participated in academic interventions in literacy and STEM skills provided by community-based partner organizations. In the pilot year, DC Meets Washington served 7th and 8th grade students at Browne Education Campus in Ward 5 and Cardozo Education Campus in Ward 1. Mirroring other DCPS summer programs, DC Meets Washington ran for five weeks, from June 30th to August 1st, 2014. The pilot served 50 students at the two sites at a cost of \$1,107 per student.

Professional Development for Educators

PSCE is committed to providing professional development to CTE educators throughout the city. In SY 2013-2014 professional development focused heavily on building the capacity of educators to practice differentiated instruction, literacy design, and instructing the adult learner, among others. Educators from secondary schools and postsecondary institutions participated in thirteen PD offerings during SY2013-2014. Details are below:

Summer 2013

- Differentiated Instruction – Proactive with Mixed Grouping: Hospitality High PCS
- Adult Learner: Instructional Strategies UDC/CC – Backus Campus

Fall 2013

- Writing for the Workplace: District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)

Winter 2014

- Motivational Strategies for Adult Learners: New Beginnings (DYRS), Maya Angelou Young Adult Learning Center OSSE's Division of Specialized Education and the George Washington University hosted a Secondary Transition Professional Development Training for DCPS and DC charter school teachers and special education transition specialists. The OSSE CTE Office provided a targeted session on career pathways, CTE student success strategies, and Districtwide resources to support student success.

Spring 2014

- Differentiated Instruction I: UDC-CC-Backus Campus: UDC-CC, YouthBuild PCS, Maya Angelou YALC
- Differentiated Instruction II UDC-CC Backus Campus: UDC-CC, YouthBuild

- Differentiated Instruction I: Maya Angelou PCS – Evans Campus
- Introduction to the Literacy Design Collaborative: Woodson HS:DCPS
- Differentiated Instruction II: Maya Angelou PCS – Evans Campus
- Differentiated Instruction I: IDEA PCS
- The Literacy Design Collaborative (LDC) Framework: New Beginnings (DYRS)

In addition, in summer 2014, school teams from five charter high schools attended the 2013 Southern Regional Education Board's (SREB) - High Schools That Work (HSTW) National Staff Development Conference.

Lastly, PSCE partnered with National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity to pilot a STEM Equity Pipeline Project for DC Schools during academic year 2013-2014. Three sites were chosen for the 2013-2014 pilot initiative that offers a five-year professional development training to promote effective STEM instruction. The three sites selected were McKinley Technology Education Campus, Howard University Middle School, and the University of the District of Columbia. Each of the sites participated in PIPESTEM™, a research-based, effective professional development program to increase the participation and success of female students--particularly girls and women of color--in STEM.

Q35: OSSE funds free SAT testing for all DC public school juniors and seniors. Please provide the Committee the following:

- **The cost of administering this program in FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date;**
- **How many seniors and juniors took advantage of this program for each of the above years;**
- **The District's average SAT scores for FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date; and,**
- **Any plans OSSE has to expand this offering to include the ACT in the future.**

RESPONSE:

In 2012, the Council of the District of Columbia passed Law 19-142, the "Raising the Expectations for Education Outcomes Omnibus Act of 2012," which requires each student attending public high school to take the SAT or ACT before graduating. Because the costs of both tests can be prohibitive (e.g. the SAT is \$52.50 per exam), OSSE provides all District juniors and seniors who attend public high school in the District the ability to take the SAT free through SAT School Day. During the fall semester, seniors take the SAT on a given day, and juniors do so during the spring semester. If an eligible student is present at school on SAT School Day, he or she is required to take the exam. The table below summarizes the cost of administering this program, the number of students served, and the District-level results on the SAT.

Fiscal Year	Administration Cost	Number of Students Served	District's Mean Total SAT (Math, Reading, Writing) scores*
FY12	No program in place during FY12	No program in place during FY12	1191 (CY11)
FY13	No program in place during FY13	No program in place during FY13	1184 (CY12)

FY14	\$224,084	5,094	1108 (CY13)
FY15	\$241,290	To date, only the October exam for seniors has been administered. 2,438 seniors took the exam on October 15, 2014. The exam for juniors is scheduled for February 25, 2015.	1132 (CY14)

*SAT scores are reported by calendar year (CY).

ACT Expansion

OSSE has explored the possibility of sponsoring an ACT School Day, similar to SAT School Day. There currently is no demand from LEAs and schools because ACT days would not fall on the same day as SAT School Days; therefore, schools would be required to set aside four school days for college entrance exam testing each year in addition to the other testing days required for standardized tests. Finally, ACT requires that a vast majority of DC schools participate; and OSSE does not currently have the funds necessary to support such an initiative.

LEAs and schools are able to obtain free or reduced price vouchers directly from ACT for students to take the ACT exam. ACT deems students eligible to receive vouchers if they are considered eligible for the Free and Reduced Meals Program (FARMS). For students who are not eligible for FARMS, schools can request that OSSE assume costs for the ACT. OSSE assumes the costs of the ACT, for non-FARMS students, if the student's school does not participate in SAT School Day. In FY14, 681 students took the ACT, with no schools requesting payment for students who are not eligible for FARMS.

Q36: Please provide the Committee with an update of OSSE's pilot to provide SAT preparation services to DC public school students. At a minimum, in your response, please include how many students participated, what schools were involved, what vendor was used and the number of hours preparation provided, and what outcomes have been observed as a result of the pilot.

RESPONSE:

In the fall of 2013, began a partnership with Bell Curves, a high-quality test preparation and educational services company, to assist schools without access to college entrance exam preparation. Bell Curves was competitively selected based on their demonstrated success working with low income students. Initial results indicate the Bell Curves model is successful in increasing SAT test scores among DC students. Between fall 2013, and spring 2014, OSSE and Bell Curves offered SAT Prep to DC Public School and Public Charter School students in three different ways:

- 1. Fall 2013:** SAT Prep classes were offered to a small group of students who participated in the OSSE Scholars Program, once a week, on Saturdays.. Students in the pilot were offered 24 collective hours of instruction from Bell Curves.
- 2. Spring 2014:** Beginning in January 2014, OSSE & Bell Curves offered in-school SAT Prep, taught by Bell Curves instructors, to 11th graders in Ballou, Coolidge, and Roosevelt High School.

Approximately 117 students were offered, on average, 57 hours of instruction throughout the semester.

- 3. Fall 2014/Spring 2015:** OSSE & Bell Curves offered in-school SAT Prep, taught by Bell Curves instructors to 11th graders at Ballou High School. Approximately 60 students received 64 hours of instruction.

OSSE has found that participation is much greater when students are able to take the class during the school day for credit compared to taking the class during non-school hours. Therefore, OSSE & Bell Curves offered a “train the trainer” opportunity for teachers at Columbia Heights Education Campus, Maya Angelou Public Charter School, and Wilson High School where the SAT preparation course will be offered during the school day as a semester-long course. These schools were selected based on their responses to a competitive Request for Applications released by OSSE and open to all public and public charter schools in the District of Columbia. The innovative model provides teachers with instruction on how to teach the Bell Curves curriculum. OSSE covers the cost of training, as well as the preparation course books and practice exams. Approximately 230 students from the three schools mentioned above began to receive in-school SAT Prep in January 2015.

SAT Prep Outcomes

Prep Type	Number of students	Total instructional hours	Average Score Increase	Lowest Score	Highest Score
OSSE Scholars (outside of school-day)*	20	24	211	1030	1910
In-school Prep	117	57-64	88	600	1520

*OSSE Scholars is a summer academic enrichment program for high-performing, low-income students. Scholars saw a greater increase in scores with fewer instructional hours; the lowest student score was a 1030, placing them well above their peers in performance. These outcomes may be attributed to the following reasons: 1) the instructional hours were fewer, but were scheduled in three-hour blocks, and 3) the students are generally high-performing and motivated students who volunteered to take a prep class on Saturdays (as opposed to those taking during the school day).

Q37: DC TAG helps District residents afford college tuition by reducing the cost of tuition at public and private institutions in the DC metro area. Please provide the following for FY12, FY13, FY14, FY15 to date:

- **The number of students participating in DC TAG overall and by each Ward;**
- **The amount of funds expended through the DC TAG program in total and the amount spent on students by each Ward;**
- **The average DC TAG award amount for the District and for each Ward;**
- **The historical graduation rate for students receiving a DC TAG award;**
- **A list of each school DC TAG students attend and the number of students at each institution; and**
- **DC TAG awards by annual household income.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 37 Attachment – DC TAG

Q38: How does OSSE evaluate the success of participating DC TAG institutions in graduating our students within five years? What is the process from removing an institution from the DC TAG list and how is this communicated to families? To date, how many institutions have been removed?

RESPONSE:

Pursuant to D.C. Code §38-2702 (2012) and Section 7000 *et. seq.* of Title 29 DCMR, an institution of higher education can only be removed from the list of eligible institutions if (1) the institution loses its academic accreditation under Title IV of the Higher Education Act; (2) the institution closes; or (3) the institution fails to comply with any of the requirements of the College Access Act, the DCMR, and/or the institution's Program Participation Agreement with OSSE.

To date, four institutions are no longer eligible for the DC TAG program due to loss of accreditation or closure—no institutions have lost eligibility due to failure to comply. In addition to information on an institution's loss of eligibility being made available to families through the institution itself and the media—especially in cases of loss of accreditation or closure—the institution's DC TAG eligibility status is displayed upon an applicant's selection of a postsecondary institution in their online application through the DC OneApp system. Deeming an institution ineligible for DC TAG based solely on low graduation or retention rates is not an option.

Accordingly, due to the statutory limitations on removing institutions from the list of eligible DC TAG institutions, OSSE has begun to focus its efforts on educating students and families on making smart postsecondary choices. This initiative has taken many forms. Currently, to evaluate the success of participating DC TAG institutions, OSSE matches student records in National Student Clearinghouse to student records in the DC OneApp system in order to compile retention and graduation rates for all colleges and universities participating in the DC TAG program. OSSE is in the process of creating updated marketing materials with that data to inform students and families about institutions that have the best outcomes for DC TAG students. The updated marketing materials include outcome information on postsecondary institutions that are highly-attended by DC TAG students at which DC TAG retention and graduation rates exceed the institution's overall retention and graduation rates. Additionally, the marketing materials include information on each institution's setting to provide families with some context about the institutions. Also, institutional persistence and graduation rates for DC TAG students are displayed to applicants when they select a postsecondary institution in their online application through the DC OneApp system. This updated marketing strategy provides families with information on the institutions that repeatedly serve D.C. students well. Moving forward, OSSE is conducting best practices research around identifying other innovative metrics that can be published to help inform smarter postsecondary choices.

In addition to a revamped marketing strategy, OSSE has entered into a partnership with the Education Advisory Board (EAB), a division of the Advisory Board Company. One deliverable from this partnership is the development of a College Report Generator tool. This tool is a workbook through which a user can select an institution and receive an easily digestible summary report about the postsecondary institution. The report includes several key details about the institution: (a) key facts,

such as location, total enrollment, freshman class size, and average net price by income level; (b) information on admissions, such as typical standardized test scores, enrollment by race, and acceptance rate; (c) information on graduation, such as overall graduation rate, graduation rate by race, and graduation rate for DC students; and (d) information on transfer pathways, such as what percent of students transfer and where students transfer. The College Report Generator will be an important tool to inform smart postsecondary choices, and can be used by high school advisors and counselors, students considering multiple institutions, and parents and families. This tool will help facilitate and focus discussion about postsecondary selection in order to ensure that all DC students, including those who participate in the DC TAG program, attend postsecondary institutions where they can succeed. OSSE is currently gathering stakeholder feedback about the data points included in the tool, and hopes to release the College Report Generator tool in June 2015.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Q39: How many DC students have IEPs? Please provide a breakdown of these students by:

- Age;
- Grade level;
- LEA;
- Disability classification (for students with multiple disabilities, please identify all the underlying disability classifications), by age, grade level, and LEA;
- Percentage of time outside of general education (less than 20%, 20-39%, 40-59%, 60-79%, 80-99%, 100%), by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification;
- Placement type (e.g., self-contained classroom, separate school, home and hospital instruction), by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification;
- Number of students attending nonpublic schools, by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification;
- Number of students who are English language learners attending nonpublic schools by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification;
- Number of students whose IEPs call for specialized instruction within the general education setting (i.e., inclusion), by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification;
- Number of students receiving each related service (e.g. behavioral support, physical therapy), by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification;
- Number of students receiving visiting instruction by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification; and
- Number of students taking DC CAS ALT, by age, grade level, LEA, and disability classification.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 39 Attachment – District IEP

Q40: In SY2011-2012, SY2012-2013, SY2013-2014, how many DC students with IEPs graduated from high school with a diploma? With a certificate of completion? Without either a diploma or certificate? Please break down the numbers by LEA and whether the student was attending a nonpublic school. If possible, please provide the reason for each student's exit without a diploma or certificate (e.g., transferred to another state, dropped out).

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 40 and Question 41 Attachment – Special Ed Leaving Public and Non Public

Q41: In each of school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 how many students exited special education prior to graduation? Please break down the numbers by LEA and whether the student was attending a nonpublic school.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 40 and Question 41 Attachment – Special Ed Leaving Public and Non Public

Q42: How much federal IDEA funding was received in FY14 and FY15 to date by the District for DC foster children enrolled in out-of-District public schools in order to receive special education services?

RESPONSE:

There are currently 76 CFSA foster children enrolled in out-of-District public schools who received special education services. In past years, this population has not been appropriately accounted for in DC's annual IDEA Child Count; OSSE is determining how best to account for this population in terms of federal IDEA funding and will seek assistance from the U.S. Department of Education if needed.

Q43: Have there been any changes in the last fiscal year to the policies that ensure that no LEA discriminates against any student with a disability? Have there been any significant discrepancies in representation of students at LEA's? If so, which LEA's have been found to have a significant discrepancy? Have there been findings of noncompliance on these grounds by OSSE? What corrective actions have been required for non-compliance?

RESPONSE:

There have not been any changes in the last fiscal year to the policies that ensure that no LEA discriminated against any student with a disability. OSSE continues to ensure implementation of its earliest policies designed to address this issue: 1) Policies and Procedures for Placement Review Guidance; (available at: <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/policies-and-procedures-placement-review-guidance-revised-april-2010>) and 2) Prohibitions on Discrimination Against Children with Disabilities in the Charter School Application During the Enrollment Process Guidance (available at: <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/prohibitions-discrimination-against-children-disabilities-charter-school-application>)

Significant Discrepancies

OSSE is required to annually review data, based on an established calculation, to monitor discrepancies and discipline rates between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers, and discrepancies in discipline rates for students with disabilities when filtered by race/ethnicity. OSEP does not establish a specific minimum threshold for special education identification for states. The IDEA does not require a set percentage of students with disabilities be met; therefore, a finding does not automatically issue when low numbers of students. Rather, a finding is issued if OSSE determines that an LEA has low numbers of students identified as needing special education services because it failed to meet its duty to conduct child-find activities. OSSE has begun implementing a general review of LEA data to identify LEAs that appear to have very low numbers of students with IEPs. For identified LEAs, OSSE is currently doing internal analysis of LEA data related to special education identification and eligibility processes. LEAs will be notified this spring, and each LEA will be

monitored and provided TA on child find and eligibility issues. OSSE will issue findings and require corrective actions as appropriate.

Q44: Describe the training, support and oversight provided by OSSE in the last fiscal year to ensure that LEA's are appropriately serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Please also describe the district's current placement process and policy for students with disabilities.

RESPONSE:

Trainings

In the last fiscal year, various trainings, supports and oversight have been provided by OSSE in to ensure LEAs are appropriately serving students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Trainings have included: Nonviolent Crisis Prevention, Youth Mental Health Aid training, Special Education Quality Review Tool Training, Root Cause Analysis Training, Common Core State Standards (CCSS) aligned with Universal Design for Learning Community of Practice, Co-Teaching, Common Core Deconstruction, CCSS Reading and Mathematics, and Positive Behavior Support and Behavior Intervention Plans. These trainings opportunities, as well as those offered to support all students in the District in grade K-12 settings, were included on a comprehensive training calendar. The training calendar is accessible to LEAs on the OSSE website as well as the LearnDC website. This calendar was, and continues to be, updated monthly to include new training opportunities.

Common Core State Standards and Universal Design for Learning Community of Practice

This opportunity focused on using principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to provide access for all students, especially students with disabilities, to the CCSS in the general education classroom. The format of the training consisted of one all-day kick-off training, held at OSSE, with five additional one-hour coaching sessions in LEA clusters. These coaching sessions were enhanced through a topic specific webinar series. In addition, all six LEA teams gathered monthly to participate in the CCSS/UDL Community of Practice (CoP) to discuss best practices and receive support in implementation of the standards and UDL. There were a total of **31 participants** across the six participating schools. Towards the end of the SY2013-14, OSSE's team met with participating LEAs to discuss how the program went for them and any additional supports they may need in order to prepare to be demonstration sites. We concluded that OSSE will provide additional supports in the fall to include observations with feedback as well as individualized support for LEAs.

Co-Teaching

During the 2013-2014 school year, the OSSE partnered with the Dr. Wendy Murawski of 2 Teach LLC, to host a professional development opportunity for LEAs on co-teaching. This opportunity focused on identifying key characteristics, skills, and behaviors needed for effective co-teaching and co-planning. The format of this training consisted of a two-day kick-off institute and a one-day follow-up training, both held at OSSE, followed by a virtual meeting to solidify co-teaching techniques among participants.

The kick-off institute was designed to build participants' understanding of different co-teaching models and support the development of co-planned lessons. Participants were expected to use the co-teaching models and co-planning lesson strategies introduced in this series in their respective

classrooms. The follow-up sessions provided co-teaching pairs with opportunities to share best practices, offer support in effective use of strategies, and build capacity within the LEA and District.

Common Core State Standards Deconstruction Initiative

In response to the needs of educators around the CCSS across the District, the divisions of Specialized Education and Elementary and Secondary Education are working together to develop an innovative tool that will allow educators to access deconstructed standards and develop a lesson plan that is both rigorous and relevant to their students.

OSSE staff will partner with vendor Cross and Joftus in efforts to work collaboratively with approximately 45 educators across grade and subject levels and who provide instruction to students identified for special education and English Language Arts services. Over the course of two intensive weeks this summer, OSSE staff and educators from the District will work to deconstruct all of the CCSS. The deconstructed Standards were made available to all educators through an interactive, on-line platform in the fall of the SY2014-15. OSSE staff, in collaboration with educators participating in the deconstruction work, has started to train educators and administrators across the District how to effectively use the deconstructed standards and the interactive tool to develop standards-based lesson plans and/or curriculum.

Common Core State Standards Reading and Mathematics

During the months of February and March 2014, OSSE held several trainings for LEAs on the process of deconstruction the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). In this training, participants learned strategies to align reading and mathematics instructional practices to the shifts in CCSS. Additionally, participants were able to determine specific ways to accommodate students with disabilities without changing the standards or lowering expectations through targeted, developmentally-appropriate strategies that would provide key supports for students.

Positive Behavior Supports and Behavior Intervention Plans

To address positive behavior supports, OSSE offered a series of in-person trainings in the spring of 2014 to elementary and secondary District educators. These trainings included:

Getting PBIS Started

Participants will learn about the essential features of School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention & Support (PBIS) and receive guidance on effective practices needed for successful implementation. Schools are encouraged to come in teams (i.e. administrator, dean, social worker, grade level teacher representatives, PBIS coordinator) in order to begin planning for the upcoming school year. Teams will also have an opportunity to review their current universal practices, analyze their current data, and develop an action plan that outlines next steps, roles, and responsibilities.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS): Implementing Tier 2 Targeted Supports

When implementing school-wide PBIS, some students may need additional supports from classroom to small groups to help them be successful. This session will review how features of effective tier 2 interventions, including an overview of Check-in Check-out (CICO) for targeted

groups and simple function-based behavior support plans for individual students. Participants are encouraged to bring their school behavior data for analysis and planning purposes.

In addition to trainings offered in-person, OSSE held trainings in the form of live webinars that were later recorded for educators to access if they were unable to attend the live sessions.

Effective Behavior Support 3-part webinar modules:

Module I: Legal Foundations for Behavior

Module II: Trauma Informed Behavior Support

Module III: Functionally Based Behavior Support

Nonviolent Crisis Prevention

During school year 2013-14, OSSE hosted thirteen (13) separate trainings where over 250 District of Columbia educators and other key stakeholders were certified in applying nonviolent crisis intervention techniques.

The model OSSE used, and continues to use, of the nonviolent crisis intervention is the Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI). The CPI model provides stakeholders with a proven framework for decision making and problem solving to prevent and, to the extent possible, de-escalate a person in behavioral crisis. Through the use of the CPI model, all participants who attended OSSE's nonviolent crisis prevention training were provided the skills and strategies needed to safely manage assaultive and disruptive behavior. Objectives of the training included:

- Recognizing behaviors that may be exhibited by an individual in behavioral crisis
- Understanding and applying de-escalation techniques
- Gaining the tools needed to support individuals before, during and after a crisis
- Understanding the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS)
- Understanding the principles of nonviolent crisis intervention in school settings

At the conclusion of each training participants were required to complete a course exam in order to receive CPI certification.

OSSE is pleased to report that the trainings have included a wide array of stakeholders, including: (a) elementary, middle, and high school educators (public and nonpublic schools); (b) preschool/early childhood educators; (c) school principals; (d) school psychologists; (e) related service providers; (f) social workers; (g) guidance counselors; (h) early childhood center staff; (i) OSSE staff; and (j) other government agencies (e.g., CFSA, DYRS).

Youth Mental Health Aid Training

Youth Mental Health First Aid is designed to teach parents, family members, caregivers, teachers, school staff, peers, neighbors, health and human services workers, and other caring citizens how to help an adolescent (ages 12-18) who is experiencing a mental health or addictions challenge, or is in crisis. Youth Mental Health First Aid is primarily designed for adults who regularly interact with young people. During this opportunity, participants (a) were introduced to common mental health challenges faced by youth, (b) reviewed typical adolescent development, and (c) learned a 5-step action plan for how to help young people in both crisis and non-crisis situations. Topics covered

included (a) anxiety, (b) depression, (c) substance use, (d) disorders in which psychosis may occur, (e) disruptive behavior disorders (including AD/HD), and (f) eating disorders.

SY2013-14 Trainings for LEA Special Education Point of Contacts

Each LEA is required to have an LEA Special Education Point of Contact (LEA SE POC) who serves as OSSE's main point of contact for all things related to State's Special Education Data System (SEDS), special education data and records, SEDS training of staff, state-level special education policies and best practices, etc.

During the 2013-14 School Year, OSSE provided a robust series of trainings for all LEA SE POCs, including training on:

- The release of new special education policies
- Expectations for providing and documenting related services for students with disabilities
- Documentation of special education services and related services in the State's SEDS
- Resources to use when training internal staff at each LEA SE POC's school site
- Troubleshooting resources for SEDS
- Guidance around evaluating students and determining eligibility for special education
- Documenting the use of assessment accommodations
- Resources for improving data quality
- Appropriate communication with OSSE regarding student-level issues
- The role of LEAs in overseeing students served at Nonpublic programs
- Responsibilities of maintaining and transferring student records
- The role of the LEA SE POC in ensuring students receive specialized transportation services

Student Led IEP Trainings

Research has shown that students who actively participate throughout the IEP process have higher levels of school engagement and are more likely to achieve their academic and personal goals. Student and family engagement allows them to be active decision makers regarding student instruction and where it takes place. It also allows for students to develop leadership skills that are necessary throughout adulthood.

During the last school year, OSSE developed new tools and resources to assist schools and families in supporting students to take an active role in planning for their future. One of these tools is "The Best Me I Can Be: Implementing Student-led IEPs" in the District of Columbia, a film that documents a demonstration project that began in the 2013-2014 school year. This film shares ideas about how students, educators, and parents can be meaningfully involved in the special education planning process. Learn how you can better support student involvement in IEP planning by participating in the following interactive training modules:

1. Getting Started,
2. Building Awareness,
3. Understanding Your IEP,
4. Preparing for Participation, and
5. Student-led IEPs.

Additionally, training participants engaged by:

- Viewing portions of “The Best Me I Can Be” film to learn how to implement highlighted best practices in their own schools
- Interacting with OSSE’s new Secondary Transition resource website and the Student-led IEP Online Toolkit
- Engaging in application activities with resources that facilitate greater student involvement
- Listening to DC teachers and administrators share the successes and challenges they have experienced in fostering meaningful student involvement throughout the IEP process
- Having the opportunity to arrange individualized action planning sessions with OSSE Training & Technical Assistance staff

Technical Assistance. The OSSE has provided technical assistance (TA) to LEAs and schools throughout the calendar year. Requests for TA typically occur as a result of trainings OSSE has provided and through determinations made from the Quality and Assurance Monitoring team. For requests that are a result of trainings offered or schools simply reaching out for additional support, OSSE has instituted a TA request form. This form resides within the Specialized Education’s Training and Technical Assistance webpage on the OSSE website.

Q45: LEAs that do not meet targets on the Office of Special Education Programs monitoring indicators must complete self-studies and develop continual performance plans. How many LEAs completed self-studies in each of FY14 and FY15 to date? Please provide copies of all self-studies and continual performance plans from FY14 and FY15 to date.

RESPONSE:

For FFY 13 (FY 14), sixteen (16) LEAs completed self-studies in the area of significant discrepancy, and two (2) LEAs developed continuous improvement plans related to significant discrepancy. For FFY 13 (FY 14), fifteen (15) LEAs completed self-studies in the area of disproportionate representation and one (1) LEA developed continuous improvement plans related to disproportionate representation. The FFY 14 (FY 15) analysis will not occur until late spring. Because these self-studies contain student-level, personally identifiable special education information, OSSE has not included copies.

Q46: Provide an update on the work of the Advisory Panel on Special Education in FY14 and to date in FY15. At a minimum, please include the following:

- **A list of all members of the Panel, including the organization they represent and the length of time they have served on the Panel;**
- **A narrative description of any action items taken or recommendations made by the Panel in FY14 and to date in FY15.**

RESPONSE:

Panel Member	Organization
Senora Simpson, Chair	Parent
Kim Acquaviva	Parent

Ja'Sent Brown	OSSE
Julie Camerata	Community Organization
Betsy Clyde Centofanti	Parent
Kimberly Ernst	Parent
Timothy Fitzgerald	CFSA
Rochanda Hiligh-Thomas	Parent
Martha Kent	Parent
Pamela LeConte	Institution of Higher Education
Marie Morilus-Black	DBH
Elisabeth Morse	OSSE
Tony Munter	Parent
John Quinn	Parent
Karla Reid-Witt	Parent
Elizabeth Rihani	Parent
Yvette Rodgers	Parent
Rebecca Salon	Dept. of Disability Services
Claudia Sauls	Parent
Kaitlin Settle	Teacher/DCPS
Shawn Ullman	University Legal Services
Molly Whalen	Parent

Narrative description of any action items taken or recommendations made by the Panel in FY14

In FY14, OSSE collaborated with the State Advisory Panel (SAP) to coordinate a series of parent/community focus groups on local regulation that governs special education practice in the District of Columbia, with the intention of revising identified key area of need. The SAP emphasized the continuing importance of focusing on key areas within special education which demand ongoing review and problem solving. The SAP noted a noticeable decline in the active participation of a number of appointed Panel members. OSSE will partner with the SAP to address the issue of continuous participation from members, particularly parent members who tend to disengage as their children graduate from public schools in order determine how best to recruit parents that are likely to remain engaged. The full SAP SY13-14 Annual Report is available here:

<http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/SAPAnnualReport2013-2014.pdf>

Narrative description of any action items taken or recommendations made by the Panel to date in FY15

During the first quarterly meeting, the SAP was provided with information on the critical actions taken by OSSE to improve outcomes for students with disabilities including realignment of OSSE's organization structure such that the new Division of Elementary, Secondary and Specialized Education will provide comprehensive city-wide supports for students K-12 and implementation of annual three-part technical assistance sessions for local education agencies (LEAs). The SAP also provided input of proposed targets to be included in OSSE's IDEA State Performance Plan (SPP). The SAP is considering its current configuration is considering structural changes to address current needs. SAP members are committed to working to recruit additional SAP members, with a special focus on

families and youth/adults with disabilities who have successfully transitioned from school to adult life. Future activities will include drilling down to determine why 20% of parent respondents to OSSE's annual parent survey are not satisfied with the current level of services their children are receiving.

Q47: Describe the annual parent survey that OSSE sends out regarding special education. At a minimum, please include in your response how many surveys were sent out and completed in FY14; when the surveys are sent out to parents; OSSE's communication and outreach to parents regarding the survey in FY14; and whether or not the survey is available online.

RESPONSE:

The annual parent survey was mailed to parents of student receiving special education services was available from October 31, 2014 to December 22, 2014. Parents had the option of completing the survey online or the hard copy survey that was mailed to each home. Parent were asked to complete this survey which was designed to measure whether or not schools were facilitating parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. Of the 12,003 parents who were given the opportunity to complete the survey, 647 (5.4%) completed the survey. 529 respondents indicated that schools were in fact facilitating parent involvement as a means of improving service and results for students with disabilities. Key results of the analysis of parent responses include:

- Procedural Safeguards: The majority of respondents (84%) agreed that their child's school ensured that the understood special education procedural safeguards.
- School's Performance in Developing Partnerships with Parents: An overwhelming majority (86%) of the parents surveyed indicated that they were encouraged to participate with their child's teachers and other professionals in developing their child's educational program, and 85% felt they were treated as an equal partner by their child's teachers and other professionals in planning their child's special education program.
- Teachers and Administrators: Satisfaction with teachers and administrators was high, with 85% of the respondents agreeing that they were shown respect for their culture as it relates to their child's education. In addition, 87% felt that their ideas and suggestions were considered at their child's IEP meetings.
- School Communication: The vast majority (81%) of respondents indicated that their child's school communicates with them regularly about their child's progress on their IEP goals, and 82% reported the information that they receive about their child's special education program is communicated in an understandable way. Additionally, 78% reported that they were offered training about special education related issues.
- Services: The majority of respondents (79%) expressed that they were satisfied with the special education services their child received during the past year.
- Outcomes: 79% of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the progress their child made during the past year.

Q48: Describe how OSSE is working to timely to support LEAs in the implementation of the provisions of the three recently passed special education bills – The Enhanced Special Education Services Act, The Special Education Student Rights Act, and The Special Education Quality Improvement Act.

RESPONSE:

OSSE is in the process of integrating the requirements from the recently passed special education bills into the DC Municipal Regulations (DCMR) Title 5-E, Chapter 30 regulatory update. This chapter governs the local implementation of special education in the District of Columbia. Details of the following legislative requirements and clarifications may be incorporated into revised rules for the beginning of the 15-16 school year, include:

Enhanced Special Education Services Act

- Age of secondary transition changed from 16 to 14 years old
- Alignment/update of the definitions of local education agency (LEA) and public charter school
- Change to the initial evaluation timeline
- Alignment/update of the definition of referral (i.e. to include oral referral)
- Addition of referral documentation requirement (i.e. an LEA shall document any oral referral within 3 business days of receipt)
- Addition of LEA responsibility to notify the SEA for assistance in instances when local implementation of an IEP is not possible
- Clarification of SEA responsibility regarding payment for nonpublic placements

Special Education Student Rights Act

- Addition of the definition of the term service location
- Explicit prior written notice applicability to proposed changes in service location
- Addition of timeline for LEA provision of the evaluation report to parents, prior to the scheduled team meeting (i.e. No fewer than 5 business days before a scheduled meeting where an IEP, IFSP or eligibility for special education services will be discussed)
- Addition of timeline for public agency provision of a new or amended IEP or IFSP to parents (i.e. No later than 5 business days after a meeting at which a new or amended IEP [or IFSP] has been agreed upon, the public agency shall provide the parents with a copy of the IEP)
- New requirements regarding parents' right to observe their student in the student's current or proposed program
- Clarifications regarding due process (e.g. burden of proof, expert witness fees, attorney fees)
- Addition of state-established procedure regarding transfer of education decision-making rights at age 18

Special Education Quality Improvement Act

- Addition of a preference in public charter school admission for students with an IEP or disability category pursuant to IDEA, with prior approval of the Public Charter School Board
- Elimination of district charter option for all public charter schools by August 1, 2017 (i.e. "By August 1, 2017, each public charter school shall be its own local educational agency for the purpose of Part B of IDEA and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (with allowable waiver application for any currently existing public charter schools with more than 90% of its students

entitled to receive services pursuant to Part B of IDEA and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act))

- Elimination of district charter option for new charter school applicants (i.e. no newly approved public charter school shall elect to be treated as a District of Columbia public school for the purpose of Part B of IDEA and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973).

SPECIAL EDUCATION TRANSPORTATION

Q49: With regard to special education transportation, please provide the following information for SY2013-2014:

- Any actions taken over the last year or planned for the next year to improve the special education transportation system;
- The current policy for providing transportation for special education students who must arrive to school early or late for extracurricular transportation;
- The number of special education students receiving transportation services from OSSE-DOT;
- The number of special education students receiving transportation services from contractors;
- The percentage of buses that arrived at school on time, broken down by month;
- The percentage of bus ride times that exceeded one hour, broken down by month;
- The number of complaints received regarding special education transportation, broken down by month and subject matter of complaint;
- The average number of days it took to resolve complaints regarding special education transportation, broken down by month and subject matter of complaint;
- The number of buses currently in service and their average age; and,
- The number of vans currently in service and their average age.
- The number of vehicles owned or leased by the District.

RESPONSE:

Any actions taken over the last year to improve the special education transportation system:

Over the last year, OSSE DOT took the following actions to improve the special education transportation system:

- In response to issues with an antiquated and inflexible Complaints/Investigations database, DOT created a new Audit and Compliance database prior to the 2014-2015 school year. The Audit and Compliance Tool (ACT) is used by the Parent Resource Center (PRC) to log complaints, by compliance specialists to track and resolve complaints, and by investigators to investigate complaints and accidents. ACT is also used to track behavioral incidents. Built in Quickbase, the database is configured for robust reporting and data analysis in order to improve resolution times and responses. ACT is more user-friendly and tracks additional information than was captured through the previous system.
- DOT implemented a realignment of two key business functions to gain efficiencies and provide a seamless customer experience. The PRC is now responsible for processing all complaints that are called in by stakeholders. The merging of the complaint call line with the general customer service call line eliminates the need for callers to dial a different number and/or be transferred to another representative. It also allows the PRC to immediately resolve reported missed pick-up calls by coordinating with Terminal Management. Because all the calls are received and processed in the PRC, the compliance specialists are afforded the time to thoroughly research and provide recommendations for complaints regarding recurring or complex issues.

- In May 2014, DOT introduced an Employee Recognition Program to acknowledge and celebrate the daily work of the school bus drivers and attendants. The overall goal of the program is to boost employee morale and promote the highest standards of professionalism and compassion as set by DC's best school bus drivers and attendants. Based on nominations from schools and parents, a committee of managers selects a Driver of the Month and Attendant of the Month at each of the four terminals. The selected employees are recognized monthly at their bus terminals, quarterly at an all-staff meeting, and finally at a year-end recognition ceremony where four Drivers of the Year and four Attendants of the Year are named. Winners receive various awards including a plaque, a certificate, and a lapel pin.
- DOT enhanced the Inclement Weather Procedures to detail the Division's operating status during inclement weather events. The Inclement Weather Procedures were communicated to DOT staff, parents, and schools, as well as posted to the OSSE DOT website <http://osse.dc.gov/service/student-transportation>. Additionally, in an effort to streamline communication regarding school closures, delays, and early dismissals from schools, DOT created an email account to centralize all communication impacting service delivery. Updates regarding operational status are also posted on the OSSE DOT website and updated on social media. During inclement weather events, DOT also updates the Parent Resource Center's telephone message to include the Division's operating status. Callers are able to receive immediate bus status information without waiting in queue to speak with a live customer service representative.
- In 2014 DOT began a Bus Safety Monitoring Program to discourage unsafe activities and promote best practices in safety for student transportation. The full launch will be completed in 2015. Improving safety practices will be accomplished through observations by safety monitors certified in safety, bus driver education, and follow-up training. The program will increase our ability to prevent collisions and better prepare staff to respond in emergencies. Drivers will be randomly observed in the field and at the terminals, evaluated and scored based on a rubric informed by jurisdictions with similar programs, the OSSE DOT Accident Review Board Table of Penalties, and a previous DOT driver observation program. In FY15, OSSE DOT will continue its coordination with OSSE-HR, the Office of Labor Relations & Collective Bargaining, and our union partners to clearly communicate program expectations to staff and formally launch the program.
- DOT has replaced its legacy transportation request system (TMS) with the new Transportation Online Tool for Education (TOTE). The Division has also populated the school rosters in TOTE so that LEA and school users can view transportation schedules information for their students. Further, the Division has refreshed the geospatial data in its routing software for more accurate scheduling, and developed a revised mechanism for identifying daily route changes and the associated details of the change to enhance communication.
- To increase the number of buses in service and available each day, DOT purchased 50 new buses. This increased the size of the fleet by 20%, reduced the average age of the buses, and modernized the fleet. At the same time, DOT carefully examined usage and repair costs and retired about 83 vehicles that were no longer cost-effective to own.

- DOT instituted a Fleet Repair Monitoring Program, which holds vendors accountable for completing appropriate and timely repairs, and submitting accurate invoices. DOT also upgraded FASTER, its asset management system. FASTER helps Fleet Management staff closely track each asset's registration, maintenance, and other attributes.
- Fleet Management employees were trained in the agency's relevant protocols and procedures and were provided with conflict resolution techniques to employ when procedures are not followed and problems arise.
- DOT, in conjunction with OSSE's Division of Elementary, Secondary, and Specialized Education, has implemented the first student transportation services policy that establishes criteria that assist LEAs in making appropriate eligibility decisions and clarifies LEA documentation and procedural requirements. The policy also establishes bi-annual student and LEA data certification that allows for the division to successfully prepare for the provision of special education services during the extended school year as well as the start of every school year.
- The division conducted training sessions for over 200 school users and administrators about the special education transportation services policy and the transportation request system and process (TOTE – Transportation Online Tool for Education).
- In 2014 DOT partnered with SC&H Consulting to evaluate and create recommendations for improvements to the entire DOT system. SC&H started by updating and editing the division's Standard Operating Procedures and continued through eight other phases: State Agency Analysis and Support; Student Transportation Policy Evaluation; Administrative Support; Technology and Software Coordination; Performance Management Evaluation; Incidents, Complaints, and Accidents Evaluation; Training and Development Support; and Budget Development and Analysis. Recommendations will be implemented over the next few years; the order of which will be determined in a Strategic Planning workshop in February of FY15. Recommendations included a more robust driver and attendant training program, improved communication with parents and schools, and updated and improved policies and procedures.
- DOT implemented a robust PRC Training Program that equipped DOT customer service representatives with the tools needed to ensure quality customer service and call handling. In addition, the OSSE DOT customer service representatives completed a series of customer service training courses including Customer Service 101, Red Carpet Customer Care, Women in Communication and Customer Service, and How to Handle People with Tact. Further, they completed an annual Call Handling and Work Tools refresher training to reinforce how to navigate through calls and respond to customers with complete and accurate information.
- DOT implemented a vehicle citation tracking, payment, and collection process. Drivers of OSSE DOT buses and vans are notified via memo of any infractions incurred while operating a District vehicle. Once identified, drivers have 15 days to contest or make payment to the jurisdiction where the violation occurred. Proof of payment must be submitted to the fiscal department. If the citation has not been paid or contested by the driver in the time allowed, OSSE DOT will pay the ticket to avoid additional penalties and vehicle registration restrictions.

After payment by OSSE DOT, a request will be sent to the Office of Pay and Retirement for collection against the employee's paycheck. The deduction amount will be \$50 per pay period until the obligation is paid in full.

Any actions planned for the next year to improve the special education transportation system:

During this fiscal year, FY15, OSSE DOT will take the following actions to improve the special education transportation system:

- DOT is implementing an Automated Event Notification Service for the parent and stakeholder community that will be sent via voice call, mobile text messages and/or e-mail communication mediums. These events include, but are not limited to route change notification alerts, bus status alerts, information regarding incidents or accidents, inclement weather-related alerts, operating status notifications, and general announcements regarding student transportation services.
- As part of the OSSE DOT Vehicle Replacement Program, an additional 50 buses will be added to the fleet for services provided to students. The goal of the program is to achieve an average age of five years for the entire fleet.
-
- DOT will create a "New Student Orientation Packet" for all new students. The packet will provide parents with detailed information on how OSSE DOT transportation works, expectations of the bus staff, how to update student data, and how and when to communicate with the Division. The goal is for the students served to have a smooth transition on the school bus, starting on day one.
- DOT will develop an incident review panel that will meet quarterly to examine safety sensitive incidents and discuss strategies to reduce occurrences of repeated incident types. DOT will develop and implement incident response protocols to include bus observations, staff development, and/or behavior intervention meetings in collaboration with the LEA, school and parents to address repeated offenses of both safety sensitive and non-safety sensitive student behavior incidents.
- Terminal Operations will more effectually manage staffing and overtime utilization by implementing the ADP Biometric scanning process. This cutting-edge system will eliminate the need for time clock supervision and processes and supplies related to badges and PIN-based time and attendance system for over 1,000 employees. Management will be able to redirect resources to managing bus operations, improving adherence to work schedules, and increasing workforce productivity. This project is aligning OSSE DOT with its mission to ensure students are receiving safe, reliable, and efficient transportation services.
- DOT is undergoing an overhaul of the Employee Handbook for Drivers and Attendants in order to better summarize policies and procedures for bus staff. Improvements to the handbook are based on frequently asked questions by drivers and attendants and will clarify key business processes and responsibilities.

- With assistance from SC&H Consulting, and per one of the recommendations stemming from their work in SY14, DOT will be updating its Transportation Policies and Procedures manual. This manual describes the business processes and expectations of each department within the division such as Bus Operations, Finance, and Audit and Compliance. Each component will refer to specific Standard Operating Procedures also updated by SC&H.
- The current lease for the New York Avenue Bus Terminal expires on June 30, 2016. OSSE DOT and the Department of General Services have identified space available for purchase to potentially relocate two bus terminals. The facility's office space will be rehabilitated, one warehouse will be converted to a driver waiting area, and other warehouses will be outfitted for bus maintenance. If approved, this will expand DOT's capability to repair vehicles in house more efficiently than the current procurement scenario.
- DOT will create a Transportation Advisory Council (TAC) to provide a forum for broad-based and robust discussions of transportation issues. Through the TAC, DOT, parents, and other stakeholders in the school transportation community will collaborate to provide the best service possible for the students we serve.
- DOT will complete the deployment of a student ridership tracking solution that allows bus drivers to record student ridership status directly from the school bus. Student ridership information will be made available to all DOT staff, including terminal management, the PRC, Performance Management, Data and Technology and the compliance team to improve our overall service delivery. The benefits of this new technology solution include enhancing the analytic capabilities within the division to more effectively measure and improve route performance.
- DOT will transition eligible DCPS student travel subsidy program participants from tokens and fare cards to the DC One Card by collaborating with the District Department of Transportation and educating participating schools. This will eliminate the need for school staff to physically visit OSSE DOT on a monthly basis in order to pick up tokens and fare cards and provide additional protection against accounting errors.

The current policy for providing transportation for special education students who must arrive to school early or late for extracurricular transportation:

Please see: Question 49 Attachment - Special Education Transportation Policy

The number of special education students receiving transportation services from OSSE DOT:

- 3,131 students riding the school bus
- 501 participating in Metro fare card program
- 16 parents receiving travel reimbursement

The number of special education students receiving transportation services from contractors:

5 students used the services of our transportation contractor, MTM.

The percentage of buses that arrived at school on time, broken down by month:

The table below indicates the percentage of buses that arrived at school on time, broken down by month. Note that the definition of “On-Time Performance” is arriving to school no earlier than 30 minutes before the bell and no later than 10 minutes before the bell.

	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14
OTP	83.4%	91.7%	94.3%	95.6%	92.9%	88.5%	91.9%	93.7%	95.7%	94.8%	95.4%	94.8%

The percentage of bus ride times that exceeded one hour, broken down by month:

The table below indicates the percentage of bus ride times that exceeded one hour, broken down by month. Note that ride times are determined on a case-by-case basis to take into account the individual medical needs of each student. The current ride-time standards set by OSSE DOT based on school locations are as follows: 75 minutes for programs in DC and within 6 miles of DC, 90 minutes for programs between 6 and 15 miles of DC, and 120 minutes for programs farther than 15 miles from DC.

	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14
> 60 min	13.5	16.8%	18.0%	18.9%	19.5%	20.5%	20.2%	20.3%	20.0%	20.0%	19.1%	17.8%
> 75 min	4.5%	6.3%	5.9%	6.4%	6.7%	7.5%	6.3%	6.7%	7.2%	7.0%	7.0%	5.7%

The number of complaints received regarding special education transportation, broken down by month and subject matter of complaint:

The table below indicates the number of complaints received regarding special education transportation, broken down by month and subject matter of complaint.

	Aug-2013	Sep-2013	Oct-2013	Nov-2013	Dec-2013	Jan-2014	Feb-2014	Mar-2014	Apr-2014	May-2014	June-2014	July-2014	Percent Substantiated
Early/Late Bus	9	85*	49	36	47	97	53	70	45	60	41	63	74.5%
Unprof. Conduct	27	54	53	29	32	49	46	62	55	46	33	41	7.7%
Missed Pick Up	8	40	18	30	20	47	51	57	32	29	42	38	36.0%
Student Behavior	6	9	13	8	7	6	8	11	11	7	3	3	16.3%
Route Issues	15	4	4	4	6	2	1	4	1	6	3	6	25.0%
Reckless Driving	4	10	10	5	4	3	9	11	22	18	12	4	1.8%
Ride Time Too Long	6	4	4				1		2	2		3	36.4%

FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Student Accommodations	4	3	3	5	1	7	1	3		2	3	6	32.3%
Fleet Issues	5	2	2							23	16	14	24.6%
Wrong Student/School Info	6	2	5		3	1	2	4	1		5	13	16.3%
Total	90	213	161	117	120	212	172	222	169	193	158	137	

*Two additional complaints were added to September 2013 Early/Late Bus category from last year's record from Quality Control checks.

The average number of days it took to resolve complaints regarding special education transportation, broken down by month and subject matter of complaint:

The table below indicates the average number of days it took to resolve complaints received regarding special education transportation, broken down by month and subject matter of complaint.

In 2014 it was recognized that many complaints had been resolved but had not been officially “closed” in the complaints database. The averages displayed below are a reflection of combing back through old cases that had already been resolved in order to “close” them in the system. April, May, June, and July are a more accurate representation of the actual resolution times. In response to this issue and other problems with the outdated complaints database, in July of 2014 a new database was created. It not only more accurately reflects resolution times, but also has improved the complaint resolution process in general.

	Aug-2013	Sep-2013	Oct-2013	Nov-2013	Dec-2013	Jan-2014	Feb-2014	Mar-2014	Apr-2014	May-2014	June-2014	July-2014	Total
Early/Late Bus	21.6	55.8	43.1	27.2	53.3	24.5	18.6	10.5	5.2	10.4	9.5	5.9	21.9
Unprof. Conduct	27.6	61.1	55.8	56.4	41.5	39.2	17.5	11.4	5.7	6.9	5.5	5.6	28.0
Missed Pick Up	25.9	41.7	31.2	26.4	34.1	22.3	16.9	9.0	3.8	4.6	7.8	6.2	16.4
Student Behavior	21.2	58.7	82.4	53.4	41.6	18.2	24.1	23.4	16.2	10.1	10.0	10.3	35.9
Route Issues	24.1	53.3	16.3	38.3	53.7	38.5	1.0	5.8	1.0	6.7	0.7	8.8	23.0
Reckless Driving	1.0	32.5	22.0	15.2	22.3	14.0	14.8	3.5	1.8	1.5	1.3	3.3	10.0
Ride Time Too Long	33.8	33.8	107.3				1.0		1.5	12.5		7.0	34.5
Student Accommodations	21.5	149.3	36.7	36.6	63.0	26.6	45.0	16.7		13.0	2.3	13.0	33.1

Fleet Issues	32.2	159.0	39.0							3.7	3.1	7.0	12.6
Wrong Student/School Info	42.7	0.0	30.8		69.3	82.0	18.0	1.0	1.0		2.2	2.8	18.4
Total	26.1	54.8	48.2	36.3	45.8	27.5	17.8	10.5	5.3	7.0	6.4	6.0	22.3

The number of buses currently in service and their average age:

- DOT currently has 603 buses in service with an average age of 6.4 years.

The number of vans currently in service and their average age:

- DOT currently has 19 vans in service with an average age of 4.9 years.

The number of vehicles owned or leased by the District:

- DOT owns 777 buses and vans for school transportation.

Q50: In FY14 and FY15 to date, how has OSSE taken steps to remedy each of the top three compliant issues received regarding special education transportation in FY13 – early/late bus, unprofessional conduct, and missed pick up.

RESPONSE:

In FY 14 and FY15 to date, OSSE DOT took the following steps to remedy the top three compliant issues received. The actions taken are summarized by issue: 1) early/late bus; 2) unprofessional conduct; and 3) missed pick-up.

Issue: Early/Late =Bus

The Department enhanced its ability to track and respond to transportation concerns by replacing the antiquated complaint database with an internally-developed Quickbase Application (ACT-Audit and Compliance Tool) that has access to data related to each student profile, vehicular and other incidents, and transportation concerns. The new system generates reports with status updates for pending issues and notifies Terminal Management and Human Resources of substantiated investigation reports of unprofessional conduct for follow up.

Issue: Bus Staff Unprofessional Conduct

The Department enhanced its ability to track and respond to transportation concerns by replacing the antiquated complaint database with an internally-developed Quickbase Application (ACT-Audit and Compliance Tool) that has access to data related to each student profile, vehicular and other incidents, and transportation concerns. The new system generates reports with status updates for pending issues and notifies Terminal Management and Human Resources of substantiated investigation reports of unprofessional conduct for follow up. Bus staff receive coaching, professional development and/or progressive discipline depending on the nature of the unprofessional conduct reported.

Issue: Missed Pick-up

Upgrades to the Navman Online AVL application and the implementation of the M-Nav Student Ridership Tracking Tool allow Compliance Specialists and PRC Representatives to conduct real-time tracking of buses in order to readily respond to early/late bus and missed pick up calls. After conducting a thorough analysis, the compliance team notifies terminal management of any reported allegations of unprofessional conduct with an associated recommendation for coaching.

Q51: Describe any technology upgrades OSSE-DOT has taken in FY14 and FY15 to date to better track buses and communicate with parents and schools regarding arrivals and pick-ups.

RESPONSE:

In FY14 and to date in FY15, OSSE DOT took the following actions to better track buses and communication with parents and schools regarding arrivals and pick-ups. A summary of the actions to date are presented below.

M-Nav Student Ridership Tracking

A new system is being installed on all buses to enable bus drivers to record directly from the school bus the ridership status for students as they get on and off. This information is available to central office staff and managers to improve overall service delivery in terms of on-time performance, Medicaid funding, and customer service. The benefits of this new technology solution include enhancing the analytic capabilities to effectively measure route performance and track student ridership. To date, two-thirds of the bus drivers and 80% of central office staff have completed training. 90% of buses have the hardware installed and approximately 50% of drivers are making use of the system.

Automated Notification System

DOT is implementing an automated notification system that will provide real-time information on bus delays, route changes, service updates, and school bus incidents via voice call, text message, and/or email. The automated notification system will reduce manpower allocated toward outbound calls, which will free up availability for inbound calls, thus resulting in faster response times and greater customer satisfaction. Phase 1, will be completed in April of 2015.

Audit and Compliance Tool

In response to issues with an antiquated and inflexible Complaints/Investigations database, DOT created a new Audit and Compliance database in preparation for the 2014-2015 school year. The Audit and Compliance Tool (ACT) is used by the PRC to log complaints, by compliance specialists to track and resolve complaints, and by investigators to investigate complaints and accidents. ACT is also used to track behavioral incidents. Built in Quickbase, the database is configured for robust reporting and data analysis in order to improve resolution times and responses. ACT is more user-friendly and tracks more information than the previous system.

GRANTS MANAGEMENT

Q52: Provide the following information for all grants awarded to OSSE during FY14 and to date in FY15:

- Grant Number/Title;
- Approved Budget Authority;
- Expenditures (including encumbrances and pre-encumbrances);
- Purpose of the grant;
- Grant deliverables;
- Grant outcomes, including grantee performance;
- Any corrective actions taken or technical assistance provided;
- OSSE program and activity supported by the grant;
- OSSE employee responsible for grant deliverables; and
- Source of funds.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 52 Attachment – FY14-FY15 Federal Grant Data State Level

Q53: Provide a complete accounting of all grant lapses in FY14, including a detailed statement on why the lapse occurred and corrective action taken by OSSE. Please also indicate if the funds can still be used and/or whether they carried over into FY15.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 53 Attachment – Lapsing Fund Report.

Q54: Provide the following information for all grants/subgrants awarded by OSSE during FY14 and to date in FY15:

- Grant Number/Title;
- Approved Budget Authority;
- Expenditures (including encumbrances and pre-encumbrances);
- Purpose of the grant;
- Grant deliverables;
- Grant outcomes, including grantee/subgrantee performance;
- Any corrective actions taken or technical assistance provided;
- OSSE employee/s responsible for overseeing the grant; and
- Source of funds.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 54 Attachment – FY14 Grants and Subgrants
Question 54 Attachments - FY15 EGMS 1 (zip file)
Question 54 Attachments - FY15 EGMS 2 (zip file)
Question 54 Attachments - FY15 EGMS 3 (zip file)

The attachment entitled “Question 54 Attachment – FY14 Grants and Subgrants” provides the requested information for FY14.

During FY15, OSSE switched to Enterprise Grants Management System (EGMS) to manage all grants. EGMS does not report the requested information in the same format. Accordingly, the zipped files entitled “Question 54 Attachments - FY15 EGMS 1,” “Question 54 Attachments - FY15 EGMS 2,” and “Question 54 Attachments - FY15 EGMS 3” contain the award amount for each sub-recipient for each grant application in EGMS for FY15 to date. Additionally, they contain all expenses reported to date by each sub-recipient, amount paid to date, and remaining balance. The purpose of the grant, grant deliverables and grant outcomes remain the same as FY14.

Q55: Provide a chart of all Title I, Title II, and Title III funding. In the chart, please include the allocation, actual spent, amount unspent, use of funds, and status of unspent funding for each LEA. Please provide this information for FY12, FY13, FY14 and to date in FY15.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 55 Attachment – Title I, II, III

Q56: As the state education agency, OSSE is responsible for overseeing and implementing the District’s Race to the Top grant funding. Please provide a description of the work undertaken through this grant in FY14 and to date in FY15. At a minimum, please include the following:

- **A narrative description of the requirements under the grant;**
- **The amount of funding provided to the District, including a breakdown of how the funds have been spent to date;**
- **A description of the results associated with this grant, including the data that has been collected to support the results and impact of this program;**
- **A list of all amendments to OSSE’s Race to the Top application, the date the amendment was requested, the purpose for each amendment, the amount of each amendment, whether or not the amendment was approved by the U.S. Department of Education, and the result of these amendments; and,**
- **A copy of fall and spring U.S. Department of Education Race to the Top progress reports for FY14 and FY15 to date.**

RESPONSE:

A narrative description of the requirements under the grant:

As a Race to the Top Grantee, DC committed to carry out ambitious reforms in the following areas:

- Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain proposed plans (sub criterion (A)(2) of the grant)
- Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments (sub criterion (B)(3))
- Accessing and using State data (sub criterion (C)(2))
- Using data to improve instruction (sub criterion (C)(3))
- Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (sub criterion (D)(2))
- Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (sub criterion (D)(3))
- Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (sub criterion (D)(4))

- Providing effective support to teachers and principals (sub criterion (D)(5))
- Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (sub criterion (E)(2))
- Promoting STEM education in the District (sub criterion (P)(2))

Please see: Question 56 Attachment - RTTT Requirements

The amount of funding provided to the District, including a breakdown of how the funds have been spent to date:

Please see: Question 56 Attachment - RTTT Budget

A description of the results associated with this grant, including the data that has been collected to support the results and impact of this program:

Please see: Question 56 Attachment - RTTT Executive Summary

A list of all amendments to OSSE's Race to the Top application, the date the amendment was requested, the purpose for each amendment, the amount of each amendment, whether or not the amendment was approved by the U.S. Department of Education, and the result of these amendments:

Please see: Question 56 Attachment - RTTT Budget Amendments

A copy of fall and spring U.S. Department of Education Race to the Top progress reports for FY14 and FY15 to date:

The Department releases Annual Performance Reports for all Race to the Top states each year. The report can be found here: <https://www.rtt-apr.us/>.

Q57: In 2007 the Department of Education designated OSSE as a “high risk” grantee and imposed Special Conditions on OSSE’s federal grant awards. What progress did OSSE make in FY14 in exiting “high risk” status? What issue(s) need to be addressed in order to exit “high risk” status, and when does OSSE anticipate this will happen?

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 57 Attachment – DC High-Risk Removal

On June 19, 2014, the U.S. Department of Education declared that the District of Columbia was no longer considered high risk due to implementation of corrective actions made to its financial, record-keeping, and internal controls systems and procedures (see enclosed letter). OSSE’s systemic reforms promote policies and procedures for successful Federal grants management and a centralized record management system. OSSE achieved full compliance in the following categories:

- Process for calculating indirect cost rates
- Financial management with strong internal controls in place

- Procurement, inventory tracking, and time and effort monitoring
- Data collection with enhanced systems in place to increase capacity to collect and report
- Title I program performance
- Programmatic and fiscal compliance under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
- Sustained improvements for Perkins program performance
- A-133 findings addressed, with no substantial findings
- High Risk Corrective Action Plan findings fully resolved and closed

Additionally, OSSE submitted to the Department of Education its final indirect cost claiming policy and procedure document and template and its final time and effort distribution policy and training documents. OSSE has developed and implemented a sub recipient monitoring plan, and continues to report quarterly to the Department of Education to ensure complete implementation of stronger internal controls and maintained compliance.

WELLNESS & NUTRITION SERVICES

Q58: OSSE is responsible for the implementation of a number of programs that provide access to free and healthy meals for District youth. Please provide a narrative description of each program that includes, at a minimum, the following:

- The name of the program;
- The amount of funding in FY14 and to date in FY15;
- The name of the employee responsible for administering the program; and,
- The number of youth that were served by the program in FY14 and FY15 to date.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 58 Attachment – Free and Healthy Programs

Q59: The Healthy Schools Act of 2010 and the Healthy Schools Amendment Act of 2011 were designed to enhance the health of our students and our schools by creating and promoting a number of wellness, environment, and other programs. Please detail the program and provide the most recent version of the Healthy Schools Act Report.

RESPONSE:

The 2014 Health and PE Report is in the process of being finalized and is forthcoming.

The OSSE-based activities directed toward implementation of the Healthy Schools Act (HSA) can be categorized into five areas as described below. All of our activities are detailed further in OSSE's yearly reports, the Farm to School and School Gardens Report and the Health and PE Report.

Grants

OSSE gives out three different grants funded by the Healthy Schools Act—School Garden Grants (SGG), Physical Activity Grants (DC PAY) and Farm Field Trip Grants. All of these grants are awarded on a competitive basis to individual schools (sometimes in partnership with a community-based organization). Efforts are made to distribute the grant awards evenly across wards and between public and public charter schools. OSSE provides training and technical assistance to the grantees and monitors the grantees through reports and site visits. Starting with the 2014 grantees, all of these grants are now being administered through OSSE's new Electronic Grants Management System (EGMS). The Request for Proposals (RFP) for the 2015 SGG is currently available on the EGMS and applications are due on January 31st. The RFP for the 2015 DC PAY grants will be released this spring.

Grant (2013-2014)	# of applicants	# of awards	Total Dollars Awarded
School Garden Grant	50	21	\$299,768
Physical Activity Grant	47	22	\$220,000
Farm Field Trip Grant	28	24	\$33,644

Professional Development Seminars and Technical Assistance

Professional development seminars are offered on a variety of topics including integrating nutrition into the curriculum, utilizing farm to school concepts and school garden concepts in the classroom, developing a school wellness committee, utilizing data to inform instruction, and incorporating physical activity throughout the school day. The seminars are offered at OSSE, schools, and community-based organizations and are advertised to schools through the LEA Look Forward, PCSB Tuesday Bulletin, and the DCPS John Davis weekly email. The schedule of these sessions is evolving throughout the year as some are provided every year and some are provided in response to a particular need that is identified among the schools. Professional development and technical assistance are also provided as part of the monitoring process for our local grants and as requested by schools. In addition to technical assistance and training provided directly by OSSE, numerous community-based organizations also provide these services to schools. OSSE works with these organizations to ensure that the information that they are providing is consistent with the Healthy Schools Act and OSSE's educational standards. In August of 2014, OSSE partnered with the Action for Healthy Kids to conduct a two-day Teacher Wellness Symposium with 60 participants each day. The Symposium included presentations on a variety of health and wellness topics, including increasing physical activity before, during, and after the school day, eating disorders, anti-bullying, and integrating nutrition into the curriculum.

Monitoring

OSSE monitors the compliance of schools with HSA and their own local wellness policies through HSA Compliance Monitoring Visits. Two years ago, OSSE visited 50 public charter schools, and last year, OSSE visited 25 DCPS schools. Beginning this year, OSSE will visit a random sample of 10% of funded schools each year. Follow up technical assistance in problem areas is provided to schools so that they may correct any deficiencies. Data on these visits is compiled and may inform professional development or programs directed towards the schools. During SY 2013-2014, 99% of schools were in compliance with HSA requirements for healthy vending, fundraising, and prizes, 100% made their local wellness policies available to faculty, staff, parents and students through appropriate means, and 97% of schools stated that they had water available to students during meal times.

Programs

OSSE conducts two yearly, citywide celebrations of the Healthy Schools Act -Growing Healthy Schools Week and Strawberries and Salad Greens Day. These events continue to be huge successes as detailed below:

- *Growing Healthy Schools Week* – The 3rd annual Growing Healthy Schools Week took place from October 21-25, 2013. The week included a wide variety of activities, such as taste tests, farm field trips, and garden-based activities, designed to reinforce school garden and farm-to-school concepts throughout the District. Details of the week are described below:
 - 52 schools and 4,000 students participated;
 - 51 chef demonstrations reached over 1,000 students;
 - 12 farmers made visits to schools; and
 - Best School Garden Awards were given to Mundo Verde PCS and Watkins Elementary School.
- *Strawberries & Salad Greens Day* — This annual celebration exposes students throughout the District to the messages of eating local produce in their cafeterias and consuming more fruits

and vegetables through tasting a locally grown fruit and vegetable along with their peers across the city. In FY14, the event took place on Wednesday, May 21, 2014 and the goals for the day were exceeded as shown in the table below:

Category	Goal	Actual
% of schools serving local strawberries and salad greens as part of school lunch	85%	86%
% of schools providing educational activities to reinforce the messages of local food systems and healthy consumption	30%	35%
# of community partners that collaborated with schools on educational activities	10	15

The educational activities provided included classroom lessons, visits to school gardens, morning announcements, and informational tables during lunch and at pick-up and drop-off times. OSSE strategically coordinated the framework of the day by providing lettuce plants, strawberry plants, stickers, talking points and distributing OSSE's new "Choose What's in Season" posters to all participating schools. OSSE also provided volunteers to every school that requested one, placing 41 individuals at schools across the city. Volunteers were given a t-shirt provided through a generous donation from Kaiser Permanente's Thriving Schools Program, as well as a HSA tote bag, provided by OSSE, as a thank you for their efforts.

Curriculum Evaluation and Training

OSSE's Health Education Team, with funding from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) 1305 and Personal Responsibility Education Program (PREP) grants, has analyzed 35 sexual health curricula, 26 PE/PA curricula, and 15 nutrition education curricula, which are now available in OSSE's Health and Physical Education Curriculum Library. The library is now being piloted with schools and community providers. Visitors are able to schedule an appointment with OSSE to view the curricula on file and a Library Catalog is currently being finalized. In addition, OSSE's Health Education Team has drafted an Alcohol, Tobacco, and other Drugs Curricula Guidance Document that was reviewed by DCPS and PCS health and physical education teachers and other community stakeholders. Further, OSSE's School Garden Specialist reviewed numerous curricula in the area of school gardens and made this information available to schools on our website (<http://osse.dc.gov/publication/dc-school-garden-based-curriculum-recommendations>). Trainings are provided to LEAs in utilizing the reviewed curricula effectively.

Data Collection, Assessment and Evaluation

OSSE collects a variety of data, both school- and student-level, to inform programming and assess compliance with HSA. OSSE is also working on conducting an evaluation of this data to assess the impact of HSA implementation on the health, behavioral and academic outcomes of DC students.

The two data sets required by HSA are:

School Health Profiles (SHP): It is required that every school complete a School Health Profile each year, and in SY 2013-2014, 98% of applicable schools complied. Data from the SHP provides a variety of information about schools' compliance with HSA as well as other measures of healthy school

environments.

DC CAS Health and Physical Education (DC CAS Health): A total of 11,743 students participated in the 2014 DC CAS Health, the third administration of this exam. The assessment includes questions addressing all of OSSE’s Physical and Health Education Standards. Due to the sensitivity of the sexual health items, parents/guardians of the students are able to “opt out” of these items.

Scores for the 2014 DC CAS Health and Physical Education are shown below:

Grade	Reporting Category	Correct (%)	Overall Correct (%)
5th	Communication and Emotional Health	83% *	66%
	Safety Skills	77%	
	Human Body and Personal Health	46% ¹	
	Disease Prevention	76% ¹	
	Nutrition	72%	
	Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	44% *	
	Healthy Decision Making	53%	
	Physical Education	74%	
8th	Communication and Emotional Health	78% *	69%
	Safety Skills and Community Health	74%	
	Human Development and Sexuality	62% ¹	
	Disease Prevention	72%	
	Nutrition	66%	
	Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	66% ¹	
	Health Information and Advocacy	73%	
	Physical Education	57% *	
High School	Human Growth and Development	80%	66%
	Sexuality and Reproduction	75% ¹	
	Disease Prevention and Treatment	65%	
	Nutrition	63%	
	Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs	63%	
	Locate Health Information and Assistance	48% *	
	Safety Skills	81% *	
	Physical Education	53%	

This was the first year that an increase in the overall score was observed at all grade levels. The greatest gain was seen at the 8th grade level, with a five percentage point increase over 2013 from 64% to 69%. Fifth grade and high school scores improved by two and three percentage points, respectively. These results are encouraging and may represent an increase in the quality of health education and PE being provided in the schools.

Q60: Are there any legislative changes with regard to the Healthy Schools Act of 2010 that OSSE would recommend?

RESPONSE:

At this time, OSSE does not have any recommendations. However, OSSE will work with the DME, LEAs, and other relevant stakeholders to determine if changes should be made to HSA and will work with the Council should we determine that changes are necessary.

Q61: Please provide the percentage and number of students eligible for free and reduced meals by LEA, individual school level, and grade at each school for SY2013-2014 and SY2014-2015 to date.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 61 Attachment – Free and Reduced Meals.

Please note that SY14-15 is currently being worked on so complete data is not yet available.

NON-PUBLIC TUITION

Q62: Provide a narrative description on how the budget for Non-Public Tuition is formulated for each Fiscal Year. Which services are funded using this money for each student (i.e. tuition, transportation, etc.)? Who is eligible for funding under non-public tuition? How are students identified and evaluated for use of this funding?

RESPONSE:

The budget for Non-Public Tuition is established based upon a review of expenditures from three prior years. The OSSE Nonpublic Payment Unit (NPU) is responsible for processing and approving tuition, residential services, room and board, various related services, including student evaluations and assessments, and travel expenses between the District residential schools outside of the District, all in accordance with services as documented on the students' Individual Educational Programs (IEPs).

The OSSE Nonpublic Tuition Fund covers costs in three categories related to students, aged 3-22, who have been identified by a Local Education Agency (LEA) as eligible to receive special education services under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 *et seq.* (2004), that are documented in an IEP:

1. Students who are placed into a nonpublic school by the LEA;
2. Students in the care of Child and Family Services Agency (CFSA) or Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS) being educated in a program outside of the District; and
3. Students served by St. Coletta's Public Charter School (PCS).

If students are placed by the LEA, the placement review and location assignment process occurs through an OSSE Policy and Procedures Oversight Unit. If students are placed for non-educational reasons by sister agencies, such as CFSA, DYRS, or the Department of Behavioral Health (DBH), OSSE provides funds that cover the educational portion of the placement. St. Coletta's PCS is provided with an annual gap payment in accordance with an established Memorandum of Agreement.

Q63: Provide an update on the District's goal to reduce non-public enrollment by 50% by the end of SY2014-2015. In your response describe how OSSE is monitoring LEAs to ensure that neighborhood schools are equipped to serve the population of students returning and describe OSSE's activities to ensure that children who transfer between non-public placements and public school do not lose credits in the process.

RESPONSE:

As of January 15, 2015, OSSE records indicated a total of 992 students with IEPs were attending nonpublic school programs, a more than 50% reduction from SY 2009-2010.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) are required by IDEA to have a continuum of alternative placements available to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities who are returning from a nonpublic school. Under IDEA, this required continuum includes instruction in regular classes, special classes, special school, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals. This

requirement is monitored by OSSE through our IDEA Part B monitoring and compliance system. OSSE's full monitoring and compliance manual can be found here: <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/sy-2014-2015-idea-part-b-monitoring-and-compliance-manual>

District of Columbia LEAs have the responsibility for ensuring that students transferring between nonpublic schools and public schools do not lose credits in the process. This includes being responsible for ensuring that the nonpublic schools that their students are sent to have the courses necessary to earn a District high school diploma. As part of the Certificate of Approval (COA) assurance process, regular on-site monitoring visits, OSSE inquires whether nonpublic schools provide coursework to enable District students to meet graduation requirements. OSSE inquires whether nonpublic schools provide coursework to enable District students to meet graduation requirements. Responses are compiled and distributed to agencies with placing authority and potentially could lead to a finding of noncompliance or refusal to issue, revocation, or denial of the COA.

OSSE's Nonpublic Program Toolkit, which can be found at <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/nonpublic-toolkit>, also provide guidance regarding transitioning students to the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Q64: Please provide the following information for FY14 and to date in FY15.

- **A list of any nonpublic schools that have applied for a Certificate of Approval (COA) in the last year, but did not received it, along with the reasons the certificate was denied;**
- **A list of any nonpublic schools with provisional Certificates of Approval and any provisions they must meet to obtain full COAs;**
- **A list of all institutions that receive funding from non-public tuition including:**
 - **The address and contact information for the institution;**
 - **The date of OSSE's most recent monitoring visit;**
 - **The date of expiration for the institution's Certificate of Approval;**
 - **The number of students served in FY14 by these nonpublic schools, broken down by nonpublic school, sending LEA, age, grade, and disability category;**
 - **Which disability classifications (e.g., emotional disturbance, learning disability) that the school is designed to serve;**
 - **The average number of special education teachers assigned to each classroom;**
 - **Whether the teachers at each school have full or provisional special education certification;**
 - **The maximum number of students the school can accommodate, and the age and/or grade levels they are designed to accommodate;**
 - **The school's maximum student-to-teacher and student-to-classroom staff ratios;**
 - **The type and number of non-teacher staff assigned to the classrooms, on average (e.g., behavior techs, aides);**
 - **Any evidence-based and/or structured curriculum used at the school;**
 - **Any online or blended instructional program used at the school;**
 - **The specialized personnel and physical resources available at the school (e.g., school psychologist, sensory room, adaptive PE equipment).**
- **For those that have a provisional COA, provide the provisions they must meet; and,**
- **Please provide a separate list including the same information for FY15, to date.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 64 Attachment – Nonpublic

However, please note that OSSE does not collect data on the following requested items:

- The average number of special education teachers assigned to each classroom;
- The school's maximum student-to-teacher and student-to-classroom staff ratios;
- The type and number of non-teacher staff assigned to the classrooms, on average (e.g., behavior techs, aides);
- Any evidence-based and/or structured curriculum used at the school; or
- Any online or blended instructional program used at the school.

Q65: Please detail and list the amount paid to each LEA in SY2013-2014 to date under the Least Restrictive Environment and Diversion from Non-Public Placement Program.

RESPONSE:

In SY 2012-2013 OSSE made one-time awards to disseminate and expand upon schools that demonstrated best practices with educating students in the least restrictive environment. In SY2013-2014 OSSE did not distribute funds.

EDUCATOR LICENSURE SERVICES

Q66: How many staff worked on educator licensure services in FY14 and to date in FY15? What is the current number of vacancies in that division?

RESPONSE:

During FY14 and FY15, the Educator Licensure unit has been comprised of five full-time staff members and one part-time light duty Department of Transportation staff person. The unit consists of:

- One (1) Licensure Administrator who oversees the overall functions of the unit and makes recommendations for improvement of the system for processing licenses;
- Two (2) Licensure Specialists who are responsible for reviewing the majority of licensure applications that arrive in the office as well as providing response to customer inquiries; and
- Two (2) Licensure Staff Assistants whose primary functions are responding to customer inquiries and managing the intake of licensure applications.
- One light duty staff person from OSSE Department of Transportation who assists with application intake and data entry functions.

Q67: Please supply the number of licensees/certified professionals/registered professionals broken down by status that the agency received and approved in FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date.

RESPONSE:

The following table shows the total number of educator license applications received and licenses issued by the agency during FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date:

Fiscal Year	License Applications Received	Licenses Issued
FY12	2870	2488
FY13	3725	2813
FY14	4268	3660
FY15 to date	1512	1113

Q68: Describe the procedures, an out of state and an in-state applicant would experience to acquire an educator license. Please include any exemptions or waivers that are offered in this process and describe what portions of the process can be completed online.

RESPONSE:

In order to be issued an educator license in the District of Columbia, a prospective applicant may access the OSSE website or visit the Educator Licensure office for a copy of the licensure application and/or guidance on how to apply. The application, however, must be completed offline via paper form and submitted directly either in person or via regular mail to the Educator Licensure Unit.

Licensure requirements vary depending on the pathway from which an applicant is seeking licensure. In-state applicants may initiate the licensure process in one of the following ways:

1. As a candidate in a DC-approved alternative-route educator preparation program;
2. As someone who has already completed a DC-approved educator preparation program; and
3. As someone who neither enrolled in or completed a state-approved program but has completed a substantial body of coursework in the foundations of education as well as the subject area for which they are seeking licensure.

For in-state applicants affiliated with a DC-approved educator preparation program, the application process proceeds as follows:

1. The Certification Officer will notify OSSE licensure staff of the applicant's completion of the approved course of study and provide program completion verification.
2. The applicant will follow by contacting OSSE directly, submitting their personal information, nationwide criminal history report, and the licensure fee.
3. OSSE staff will issue, via regular mail, a license certificate which corresponds to the subject area program that was completed by the applicant.

For in-state applicants not affiliated with a DC-approved educator preparation program or who request licensure from outside of DC, the following sequence of steps applies:

1. The applicant visits the Educator Licensure office for a copy of the application and guidance or downloads it from the OSSE website.
2. The applicant submits the completed application, all required supporting documents, and the licensure fee via regular mail or in-person to a member of the Licensure team.
3. OSSE staff will issue, via regular mail, a license certificate if applicant is eligible based on the documentation submitted. If an applicant is not eligible for a license, she/he will receive a licensure evaluation form which outlines the application deficiencies.

An out-of-state applicant may also obtain a license accordingly:

1. An out-of-state applicant must show completion of a state-approved program and completion of basic skills, subject matter, and pedagogy assessments. However, the assessments do not have to be the DC-recognized tests. We accept them as long as they are comparable (basic skills in reading, writing and math; matching subjects and related pedagogy).
2. If an out-of-state applicant possesses a valid, full teaching license from outside DC and can demonstrate that they have taught satisfactorily for 3 of the last 7 years, we will waive the pedagogy test.

There are two licensure waivers, one of which is a partial waiver and one which is a full waiver of licensure requirements, as follows:

1. OSSE may waive the pedagogy testing requirement for out-of-state applicants who hold a valid, full teaching license and can demonstrate that they have taught satisfactorily for 3 of the last 7 years.
2. The District of Columbia offers a one-year, non-renewable Transitional License, which serves as a temporary or emergency license. The Transitional License waives all licensure requirements during the one-year term. In order for a Transitional License to be issued, it must be requested by the hiring LEA. Annually, the Educator Licensure Unit receives and issues approximately 5 or 6 applications for a Transitional License, all of which are from PCS LEAs and none of which are ever upgraded to a full license after the one-year term ends.

The full requirements and procedures for licensure applicants can be found at the following page on the OSSE website: <http://osse.dc.gov/service/teacher-licensure>.

During 2013, the Educator Licensure Unit worked jointly with the Education Licensure Commission and the Division of Early Learning to contract a vendor for the development of a web-based licensure application system. The Licensure Unit spent several months but ultimately the project was terminated in spring 2014 because the system could not be customized in such a way that would meet the specialized usability requirements of the Educator Licensure unit.

In the summer of 2014, the Educator Licensure Unit and Office of Information Technology began working with Teachers-Teachers.com to develop a comprehensive web-based application system capable of modernizing the process of applying for a license to teach, or to serve as a school leader or other school personnel in the District of Columbia. Teachers-Teachers.com is a subscription-based, online educator recruitment tool that OSSE has made available to DC LEAs for nearly a decade to assist with their staffing of teaching, leadership, and other school personnel positions. Because of OSSE's longstanding relationship with Teachers-Teachers.com, the organization is partnering with OSSE to develop this system at no additional cost to OSSE. The new system will streamline the processes of application submission and intake by Educator Licensure program staff, allow for online transmission of supporting documents, and greatly reduce application processing times along the way. Development of the automated licensure application system is moving steadily and the system is expected to go live in September 2015.

Q69: List and describe all the alternative certification/licensure programs that are currently available in the District for FY14 and FY15 to date. How many individuals were licensed through those programs?

RESPONSE:

The federal definition of alternative certification program, which OSSE follows, is any licensure program where a teacher candidate serves as a teacher of record in a DC school while also completing coursework, field experience, and clinical practice requirements toward completion of the program. Thus, in DC an alternative certification program can be based within an institution of higher education, such as The George Washington University, or in a non-profit organization, such as Teach for America, or in a local education agency (LEA), such as KIPP DC. The following table identifies all state-accredited alternative certification providers in the District of Columbia and shows the number of teacher candidates who were licensed through each.

Alternative Certification Provider	Program Type	Licenses Issued FY14	Licenses Issued FY15
American University	University-based	1	7
Catholic University of America	University-based	0	2
Center for Inspired Teaching	Non-Profit Org	15	25
Capital Teaching Residency – KIPP DC	LEA-based	0	16
The George Washington University	University-based	0	2
Teach for America	Non-Profit Org	36	41
Teach-Now	Non-Profit Org	11	7

TNTP Academy	Non-Profit Org	109	75
Trinity Washington University	University-based	2	8
Urban Teacher Center	Non-Profit Org	63	77
University of the District of Columbia	University-based	1	2

All programs listed above were actively enrolling and graduating candidates during the FY14 and FY15 academic years.

Q70: Describe OSSE’s work with LEAs in FY14 and FY15 to date to increase the number of highly qualified teachers? How many teachers were considered highly qualified in FY14 and how many are considered highly qualified to date in FY15?

RESPONSE:

During FY14 and FY15 OSSE has been engaged in many activities with the goal of increasing the quality and effectiveness of teachers in the District of Columbia. Examples of OSSE initiatives aimed at meeting this objective follow:

State Model Teacher Evaluation System

The DC model teacher evaluation system development program, which was launched in the fall of 2014, is a collaborative project between OSSE, Thurgood Marshall Academy, and number of other LEAs. The goal of the effort is to develop an opt-in teacher evaluation system available for use in SY 15-16. Over the course of SY 14-15, these stakeholders will convene as a planning committee, with monthly meetings consisting of professional development, language norming, and critical feedback regarding aspects of teacher evaluation. The goal of each meeting is to create a set of procedures and tools for use in the DC model teacher evaluation system. In turn, the end of the planning year will result in an agreed-upon set of procedures, tools or other applicable materials which form a comprehensive evaluation system. Thus, far the planning committee has participated in three (3) meetings which occurred in November 2014, December 2014, and January 2015. During these initial meetings the participating LEAs have collaborated and provided input on the design and development of a classroom observation rubric that will serve as the core domains of the model evaluation system. Additional monthly meetings are scheduled to occur February 2015 through June 2015 with a pilot of the model system scheduled for launch at the start of the 2015-2016 school year. In April 2015, OSSE staff will begin recruiting DC LEAs to participate in the pilot year implementation.

Educator Talent Cooperative

The DC talent cooperative, a teacher retention project set to begin in the summer of 2015, will include a variety of OSSE-provided incentives for individual teachers and schools. Highly effective teachers will be eligible for the following incentives: \$10,000 retention bonuses in exchange for a two year commitment; automatic eligibility for low-interest mortgages; official recognition from OSSE; and access to professional development and grant opportunities focused on scaling best practices and providing school based professional development. Teachers will regularly convene for OSSE-led cooperative sessions.

Revision of Teacher Licensure Requirements

OSSE continues to explore ways to improve its teacher licensure system and eliminate unnecessary burdens that impede the ability of LEAs to hire and retain highly qualified and effective teachers.

During SY14-15 OSSE will draft and propose new teacher licensure requirements aligned with teacher effectiveness principles. The goals of the initiative will be to eliminate unnecessary barriers to entry, increase the rigor of the process, align licensure to teaching performance, and reward excellent practice.

Teacher Quality Improvement Grant (TQI) & Math Science Partnerships Grant (MSP)

The OSSE has aligned the priorities of the Teacher Quality Improvement Grant (TQI) and Math Science Partnership Grant (MSP) to ensure more educators are exposed to professional development aimed at supporting teacher and leader effectiveness. The FY 14 and FY 15 MSP and TQI grants both established priorities pertinent to teacher and leader effectiveness. In FY 14, applicants for both programs were encouraged to submit proposals for professional development programs designed to increase competency in core content subjects. These grant programs support teachers rated effective or minimally effective, to help them obtain a rating of highly effective, per their LEA's teacher evaluation system. Each year, more than 200 DC teachers receive professional development training through the Teacher Quality Improvement and Math Science Partnership programs, aimed at advancing the proportion of teachers who are highly qualified and effective.

District of Columbia Faculty and Staff data

SY2013-2014 *(OSSE compiles the requested data by school year, not fiscal year)*

Because a teacher may be highly qualified to teach one subject but not another, OSSE measures teacher quality by counting the number of classes for which a teacher is HQ, and calculating the percentage. A "class" is defined as a section or a classroom containing a unique group of students. Elementary teachers, ESL and Special Ed teachers generally have one classroom. Middle school, secondary, and single-subject standalone teachers generally teach have multiple classes. Highly qualified status is calculated for teachers of core subjects, Special Ed, and ESL. Highly qualified status is not calculated for non-core subjects.

Teacher counts

Number of teachers	5817
Number of teachers teaching core courses, Special Ed, ESL	4736
Number of teachers teaching core courses, Special Ed, ESL who teach at least one course in which they are highly qualified	3939 (83%)

Classroom counts

Number of classes taught	19163
Number of core courses, Special Ed, ESL classes taught	15069
Number of core courses, Special Ed, ESL classes taught by HQ teachers	12301 (82%)

SY2014-2015

OSSE is currently in the process of gathering SY14-15 teacher quality data from DC LEAs and will engage in data analysis once LEA reports are received in February 2015. OSSE expects to have SY14-15 teacher and classroom counts by late-May or early-June 2015.

Q71: How many early childhood educators by grade licensed in the District were considered highly qualified in FY14 and in FY15 to date?

RESPONSE:

OSSE does not define our early childhood providers as being highly qualified and, thus, OSSE does not have a count as to how many of our early childhood educators would be considered highly qualified.

Q72: How many transitional or one-year temporary licenses were issued in FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date? Of those candidates, how many were granted a regular license following the end of their nonrenewable transitional period in FY12 and FY15 to date?

RESPONSE:

The following table shows the number of transitional license applications issued and the number of transitional license holders who updated to a Regular II license during FY12, FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date:

Fiscal Year	Transitional Licenses Issued	Transitional Licenses Upgraded to Regular II
FY12	5	0
FY13	4	0
FY14	6	0
FY15 to date	6	0

Q73: What was the average lag time to review and approve a license in FY13, FY14, and FY15 to date and what are criteria are used to approve a license? How can this process be improved?

RESPONSE:

During FY13 and prior, the Educator Licensure Information System did not have the capabilities in place to track the average processing time for licensure applications. During FY14 the average time for processing and review of licensure applications was 33 calendar days. During FY15 to date, the average time for processing and review of licensure applications has been approximately 40 days.

The increase in processing time from FY14 to FY 15 is due in large part to the fact that there have been fewer active licensure staff team members working on licensure issues during the last 7 months. Although average application review times still remain well inside the published application processing timeframes, these staff losses have impacted the overall productivity of the unit.

The criteria for approving licensure applications are as follows:

- Requests for a substitute teaching license, additional teaching endorsement certification, or a reevaluation appeal may take up to 8 weeks.
- Individuals who completed an approved program in the appropriate subject, are seeking license renewal, or seeking the issuance of a Regular I license may take up to 10 weeks.

- Individuals who did NOT complete an approved program, are educators prepared outside of the United States, or are seeking occupational or experience based vocational licensure may take up to 12 weeks.
- Applications are approved based upon submission of appropriate documentation providing evidence of satisfactory completion of all requirements prescribed by the District of Columbia for the respective subject area.

For Regular I (i.e. former provisional) licensure OSSE reviews documentation to verify the following:

1. An appropriate criminal history record,
2. A completed bachelor's degree,
3. Admission into a state-approved teacher education preparation program,
4. Passing scores for an approved basic skills exam (that includes reading, writing and math components),
5. Passing scores for an approved content knowledge exam, and
6. Verified employment as a teacher of record in a elementary, middle or secondary school operating in DC with a teaching assignment matching the teacher education program and required content exam.

For initial full licensure certification we review documentation to verify the following:

1. An appropriate criminal history record,
2. A completed bachelor's degree,
3. Completion of an approved program in the area of license being sought or completion of all individual coursework requirements found in Chapter 16 of the DC Municipal Regulations,
4. Passing scores for an approved basic skills exam (that includes reading, writing and math components),
5. Passing scores for an approved content knowledge exam,
6. Passing scores for an approved pedagogy exam or applicable recognized full-time teaching experience (where applicable), and
7. Verified possession of an appropriate license issued by another state (where applicable).

In instances where an individual did not complete an approved program, OSSE must conduct a course by course or transcript analysis review of that individual's preparation to determine if all requirements have been satisfied to qualify for issuance of a credential in the applicable subject area.

For individuals who have completed degrees and other educational studies at institution located outside of the United States, OSSE must also ensure that the applicant has completed preparation which is deemed equivalent to an earned degree and/or related educational studies completed in the US.

For additional teaching endorsement certification, OSSE reviews documentation to verify the following:

1. Possession of a full DC teaching license in another subject area,
2. A completed degree major in the subject area of the added endorsement OR passing scores for the content knowledge exam in the subject area of the endorsement, and
3. Passing score for the appropriate pedagogy exam if applicant has not completed 3years of recognized fulltime teaching experience at the grade level(s) of the added endorsement.

For license renewals, OSSE reviews documentation to verify the following:

1. Completion of appropriate content specifically related to field of the license being renewed,
2. Completion of total professional development hours required for renewal, and
3. Authenticity of documentation being presented.

For re-evaluation or appeals request we review documentation to verify the following:

1. Course description or syllabi that demonstrates that noted deficiencies were actually embedded in other coursework completed, and
2. Completion of missing exams or coursework that has since been completed by applicant per the requirements of a review previously conducted.

For substitute teacher licensure certification, OSSE reviews documentation to verify the following:

1. A completed bachelor's degree, and
2. An acceptable criminal history record.

In an effort to improve the process of receiving and reviewing applications, and issuing licenses where applicable, the Educator Licensure unit is engaged in an effort to automate the process through work with an external vendor. The planned automated licensure system will be web-based and will introduce overall efficiencies to the existing process in the following ways:

Task	Existing Process	Automated System Process
Application Retrieval and Submission	Applicant prints paper application from OSSE website and submits to OSSE.	Applicant completes online application.
Application Fee Payment	Applicant submits money order along with paper application.	Applicant submits payment electronically along with online application.
OSSE Staff Application Data Entry	Upon receiving the paper application, OSSE Staff enter the application information into Educator Licensure Information System (ELIS).	No longer applicable – Applicant profile is created at the time their electronic application is completed.
Licensure Receipt Notifications	A paper receipt is handed to applicants who submit their application in person to OSSE staff. No notification of receipt is issued for applications mailed.	Applicants will receive an automatic email notification once they have submitted the online application.
Licensure Status Notifications	Applicants receive the license they requested and a cover letter if eligible or a letter outlining deficiencies in their application if they are not eligible.	Applicants will be able to visit the online application portal any time after submission to review its status. Applicants will receive an automatic email notification when their licensure review has been completed.
OSSE Staff License Issuance	After approving a licensure application, OSSE staff prints the license and send it to applicants via regular mail. Applicants may also request that the application be printed and held for pickup.	No longer applicable – The automated system will generate a virtual license that is maintained online within the licensure portal. Applicants may print copies of their license on their own for their records and to distribute to school districts and other state agencies.
Application Processing Timeframe	Approximately 40-day application processing time.	Approximately 20-day application processing time.

EDUCATION LICENSURE COMMISSION

Q74: Provide a narrative on the purpose and goals of the Commission. In addition, please include:

- **A list of all professions regulated by the commission, noting which professions are licensed, which are certified and which are registered;**
- **A list of commissioners, including their name, a brief bio, when their term began, the length of their term, and when their term expires; and**
- **A list of any/all vacancies on the Commission**

RESPONSE:

Purpose and Goals of the Commission:

The Education Licensure Commission ("ELC", the "Commission") is a five member Mayoral appointed regulatory, consumer protection authority. The ELC is responsible for public protection with regard to legitimate quality postsecondary education in the District of Columbia. The Commission establishes standards for postsecondary educational operations, authorizes those operations, approves programs, and oversees all private postsecondary educational institutions in the District of Columbia.

The Commission is the Mayor's only entity authorized to issue postsecondary educational licenses and is charged with advising the Mayor and City Council with respect to postsecondary educational needs of the District. The Commission is responsible for ensuring that institutions under its jurisdiction meet and comply with the standards and other requirements established by laws and regulations. The Commission's granting or denial of license assures students who are enrolled in District of Columbia institutions that the courses offered and degrees conferred meet their standards and that the institutions with which they are dealing are presenting themselves in an honest and forthright manner.

The Commission has additional functions which include, but are not limited to, regulating and enforcing postsecondary laws and regulations, maintaining the student records of institutions which close and have no other depository, issuing certified transcripts, and investigating student and faculty complaints against educational institutions under its jurisdiction.

A list of all professions regulated by the commission, noting which professions are licensed, which are certified and which are registered:

The ELC does not regulate professions. The ELC regulates institutions that offer post-secondary education in the District.

A list of commissioners, including their name, a brief bio when their term began, the length of their term, and when their term expires

Note: Commissioners are able to serve two consecutive 3-year terms. Some service periods exceed 6 years when the appointee was selected to complete the term of someone else. Completing the term of a previous commissioner does not factor into the two-term limit. Below is a list of the current commissioners:

Dr. Gailda P. Davis (Chair)

Term Began: 10/4/06
Term Expires: 8/15/16

Dr. Johnetta Davis (Vice-Chair)
Term Began: 7/16/10
Term Expires: 8/15/16

Dr. Mary E. Dilworth (Secretary)
Term Began: 8/15/14
Term Expires: 8/15/16
Eligible for reappointment

Dr. Joanne D. Joyner
Term Began: 8/15/2014
Term Expires: 8/15/17
Eligible for reappointment

Please see: Question 74 Attachment - Commissioner Bios

A list of any/all vacancies of the Commission:

There is one vacancy on the board for which the ELC has received 2 resumes as potential candidates.

Q75: What were the major accomplishments of the Commission in FY14 and in FY15 to date? Please include the following:

- **Specific efforts to engage with the community and other jurisdictions;**
- **Attempts to make the licensure process more modern and user-friendly;**
- **Improvements to the process for investigating and disciplining misconduct;**
- **Changes made to regulations regarding licensure requirements or continuing education requirements; and**
- **Quarterly reports published by the Commission.**

RESPONSE:

Specific efforts to engage with the community and other jurisdictions

To engage with the community, the ELC has:

- Conducted a customer feedback survey, as a part of its strategic planning process, to gather information from licensees about their overall experience with the ELC and recommendations for service delivery improvement;
- Launched a stakeholder engagement committee and involved representatives from both degree and non-degree granting institutions in a workshop to provide feedback on the usability of the ELC's recently developed Financial Stability Assessment Tool.
- Held monthly New Applicant Workshops and provides technical assistance to potential licensees.

- Continued to liaise with other regulatory bodies in the District to ensure licensure congruence (e.g. Board of Nursing (BON), Board of Occupational Therapy (BOT), Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Administration (HEPRA), and the Board of Barbering and Cosmetology).

To engage with counterparts in other jurisdictions throughout the nation, ELC staff participated in several national regulatory conferences/trainings this year, including the Council on Licensure Enforcement and Regulation (CLEAR), the Federation of Associations of Regulatory Boards (FARB), and the National Association of State Approving Agencies (NASAA). Additionally, the Executive Director of the ELC serves on the Southern Regional Education Board – National Council for State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SREB – NC SARA) steering committee. ELC staff members are also subscribed to the National Association of State Administrators and Supervisors of Private Schools (NASASPS) Yahoo group, which is used as an information sharing tool with counterparts nationwide.

Attempts to make the licensure process more modern and user-friendly

The ELC webpages have received significant updates to improve transparency and user experience to include: the automation of the student complaint and public comment form, FAQs for students and institutions, and revised, streamlined applications for Conditional Exemptions, New Location, and Transcript Requests.

The ELC has also made significant progress on the development of requirements for an E-licensing system (online application process), which included reviewing multiple vendor demonstrations. Staff is currently preparing a vendor solicitation. Once procured and developed, this system will allow for enhanced data collection and analysis as well as better access to relevant information for stakeholders and the automated submission of applications

Improvements to the process for investigating and disciplining misconduct

The ELC has established a working relationship with the OAG's Office of Neighborhood and Victim Services, to whom staff, through OSSE's Office of the General Counsel (OGC), has begun to refer unlicensed activity. Additionally, the ELC is exploring additional avenues to bolster its enforcement authority, such as proposing a change in the statute to allow the Commission to impose fines and penalties on entities that engage in unlicensed activity.

Changes made to regulations regarding licensure requirements or continuing education requirements

Additionally, the ELC has been working with OSSE's OGC on a comprehensive overhaul of the ELC regulations. It is expected that the proposed overhaul of the regulations will be published for public comment before the end of 2015. On January 22, 2015, the Education Licensure Commission Temporary and Emergency Act, D.C. Law 20-590 was enacted to extend authority to the Commission to require an educational institution physically located outside of the District offering postsecondary degree-granting or non-degree granting online programs to District residents to be licensed in the District. The Education Licensure Commission Temporary and Emergency Act also provided the Commission authority to enter into reciprocity agreements with other states in regard to online instruction. A first of draft of the corresponding regulations has been created and will be published for public comment early in 2015.

Quarterly reports published by the Commission

The ELC continues to draft and transmit quarterly reports, and has increased the content which is being reported on these reports to include all actions taken by the commission, rather than simply approvals and denials.

Please see: Question 75 Attachment - 2014 1st Quarter Report
 Question 75 Attachment - 2014 2nd Quarter Report
 Question 75 Attachment - 2014 3rd Quarter Report
 Question 75 Attachment - 2014 4th Quarter Report
 Question 75 Attachment - 2015 1st Quarter Report

Please note that the report for FY 15 Quarter 1 is being finalized and therefore is subject to change.

Q76: How does the commission communicate with education professionals under its regulation (i.e. board meetings, newsletters, surveys, conferences, symposiums)? Please explain the methods and frequency of communication the Commission has with these professionals. Additionally, please describe any outreach and/or education efforts that the Commission has made to engage the public in its work in FY14 and FY 15 to date.

RESPONSE:

The ELC communicates with institutions through site visits, (both scheduled and random), email and telephone. Site visits are conducted at least once annually. Email and telephone communication are as needed. The Commission makes all of its formal decisions during public sessions held every other month. These meetings are announced through the D.C. Register. In addition, the ELC has come into compliance with the BEGA requirements and now has the minutes from public meetings available on the ELC website.

To engage the public, in 2014, the Commission conducted a customer feedback survey to gather information from licensees about their overall experience with the ELC and recommendations for service delivery improvement. As part of the strategic planning process, the ELC is focusing its efforts in 2015 on creating a newsletter targeted at ELC licensees.

Q77: What interagency or intra-agency efforts have been made to improve Education licensure functions in FY14 and FY15 to date? How does the Commission and the office of education licensure and accreditation work with DCPS, PCSB, UDC, and the DME? Additionally please describe efforts to collaborate with other boards and agencies to engage in District education initiatives.

RESPONSE:

Internally, the ELC has made strides in sharing its purpose, mission and vision so that others in OSSE understand the role and function of the regulatory body.

The Commission does not specifically engage with DCPS and PCSB. UDC is excluded from licensure because the institution operates as an instrumentality of the government. From time to time, the ELC

receives requests from UDC for documentation to that effect. The ELC has also responded to requests for information from the DME's office.

The ELC has strong working relationships with other regulatory boards in the District (e.g. Board of Nursing (BON), Board of Occupational Therapy (BOT), Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Administration (HEPRA), and the Board of Barbering and Cosmetology). Staff of each regulatory board attends other boards' meetings, participates in joint training activities, communicates about best practices, conducts joint site visits, and ensures that rules and regulations are in congruence.

Q78: Provide a complete, up-to-date organizational chart for the Education Licensure Commission.

- **Please include a list of the employees (name and title) and the number of vacant positions.**
- **Please provide a narrative explanation of any organizational changes made during the previous year.**

RESPONSE:

There were no organizational changes made during the previous year and there are no vacant positions.

Please see: Question 78 Attachment - Organizational Chart

Q79: Please provide the following budget information for FY13, FY14 and FY15 for the Education Licensure Commission.

- **At the program level, please provide the amount approved and expenditures to date broken out by source of funds and by comptroller source group and comptroller object.**
- **Provide a worksheet detailing all budgeted revenues collected by, and payments to, the Commission.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 79 Attachment: 2013 Deposits.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2013 Local Budget Worksheet.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2013 O Funds Budget Worksheet.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2014 Deposits.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2014 Local Budget Worksheet.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2014 O Funds Budget Worksheet.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2015 Deposits.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2015 Local Budget Worksheet.xls
Question 79 Attachment: 2015 O Funds Budget Worksheet.xls

Q80: Provide the performance plan for the Commission and the office of education licensure and accreditation for FY14 and FY15. Did the division meet all the objectives set forth in the performance plan? Please provide a narrative description of what actions the division took to meet each performance indicator and any reasons why such indicators were not met.

RESPONSE:

FY 2014

1. Update the Higher Education Licensure Commission's (HELC) regulations to reflect postsecondary industry best practices and to improve quality assurance.

In FY13, the HELC updated legislation related to the regulation of distance learning programs. Additionally, in FY14, the HELC will update regulations for non-degree granting institutions and codify through regulations HELC's operating procedures. Updating the regulations and codifying operating procedures will clarify and improve the standards used to evaluate institutions and standardize the Commission's procedures. The work will ensure that the Commission is operating based on best practices and will eliminate unnecessary ambiguity in the Commission's work. Completion Date: June 30, 2014.

PARTIALLY ACHIEVED: During FY 14, the process to update and revamp the ELC regulations for the degree granting, non-degree granting education programs began. This work is continuing in FY15. Additionally, in FY14, the Council passed emergency and temporary legislation, which gives the HELC jurisdiction to regulate distance education. It is expected that permanent legislation will be introduced during FY15.

FY 2015

1. Update the HELC's regulations to reflect postsecondary industry best practices to improve quality assurance, and to expand its jurisdiction to include distance learning. In FY14, the Mayor introduced legislation related to the regulation of distance learning programs. No action was taken on this legislation, so it is anticipated that this legislation will be reintroduced in FY15. Further, in FY15, the HELC will update regulations for degree and non-degree granting institutions, as well as distance learning programs, and codify through rulemaking HELC's operating procedures. Updating the regulations and codifying operating procedures will clarify and improve the standards used to evaluate institutions and standardize the Commission's procedures. The work will ensure that the Commission is operating based on best practices and will eliminate unnecessary ambiguity in the Commission's work. Completion Date: April 1, 2015.

2. Streamline the licensure application process for postsecondary institutions. OSSE will develop an automated application system to better serve institutional applicants, HELC commissioners and staff. The system will streamline application processing, provide a database inclusive of institutional statistical data, reduce paper collection, and diminish the storage challenges of the HELC. Completion date: September 30, 2015

Q81: What is the budget for the Education Licensure Commission and how were funds spent in FY14 and to date in FY15.

RESPONSE:

The response to this question was provided in Question 79. Please refer to the following attachments previously presented:

Question 79 Attachment: 2014 Local Budget Worksheet.xls

Question 79 Attachment: 2014 O Funds Budget Worksheet.xls

Question 79 Attachment: 2015 Local Budget Worksheet.xls

Question 79 Attachment: 2015 O Funds Budget Worksheet.xls

****NOTE:** The Commission is not an accreditation body.

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL CREDIT ENHANCEMENT FUND COMMISSION

Q82: Please provide a narrative description of the purpose and goals of the Commission. In your response, please include:

- **A list of all members of the Commission, including the organization they represent and the length of time they have served on the Commission;**
- **A list of the date and time of all meetings in FY14 and to date in FY15;**
- **A narrative description of any action items taken or recommendations made by the Commission in FY14 and to date in FY15.**

RESPONSE:

Purpose/Goals

The District of Columbia Public Charter School Credit Enhancement Committee (“Committee”) is an independent loan committee responsible for approving any transactions funded from the District of Columbia Public Charter School Credit Enhancement Fund, Direct Loan Fund, or any other Fund supporting a public charter school financing program as established by the Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia, or the Congress. The funds may be provided directly to public charter schools or to non-profit entities to promote innovative credit enhancement initiatives for public charter schools.

Current Committee Members

The Committee is comprised of five members; three members are appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia and two are appointed by the DC Public Charter School Board.

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	Company	Appointment
Tate	Geoffrey	Certified Professional Housing Counselor, Creloba Counseling Services	9/21/2009
Bobo	Cedric	Principal, The Carlyle Group	5/5/2010
Musante	Michael	President, Musante Strategies, LLC	12/3/2009
Williams	Frank	Senior VP, Bank of America Merrill Lynch	9/27/2013
Henderson	James	Director of Operation, Daycon Products Company	10/28/2013

FY 14 and FY 15 Meetings to Date

Meeting Dates	Meeting Times
October 1, 2013	12:00 PM Executive Session 12:30 PM Loan Committee Meeting

November 21, 2013	12:00 PM Executive Session 12:30 PM Loan Committee Meeting
March 20, 2014	12:00 PM Executive Session 12:30 PM Loan Committee Meeting
April 17, 2014	12:00 PM Executive Session 12:30 PM Loan Committee Meeting
December 18, 2014	12:00 PM Executive Session 12:30 PM Loan Committee Meeting

Action Items Taken or Recommendation Made by the Committee

- 1. DC Preparatory Academy PCS** – On October 1, 2013, the Committee approved a \$2,000,000 Direct Loan and a \$500,000 unfunded Credit Enhancement for DC Preparatory Academy to be used to support the takeover of the Benning site from the Charter School Incubator Initiative, the renovation of the existing 70,900 square foot Elementary School building, and the construction of a 30,000 square foot addition to house the school’s new Middle School campus.
- 2. Mundo Verde PCS** – At the November 21, 2013 meeting, the Committee approved a \$2,000,000 Direct Loan and a \$1,000,000 unfunded Credit Enhancement for Mundo Verde PCS to be used to support the purchase and renovation of the unused DCPS Cook Elementary School, located at 30 P Street, NW.
- 3. Paul PCS** – At the March 20, 2014 meeting, the Committee approved a \$2,000,000 Direct Loan and an unfunded \$500,000 Credit Enhancement for Paul PCS to facilitate the acquisition and renovation of the Paul Campus to provide 26,250 square feet of new space.
- 4. Creative Minds PCS** – At the March 20, 2014 meeting, the Committee denied a request for a \$2,000,000 Direct Loan to Creative Minds PCS because necessary due diligence was incomplete. Additional due diligence was done and the Committee subsequently approved the \$2,000,000 Direct Loan request at its April 17, 2014 meeting. This transaction will be used to fund the renovation of four floors of the Armed Forces Retirement Home located at 3700 North Capital Street, NW.
- 5. Inspired Teaching PCS** - At its April 17, 2014 meeting, the Committee approved a \$2,400,000 disbursement from the Federal Credit Enhancement Program. The Credit Enhancement will support a senior Bank of America loan to rehabilitate the Shaed School. The Shaed School will support Inspired Teaching PCS and Lee Montessori PCS as short term tenants for two years.
- 6. Two Rivers PCS** – On December 18, 2014, the Committee approved a \$1,500,000 Direct Loan and a \$500,000 unfunded Credit Enhancement to support the renovation of the Charles E. Young School building in northeast Washington, DC.

Q83: Please provide a record for each account listed below under the purview of the Commission. In your response please include the current fund balance for the account, the amount loaned out to each charter school, and any transfer of money from the account to other programs or initiatives.

- **Direct Loan Account;**
- **Credit Enhancement Account.**

RESPONSE:

Account Type	Current Fund Balance	Amount Loaned Out	Transfers from specific account to other programs or initiatives
Direct Loan	\$35,730,959.98	\$10,472,461.13 (1)	No transfers to other programs or initiatives.
Credit Enhancement	\$ 2,006,460.77	\$6,789,193.72 (2)	No transfers to other programs or initiatives.

DIRECT LOANS		CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS	
Amount	Public Charter School	Amount	Public Charter School
\$733,111.22	Carlos Rosario PCS	\$729,059.72	William E. Doar PCS
\$1,151,463.54	William E. Doar PCS	\$306,000.00	Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS
\$907,047.47	Eagle Academy PCS	\$3,000,000.00	Friendship PCS
\$1,833,884.12	Ideal Academy PCS	\$2,404,134.00	ELH Support Corporation
\$1,780,453.87	Hyde Leadership PCS	\$350,000.00	Charter School Incubator Initiative
\$66,500.91	Hospitality High PCS		
\$2,000,000.00	Mundo Verde PCS		
\$2,000,000.00	Paul PCS		

Q84: What is the total amount currently allocated in credit enhancements that have been awarded to public charter schools in FY14 and to date in FY15? How much of this allotment has been spent?

RESPONSE:

Public Charter School	Total Allocation in FY14	Total Allocation in FY15	Total Expenditures to Date
Mundo Verde PCS	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000
Paul PCS	\$500,000		\$500,000
Two Rivers PCS		\$ 500,000	Closing Feb. 2015

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Q85: Provide a current organization chart for OSSE and the name of the employee responsible for the management of each office/program. If applicable, please provide a narrative explanation of any organizational changes made during FY14 or to date in FY15.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 85 Attachment – Organization Chart.

OSSE realigned beginning in the late spring of 2014 to bring focus and support to both the PK-Postsecondary continuum and to the agency's research and analysis functions. An official budget restructure to mirror the organizational design is in process.

Office of the Director (D100).

- The Office of Enterprise Data Management has been renamed to the Office of Data, Accountability, Assessment and Research and will exist as a separate program with the following activities: (1) Office of the Assistant Superintendent (2) Data Collection & Federal Reporting, (3) Assessment & Accountability and (4) Research & Analysis and (5) Program Support & Evaluation.
- The Human Resources activity (D304) was moved to the Office of the Director from the Office of the Chief Operating Officer and renamed Human Capital Management.
- Athletics moved from Wellness and Nutrition Services (D500) to the Office of the Director.
- New activities (formerly budgeted to the Office of the Chief of Staff, D102) were created for (1) Communications and Community Outreach and (2) Policy, Intergovernmental Relations & Legislative Affairs.

OSSE established a Federal Grant Programs office which is currently overseen by the chief operating officer. Activities were created for (1) Compliance & Monitoring, (2) Grants Management, (3) Fiscal Policy & Professional Development and (4) Enrollment & Residency. Nutrition- focused programs funded by federal grants, formerly grouped under the Office of Wellness and Nutrition Services, were also moved to this division.

Elementary and Secondary Education (D600), Special Education (D900) and Health Education (formerly part of the Office of Wellness and Nutrition Services) merged to become Elementary, Secondary and Specialized Education. To add to the existing activities of Teaching & Learning, Educator Licensure and Community Learning, six new activities were created: (1) K-12 Performance, Accountability & Support, (2) Monitoring & Compliance, (3) Policy, Planning & Charter Support, (4) Special Programs, (5) State Complaints and (6) Operations & Fiscal Support.

Q86: Provide the agency's performance plan for FY14. Did OSSE meet the objectives set forth in the FY14 performance plan? Please provide a narrative description of what actions the agency undertook to meet the key performance indicators, including an explanation as to why any indicators were not met.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 86 Attachment – FY14 Performance Plan

All of the agency's initiatives were either fully or partially achieved with the exception of the following three. While none of the three unachieved initiatives will have a severely detrimental impact on the quality of services the public receives, the responsible divisions continue to target their efforts in these areas of improvement.

OFFICE OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION

INITIATIVE 3.2: Increase the number of Facilitated Resolution Meetings.

This initiative supports federal, local and judicial guidance to provide a wider range of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) services to children and families. In FY14, OSSE will increase Facilitated Resolution Meetings (FRM) participation to 30% of the approximately 60 due process complaints filed per month using a facilitator in resolution meetings.

Completion Date: September 30, 2014.

Not achieved. Much of OSSE's focus regarding ADR has been on developing and stabilizing the mediation program (as per Initiative 3.1), which prevented full development of the FRM program. No requests were made for FRM services in FY14. Nonetheless, OSSE has worked to build the infrastructure of the FRM program by hiring and training hearing officers. OSSE has also produced and disseminated marketing materials to families and LEAs to bring awareness to the FRM service and encourage participation. Upon full development of OSSE's mediation and FRM programs, OSSE will turn its focus to increasing the number/percentage of due process matter participation in the FRM program.

DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION (DSE)

INITIATIVE 1.2: DSE Stakeholder Surveys. DSE will continue to publish monthly updates and start to solicit performance feedback from key stakeholders, including staff, parents and other community-based stakeholders, on a semi-annual basis. Responses will be used to help refine DSE's policies and practices. **Completion Date: September 30, 2014.**

Not Achieved. The Division is in the process of developing monthly surveys. During the beginning of FY15, the division has completed surveys to parents and community based stakeholders through our Annual Parent Survey. We hope to increase the frequency with which we survey our stakeholders.

INITIATIVE 3.3: Expansion of Medicaid Claiming. In FY13, DSE successfully initiated Medicaid transportation claiming. In FY14, DSE will initiate collection of Medicaid reimbursements for allowable services provided to children with qualifying disabilities via OSSE's Part C Program and Non-Public Tuition Payment Unit, and ensure LEAs, Part C providers, and nonpublic programs have access to training and technical assistance that will allow for full claiming. **Completion Date: September 30, 2014.**

Not Achieved. OSSE continues to work with Department of Healthcare Finance to finalize the State Plan Amendment (SPA) that will authorize the claiming for services performed in

nonpublic programs. If the SPA is approved in FY 15, claiming in this area will commence. In the area of LEA training and technical assistance, the unit continues to provide support and guidance as needed.

Q87: Provide the agency's performance plan for FY15. What steps has the agency taken to date in FY15 to meet the objectives set forth in the FY14 performance plan?

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 87 Attachment – FY15 Performance Plan

Q88: Provide a list of all studies, research papers, and analyses the agency prepared, or contracted for, during FY14 and FY15, to date. Please state the status and purpose of each.

RESPONSE:

The following studies, research papers, and analyses were prepared or contracted for during FY14 and FY 15 by OSSE:

- **District of Columbia Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 2012 (Released in 2014):** The report presents data from the 2012 District of Columbia Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), including examining the following behavior categories: alcohol, tobacco and other drugs; emotional health and wellness; nutrition, physical activity and sedentary behaviors; sexual health; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and questioning; violence and bullying; and dating violence and neighborhood violence.
- **Reducing Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions in District of Columbia Public and Public Charter Schools (Released in 2014):** The report examined local trends in school suspensions and expulsions for violence, drugs, alcohol, and weapons, including the relative risk of suspension and expulsion for different student subgroups (for example, the risk for African-American students as compared to the risk for White students).
- **Student Pathways to Postsecondary Success: Research Findings on the College Persistence and Graduation of DC Public High School Graduates (presented in early 2015 at OSSE Postsecondary Conference):** The study, conducted pro bono for OSSE by the Education Advisory Board, examines the impact of gender, race, academic preparation, linear distance from DC, student transfer, and academic major choice on the likelihood of a student to persist and graduate from higher education and the amount of time it takes students to earn a degree.
- **District of Columbia Graduation Pathways Project Summary (released 2014):** This project, created under an OSSE contract, analyzed DC students' high school outcomes to identify when students fall off-track, why, and to identify programs and schools that are able to get students back on-track, including to inform the creation of a statewide early warning system.
- Analysis of DC CAS 2014 scores (released in late July 2014)
- Analysis of student, school, and state data to support Equity Reports (went live on the LearnDC.org site in January 2015)

- **Expansion of Infant/Toddler Care:** In FY14 and in FY15 to date, OSSE has identified a need for additional infant and toddler childcare slots throughout the District. Analysis of pre-k enrollment data across all public sectors show enough slots to accommodate all pre-Kindergarten aged children in the District, but still insufficient capacity for the approximately 30% of the unserved infant and toddler population. OSSE has conducted on-going geographic analysis to determine areas needing additional capacity for infant and toddler slots. To meet this need, OSSE applied for and received funding to provide additional high quality slots through the Head Start Childcare Partnership grant, which establishes a Quality Improvement Network in these areas.
- **Research Collaboration:** OSSE currently maintains relationships with local universities, colleges and research organizations and non-profits, such as the DC Fiscal Policy Institute, DC Action for Children, School Readiness Consulting and Howard University. In FY15, OSSE plans to develop new relationships with research partners within the District that already have extensive knowledge about many of the urban issues impacting early education policy.
- **Head Start Enrollment Collection:** OSSE collected student level enrollment data for the first time in 2014 from both Early Head Start and Head Start programming. Collecting and assigning OSSE identifiers to this population will enable a better understanding of who Head Start is reaching and how to better support this sector as well. From a policy perspective, this also allows OSSE to better understanding how federal and local funding streams are affecting early childhood populations and how to improve the delivery of services.
- **ECE Staff Collection:** In fall 2014, OSSE completed a statewide collection of staff qualifications and demographics for all those employed in licensed childcare. These data allow OSSE to establish benchmarks for the credentials and experience of early childhood staff and help facilitate OSSE's creation of supports for staff to move along the career lattice. Additionally, analysis of staff qualifications can be examined as an input to determine the impact and relationship to other variables within childcare.
- **Howard University Classroom Quality Evaluation:** In FY 2014, OSSE contracted Howard University Center for Urban Progress to conduct various program quality evaluations to determine the level of classroom quality in the District's Child Development Programs. Evaluation results are being used to inform instruction, classroom management and professional development needs. Below are the evaluations done by Howard University:
 - **Quality of Early Learning and Care Centers:** Howard University Center for Urban Progress (HUCUP) conducted a baseline quality assessment of community based child care subsidy providers. The evaluation included toddler classrooms (ages 18 months – 36 months) and pre-kindergarten classrooms (ages 3 and 4) utilizing the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) – CLASS Toddler and CLASS Pre-K. HUCUP also conducted a baseline quality assessment in family home settings (infants – school aged) utilizing the Family Child Care Environment Rating Scale – Revised (FCCERS-R). Observations were conducted across each ward to assess the quality of early childhood classrooms and home settings in the District of Columbia. Additionally, HUCUP administered the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Fourth Edition (PPVT4) and Expressive Vocabulary Test – Second Edition (EVT2) individualized

assessments to a sample of 3 and 4 year old children enrolled in the community based child care subsidy centers and homes to gain a baseline of expressive and receptive language outcomes of children early childhood programs in the District of Columbia.

- Pre-k Enhancement and Expansion Classroom Quality Evaluation: HUCUP conducted the Pre-K Expansion and Enhancement classroom quality evaluation utilizing the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS Pre-K) observation tool. Additionally, Howard administered student outcome assessments to a representative sample of pre-k students in CBOs utilizing the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - IV (PPVT4) and Expressive Vocabulary Test – II (EVT2) in the beginning of the year and at the end of the year to measure growth in expressive and receptive language development. The CLASS assessment scores are included in the 2014 Pre-K Report.
- Infants and Toddlers Quality Improvement Initiative Classroom evaluation: HUCUP conducted a post evaluation utilizing the Infant/Toddler Environment Rating Scale – Revised (ITERS-R) to continue monitoring the quality improvement of the Infant and Toddler Quality Improvement Initiative classrooms during the “full intervention phase” once programs received one year of professional development interventions such as mentor-coaching support and trainings on infant and toddler curriculum and exemplary practices.
- **School Readiness Consulting Pre-k evaluation:** OSSE contracted School Readiness Consulting (SRC) to implement classroom observations, analyze results, and prepare a final report to summarize findings to Pre-k classrooms in the Community Based Organization and DC Public Charter Schools. The study aimed to create a baseline understanding of pre-k classroom quality throughout the District. The results from the evaluation will help OSSE create consensus around decisions regarding the quality improvement needs of pre-k programs throughout the District. A subsequent phase of work may build on this baseline study, implementing CLASS observations District-wide to inform a broader quality rating process and communicate this information to early learning stakeholders.
- **Child Care Cost Modeling Study:** OSSE has started work on the child care cost modeling initiative to determine where child care reimbursement rates should be set in a manner that provides parents access to quality care as well as help inform the development of family-friendly child care subsidy policies. The reauthorization of the Child Care Development Block Grant allows states to use alternate methods to determine reimbursement rates for child care.

Q89: Explain the impact on your agency of any legislation passed at the federal level during FY14 or FY15, to date.

RESPONSE:

The Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization: In FY 14, President Obama signed the Child Development Block Grant Act of 2014 into law- the first reauthorization of the federal child care program since 1996. The law aims to protect the health and safety of children in child care, facilitate families’ access to child care assistance, and improve the quality of care assistance, and improve the quality of care. The following areas are affected by the law:

- CCDBG Purposes and General Administration
- Consumer education and provider compliance with Health and safety standards (including criminal background checks)
- Child Care Program Standards and Quality Improvement Activities
- Family- Friendly Policies
- Payment Rates and Practices

The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) was signed into law by President Obama on July 22, 2014. The bill revises and reauthorizes the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), which provides funding and corresponding parameters associated with the District’s Workforce Development, Adult Education, and Career and Technical Education (CTE) systems. The new law requires an enhanced level of collaboration among multiple agencies, including OSSE’s Adult and Family Education (AFE) and CTE divisions, DOES, the WIC, DHS, RSA, DDS, and others. This collaboration includes the drafting of a unified state plan for adult education and workforce training, due in March 2016, which will require a multi-agency planning process. Conversations, led by the WIC, have already begun on how to prepare for successful implementation and OSSE plans to release a new RFP based on the new law for FY16 for sub-grantees. The full impact of changes will not be known until the WIOA regulations are published in late spring 2015.

Q90: List all regulations for which the agency is responsible for oversight or implementation. Please list by chapter and subject heading, including the date of the most recent revision. Please provide any schedule OSSE has for review of these regulations. What regulations does OSSE anticipate will be re-reviewed or redrafted in FY15? What are the anticipated dates of finalization? Please also identify all new policies that have been finalized in the past year or that are expected to be promulgated in FY15. How does OSSE inform LEAs and the public of new or advised regulations or policies?

RESPONSE:

Current Regulations

OSSE is responsible for oversight and implementation of the regulations listed in the table below. In FY15, OSSE intends to review and redraft the regulations identified according to the timetables indicated below.

Title-Subtitle/Chapter Number	Chapter Heading	Date of Most Recent Revision	Any Schedule OSSE has for Review/Redraft?
5-A21	COMPULSORY EDUCATION AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE	Final Rule 1/10/14, 61 DCR 222	
5-A23	STATE-WIDE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS	Final Rule 5/22/09, 56 DCR 4105	
5-A24	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DUAL ENROLLMENT REGULATIONS	Final Rule, 9/28/12, 59 DCR 11141	
5-A27	INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETICS	Final Rule, 11/22/13 – 60 DCR 16052	
5-A28	CERTIFICATES OF APPROVAL FOR NONPUBLIC SPECIAL EDUCATION	6/22/12, 59 DCR 7495	

*FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education*

	SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS SERVING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES FUNDED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SPECIAL EDUCATION		
5-A29	INVOICE PROCESSING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION PROVIDERS SERVING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES FUNDED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Final Rule, 6/22/12, 59 DCR 7495	
5-A31	EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAM FOR INFANTS AND TODDLERS WITH DISABILITIES	Final Rule – 4/12/2013, 60 DCR 561	
5-A34	PRE-K ENHANCEMENT AND EXPANSION PROGRAM ASSISTANCE GRANTS	Final Rule, 10/15/10, 56 DCR 9727	
5-A50	RESIDENCY VERIFICATION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS	Final Rule, 3/27/09, 56 DCR 2386	
5-A51	NON RESIDENTS ATTENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS	Final Rule, 4/3/09, 56 DCR 2586	
5-A54	APEAL PROCEDURES FOR DENIAL OF A PETITION TO ESTABLISH A DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL	Last Update Final Rule, 7/6/12, 59 DCR 8184	
5-A70	CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION GRANTS	New - Final Rule, 12/19/2014, 61 DCR 12775	
5-A80	POSTSECONDARY DEGREE GRANTING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS	Final Rule, 3/18/11, 58 DCR 2424	
5-A81	POSTSECONDARY NON-DEGREE SCHOOLS	Final Rule as to general authority and fees, 1/27/12, 59 DCR 531	
5-A82	ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES OF THE EDUCATION LICENSURE COMMISSION	Final Rule, 1/18/91, 38 DCR 598	
5-E	5-E EDUCATION – ORIGINAL TITLE 5		
16-36	CONSUMERS, COMMERCIAL PRACTICES, & CIVIL INFRACTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (DOH) INFRACTIONS; SECTION 3602, CHILD CARE AND CHILD PLACING INFRACTIONS	Final Rule – 5/27/05, 52 DCR 4981	
29-3	PUBLIC WELFARE – CHILD DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES	Final Rule – 1/22/10, 57 DCR 984;	
29-70	PUBLIC WELFARE – TUITION GRANT PROGRAM	Final Rule, 6/1/01, 48 DCR 5013	Proposed Rule, 1/9/2015, 62 DCR 2, Comment Period ended 2/9/15.

Policies that were finalized during FY14 to date:

Policy Title	Date Issued	Document Link
--------------	-------------	---------------

*FY2014 Performance Oversight Questions
Office of the State Superintendent of Education*

OSSE Bullying Policy	10/08/2013	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/OSSE%20Bullying%20Policy.pdf
McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act	01/02/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/McKinney-Vento%20Homeless%20Act%20Law-2.pdf
Institution Appeal Rights and Procedures for the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP)	01/17/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/Institution%20Appeal%20Rights%20and%20Procedures_Revised%20May%202012.pdf
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Grant Eligibility and Administration Hearing Process Policy	01/27/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/Final_IDEA%20Part%20B%20Grant%20Hearing%20Policy_01272014.pdf
Confidentiality of Student Information Policy	01/27/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/Final_Confidentiality%20of%20Student%20Information%20Policy_01272014.pdf
Extended IFSP Option for Children Age 3 to Age 4 Policies And Procedures	02/07/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/OSSE%20Extended%20IFSP%20Option%20Policy%20Final%204%2015%2014.pdf
Career and Technical Education (CTE) Monitoring Policies and Procedures Guidelines Manual	04/28/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/Guidance%20MASTER%20POLICY%20MANUAL%20%20FINAL%20Rev%209.16.13.pdf
Special Education Transportation Services Policy	07/30/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/OSSE%20Transportation%20PolicyV07292014.pdf <i>and</i> http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/Special%20Education%20Transportation%20Services%20Policy%20Memo_v11.06.2013%20%281%29.pdf
Office of Dispute Resolution Redaction Policy	08/04/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/HOD%20Redaction%20Policy%20ODR.pdf
Sub-Recipient Grant Monitoring Policy	10/20/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/OSSE%20Sub-Recipient%20Grant%20Monitoring%20Policy.pdf
Strong Start DC EIP Policies	10/28/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/Final%20DC%20Part%20C%20Policies.pdf
Individualized Education Program (IEP) Implementation for Transfer Students Policy	12/18/2014	http://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/publication/attachments/IEP%20Implementation%20for%20Transfer%20Students%20Policy%20%2812-17-14%29.pdf

How does OSSE inform LEAs and the public of new or advised regulations or policies?

OSSE informs the LEAs and the public of new or advised regulations through various engagements with major stakeholder groups including working groups, public hearings and meetings, and monthly LEA Data meetings. In addition, OSSE informs LEAs and the public of new or altered regulations or policies through existing partner lists and coalitions or consortia as well as through OSSE's weekly newsletter, the LEA Look Forward. OSSE provides a thirty-day public comment period for regulations and, in some cases, produces a press release.

Q91: Please provide the following budget information for OSSE and all programs under its purview, including the approved budget, revised budget, and expenditures, for FY14 and to date in FY15:

- **At the agency level, please provide the information broken out by source of funds and by Comptroller Source Group and Comptroller Object.**

- **At the program level, please provide the information broken out by source of funds and by Comptroller Source Group and Comptroller Object.**
- **At the activity level, please provide the information broken out by source of funds and by Comptroller Source Group.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 91 Attachment – Budget and Expenditures

- Q92: Provide a complete accounting of all intra-district transfers received by or transferred from OSSE during FY14 and to date in FY15. For each, please provide a narrative description as to the purpose of the transfer and which programs, activities, and services within OSSE the transfer affected.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 92 Attachment – Intra –District

- Q93: Provide a complete accounting of all reprogrammings received by or transferred from the OSSE during FY14 and to date in FY15. For each, please provide a narrative description as to the purpose and reason of the transfer and which programs, activities, and services within the agency the reprogramming affected. In addition, please provide an accounting of all reprogrammings made within the agency that exceeded \$100,000 and provide a narrative description as to the purpose and reason of the transfer and which programs, activities, and services within the agency the reprogramming affected.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 93 Attachment – Reprogramming

- Q94: Provide a complete accounting of all of OSSE's Special Purpose Revenue Funds for FY14 and FY15. Please include the revenue source name and code, total amount generated and expended, and the purpose of the funds.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 94 Attachment – Special Purpose Revenue

- Q95: Provide a list of all OSSE's fixed costs budget and actual dollars spent for FY14 and to date in FY15. Include the source of funding and the percentage of these costs assigned to each OSSE program. Please provide the percentage change between OSSE's fixed costs budget for these years and a narrative explanation for any changes**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 95 Attachment – Fixed Costs

Q96: Provide the capital budget for OSSE and all programs under its purview during FY14 and FY15, including amount budgeted and actual dollars spent. In addition, please provide an update on all capital projects undertaken in FY14 and FY15. Did any of the capital projects undertaken in FY14 or FY15 have an impact on the operating budget of the agency? If so, please provide an accounting of such impact.

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 96 Attachment – Capital Budget

Q97: Provide a current list of all properties supported by the OSSE budget. Please indicate whether the property is owned by the District or leased and which agency program utilizes the space. If the property is leased, please provide the terms of the lease. For all properties please provide an accounting of annual fixed costs (i.e. rent, security, janitorial services, electric).

RESPONSE:

Only two properties are partially supported by the OSSE budget - 441 4th Street and 810 First Street. The DOT Terminals are not paid out of OSSE's budget, but are instead paid out of DGS's budget (AMO) which was done per OSSE's request. 441 4th Street is owned and 810 First Street is Leased. Enclosed is a Lease abstract for 810 First Street, which summarizes the Lease. DGS's budgets are at the Agency level, not the program level, partly because some of the agency's program level information is considered classified. For example, program level information on the Consolidated Forensic Labs is classified. The enclosed worksheet has FY 14, 15 and 16 costs. Since FY 14 is closed, the number provided on the worksheet is the actual rent spent at 810 First Street. The actual costs for 441 4th Street for FY 14 are unknown at this time, but the budget is \$33,887. The other two years (FY 15 & FY 16) are budget amounts.

Please see: Question 97 Attachment – OSSE Property
Question 97 Attachment – OSSE Property 810 First Street

Q98: Describe any spending pressures that existed in FY14. In your response please provide a narrative description of the spending pressure, how the spending pressure was identified, and how the spending pressure was remedied.

RESPONSE: Given the transition in leadership, this historical information is not available.

Q99: Identify potential areas where spending pressures may exist in FY15? Please provide a detailed narrative of the spending pressure, including any steps that are being taken to minimize the impact on the FY15 budget.

RESPONSE:

For FY 2015, OSSE anticipates that it may have the following spending pressures:

- \$3.2 million for state-administered assessments – The District's adoption of the Common Core State Standards in 2010 and the Next Generation Science Standards in 2013 led to required

transition to the development and administration of new annual assessments aligned to these standards, in accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). New assessments developed for implementation in spring 2015 are the following: PARCC (Partnership for Assessments of Readiness for College and Careers) ELA and Math; NCSC AA-AAS (National Center State Collaborative Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards) ELA and Math; and DC's Next Generation Science Assessment. The total cost of implementation was not identified when the FY15 budget was developed, and the cost of administration was not accounted for in the District's FY 15 budgeting process. OSSE is currently looking for solutions to this pressure by redirecting spending priorities within its current budget.

- \$0.9 million for union incentives – two of OSSE's Division of Student Transportation (OSSE-DOT) unions (Teamsters and AFSCME Local 1959) have required incentives through their collective bargaining agreements that must be fulfilled. Incentives for bus drivers and attendants were included as part of the Collective Bargaining Agreements. The costs of the incentives are not budgeted in OSSE-DOT.
- \$3.5 million for Part C – Additional children were served based on new local regulations that expanded eligibility criteria under Part C of IDEA (early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities) and allowed families the option of maintaining Part C services for an additional year through an extended Individualized Family Services Plan (IFSP). These services exceeded the FY15 budget.

OSSE anticipates a one-time cost settlement from Medicaid claiming. If this is received, OSSE expects to be able to address these spending pressures internally. If not received,

Q100: Provide a list of all FY14 full-time equivalent positions for OSSE, broken down by program and activity. In addition, for each position please note whether the position is filled (and if filled, the name of the employee) or whether it is vacant. Finally, please indicate the source of funds for each FTE (local, federal, special purpose, etc.).

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 100 Attachment – Full Time Equivalent Positions.

Q101: How many vacancies were posted for OSSE during FY14? To date in FY15? Which positions? Why was the position vacated? In addition, please note how long the position was vacant, what steps have been taken to fill the position, whether or not the position has been filled, and the source of funding for the position.

RESPONSE:

In FY14, OSSE posted a total of 82 vacancies. To date in FY15, OSSE posted a total of 18 vacancies.

Please see: Question 101 Attachment – OSSE Vacancies.

Q102: How many employee performance evaluations were completed in FY14 and how was performance measured against position descriptions? To date in FY15? What steps are taken to correct poor performance and how long does an employee have to correct their performance?

RESPONSE:

Managers set measurable goals based on the individual job requirements and the general outlines of the position description. If a manager determines that an employee is not performing at the level in which he or she should, that manager will work with the employee to resolve the deficiencies prior to the evaluation stage of the performance cycle.

Performance evaluations completed in FY14 – 229 people (12.34%)

- OSSE General – 181 people (58.20%)
- OSSE Department of Transportation (DOT) – 48 people (3.11%)

Performance evaluations to date in FY15 – 182 people (15.44%)

- OSSE General – 303/333 complete (90.99%)
- OSSE DOT – 136/1510 complete (9.00%). Note that this performance cycle, bus drivers and attendants were excluded from the standard citywide performance process. Beginning FY16, all DOT employees will be required to participate in the standard evaluation process.

If the matter requires placing the employee on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP), the manager may elect to do so within a specified timeframe. The employee may be placed on the PIP for 30, 60, or 90 days to allow them ample time for improvement. If the employee fails to improve their performance during the PIP process, the manager then has the right to reassign, demote, or terminate the employee from their position. The deadline for completion of FY14 performance evaluations was December 31, 2014.

Q103: Has OSSE adhered to all non-discrimination policies in regards to hiring and employment?

RESPONSE:

Yes. The agency has followed the recruitment guidelines and strategies set forth by the DC Department of Human Resources (DCHR), which allows the agency to stay in compliance and adhere to all non-discriminatory policies.

Q104: Have there been any accusations by employees or potential employees that OSSE has violated hiring and employment non-discrimination policies in FY15 or to date in FY15? If so, what steps were taken to remedy the situation(s)?

RESPONSE:

No. Currently in FY15, there have not been any accusations, reported at the agency level, of violations of any of OSSEs hiring or employment non-discrimination policies.

Q105: Provide the Committee with the following:

- **A list of employee receiving bonuses, special pay, additional compensation, or hiring incentives in FY14 and to date in FY15, and the amount; and,**
- **A list of travel expenses for FY14 and to date in FY15, arranged by employee.**

RESPONSE:

The following employees received Additional Income Allowance:

- Cedric Thompson – Additional Income Allowance (AIA) \$2,828.00 for FY14
- Amy Maisterra – Additional Income Allowance (AIA) \$1,730.76 for FY15 & \$9,230.72 for FY14

Please see: Question 105 Attachment – FY14 Travel Expense Log
Question 105 Attachment – FY15 Travel Expense Log

Q106: Provide the following information for all contracts awarded by OSSE during FY14 and to date in FY15:

- **Contract number;**
- **Approved Budget Authority;**
- **Funding Source;**
- **Whether it was competitively bid or sole sourced;**
- **Expenditures (including encumbrances and pre-encumbrances);**
- **Purpose of the contract;**
- **Name of the vendor;**
- **Contract deliverables;**
- **Contract outcomes;**
- **Any corrective actions taken or technical assistance provided; and**
- **OSSE employee/s responsible for overseeing the contract.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 106 Attachment – FY14-15 Large Contracts

Q107: Provide the following information for all contract modifications made by OSSE during FY14 and to date in FY15, broken down by OSSE program and activity:

- **Name of the vendor;**
- **Purpose and reason of the contract modification;**
- **Employee/s responsible for overseeing the contract;**
- **Modification cost, including budgeted amount and actual spent; and**
- **Funding source.**

RESPONSE:

Please see: Question 107 Attachment – FY14-15 Large Contract Modification

Q108: Provide the following information for all purchase card transactions during FY14 and to date in FY15:

- **Employee that made the transaction;**
- **Transaction amount; and,**
- **Transaction purpose.**

RESPONSE:


Please see: Question 108 Attachment – FY14 Purchase Card Transactions
 Question 108 Attachment – FY15 to date - Purchase Card Transactions

Q109: Provide copies of any investigations, reviews or program/fiscal audits completed on programs and activities within OSSE during FY14 and to date in FY15. This includes any reports by the DC Auditor or the Office of the Inspector General. In addition, please provide a narrative explanation of steps taken to address any issues raised by the program/fiscal audits.

RESPONSE:

All completed reports or program/fiscal audits by the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor or the Office of the Inspector General that were completed during this timeframe can be found at the following links.

Office of the District of Columbia Auditor

- [DC Public Education Reform Amendment Act \(PERAA\) Report No. 5 \(Report num: DCA042015\)](#)
- [DC Public Education Reform Amendment Act \(PERAA\) Report No. 4 \(Report num: DCA222014\)](#)
- [DC Public Education Reform Amendment Act \(PERAA\) Report No. 3 Part II \(Report num: DCA202014\)](#)
- Fiscal Year 2014 Report Number: DCA292014 Report:  [DCA292014.pdf](#)
- [DC Agencies Compliance with Fiscal Year 2013 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals.pdf](#)

The following completed reports or program/fiscal audits that were completed during this timeframe can be found at their corresponding attachment.

United States Department of Education

- *Highly Qualified Teachers and Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (ESEA Title II, Pt. A) Monitoring Report (August 27-28, 2014)*

Please see: Question 109 Attachment – Title II Monitoring Report

DC TAG Audit

In FY 13, the Division of Postsecondary and Career Education (PSCE) contracted F.S. Taylor & Associates, P.C. (“the auditor”) to conduct an audit of the District of Columbia Tuition Assistance Grants Program’s (DC TAG) payments, policies and procedures.

Please see: Question 109 Attachment – DCTAG Audit
 Question 109 Attachment – DCTAG OCFO Report
 Question 109 Attachment – OSSE’s Actions in Response to
 DCTAG Audit Recommendations