

Organization and Budget

- Q1: Please provide a complete, up-to-date organizational chart for each division within the DCPS central office including, either attached or separately, an explanation of the roles and responsibilities for each division and subdivision.
- Please provide a narrative explanation of any organizational changes made during the previous year.

**Please list this information by program and activity*

See “Q1 Attachment_DCPS Central Org,” together with “Q2 Attachment_Org Chart Budget Crosswalk.”

- Q2: Please provide a crosswalk between DCPS current organizational chart and DCPS budget for FY12 and FY13, to date. Please also provide a crosswalk between the organizational chart, budget, and the three budget categories of funding as defined in the DCPS Budget Guide: School, School Support, and Central Office. In your explanation of what staffing falls into the School Support category, please identify what school or schools are supported by each position.

See “Q2 Attachment_Org Chart Budget Crosswalk.”

- Q3: Did the agency meet the objectives set forth in the performance plan for FY12 and FY13, to date? Please provide a narrative description of what actions the agency undertook to meet the key performance indicators or any reasons why such indicators were not met.

See “Q3 Performance Plan.”

- Q4: Please provide a chart showing your agency’s approved budget and actual spending, by program, for FY12 and FY13, to date. In addition, please include the approved budget, revised budget (after any reprogrammings), and actual expenditures for FY12 and FY13, to date:
- At the agency level, please provide the information broken out by source of funds and by Comptroller Object;
 - At the program level, please provide the information broken out by source of funds and by Comptroller Object;
 - At the activity level, please provide the information broken out by source of funds and by Comptroller Object;
 - At the service level, please provide the information broken out by source of funds and by Comptroller Object
 - Please also provide a school-by-school budget for FY12 and FY13 to date that includes the approved budget, revised budget (after any reprogrammings), and actual expenditures.

See “Q4 Attachment_FY12 and FY13 Budget to Spending.”

Q5: Please provide a complete accounting for all intra-District transfers received by or transferred from the agency during FY12 or FY13, to date. For each, please provide a narrative description as to the purpose of the transfer and which programs, activities, and services within DCPS the transfer affected.

See “Q5 Attachment_Intradistrict Transfers_FY12 and FY13YTD.”

Q6: Please list any reprogrammings, in or out, which occurred in FY12 or FY13, to date. For each reprogramming, please list the total amount of the reprogramming, the original purposes for which the funds were dedicated, and the reprogrammed use of funds.

See “Q6 Attachment FY12_FY13YTD Reprogrammings.”

Q7: Please describe any spending pressures that existed in FY12. 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. Please identify potential areas where spending pressures may exist in FY13. Please provide a detailed narrative of the spending pressure, including any steps that are being taken to minimize the impact on the FY 2013 budget.

See “Q7 Attachment_FY12 Spending Pressures.”

Q8: Please identify any special purpose revenue accounts maintained by, used by, or available for use by your agency during FY12 or FY13, to date. For each account, please list the following:

- The revenue source name and code;
- The source of funding;
- A description of the program that generates the funds;
- The amount of funds generated by each source or program in FY12 and FY13, to date; and
- Expenditures of funds, including the purpose of each expenditure, for FY12 and FY13, to date.

See “Q8 Attachment_Special Purpose Revenue Accounts.”

Capital Funds/Facilities

- Q9: Please provide a list of all projects for which your agency currently has capital funds available. Please include the following:
- A description of each project;
 - The amount of capital funds available for each project;
 - A status report on each project, including a timeframe for completion; and
 - Planned remaining spending on the project.

The Capital Balance Report in “Q9 Attachment_DCPS Capital Balance Report” details the various capital projects for facilities for which DCPS is the owner agency. This information is based on the FY13-FY18 Approved Capital Improvement Plan and includes status of the projects, as well as current budget information.

- Q10: Please provide a current list of all properties supported by the DCPS budget. Please indicate whether the property is owned by the District or leased and which DCPS 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). For each building, please note its current use (DCPS instruction, Charter School use, being used by another District agency, or vacant) in school year 2012-2013. Please also provide a description of the plan DCPS has for each building including any that are slated for surplus.

See “Q10 Attachment_DCPS Properties List.”

- Q11: Please provide a list of DCPS buildings transferred to the Department of General Services (DGS) or its predecessor agency in the last 10 fiscal years and its current use.

See “Q11 Attachment_Transferred Properties List.”

- Q12: Please list and provide a narrative description of cases in which DCPS worked with charter school operators to utilize empty or underutilized DCPS facilities through the “right of first offer” process. How has this process worked in the past? What executive agencies or offices are involved in that process? Please provide a timeline from when DCPS vacates a building to when the charter operator takes control and begins use of the facility.

There have been only a few instances in which DCPS has engaged directly with a D.C. public charter school operator to provide them with a short-term lease - typically a one-year use agreement - for space in a DCPS facility. The use agreements are administered through the Realty Office at the Department of General Services (DGS). Existing usage agreements with charter schools include:

District of Columbia Public Schools FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- Apple Tree Public Charter School at Amidon ES - 2 Early Childhood classrooms
- Bridges Public Charter School at Sharpe Health - 5 classrooms
- DC Scholars Public Charter School at Shadd ES – 1st floor

Other arrangements with charter schools have been temporary requests raised through the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME) and DGS, for which DGS issues the same limited, one-year use agreements, with the option to renew, depending upon the specific circumstances. The timelines for executing these agreements have varied widely and, typically, the DME manages this process.

Q13: How does DCPS coordinate with DGS and other government agencies on issues related to facilities management and fixed costs? Please provide a narrative description of that coordination for each government agency

DCPS coordinates with DGS on issues related to facilities management and fixed costs through the budget process. The budget process starts a year in advance and involves input from DGS and DCPS. DGS estimates costs by buildings (i.e. energy, facility, rent, security) and shares that information with DCPS and OCFO for their review and feedback.

Comprehensive Staffing Model

Q14: Please explain the policies and procedures regarding the formulation of salaries for school-based personnel.

- Please provide an explanation as to how DCPS determined the various salary amounts used as part of the comprehensive staffing model. Is it median? Mean?
- How does DCPS account for variations in actual salaries across the District?
- Does budget as loaded for each school reflect actual salaries for that particular school or loaded based on the CSM averages?

For our non-instructional staff in schools, DCPS calculates the mean salary by position by directly exporting the current salary information from PeopleSoft, the DC government personnel management system. Once that mean has been derived, the percentage cost of benefits is applied to that average salary. DCPS receives the projected percentage cost of benefits annually from the District's Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

For instructional staff in schools, meaning the ET-15 position, which covers all Washington Teachers' Union (WTU) members, a more sophisticated formula is applied that incorporates the following factors:

- Average base salary of expected positions
- Projected percentage cost of benefits (provided by city OCFO)
- Per unit cost of performance-based salary increases
- Per unit cost of performance-based bonuses
- Per unit cost of contract requirements, including early retirement option, buyout option, and extra year option
- Per unit cost of substitute teacher coverage
- Per unit cost of administrative fees, such as fingerprint screening and Fitness for Duty testing

For budgeting purposes, schools use the average salary of a position. This is so schools may budget for the best possible program without requiring an employee's actual salary to unduly influence that decision-making.

Medicaid Billing

Q15: How does the DCPS ensure that schools are properly billing Medicaid for eligible school-based services? Please provide the following information on Medicaid bill for school-based services:

- How does DCPS track such Medicaid billing?
- How does DCPS work with the Administrative Services Organization (Public Consulting Group, or PGC) in order to ensure claims are properly filed, reimbursements are maximized, and denials are minimized?
- What was DCPS' total Medicaid billing and total Medicaid received for FY12 and FY13, to date?
- Please provide a list of the 20 most frequently billed Medicaid reimbursable school-based services.
- Please provide a school-by-school breakdown of Medicaid billing and received for FY12 and to date in FY13.

Medicaid Billing. DCPS works closely with the agency's billing vendor, Accelify, to validate, produce, and track Medicaid claims. We contracted with Accelify in October, 2011, and actively began billing in March 2012. With Accelify's expertise and capable billing platform, DCPS was able to capture an additional \$1 Million in retroactive claims originating from SY10-11 that were missed by the previous billing vendor, increasing FY12 revenue from \$1,556,871 to \$2,570,666 — a 65 percent increase.

On a regularly scheduled basis, claiming data, which originate in the DCPS Student Tracking and Reporting System (STARS) or the Special Education Database System (SEDS), are pushed to Accelify, that then validates all student, provider, school, and service information, and builds claim files. DCPS Medicaid monitors all components of this process through subsidiary databases and additional, quality assurance processes.

DCPS tracks all claims created by its billing vendor both independently, via a claim log, and through Accelify's robust online billing platform. Accelify's database, called AcceliCLAIM, provides data on all claims made by DCPS. Through AcceliCLAIM, we can view claiming breakdowns, e.g. paid, denied, suspended, and in process claim statuses. Analyzing claiming data has been made simple; DCPS can break its claims down by fiscal year, school year, student, school, month, etc. —allowing our internal Medicaid unit to closely monitor the billing process, identify aberrations in the cycle, and mitigate risks.

Working with the ASO. DCPS holds bi-weekly conference calls with the ASO to manage technical issues, resolve errors in the production billing cycle, investigate questionable adjudication reasons for denied claims, and increase the rate of approved claims. DCPS ensures proper claiming and maximum revenue return through two processes: first, we monitor all claims pushed through the ASO online claiming system to ensure proper processing, catching errors as they arise and solving them with the ASO. Second, DCPS constantly communicates with its billing vendor, Accelify, to improve validation files and retroactively bill for previously denied claims, capturing viable revenue.

Total Medicaid Billed and Total Medicaid Received, FY12 and FY13, to date

FY12 Billed	FY12 Paid	FY13 Billed	FY13 Paid*
\$ 5,041,517.00	\$ 2,588,791.00	\$ 1,466,076.00	\$ 945,565.00

*FY13 Total SBHS FFS Revenue (current and expected reimbursements): \$945,565.00
See supplementary table below:

FY13 Medicaid Revenue Processed	\$ 595,279
Additional Check 1 (received 2/6/13)	\$ 219,572
Additional Check 2 (in pipeline)	\$ 130,714
Total	\$ 945,565

*SBHS FFS – school-based health service, fee-for-service

Following is a listing of the 20 most frequently billed Medicaid reimbursable school-based services:

FY12 Service Data: Top 20 Billed Services		
Service Type: CPT code - Description	Sum of Units	Sum of Paid Amount
92508 - Group therapy session - Speech Therapy	199,741	\$ 743,225.83
H0004 - Group behavioral counseling therapy	91,063	\$ 201,725.76
97530 - OT Dynamic therapeutic activities, ...	50,111	\$ 586,148.75
H0004 - Individual behavioral counseling therapy	44,063	\$ 298,413.27
97150 - OT Therapeutic procedure, group	38,206	\$ 139,557.04
92507 - Individual therapy session - Speech ...	26,869	\$ 287,804.31
90853 - Group psychotherapy	14,956	\$

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

FY12 Service Data: Top 20 Billed Services		
		37,572.83
		\$
97530 - PT Dynamic therapeutic activities, ...	14,465	143,193.00
		\$
92507 - Individual therapy session - Audiology	2,230	19,843.66
		\$
90804 - Individual psych, insight orientated 20 ...	1,607	19,141.88
97150 - PT Therapeutic procedure, group	1,467	\$ 4,804.61
		\$
96101 - Psych testing, per hour. Exam and ...	1,188	24,065.97
		\$
90806 - Individual psych, insight orientated 45 ...	1,018	21,569.85
G9042 - Rehabilitation services for low vision	964	\$ 6,033.94
		\$
92506 - Speech/hearing evaluation	523	13,977.98
		\$
97004 - Occupational therapy re-evaluation	296	10,152.79
90808 - Individual psych, insight orientated 75 ...	273	\$ 9,150.82
		\$
97003 - Occupational therapy evaluation	110	489.88
		\$
97001 - Physical therapy evaluation	84	168.02
Total	489,234	\$ 2,567,040.19

For the school-by-school breakdown of Medicaid billing and receipts for FY12 and FY13, to date, see “Q15 Attachment_School-by-School Medicaid Claiming.”

Personnel

Q16: Please provide the number of FY13 full-time equivalents (FTEs) for the agency, 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.).

- Title of position;
- Name of employee or statement that the position is vacant, unfunded, or proposed;
- Salary and fringe of position; and
- Job status (continuing/term/temporary/contract).
- The location or school where the employee performs their work
- Source of Funding
- For each vacant position, please note how long the position has been vacant and whether or not the position has since been filled.
We do not currently have a method of capturing time-to-fill for vacancies/positions.
- How many vacancies within the agency were posted during FY12 and FY13, to date?
In FY12, 1,970 vacancies were posted; and in FY13, to date, 430 vacancies have been posted for the agency.

For details of FY13 FTEs, see “Q16 Attachment_Agency FTE Listing.”

Q17: Does the agency conduct annual performance evaluations for non-instructional staff? Who conducts such evaluations, what are their qualifications to perform these evaluations, and at what point of the year are they conducted? What steps are taken to ensure that all agency employees are meeting individual job requirements?

Yes, DCPS evaluates all school-based staff members, including all non-instructional staff (such as custodians, librarians, related service providers, business managers, etc.).

Non-Instructional School-Based Staff

Evaluations are most often conducted by school administrators, both principals and assistant principals. For some employees, such as social workers or other related service providers, a content-specific central office program manager will also conduct some or all of the evaluations. School leaders and central office program managers are carefully selected by DCPS. These individuals are explicitly hired because they have the experience and expertise to lead aspects of a school or program, including evaluation of staff members. School leaders and content-specific central office program manager are provided training regarding the IMPACT process and supported throughout the year by the

IMPACT team. Most non-instructional staff members are evaluated twice a year. The deadlines for evaluation vary based upon the role. In the 2011-2012 school year, all non-instructional staff except related service providers received their first assessment by December 1, 2011 and their second by June 14, 2012. Related service providers received their first assessment by February 1, 2012 and their second by June 14, 2012.

In order to ensure that all employees are meeting individual job requirements, DCPS ensures employees have a clear set of standards and expectations and provides targeted professional development and support. For our non-instructional staff, each position has a role-specific performance rubric. These rubrics, outlined in IMPACT, identify the key job functions and lay out indicators for each performance level. Employees meet with their administrator twice a year to discuss their scores on the rubric and their overall performance. Administrators can then assist staff members in seeking professional development either within the building or through the Educator Portal, which has role-specific pages detailing professional development opportunities.

Central Office Employees

DCPS also formally evaluates all central office employees according to a central office assessment rubric. This rubric was designed by DCPS in 2007 and includes eight general “Operating Principles” against which all central office and school support employees are assessed. Managers in the central office are also assessed against five “Management Leadership Qualities”.

It is our policy to evaluate each central office employee twice a year—half the employees are assessed in January and July, the other half in April and October. The employee’s direct supervisor writes and delivers the assessment, which must be approved by a director or department chief before being delivered. Before each assessment round, managers receive training on what constitutes effective feedback as well as how to apply the Operating Principles and Leadership Qualities to an employee’s individual position.

Q18: Please list the number of school-based mental health professionals by school that are currently employed by DCPS. Please also indicate how many mental health clinicians are employed by the Department of Mental Health and indicate to which school or schools they serve.

DCPS employs social workers (133.5 FTEs) across the district. Some of the positions are shared across schools. In addition, the Department of Mental Health currently provides 34 mental health clinicians across 39 schools.

Using a whole-school approach, school mental health services support students across the spectrum of needs. The DCPS social workers provide mental health

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

and behavioral support services to all students for school wide initiatives (general academic support. They serve as members of IEP teams (when behavioral needs are indicated), consult on special education with school staff and support the implementation of Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs). They also provide critical support for our various attendance and truancy initiatives

The DMH mental health clinicians screen and provide mental health services to students; collaborate with teachers and school staff; and provide case management services for specific students on their caseload

DMH and DCPS Clinicians do not service the same students, except in times of crisis when availability dictates first responders. The table below illustrates their respective areas of service provision and “Q18 Attachment – School-based Mental Health Staffing” shows their respective staffing by school.

<p>School Social Worker</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide early intervention services, including mental health services, crisis counseling, case management, and collaboration (with other systems of care) Tiers 1, 2, and 3 – Whole School Support • Provide individual and/or group counseling and other behavioral support services to students with disabilities. • Implement new initiatives in evidence-based and empirically-informed treatments (trauma-focused, cannabis use, play therapy) – Inc. Screening • Support healthy social development and positive adjustment in the academic setting; build student strengths and ability to cope with academic frustrations; increase resiliency and improve emotional regulation. • Lead efforts to improve attendance, positive behavior, and outreach with community partners. • Contribute to the total school population through collaborative work with parents and teachers, resource development, and crisis intervention.
<p>DMH Clinicians</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide early intervention services, including mental health services, crisis counseling, and case management (collaboration with other systems of care) • Support attendance initiatives • Tier 1 and 2 services ONLY / Significantly smaller caseloads

Q19: Please give a narrative description of recruitment efforts by DCPS. Please include a description of all recruitment policies, initiatives, and any strategic plans related to personnel recruitment.

Please see attached documents (Q19 Attachment_DCPS Recruitment and Selection) providing overviews of recruitment and selection focus areas and priorities, including: Central Office Recruitment and Selection; Teacher Recruitment and Selection; Principal Recruitment and Selection; and the Mary Jane Patterson Fellowship (a key recruitment and selection strategy focused on developing future principals from within the system's ranks).

Q20: Please provide the Committee with:

- A list of all employees who receive cell phones, personal digital assistants, or similar communications devices at agency expense;
See “Q20a Attachment - DCPS Cellular_Aircard Assigned Inventory”
- A list of all vehicles owned, leased, or otherwise used by the agency and to whom the vehicle is assigned;
See “Q20b Attachment– DCPS Vehicle List.” This list includes all vehicles owned, leased, or otherwise.
- A list of employee bonuses, additional compensation, hiring incentives, or special award pay granted in FY12 and FY13, to date (include the amount);
See “Q20c Attachments_Additional Compensation” for FY12 and FY13YTD.
- A list of travel expenses, arranged by employee;
See “Q20d Attachments_Travel”
- A list of the total overtime and workman's compensation payments paid in FY12 and FY13, to date.
See “Q20e Attachments_Overtime Payments.”

IMPACT Evaluation System

Q21: Please answer the following questions regarding IMPACT, DCPS’s system for assessing the performance of teachers and other school-based staff:

- Define each rating (i.e., highly effective, effective, minimally effective and ineffective), and list the number of employees that are in each rating category in the 2011-2012 school year.
- Please provide the number of employees by school and grade taught (if applicable) who were ranked highly effective, developing, minimally effective, and ineffective for the 2011-2012 school year.

IMPACT Ratings Defined:

Highly Effective: This rating signifies outstanding performance. Members of the Washington Teachers’ Union (WTU) who earn this rating will be eligible for additional compensation under the new WTU contract.

Effective: This rating signifies solid performance. Individuals who earn this rating will progress normally on their pay scales.

Minimally Effective: This rating signifies performance that is below expectations. Individuals who receive this rating are encouraged to take advantage of the professional development opportunities provided by DCPS. Such individuals will be held at their current salary step until they earn a rating of Effective or higher. Individuals who receive a rating of Minimally Effective for two consecutive years will be subject to separation from the school system.

Ineffective: This rating signifies unacceptable performance. Individuals who receive this rating will be subject to separation from the school system.

	Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
Total Teachers	741	2,356	314	42
Total Non-Teachers	1,045	1,835	189	26
TOTAL Employees	1,786	4,191	503	68

See “q21 Attachment_IMPACT Data.”

Note: In viewing the data associated with this question, it is important to note that teacher grades are entered by principals and are not cross-checked by the IMPACT team. Additionally, when teachers transfer schools, their grade levels may not have been updated. This may result in a small percentage of teachers with grade-level errors.

Q22: How are IMPACT scores calculated for each category of staff? What student-generated work, outside of DC-CAS, is factored into IMPACT evaluations? How are characteristics of students (i.e. free and reduced lunch status, special education, etc.) factored into teacher evaluations?

Non-School Leader Staff

Through IMPACT, teachers and other school-based staff are evaluated by their school administrator or content-specific central office program manager multiple times a year. Teachers are also evaluated by master educators, content experts who provide external judgment.

All staff members have a primary, role-specific rubric, each of which contains multiple standards. Each standard is scored on a one to four scale. Many staff members are also rated on other components, which are also scored on a one to four scale. For example, all school-based staff members are also rated on Commitment to School Community (CSC).

All components on which an employee is evaluated are outlined in position-specific staff guidebooks distributed at the start of each school year. This ensures that from the beginning of the school year staff members have a clear understanding of how they will be evaluated over the course of the school year.

At the end of the year, staff members' rubric scores are averaged together and then multiplied by the appropriate weight. All of the weighted scores are added together, generating a number ranging from 100 to 400. Finally, any CP deductions are subtracted from the score. Final scores are then converted to final ratings using the following translations: 100-174: Ineffective; 175-249: Minimally Effective; 250-349: Effective; 350-499: Highly Effective. Consequences are applied and bonuses are offered based on those final scores.

Guidebooks which detail the exact scoring process for each group are available via the DCPS website at <http://dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/In+the+Classroom/Ensuring+Teacher+Success/IMPACT+%28Performance+Assessment%29/IMPACT+Guidebooks/IMPACT+Guidebooks+2011-2012>)

School Leaders

Through IMPACT, principals and assistant principals are evaluated on student achievement goals and the leadership framework (LF) rubric twice a year which focused on three key leadership standards: (1) Instructional Leadership, (2) Organizational Leadership, (3) Leadership for Increased Effectiveness. Each component has multiple subcategories for a total of 11 scored standards. At mid-year

and end-of-year, the school leaders' supervisors complete the LF assessment by assigning scores ranging from one to four to each standard.

In addition to the LF rubric, school leaders were also held accountable for additional components such as Special Education Compliance, Teacher Retention and Family Engagement. All of the components on which a school leaders are evaluated are outlined in a guidebook that is distributed during the start of each school year. This ensures that school leaders and supervisors have a clear understanding of how they will be evaluated over the course of the school year.

During each evaluation cycle, school leaders engage in a conference with their supervisors. At the end of the year, all school leaders receive a report outlining their scores in each component of the IMPACT system including their goals, LF scores and all other components. No overarching ratings or scores were generated.

Guidebooks which detail the exact scoring process for school leaders are available via the DCPS website at <http://dc.gov/DCPS/Learn+About+Schools/School+Leadership/IMPACT+%28Performance+Assessment%29>

Q22b: What student-generated work, outside of DC-CAS, is factored into IMPACT evaluations?

Student-generated work, outside of DC CAS, is factored into the IMPACT system through a process called Teacher-Assessed Student Achievement Data (TAS). TAS is a measure of students' learning over the course of the year as evidenced by a rigorous assessment other than the DC CAS. These assessments must be approved by principals and may include a range of standardized and teacher-created assessments including: the Text and Reading Comprehension (TRC) assessment, the Brigance for special education students, the Teaching Strategies GOLD early childhood assessment, student portfolios, science fair projects, writing samples, end of course exams, etc.

TAS accounts for 10% of the final overall IMPACT scores for teachers in Groups 2-6. Building on a beginning of year goal-setting conference, teachers meet with their principals at the end of the year (and often throughout the year) to review student work samples, analyze achievement data on assessments other than the DC CAS, and discuss whether the teacher met the goal they set for themselves and their students at the beginning of the year.

Q22c: How are characteristics of students (i.e. free and reduced lunch status, special education, etc.) factored into teacher evaluations?

Student characteristics are factored into teacher evaluations through the student achievement metrics of Individual Value-Added, School Value-Added, and Teacher-Assessed Student Achievement data. For teachers in grades 4-10

ELA and 4-8 Math, the Individual Value-Added component takes into account free and reduced price lunch status and special education status among other student characteristics as a part of the value-added statistical model. Controlling for factors outside the teacher's control allows the value-added score to better reflect the contributions of the teacher. At the school level, the same is true for employees in schools in which a school-value added score was calculated. For all teachers, Teacher-Assessed Student Achievement involves teachers and principals collaboratively choosing a set of appropriate, rigorous assessments and setting appropriate goals based on their knowledge of the teacher's classroom. In this way, teachers and principals can take individual student characteristics into account as they choose appropriate assessments and set appropriate goals.

Q23: How does DCPS use the information provided by IMPACT to make decisions about professional development?

IMPACT is a key method of supporting teachers. Through IMPACT, every teacher receives an unprecedented amount of feedback on their practice – feedback from a variety of observers, some of whom are familiar with their students, others of whom are content area experts, all of it personalized and delivered in one-on-one conferences. These conferences also focus on how teachers can improve, providing them with specific suggestions for improvement.

All IMPACT data are housed in an online database where administrators, instructional superintendents, and other district leaders can view data at the individual school, cluster, and district levels. As mentioned above, administrators analyze trends at the school-level, as well as at the individual teacher and subject/grade levels, in order to target support and resources effectively. Through the IMPACT database, employees have consistent access to all evaluation scores and comments.

Central office staff members also use IMPACT data to plan professional development that targets district-wide areas of weakness. For example, the results from our first cycle of IMPACT observations during the 2011-2012 school year indicated that delivering rigorous instruction (Teaches 3 and 7 on the Teaching and Learning Framework) was a key area in which our teachers were struggling. As a result, this became one of our major points of focus in district-wide professional development efforts for both teachers and administrators.

Q24: Describe the administrative actions taken for employees in each category, including termination, professional development and other support where relevant. Please also provide a timeline for such actions.

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

Rating	Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
Administrative Action and Timeline	WTU members eligible for bonuses were given a window of time to accept the bonus during August 2012. Bonuses were distributed in the fall of 2012.	Individuals with an effective rating advance normally on the pay scale and no unique administrative actions were taken.	<p>In July 2012, individuals rated minimally effective for the first time were informed that their final rating would result in a step hold for the 2012-2013 school year. The step-hold was placed in August of 2012.</p> <p>In July 2012, individuals rated minimally effective for the second time were sent termination documentation. The effective date of termination was August 10, 2012.</p>	In July 2012, individuals rated ineffective were sent termination documentation. The effective date of termination was August 10, 2012.
Professional Development	These individuals were encouraged throughout the year to access professional development through the coaching cycles, the educator portal, building-level	These individuals were encouraged throughout the year to access professional development through the coaching cycles, the educator portal, building-level	These individuals were encouraged throughout the year to access professional development through the coaching cycles, the educator portal, building-level professional development,	These individuals were encouraged throughout the year to access professional development through the coaching cycles, the educator portal, building-level professional development,

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

Rating	Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
	professional development, and through other avenues in order to further increase their effectiveness. See Q23 for additional information about professional development as it relates to IMPACT.	professional development, and through other avenues in order to further increase their effectiveness. See Q23 for additional information about professional development as it relates to IMPACT.	and through other avenues in order to improve performance. See Q23 for additional information about professional development as it relates to IMPACT.	and through other avenues in order to improve performance. See Q23 for additional information about professional development as it relates to IMPACT.

School Leaders

During the 2011-12 school year, school leaders did not receive an overall IMPACT rating (e.g., Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective). They instead received a score of 1-4 for each of the different evaluation components (e.g. DC CAS Gains Goals, Leadership Framework Assessment, Family Engagement, Teacher Retention, etc.). During the 2012-13 school year, school leaders will receive overall IMPACT rating that come with different administrative actions.

Q15: How does DCPS solicit and receive feedback from parents, students, and the educator’s peers into the IMPACT evaluation? Please describe how DCPS incorporates this feedback into the IMPACT evaluation?

In the spring of 2012, DCPS administered a student survey pilot in six schools in order to determine whether teachers and principals found the feedback helpful in informing improvements to teacher practice, and exploring whether student surveys should be formally incorporated into IMPACT in the future. Approximately 85 teachers administered the survey to more than 1,400 students. The survey instrument was developed by Dr. Ron Ferguson and his Tripod Project team at Harvard University and is based on ten years of research.

While participating teachers did find the student survey results helpful, we decided not to broaden the pilot or formally include student surveys as part of IMPACT for the time being. The primary reasons for this decision were:

- There were a number of other significant changes planned for the 2012-13

iteration of IMPACT, and we wanted to be sensitive to the number of changes to which teachers and school leaders would need to adjust.

- We need to be cognizant of attaching high stakes to student surveys and how that will affect classroom culture and relationships between students and teachers.
- The capacity required to implement student surveys with fidelity in all schools would be a significant lift for central office, both in terms of workload and cost.
- To make the student survey data meaningful, schools would need to plan targeted professional development and support for teachers. Given the many competing priorities and the current focus on implementing the Common Core State Standards, we determined that this was not the appropriate time to implement student surveys in all schools.

We did, however, make the student survey instrument and other resources available to teachers online so that they could use the surveys as an additional mechanism for gathering feedback on their practice throughout the year.

Regarding parent engagement, “Partnership with Families” is one standard of the Commitment to the School Community component, which makes up 10% of a teacher’s final IMPACT score. This standard allows principals to assess how effectively teachers engage and collaborate with students’ families. In assessing teachers on this standard, principals consider feedback they’ve received from students’ families as well as additional evidence regarding teachers’ parental engagement systems and strategies. While parent input is not included in IMPACT in any additional ways, parental engagement and feedback are critical means of assessing how effectively our teachers and schools are serving our students, and principals and teachers are continuously gathering and acting on this feedback in formal and informal ways.

Teachers’ peers are another critical source of feedback, and while we have created opportunities for teachers to seek peer feedback in informal ways because we know that it helps them improve their practice (including our district-wide Teaching in Action program through which teachers can observe teachers in other schools), we have decided not to include it explicitly in IMPACT for the reasons mentioned above with respect to parent input.

We are judicious in determining when feedback or other evidence of teacher practice should be formally included in IMPACT – and when it is more appropriate, effective, and operationally feasible for teachers to receive that feedback through other mechanisms over the course of the year. There will always be aspects of teachers’ diverse responsibilities on which they receive feedback and for which they are held accountable outside of the IMPACT process.

Q26: What changes, if any, have been made to IMPACT in FY 12 and FY13? Does DCPS intend to make any changes to IMPACT in the near future?

The following changes were made to IMPACT for the 2012-13 school year:

Raising Expectations

Key Change: The minimum score required for an Effective rating has been raised from 250 to 300 on the 100-400 IMPACT scale. This change also includes a new fifth rating, Developing, for teachers and staff who earn final scores between 250 and 299.

- The full range is: Ineffective (100 to 199), Minimally Effective (200 to 249), Developing (250 to 299), Effective (300 to 349), and Highly Effective (350 to 400).
- Teachers who earn Developing ratings will have three years to take advantage of the district's professional development, including system-wide school-based coaching, videos of exemplary practice, and a new program of content-specific support that will be provided to teachers in the system's 40 lowest-performing schools. Teachers who are still not meeting expectations after three years will be subject to separation from the system.
- The modifications to ratings were made based on three years of IMPACT data, along with extensive feedback from school leaders, educators, and senior district staff. The data and feedback indicated that DCPS's definition of teacher effectiveness needed to be more rigorous if the district is to dramatically accelerate student achievement, and that the old Effective category, which included 68% of teachers in 2011-12, was too wide a range to be a high standard. For example, teachers scoring at the low end of the old Effective category (250) produced 8 fewer months of learning in math and 6 fewer months of learning in reading than did teachers at the top end of the category (350).

Broadening How Student Achievement Is Measured

Key Change: IMPACT will continue to weight student achievement at 50% of a teacher's evaluation, but now includes multiple measures of student learning.

- Research indicates, and we believe strongly, that value-added is the fairest and most accurate method of capturing a teacher's impact on student achievement, but we recognize that it does not reflect everything students have learned.
- Value-added will now be weighted at 35%. For the other 15%, each teacher will work with her or his principal to collaboratively select an assessment and set learning goals against which the teacher will be evaluated (the TAS component).

Increasing Support and Flexibility

Key Change: Teachers in their first year in DCPS will receive an informal administrator observation before they receive any formal observations.

- This informal observation will be an opportunity for new teachers to receive a full set of scores and suggestions for improvement before being given any scores that count toward their final rating. Also, new teachers will not be observed by a master educator until January, giving them more than four months to become comfortable with the system.

Key Change: IMPACT observations will be differentiated based on teacher performance in order to recognize outstanding performance and increase support.

- Consistently high-performing teachers – both teachers who are consistently Highly Effective and those who have consistently scored in the top half of the Effective category – will be able to waive some of their formal observations.
- This recognizes our strong teachers, and will also free up more time for principals to support struggling teachers.

Key Change: In cases in which one observation score is at least one point lower than the average of the other observation scores, the lowest score will be dropped at the end of the year.

- This change recognizes that for any number of reasons – a lesson that went poorly, a first attempt at a new teaching strategy, or a last minute change to the daily schedule – even outstanding teachers are not always at their best.

Key Change: We will continue to expand the developmental aspects of IMPACT.

- In addition to informal observations, teachers will also continue to participate in instructional coaching learning cycles. Teachers in the district's 40 lowest-performing schools will receive intensive support from a cohort of master educators.
- A broad range of instructional and pedagogical resources – including videos of best practice and extensive curricular resources – will be posted on the district's new online platform for professional development, Educator Portal+.

Key Change: IMPACTplus bonuses and base salary increases will be adjusted to focus our limited resources on recognizing the best teachers in our highest-need schools.

- The maximum annual bonus is \$25,000, just as in past years; \$10,000 of this bonus will be for teachers who work in our 40 lowest-performing schools.
- Only teachers in high-poverty schools (more than 75% of our teaching force) will be eligible for base salary increases.

Regarding future changes to IMPACT, we recognize that it is not reasonable to significantly change expectations for teachers and school leaders each year – doing so introduces a level of unpredictability and instability and can undermine

educators' investment in the system. Changes also require that considerable time and resources be devoted to training and communications. However, we are committed to continuously improving IMPACT. To that end, we regularly gather feedback, analyze data, research best practices in other systems across the country, and consider potential future improvements.

Q27: How does DCPS solicit feedback from its excessed teaching workforce, the principals that are not reappointed, and the teachers and educational professionals that do not return as a DCPS employee the following year?

- What has the agency learned from this feedback?
- How has the agency changed its practices as a result of such feedback?
- Please provide a sampling of this feedback to the Committee.

DCPS has solicited structured feedback from Teachers and Related Service Providers (WTU members) that have chosen to separate from DCPS. Human Resources collects exit survey data from WTU members participating in the annual Declaration of Intent to Not Return (DINR) process and the Teacher Effectiveness division collects feedback from teachers through a Satisfaction Survey. We do not currently collect structured feedback from separating employee other than WTU members. We do, however, have anecdotal conversations with our non-reappointed Principals to gather general feedback about their experience within DCPS.

Moving forward, Human Resources will be implementing an exit survey in the forthcoming Separations Database, which will allow all separating employees to provide feedback on their reasons to leave DCPS and ways we can improve our practices.

We have learned that while many teachers leave the system for reasons beyond our control, such as retirement or relocation, a good number exit because of concerns with programs or policies that can be adjusted or improved. We have been able to categorize the (avoidable) concerns raised by teachers into four primary areas and have taken steps to address each of them. They include:

- School leadership
- IMPACT
- Leadership Opportunities (we heard this through quotes and anecdotal information received from teachers)
- Professional development and curriculum

Following are several ways in which we have changed our practice as a result of this feedback:

- *Support for principals to better retain teachers.* Principals have been given information and strategies to better retain their high performing teachers. Information was compiled from principals and instructional superintendents

who have been effective at this in the past. Strategies were shared by email and through a session at a School Leadership Academy meeting in which principals learn about the importance of retention, identify top teachers to retain, receive strategies to implement, and are provided with hands-on recognition items to assist with retention efforts.

- *Adjustments to IMPACT.* The IMPACT design team made critical changes in response to teacher feedback, including 1) the ability for teachers to drop the lowest outlier score they received on observations, 2) the lowering of Individual Value Added data in a Group 1 teacher's annual evaluation from 50% to 35%, 3) differentiated observations for teachers at different levels of the new career ladder, which ensures that newer teachers can receive more feedback and high performing teachers can worry less about observations, and 4) introduction of informal observations for new teachers to allow them to receive low-stakes, helpful feedback.
- *Development of LIFT.* DCPS has developed a five-stage career ladder, which is aligned to IMPACT observations, compensation, and leadership opportunities. The career ladder is intended to better retain our strong teachers who indicated these areas as concerns when we requested feedback. It allows us to pay strong teachers more, provide them with more prestigious leadership opportunities, and evaluate them less frequently.
- *Additional professional development options.* In response to teacher concern about the amount and quality of professional development, DCPS has developed a wider array of PD opportunities for teachers. Teachers were already offered job-embedded, on-going support from their instructional coaches. They can now also get additional resources through the Educator Portal+, an online platform where unit plans, lesson plans, and other resources can be found. The Ed Portal also houses over 80 videos that are aligned to the Teaching and Learning Framework that teachers can use to improve pedagogical skills. Teachers are also able to reserve a time to observe other teachers through the *Teaching In Action* program, where they can sign up online to visit and then debrief with a high performing teacher. Finally, teachers can convene with one another in content area groups through the "Meet-Up" group program, which provides informal PD and resources to teachers.

Q28: Please list all employees detailed to or from your agency, if any. Please provide the reason for the detail, the detailed employee's date of detail, and the detailed employee's projected date of return.

There are no employees detailed to or from our agency.

Grants, Reports, Contracts, and Purchase Orders

Q29: Please list each contract, procurement, and lease awarded, entered into, extended and option years exercised, by your agency during FY12 and FY13, to date. For each, please provide the following information, where applicable:

- The name of the contracting party;
- The nature of the contract/agreement, including the end product or service;
- The dollar amount, including budgeted amount and actually spent;
- The price and fee structure for each contract exceeding \$1 million or for multiple years;
- The term of the contract;
- Whether the contract was competitively bid or not;
- The name of the agency’s contract monitor and the results of any monitoring activity; and
- Funding source.

See “Q29 Q32 Q33 Attachment_Agency Contracts and Purchase Cards, FY12 and FY13YTD”

Q30: Please list each subgrant and grant awarded to or accepted by your agency during FY12 and FY13, to date. For each contract, please provide the following information, where applicable:

- The grant title/number;
- 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;
- DCPS employee responsible for overseeing the grant; and
- Source of funds.

See “Q30 Attachment_DCPS Grants Awarded_FY12 and FY13YTD.”

Q31: Please provide the following information for all grants/subgrants awarded by DCPS during FY12 and to date in FY13, broken down by DCPS program and activity:

- 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;

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- OSSE employee/s responsible for overseeing the grant; and
- Source of funds.

None occurred in FY12 or to date in FY13. As a local education agency (LEA), DCPS does not award grants or sub grants, according to the attributes requested in this question. In April 2012, the Proving What’s Possible (PWP) Fund was identified by redirecting existing funds and internal savings to reward those schools that developed and submitted compelling plans that would dramatically improve outcomes for students after one year of implementation. All DCPS schools were eligible to apply for two types of PWP awards. Major Grants (\$250,000–\$400,000) were designed for schools with the largest population of students in need of academic improvement or a group of students who needed to make the largest academic gains. And Targeted Grants (\$50,000–\$100,000) were designed for schools that want to focus on supporting a targeted intervention for a subgroup within a school. John Davis, Chief of Schools, provides oversight for PWP funding and the attached PDF provides a list of the PWP schools, a brief description of their plan and the amount received.

- Q32: Please provide the following information for all contract modifications made by DCPS during FY12 and to date in FY13, broken down by program and activity:
- Name of the vendor;
 - Purpose and reason of the contract modification;
 - DCPS employee(s) responsible for overseeing the contract;
 - Modification cost, including budgeted amount and actual spent; and
 - Funding source.

See “Q29 Q32 Q33 Attachment_Agency Contracts and Purchase Cards, FY12 and FY13YTD”

- Q33: Does the agency use purchase orders and purchase cards to acquire supplies or services? If so:
- What safeguards has your agency put in place to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of purchase cards and orders;
 - All users must attend training on program use, policy & procedures that include funding, suspension process;
 - All users have secure logon IDs and passwords for review and approval of transactions
 - All users must attend monthly Agency Review Team meetings to review transactions and settle issues;
 - Generate reports to show transaction details, declines, unusual activity, disputes, card suspension and cancellation; and
 - Accounts are audited.

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- How many purchase cards were received, completed, for how much, and to whom in FY12 and FY13 to date;
 - There were two (2) purchase cards received and completed for Jeffrey Mills and Lisa Rios (OFNS) totaling \$21,441.18 for FY 12.
 - There were two (2) purchase cards received and one (1) purchase card completed totaling \$8,428.41 for Jeffrey Mills and Melina Hong (OFNS).

See “Q29 Q32 Q33 Attachment_Agency Contracts and Purchase Cards, FY12 and FY13YTD”

- How many purchase cards were issued, to whom, and for how much in FY12 and to date in FY13;
 - There were two (2) purchase cards issued in FY 12 to Jeffrey Mills and Lisa Rios (OFNS) for \$21,441.18.
 - There are two (2) cards issued for FY 13 to Jeffrey Mills and Melina Hong (OFNS) for \$40,000

See also “Q29 Q32 Q33 Attachment_Agency Contracts and Purchase Cards, FY12 and FY13YTD” for additional information.

- What is the maximum amount that can be spent with a purchase card;
- What limitations are placed on the items that can be purchased with a purchase card;
 - Single Purchase Limit of: \$2,500.00
 - Daily Purchase Limit of: \$2,500.00
 - Monthly Cycle Limit of \$10,000.00
- What has been purchased using these methods in FY12 or in FY13 to date.

See Tabs PCard Trans FY12 and Pcard Trans FY13 on “Q29 Q32 Q33 Attachment_Agency Contracts and Purchase Cards, FY12 and FY13YTD”

Q34: What MOUs were in place for FY12 and what ones are either in place or planned for FY13? Please provide a narrative description of each MOU.

See “Q34 Attachment_MOUs_FY12 thru FY13YTD.”

Q35: For contracts above \$100,000, please report on each contracting party’s compliance with First Source requirements detailing the contracting party’s number of new hires during FY 12, and FY 13 to date, and the percentage which were District residents.

A listing of all contracts about \$100,000 is included on the “FY12 POs>\$100k Tab” and “FY13 POs>\$100K Tab” in “Q29 Q32 Q33 Attachment_Agency Contracts and Purchase Cards, FY12 and FY13YTD”

We do not compile First Source hiring compliance data within our agency; however, we do ensure that, for all bi-lateral contracts for \$100K and above, we secure First Source Agreements from each contractor. Upon receipt, our agency transmits these agreements to the Department of Employment Services (DOES) for review and approval. DOES monitors the compliance of each contractor.

Q36: Please list and describe any ongoing or completed investigations, studies, audits, or reports on your agency or any employee of your agency that occurred during FY12 or FY13, to date.

FY 12 Completed Investigations

Office of the Inspector General:

1. Capitol Hill Cluster School – Investigation into a complaint that DCPS violated a vetted agreement for rental of space, maintenance and security.
2. DCPS Central Office – Investigation into a complaint that DCPS pays to cover fixed costs (rent/utilities) for facilities it no longer operates.
3. Seaton Elementary School – Investigation into a complaint of an unsafe and hostile working environment.
4. Eastern Senior High School – Investigation into a complaint of discrimination and denied worker’s compensation.
5. DCPS Employees (19) – Investigation into employee misconduct and violations relating to unemployment insurance compensation benefits to which the employees were not entitled to. (All 19 of these matters were investigated by the DCPS Office of Labor Management and Employee Relations.)
6. Wheatley Education Campus – Investigation into a complaint that Wheatley received federal subsidies for a child who no longer attends the school.
7. Contract Service Provider – Investigation into whether a contract service provider instructed its employees to back date personnel records. (DCPS is a recipient of the services rendered by this contractor; however, DCPS was not the contract administrator for this vendor, and therefore could not provide any evidence on this matter.)
8. Phelps Architecture, Construction and Engineering High School – Investigation into a complaint that teaching positions were eliminated in order to add certain specialty programs.
9. Turner @ Green Elementary School – Investigation into a complaint that funds were misappropriated.
10. Walker Jones Education Campus – Investigation into a complaint involving improprieties in the hiring and background screening process.
11. DCPS Office of Special Education – Investigation into a complaint that a hearing officer mismanaged the special education placement process.

District of Columbia Public Schools FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

(Hearing Officers are employed by the Office of the State Superintendent; therefore, we referred the OIG to the OSSE.)

12. DCPS and OSSE – Investigation into a complaint that budget decisions were being made that adversely affect services for special needs students.
13. Barnard Elementary School – Investigation into a complaint that a student attending Barnard is a non-resident. (This matter was investigated by the DCPS Student Residency Office.)
14. Office of Human Capital – Investigation into a complaint that highly qualified teachers are transferred to low performing schools and awarded incentive pay, thereby nullifying the WTU contract.
15. DCPS Employee – Investigation into a complaint that DCPS students do not receive the academic, emotional and behavioral support necessary to be productive students. (This matter was investigated by MPD and the DCPS OSS)

Office of the DC Auditor:

1. Audit of the District's Career Technical Education (CTE) Programs (audit initiated in December 2011)
2. Banneker Senior High School – Investigation into a complaint that the DCPS cell phone policy allows outside vendors to hold student cell phones for a fee.
3. Audit of the District's Career Technical Education (CTE) Programs (initiated in December 2011).

Office of the Inspector General:

1. Audit of the Closure and Consolidation of DC Public Schools - audit to determine the cost of the 2008 school closures.

FY12-13 Reports

Office of the Inspector General:

1. DCPS Central Office – OIG Management Alert Report that DCPS has inadequate policies in place to govern students who travel on out-of-town trips.
2. DCPS Central Office – OIG Management Alert Report that informed DCPS about special evaluation of government wide administration of mandatory drug and alcohol testing (MDAT) programs for employees who serve children and youth in safety sensitive positions. (This matter was referred to the DCPS Office of Labor, Management and Employee Relations.)

Q37: Please identify all recommendations identified by the Office of the Inspector General, D.C. Auditor, or other federal or local oversight entities during the previous 3 years. Please note what actions have been taken to address these recommendations.

District of Columbia Public Schools |
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

Please see “Q37 Attachment_Actions on OIG and Auditor Recommendations.”

Community Engagement

Q38: How does the agency solicit feedback from students, parents, and stakeholders? Please describe.

- What has the agency learned from this feedback?
- How has the agency changed its practices as a result of such feedback?

The Office of Family and Public Engagement (OFPE) leads our efforts to engage parents, families, partners and community stakeholders to establish and strengthen relationships that improve the educational environment for our students and informs the development of resources and supports enabling students to achieve academic success . OFPE seeks to be accessible to schools and communities through communications vehicles such as text, email and social media and through regular attendance at community meetings and special events. On average, OFPE staff members attend three community meetings a week - including, special school-based events, PTA and School Improvement Team (SIT) meetings. During FY12, community engagement included targeted activities with parent leaders; the Ward 5 Great Schools Initiative; and public meetings to provide opportunities for the larger DCPS community to stay informed and to provide feedback. A description of some of this outreach is included below:

Parent Leaders (e.g. parent organization chairs and LSAT chairs)

- Monthly meetings held with DCPTA to bolster the support of the nationally recognized PTAs (began November 2011)
- Weekly emails distributed to over 200 parent leaders and monthly teleconferences were held (began January 2012)
- 125 participants in webinar or in-person LSAT trainings (September 2012)
- Attend PTA/LSAT meetings (scheduled and unscheduled)
- Support schools directly with the establishment of parent organizations
- Serve as intermediaries when there is conflict between parents and school leaders

DCPS stakeholders (e.g. parents, parent leaders, and community members)

- 100 participants joined us at five (5) family engagement town hall meetings where they shared their vision for DCPS' engagement strategy
- Approximately 50 stakeholders participated in two Parent Resource Center (PRC) re-launch meetings and coordinated a community- and parent-led selection committee. 75 people participated in school-based community building programs. The program was conducted in three schools in September 2012 and included the teachers, principal and parents exploring ways to leverage racial, ethnic and economic diversity to boost student achievement. The program, held at Maury ES, Stuart-Hobson MS and Tyler ES, sought to reduce barriers to parent and student engagement to improve communications that will help close the

achievement gap. At the conclusion of the program, each pilot school developed an action plan to work to solve student achievement challenges related to racial, socio-economic, and cultural differences.

- Eight State of the Schools meetings were held in each ward respectively and co-hosted by the Chancellor and the respective Councilmember.
- 8 planning meetings were held prior to each State of School whereby DCPS stakeholders could influence the format of the meeting and the areas for discussion.
- 832 attended the State of School meetings (this excludes DCPS central office and school based staff)
- Feedback from the State of the Schools meetings provided insight into continuing school-based challenges and informed central office processes and planning. Several follow-up meetings and discussions were conducted with the Chancellor and/or DCPS leadership to address issues raised at meetings in specific school communities such as Turner Elementary School to address tensions within the school and a meeting with DCPS students from the Student Multiethnic Academic Research Team to address the needs of English Language Learners.
- OFPE conducted focus groups with parents and community members identified at public meetings to provide feedback on the development of a DCPS Parent Handbook scheduled for distribution in April 2013.
- OFPE Staff attend and present at numerous civic, neighborhood, and education organizations/group meetings across the district (e.g. Cardozo feeder system parent group, Capitol View Civic Association)

A Ward-based Initiative (Ward 5 Community)

The Ward 5 Great Schools Initiative was DCPS' response to the Ward 5 community's interest in establishing a stand-alone middle school in the ward. As a result of extensive parent and community input, DCPS created a portfolio of enhanced middle grades options in Ward 5. DCPS will open McKinley Middle School in the annex of McKinley Technology High School to create the McKinley Technology Education Campus in August 2013. Brookland Middle School will open in August 2014 with an arts and world languages focus. The engagement process for the Ward 5 Great Schools Initiative included:

- Three community meetings during SY 2011 (total of 273 attendees) where Ward 5 and district residents weighed in on the middle school planning
- PTA and school based meetings at all Ward 5 ECs and ES (total of 200 attendees)
- Close to 3000 surveys were sent to Ward 5 families
- 150 (surveys and 1-pagers were distributed during morning drop off
- A 12-member Parent Engagement Committee was created and provided advice to architects and the overall planning and design process.

- Presentations to Ward 5 organizations (eg., Ward 5 Council on Education, Brookland Neighborhood Civic Association)
- Prepared responses to daily/weekly emails and responses to individual calls with interested stakeholders.

LESSONS LEARNED

Parents and families want comprehensive and regular updates and opportunities to engage with and provide feedback to the Chancellor and decision-makers within DCPS. DCPS stakeholders want more opportunities to regularly see the Chancellor and representatives of DCPS in their schools and communities. We also learned that when parents and community members receive regular updates through traditional and new media and feel that their concerns are acknowledged and addressed in a timely manner, there is greater satisfaction and trust that the school system is working. Stakeholders also want evidence that their point of view has been heard and their feedback has resulted in some change.

CHANGES IN PRACTICE

Examples include: the feedback received from the Ward 5 Great Schools Initiative greatly informed the evolution of the design, planning and offerings of the new Ward 5 middle schools. Through focus groups conducted prior to the State of Schools public meetings, stakeholders told us that the small groups discussion design made participants feel as if DCPS was employing a “divide and conquer” strategy. This feedback influenced our decision to eliminate small group discussions, and the revised town hall format allowed for everyone to see and share their views with the Chancellor and to hear from the Chancellor directly.

We have also worked much harder to track and analyze our digital footprint and communication strategies. In understanding the reach and overall return on investment of each digital and new media tool, we are better positioned to harness them in a manner that ensures that our key stakeholders are informed and fully engaged in the effort to improve our schools.

As an example, OFPE prioritized the launch of the EngageDCPS.org site as key outreach strategy after the agency’s consolidation and reorganization proposal was released to the public in November 2012. We came to the conclusion that in addition to the planned community meetings and the one-way communications, we needed a forum that was much more accessible and that allowed for authentic two-way communication, not just between the Central Office and parents but between all key stakeholders.

For additional context, usage rates and FY12 reports from our digital and new media is included below:

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

DCPS Website (dcps.dc.gov)

	Metric on 9/30/12	Gain from FY11 to FY12	%growth from FY11 to FY12
Website Page views	11,376,871	286,045	3.74%
Website Visitors	1,609,051	20,418	2.11%

The website includes multiple forms for users to submit feedback and/or receive notifications of key activities and events, including a space to submit messages to the Chancellor’s Office and website team; stakeholder feedback; research requests; and obtain lottery notifications. The DCPS website was redesigned in August 2009 and is slated to relaunch a new design by August 2013.

DCPS Communication Tools

Tool	Metric on 9/30/12	Growth since 10/1/11	Notes
Email new subscribers (Started in 2009)	43,024	+ 38%	DCPS regularly sends mass emails to parents, families and stakeholders about emergencies, key events and important messages from DCPS leadership. All parent email addresses are automatically included and any district resident can sign up to be on the subscriber list.
Text messaging subscribers (Started in 2010)	9,215	+56%	Since text messages have a 90% open rate, DCPS’ text messaging service is an invaluable tool we use for emergencies and important news. We’ve seen significant growth this year, especially during times of inclement weather.
Blackboard Connect robocalls (Service has been used for several school years)	359,483	+361%	Blackboard Connect is the robocall service that all schools and central office use to do mass communications with parents and families. The system now allows for email and text communication, which schools have started to use and that been popular among parents. The system is also used by

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

Tool	Metric on 9/30/12	Growth since 10/1/11	Notes
			schools to send attendance calls and text messages when students are not in school.
Email addresses for the Office of Public Engagement			DCPS.communications@dc.gov and info.ofpe@dc.gov are two key email addresses where stakeholders contact our office.

DCPS Social Media

Tool	Metric on 9/30/12	Growth since 10/1/11	Notes
Facebook fans (Started in Jan. 2010)	4,650	+ 30%	Facebook is used to share good news, critical information and provide an opportunity for our stakeholders to interact with central office and each other.
Twitter followers (Started in Jan. 2010)	9,171	+71%	Twitter has become our most popular social media tool where we share good news, critical information and allowing stakeholders to interact with us directly. This has also become a great listening tool for us to hear what stakeholders are tweeting about so that we are better able to respond to their needs.
Instagram followers (Started in Aug. 2011)	586	+ 58,500%	DCPS opened our account in Aug. 2011 to share photos of activities happening across DCPS.
YouTube Views (Started in April 2009)	100,302 (since 2009)	+ 9% (Gain from SY11 to SY12)	DCPS regularly posts a variety of videos featuring students, teacher, and DCPS leadership.

Q39: Please specify the student recruitment and outreach efforts that were implemented in FY12, and that will be made in FY13 to reach families and students? In addition, please specify:

District of Columbia Public Schools FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- The agency’s timeline for student recruitment;
- The agency’s goals for student enrollment;
- How DCPS will publicize schools throughout the communities; and
- The resources allotted for this effort.

The recruitment school project began in 2009 as an attempt to support low-enrolled schools. For the last 4 years, 10-15 schools were selected based on a number of different criteria which include, but not limited to, excess building capacity, improving or compelling academic programs, strong school leadership, and geographic neighborhood from which to pull students. The goal of the program is to increase enrollment at the selected schools and to build capacity at the school to incorporate student recruitment in their annual activities. For FY12, schools were given a recruitment target 8% above their enrollment projection.

As participants in the program, schools were allotted a small stipend (\$2000-\$3000) in order to support the development of a recruitment plan, purchase of recruitment materials, implement recruitment activities in their community and across the city, and develop internal capacity to incorporate recruitment strategies in their overall administrative culture. Schools also had access to Central Office advertising and marketing expertise via our Office of Communications.

In FY12, DCPS leveraged a number of different resources and tools to publicize schools throughout the communities. The following is a sample list of the activities conducted on behalf of and in collaboration with selected recruitment schools to increase their visibility in their respective communities –

- Implemented direct mailing campaign for select schools which distributed school-specific fliers to about 2000 residential addresses in their respective neighborhoods
- City-wide marketing campaigns – radio advertisements, bus advertisements, bus station advertisements, metro train advertisements
- Developed school branded items for students and parents (t-shirts, bumper stickers, etc) to be distributed at neighborhood events (fairs, open houses, etc).
- Attended community fairs & events
- Distributed flyers/brochures in local businesses/community centers
- Posted Messages on neighborhood and local parent/playgroup list serves
- Posted door hangers/postcards in surrounding neighborhood
- Worked with feeder schools to host buddy days or other events for students to visit your school
- Posted advertisements in local media—free and paid coverage in local media outlets (local newspapers—East of the River, Hill Rag, Northwest Current, etc.)

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- Held summer events (movie nights, field days, etc) to welcome parents and students back to school

In FY13, DCPS continues to provide targeted marketing support to the previously identified recruitment schools and will extend resources and supports to the 20 schools receiving students from schools recently slated for closure. DCPS is currently working to identify a graphics and communications firm to produce and refresh marketing materials and develop a marketing toolbox for schools to use. DCPS will conduct training for school leadership and staff to build their capacity to engage more effectively with families and ultimately improve the overall culture and climate at schools to create a more welcoming environment. DCPS will also work with schools to conduct extensive direct outreach to parents to include personalized phone calls to encourage them to enroll and/or re-enroll in a DC Public School.

Q40: Please provide a list of all parent resource centers administered by DCPS in FY12 and FY13, to date? Please provide the following:

- The allocated budget and actual expenditures for parent resource centers in FY12 and FY13 to date;
- A list of services broken down by parent resource center; and
- Total utilization rates for each parent resource center.

Beginning in March of FY12, DC Public Schools administered the following Parent Resource Centers (PRCs):

<p>Ward 1 Parent Resource Center (at Harriet Tubman Elementary) 3101 13th Street NW, Washington, DC 20010</p>	<p>Ward 8 Parent Resource Center (at Mary Church Terrell Elementary) 3301 Wheeler Rd. SE Washington, DC 20032</p>
---	--

The total cost to operate three parent resource centers in Wards 1, 7 and 8, between 2006 – 2011 was approximately \$4.5 million - with an unacceptably low number of parents officially being served. In July 2011, the centers were temporarily closed and restructured. In FY12, DCPS initiated a lengthy community engagement process to re-launch the PRCs by partnering with community partners that specialize in supporting parents and families. The process included six parent engagement meetings and two meetings with a parent steering committee comprised of parents, community members, and school staff. The committee developed a Request for Proposals (RFP) process along with a scoring rubric to identify and select a community-based organization to operate the PRCs.

Through the RFP process, two community organizations, The House, Inc. and National Center for Children and Families (NCCF), were selected in March 2012 to operate two of the three centers - in Wards 1 and 8. A suitable organization was not identified to coordinate the services in Ward 7. DCPS made an in-kind commitment to provide office and program space, security, and custodial services to each PRC partner operator, but no program funding was provided. Additionally, all equipment, furniture, and materials from the previous PRCs were repurposed and used by each PRC partner operator. Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) were executed to set forth the terms of the partnership agreement.

Following the execution of the MOA, DCPS conducted site visits, attended planning meetings with the respective operators, and managed facilities and technological support at each PRC to ensure effective service delivery.

ALLOCATED BUDGETS AND EXPENDITURES IN FY12 AND FY13

From the onset of the selection process, interested organizations were informed that the opportunity to operate the PRCs would come with no direct funding. Operators would be expected to deliver the programming at their own cost. However, in accordance with Section 3, DCPS agreed to provide the use of required DCPS facilities and office space, including “limited custodial services and security.”

Section 2 of the Memorandum of Agreement for each Parent Resource Center operator reads as follows:

“No capital commitment on behalf of DCPS shall be associated with the formation of or any of the obligations under this MOA. All funding necessary to carry out the terms of this MOA shall be furnished by the Provider. DCPS shall be under no obligation to provide funding to the Provider.”

SERVICES BY CENTER

The PRC for the Ward 8 Center, located at MC Terrell, has operated from March 2012 to present. The Center provides the following programming : 1) Computer Lab/Class, 2) Fitness, 3) Parenting Workshops, 4) Personal Development (e.g. GED, Men's Support Group, Knitting/Stitching Club, Green Thumb Club), and 5) Special Events (e.g. Back to School Nights, Turkey Giveaway). The PRC for the Ward 1 Center, located at Tubman ES, operated from March 2012 to July 2012; however, the operator there, The House, provided notice to DCPS in August 2012, one week prior to the start of school, that they did not intend to operate nor return for SY12-13. The Ward 1 PRC facility is still available to parents and operates under the supervision of the school leader.

UTILIZATION RATES FOR EACH CENTER

Despite repeated requests, the Ward 1 PRC operator never provided OFPE staff with sign-in sheets for the time they operated, so we are unable to confirm attendance and utilization rates. Anecdotally, we were told that attendance ranged between 5 and 15 parent participants each week. The Ward 8 PRC operator (NCCF) reports a range of 2-15 parents each program day. Special events such as Back to School Breakfast and an Open House saw 50-60 attendees.

In SY13-14, DCPS will no longer operate PRCs. We considered multiple factors in deciding to close the PRCs, including the rates at which parents from across the city participated in the services and the availability of existing support agencies and organizations in proximity to the school communities. The majority of the families served are families of students that attend the school in which the Center is located. This information has been shared with critical stakeholders of the PRCs, including the individual schools and the PRC Steering Committee. DCPS has increased its efforts through our school level engagement and professional development trainings to build the capacity of school leaders and staff to identify serve and support families more effectively at their respective schools. The Ward 8 PRC is located in MC Terrell, a school that will be consolidated with Martin Luther King Elementary School in SY13-14. The furniture and equipment at MC Terrell that supports the PRC will be repurposed for use in King ES and other DCPS schools in the community.

Q41: Please describe DCPS' efforts to retain students attending schools scheduled for consolidation. How many staff at DCPS are directly involved in these efforts?

In FY12, DCPS closed one school – River Terrace Elementary School. River Terrace closed at the end of the 2011-12 school year. In an effort to support this transition, DCPS assigned one staff person to act as the point of contact for both the closing and receiving school. In collaboration with the principals, this person was responsible for:

- Establishing a transition team made up of parents, staff, and community members that would help establish a transition plan for both communities.
- Ensure that all transition activities were well planned for and supported. These events include:
 - community building activities that helps bring both communities together
 - Enrollment drives to ensure as many students from the closing

- school are captured by the receiving school or DCPS
- Logistics – ensure that staff have a clear understanding and timeline for packing and moving.
- Address any questions or concerns by parents or staff related to the transition – transportation, school options, etc.
- Act as liaison for school to other DCPS central office departments - human resources, logistics/warehouse, special education.

Q42: Please list each policy initiative of your agency or that your agency partnered with community groups or organizations during FY12 and FY13, to date. For each initiative please provide:

- A detailed description of the program;
- The name of the employee who is responsible for the program;
- The total number of FTE's assigned to the program; and
- The amount of funding budgeted to the program.

See “Q42 Attachment_Strategic Policy Initiatives and Partnerships.”

Program Operations and Data

Q43: Please identify all electronic databases maintained by your agency, including the following:

- A detailed description of the information tracked within each system;
- Identification of persons who have access to each system, and whether the public can be granted access to all or part of each system; and
- The age of the system and any discussion of substantial upgrades that have been made or are planned to be made to the system.

See “Q43 Attachment X_Data Systems Inventory_FY12.”

Q44: Please provide a list of all studies, research papers, and analyses the agency prepared, or contracted for, during FY12 and FY13, to date. Please state the status, delivery date, and purpose of each.

See “Q44 Attachment_Evaluations and Studies_FY12.”

In addition to those listed in the attachment, the Office of Human Capital conducted the following research projects:

DCPS is participating in a Bain & Company research study the purpose of which is to understand how U.S. schools can attract, develop and retain transformational school leaders. The study began in January 2013 and will continue this spring. Bain & Company will provide findings later this year (2013). This study is being funded by an external agency/organization and DCPS is not contributing financial resources to this study. Additional detail on the study is attached. See “OHC Attachment 7 – School Leadership Study.” Key research questions include:

- Who are the transformational principals, how can we identify them?
- What are the key challenges and potential solutions around attracting, preparing, selecting, and retaining transformational principals? What strategies can various stakeholders employ?
- What are the common attributes of transformational principals?

DCPS is partnering with Dr. Jim Wyckoff, Dr. Thomas Dee, and Dr. Daphna Bassok at The University of Virginia to analyze IMPACT data. This partnership began in November 2011 and will continue through 2014. The first set of their analyses will answer the following questions:

- Do the rewards, incentives, and supports associated with IMPACT and IMPACT*plus* appear to influence improvement in teacher performance as measured by student achievement and as measured by classroom practices?
- What are the attributes of teachers who have left DCPS, those who remained in the same DCPS schools, and those who transferred among

District of Columbia Public Schools FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

DCPS schools (e.g., IMPACT scores, age, race, experience, school attributes, whether they were hired other DC area schools?)

- How do teacher scores predict the likelihood of teacher retention?
- In addition, this partnership has been designed to extend over multiple years and to be flexible enough to evolve over time, such that the researchers will play a role in investigating the outcomes of the new initiatives included in this TIF grant. The researchers have expressed an interest in pursuing this additional investigation.

DCPS is working with Dr. Brian Jacob from the University of Michigan and Dr. Jonah Rockoff from Columbia University to analyze the complete set of DCPS's teacher selection data in order to determine the extent to which different aspects of the selection process are predictive of performance in the classroom, as measured by IMPACT.

DCPS is working with Dr. Raj Chetty and Dr. John Friedman at Harvard University to investigate the effects of the implementation of a high-stakes teacher evaluation system on teacher behavior. Specifically, the researchers will investigate whether IMPACT has reduced the signal quality of value-added measures as a predictor of teacher quality. This is another partnership for which we have outlined an initial scope of work, but have discussed expanding the research questions in the future. This MOA was signed in August 2012 and the partnership will continue through 2014.

DCPS is working with Dr. Grover J. "Russ" Whitehurst, Michael Gallaher, and Matthew Chingos from the Brookings Institution to explore outcomes in DCPS and several other large urban school systems in order to determine the overall reliability of teacher evaluation scores over time and correlation between evaluation scores from one year and student achievement outcomes in the following year. This MOA was signed in June 2012 and will continue through 2013.

Q45: Please identify any statutory or regulatory impediments to your agency's operations.

In all reality, any legislative imperatives that have financial and/or staffing implications for DCPS will need to be finalized very soon, or we will not be able to incorporate and plan for them in our FY14 (SY13-14) budget. As one example, the physical education (PE) requirements outlined in the Healthy Schools Act will pose significant staffing and implementation challenges for the agency and for our schools starting in FY15. Several other proposed pieces of legislation have the same potential to challenge our budgetary planning (eg. the proposed legislation requiring school librarians in all schools; the recently proposed READ legislation, and the proposed AED/CPR certification legislation).

Q46: Please explain how any legislation passed at the federal level during FY12 or FY13 to date has affected the operations and/or polices of DC Public Schools.

The federal sequestration will likely pose challenges for our agency, if enacted in March.

Q47: Please answer the following questions regarding the DCPS food service program:

- What were the approved budgets, the actual expenditures, and the actual revenue (please include funding sources) for food services in FY12 and FY13 to date?

“Q47 Attachment_ Food Services Revenue and Expenditures.”

- For each food service vendor please list the total number of meals served in FY13 to date, broken down by fully paid meals, free, and reduced priced meals for each meal service (i.e. breakfast, lunch, snack, and supper).

“Q47 Attachment_ Food Services Vendor and Meal Participation Rates.”

- What measures does DCPS plan to put in place to control food services costs for the remainder of FY13?

The following table outlines additional possible savings within our current contract parameters. If the projected additional are realized, this will bring our expenditures down from \$9.9M over projected revenue to approximately \$8.1M over projected revenue in FY13. Additional savings may be realized through contract modifications. We will continue to engage our vendors and evaluate ways to reduce costs.

Projected Cost Savings and Revenue Generating Programs

Savings Probability	Savings Category	Scope of Change	Projected Reduction/Savings
Likely based on first quarter data analysis	Additional Savings	<p>Modify Food Service Management Company contracts to reflect changes in meal projections from the estimates calculated in the Request for Proposal to extrapolated projections based on actual meal participation</p> <p>Now that we are more than</p>	\$1,000,000

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

		<p>1/3 of the way through the school year, we have enough data from which to extrapolate accurate projections for total meal counts in SY12/13.</p> <p>Request for Proposal Estimates – 9.9M</p> <p>Extrapolated Meal Projections – 9.5M</p>	
Negotiation with vendor required	Additional Savings	<p>Reduce Equipment Cost-Reimbursable Portion of Vendor Contracts</p> <p>All 3 food services contracts currently project that contractors will spend less than the costs listed in the cost reimbursable portion of the contract for equipment/repairs. Each vendor was budgeted \$11,596.64 per school to pay for equipment/repairs during school year 2012/2013.</p> <p>Chartwells Thompson was budgeted approximately \$1.24 million for equipment/repairs for SY 12/13 and approved expenses are only projected to reach approximately \$600,000 by the end of the school year. Projections were made based on the data gathered from August 2012-November 2012.</p> <p>DC Central Kitchen was budgeted approximately \$104,000 for equipment/repairs for SY 12/13 and approved expenses are only projected to reach approximately \$88,000 by the end of the school year.</p>	\$700,000

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

		<p>Projections were made based on the data gathered from August 2012-November 2012.</p> <p>Revolution Foods was budgeted approximately \$35,000 for equipment/repairs for SY 12/13 and approved expenses are only projected to reach approximately \$15,000 by the end of the school year. Projections were made based on the data gathered from August 2012-November 2012.</p> <p>In all, current projections show DCPS using only \$662,505.90 of the \$1,380,001.35 that was designated for equipment/repairs. This would result in a savings of over \$700,000.</p> <p>In future option years, DCPS expects annual equipment/repair costs to be similar to the projected costs above. School consolidations may also reduce the amount of funds allotted for equipment/repairs.</p>	
Complete	Additional Savings	<p>Elimination of A la Carte Meal Service</p> <p>Service (and sales) of a la carte meals in schools resulted in additional costs to DCPS for all 3 previous food service contracts. The elimination of a la carte sales will not only result in contract related cost savings (projected at approximately \$74,000), but will allow DCPS to reduce the</p>	\$74,000

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

		number of armored car cash pick-ups required from schools (see below).	
In Process	Additional Savings	<p>Reduction of Armored Car Services</p> <p>DCPS requires armored car services to facilitate cash pick-ups from a select set of schools. We have an MOU with the Office of Finance and Treasury (OFT) that allows us to contract with Dunbar Armored Services to pick up cash from schools according to set schedule.</p> <p>Due to the adoption of the Community Eligibility Option (Provision 4) in most schools (83 total), where all students eat for free, and the elimination of a la carte sales, fewer schools collect cash in the cafeteria. This necessitates fewer cash pickups and reduces overall costs.</p> <p>The previous MOU between OFT and DCPS was for \$150,000. This year's annual projections predict that we will spend just over \$75,000 on cash pick up services for 52 schools. In addition, as a result of the elimination of a la carte sales in all schools, DCPS will only request Dunbar's services at the 31 schools that are not 100% certified for free meals (Provision 4 or Provision 2) starting in January. This will result in a further reduction of spending and overall savings of</p>	\$80,000 - \$100,000

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

		\$80,000 - \$100,000.	
--	--	-----------------------	--

- What efforts has DCPS engaged in to recover rebates and discounts owed to it by food service vendors;
DCPS has not found substantial evidence that there were instances of overbilling or overages in relation to food costs. In the audit conducted by Federal Management Systems (FMS), they were tasked with analyzing the prices, rebates, discounts, and allowances returned to DCPS from the vendor in the scope of the cost-reimbursable contract. In the cost-reimbursable contract, the vendor was required to purchase all food and non-food commodities at the lowest price possible. In their research, FMS compared a product list vetted by DCPS against the vendor’s price list and the price lists of independent supplies. The result of this comparison was inconclusive. FMS stated, “the FSMC’s price was sometimes lower, sometimes higher, and/or equal to the amounts quoted by other suppliers.” In the new fixed-price-per meal contract structure, this is no longer a concern for food items. Rebates and discounts are incorporated into the fixed-price-per-meal in the new contract, with the exception of the cost reimbursable portion. In the Chartwells-Thompson contract a 5% rebate is applicable to equipment purchases and repairs. The vendor accounts for these rebates in their monthly invoices to DCPS.

- Please detail the total school meal participation rates in FY11, FY12, and FY13 to date for breakfast, lunch, snack, and supper.

Q48: How does DCPS determine which students go to summer school? Please describe the process for summer school enrollment, including the timeline for notifying parents, registering students for classes, and hiring staff.

DCPS offered a number of different programs over the summer in SY2011-12. For students in grades K-8, ten summer school sites operated throughout the district, offering both literacy and math instruction. Students enrolled on a first-come/first-served basis. For rising 9th graders, a new Summer Bridge program helped support the key transition to high school, combining a career-themed literacy/math curriculum with an advisory program that cultivated high school success skills. DCPS used student-level data, including course performance, CAS scores, attendance and behavior to recruit students who might most benefit from the Bridge program; additionally, we partnered with the Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP) so our two sites were also SYEP placements for additional rising 9th graders. At the high school level, we operated three high school summer schools that offered credit recovery courses to students who had previously failed particular courses. School staff, especially counselors, work to

enroll students in the high school program. Priority was given to DCPS 9th grade students and to 12th grade students who needed 3.0 credits or fewer to graduate. Finally, we ran a new program for a group of English Language Learner students through which students entering their second year of high school but who had not yet taken English I were able to take the course from a team of ESL and English teachers. These students were identified through data analysis and school recommendation.

Central Office provided notice to all parents about general summer school programming in February. However, schools take the lead on notifying students regarding the need to attend high school summer school based on Term 2 and Term 3 grades (late February– early March). In addition, high school guidance counselors, while reviewing a student’s Letter of Understanding (i.e., an account of credits earned and required), encourage students to attend summer school in order to recover credits and graduate in a timely manner. Over 400 students graduated in August at the end of summer school.

The high school enrollment process was as follows:

- Student registration was open from Monday, March 12, 2012, through Monday, April 30, 2012.
- All eligible students had to: (1) complete the DCPS HS Summer Credit Recovery Program Enrollment Form; and (2) meet with their school counselors to complete the DCPS HS Summer Credit Recovery Program Certification of Eligibility Form.
- School counselors faxed completed forms to the Office of College & Career Readiness by April 30, 2012.

To recruit Summer School teachers and aides, DCPS posted the job openings on the DCPS website, distributed flyers to schools, emailed highly effective teachers and encouraged them to work in Summer School, and received recommendations from principals. We also did an IMPACT score screen in order to ensure we hired teachers who were evaluated as being "effective" or "highly effective." To fill particular content needs, we hired some non-DCPS teachers and aides, but priority was always given to DCPS employees. Additionally, we partnered with the DC Teaching Fellows program to place their Fellows—who would start teaching in the fall—in summer school classes alongside cooperating/mentor DCPS teachers. All summer school teachers and aides received training in early June. The training focused on the goals of the Summer School program, roles and responsibilities of teachers and aides, and the curriculum materials or online resources that were used for the program.

Q49: What is DCPS’s policy for grade promotion? How was this policy developed, when was it last revised, and who in DCPS is responsible for ensuring adherence

to the policy? Please provide the total promotion rate (percent and number of students) by school and by grade for DCPS for school year 2011-2012.

The state-level rules for promotion and retention of District public school students, established by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education, are codified in Title 5, Chapter 22 of the DC Municipal Regulations (DCMR). The DCMR provisions were last revised on May 11, 2007. Our LEA policy for grade promotion and retention is based on the state regulations and the Office of the Chief Academic Officer, in collaboration with the Office of the Chief of Schools, is responsible for ensuring adherence to the policy.

See “Q49a Attachment– OCAO Memo Regarding Promotion/Retention Policy “

We are still compiling the promotion rate data by school and by grade for SY 2011-2012, and will submit to the Committee in advance of our agency performance hearing.

Q50: Please provide the 4-year cohort graduation rate for each high school and an average rate for the school system. Please also provide the dropout rate for each school and an average for the school system.

– What is the policy and procedure for an official dropout or withdrawal from DCPS?

DCPS does not currently calculate a student dropout rate. Assessing this number at the LEA level is fairly difficult to determine, in large part, because of the very high student mobility between LEAs inside and outside the District. Students who withdraw from DCPS do not regularly follow the formal withdrawal procedure (i.e., having the parent come in sign the withdrawal form, providing the sending school with student’s receiving school information, having the receiving school contact the sending school for student records, etc.); therefore, it is very difficult to track where these students actually end up after leaving DCPS – either as transfers to another LEA, or as actual dropouts. OSSE may be able to calculate at the state level since that agency has better visibility on the student mobility across LEAs in DC.

DCPS is currently working on a comprehensive Admission and Withdrawal Policy. The guidance we currently give schools for (general education) withdrawals to be coded in our student information system as “drop-out” codes follows:

- Enrolled in an adult education or training program - parent/student over 18, signed withdrawal form, proof of enrollment required
- Expelled or involuntarily withdrawn- court order required
- Non-attendance – implementation of truancy protocol (phone calls, home visits, meetings, referrals), court referral required

District of Columbia Public Schools FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- Enrolled but never attended - letters and phone calls to the parent required
 - Discontinued schooling - for students over 18 only—signed withdrawal form required
 - Completed grade 12, but did not meet all graduation requirements - no proof required.
- Please provide a detailed description of all efforts, programs, or initiatives, planned or undertaken, in FY12 and to date in FY13 to increase the graduation rate and decrease the dropout rate.

In SY11-12 and through the first half of SY12-13, DCPS has taken a number of steps to increase the adjusted cohort graduation rate as we work to meet Goal #3 of *A Capital Commitment*. First, students must be in school every day, ready to learn, if they hope to graduate on time; accordingly, we incorporate by reference all of the anti-truancy work that took place last year and is deepening this year.

Second, we continued to offer a broad range of credit recovery opportunities to help students who have fallen off track through course failures. Credit recovery takes place during the school day, in our Evening Credit Recovery program, and through our High School Summer School program. Increasingly, we are leveraging online/blended learning models to help students recover credits.

Third, starting in SY12-13, we have begun paying closer attention to key student performance metrics that indicate a likelihood of dropping out—particularly, the ABCs for attendance, behavior and course performance data. This allows us to identify struggling students before they fall too far behind to graduate on time.

Fourth, although some schools have run Summer Bridge programs for their incoming 9th graders, DCPS ran two centralized Bridge programs that served about 400 rising 9th graders last summer. This is a key strategy because on-time promotion to 10th grade is a leading indicator of likelihood to graduate.

Finally, we have continued to empower and support students so they help keep themselves on track to graduation. The main mechanism for this work has been the Individual Graduation Portfolio (IGP), a free online portfolio that allows students in grades 6–12 to discover their interests, set appropriate goals, and create a thoughtful plan for high school and beyond.

Q51: Please provide the following enrollment data:

- Total DCPS student enrollment by grade, for school years 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 (all based on the final audited enrollment report);

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- DCPS individual school enrollment by grade for school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 (based on the final audited enrollment report);
 - Summer school enrollment, broken down by school for FY11 and FY12; and,
 - What is the proposed summer school enrollment for FY13?

See “Q51 Attachment_DCPS Enrollment” and Q51 Attachment_Summer School Enrollment.”

Q52: Please provide a diagram of all feeder patterns in DCPS as well as a timeline of when they were last updated.

See “Q52 Attachment _Feeder Pattern and Destination Schools, SY12-13”

Q53: Which feeder pattern(s) does the agency propose to change and why for the upcoming school year? For each change, please provide a detailed narrative describing the reasoning for the decision and any corresponding data used to make each feeder pattern change.

The only feeder pattern changes made for next year where those schools impacted by the consolidation plan. That list of schools that will be changing feeder pattern for the 2013-2014 school year follows:

School	Will now feed
Barnard Elementary School	Truesdell EC or West EC
Browne Education Campus	Eastern High School
Burrville Elementary School	Kelly Miller Middle School
Cleveland Elementary School	Cardozo Education Campus
Columbia Heights EC (8 th grade)*	Cardozo EC (9 th grade)
Garrison Elementary School	Cardozo Education Campus
Houston Elementary School	Kelly Miller Middle School
Langdon Education Campus	Dunbar High School
Langley Elementary School	McKinley EC (6 th grade)
Marie Reed Elementary School	Cardozo Education Campus
McKinley Education Campus (8 th grade)*	Dunbar High School

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

Powell Elementary School	Columbia Heights EC
Ross Elementary School	Cardozo Education Campus
Seaton Elementary School	Cardozo Education Campus
Thomas Elementary School	Kelly Miller Middle School
Wheatley Education Campus	Dunbar High School

Q54: Please answer the following questions regarding the DCPS out-of-boundary (K-12), preschool, and pre-K lottery process for both the FY12 (January – February 2012) and FY13 (January – February 2013) process:

- How many and what percentage of students applied through the out-of-boundary lottery?

In FY12, DCPS received 3193 K-12 out-of-boundary (OOB) applications; and 4106 PS/PK applications, for a total of 7299 OOB applications. The lottery for SY 13-14 (FY13) closes on February 25th and we will release those results on March 8.

- How many and what percentage of students in each school are out-of-boundary?

See “Q54 Attachment_InBoundary OOB Percentages by School_SY12-13.”

- Please give a narrative description of how the lottery system works

The Out-of-Boundary Lottery is a school choice service offered by DCPS. The system allows families to apply for available seats at schools other than their child's school(s) of right. There are two types of "schools of right" within DCPS. The first is based on the address of the family. Every DC family has a right to attend an in-boundary school based on their address, beginning in kindergarten. The second "school of right" refers to the school into which a DCPS student's current school feeds.

Preschool and pre-kindergarten are non-compulsory grades within the District, and some DCPS schools are unable to accommodate all interested families. The Preschool/Pre-Kindergarten Lottery serves as the fair and equitable process by which available preschool and pre-kindergarten seats are allocated.

Preschool/Pre-Kindergarten and Out-of-Boundary Lottery applicants use an online system to complete and submit a lottery application. Applicants may select up to 6 schools on their application and are asked to rank the school selections in order of preference. The application is available on the DCPS website from the last Monday in January, through the last Monday in February (Jan. 28, 2013 – Feb. 25, 2013). After the lottery

District of Columbia Public Schools FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

closes on February 25, 2013, the computer-based lottery algorithm will run, with the order of preferences, and results will be determined. See also, "Q54 Attachments_ PK12 and PSPK Lottery FAQ" for more detailed information.

- How are parents notified of and informed about the lottery process?
DCPS provides many opportunities and avenues for families to learn about the lottery process. In FY12, the following outreach strategies were implemented:
 - DCPS creates and circulates Preschool/Pre-Kindergarten and Out-of-Boundary FAQ one-pagers translated into Spanish, French, Chinese, Amharic and Vietnamese.
 - DCPS staff members from the Offices of Special Education, Bilingual Education, School Operations, and Early Childhood Education, who work closely with schools and families, are trained on the lottery application. These staff members then support families through the lottery process.
 - DCPS hosts and participates in numerous in-person public "Lottery 101" sessions where families can learn more about the lottery process and receive one-on-one assistance from knowledgeable DCPS staff.
 - Online campaign that includes:
 - online live web chats where families and community members can have their lottery questions answered by DCPS staff members.
 - email, text message, and various social media outlets.
 - Prominent web presence – home page feature
 - The Office of Early Childhood Education runs bus advertisements throughout the city, and partners with CBOs to engage in a major grassroots effort to get the word out about the lottery.

Q55: What is the percentage and number of students who are qualify for free and reduced lunch at each DCPS School?

Q55 Attachment_DCPS FARM Data.”.

Q56: Please also provide the total amount of funding that was allocated to and spent by each DCPS school for Title I in FY11, FY12, and FY13 to date.

For the total Title I funding that was allocated to and spent by each eligible DCPS school in FY11, FY12, and FY13 to date, see "Q56 Attachment_Title I School Allocations.”

Q57: Please provide the following for DCPS career and technical education programs:

– How are students directed to career and technical education programs?

Students are directed to career and technical education (CTE) programs through the following career exploration and scheduling activities:

- CTE Guidebook – CTE Guidebooks are sent to all DCPS middle schools at the beginning of the fall semester. This is designed so that all DCPS 8th graders receive a copy of the Guidebook prior to attending the annual High School Fair
 - Annual High School Fair – All DCPS High Schools participated in the annual high school fair. Schools that have CTE programs showcase their programs and recruit students into their programs at the fair. The CTE Guidebook is also distributed to the attendees at the High School Fair.
 - Individualized Graduation Portfolio (IGP) online system – Students are directed to explore and discover their career interests through the use of their own Individualized Graduation Portfolios (IGP). Working alongside their high school guidance counselors, DCPS middle and high school students are provided with time and technology to complete their interest assessments in the IGP online system and match their interests and skills to suggested careers and majors. From the results, students can discover which courses are needed to complete a desired CTE program of study. With the assistance of their counselors, students will then be able to select the desired courses and take ownership of their course plans (student course selections are automatically migrated from IGP into the DC Student Tracking and Reporting System (DC STARS) which generates student schedules.) Students have the flexibility to transition within and among CTE programs of study as their interests change and different opportunities emerge.
- The number of students enrolled in each program and the school in which it is located;
See “Q57b Attachment_CTE Program Enrollment by Location SY11-12.”
- The type of professional certification, if any, provided by each program;
See “Q57c Attachment_CTE Programs, Courses and Industry Certifications SY11-12.”
and
- The hours that each program is in operation.
Ballou STAY, Roosevelt STAY, and Spingarn STAY operate Monday – Thursday from 11:30AM – 8:30PM. All other schools in Q57c Attachment operate Monday through Friday from 8:45AM – 3:15PM.

Q58: Please describe DCPS’s plan to improve the quality of and access to career and technical education programs for students. Please also list which career and

technical education programs provide students with professional certification and/or college credit and which do not?

DCPS's work during SY11-12 to improve the quality and access to career and technical education programs included the following initiatives:

- Alignment of the CTE curriculum to Technical and Employability Skills Standards in SY2011-2012.
- Establishment of seven (7) additional articulation agreements with local postsecondary institutions including six (6) with UDC-CC and one (1) with George Washington University.
- Restructuring of course offerings for selected CTE programs of study for SY2012-2013 to provide the most efficient and effective paths for students to earn industry certification and/or college credits.
- Professional development to CTE teachers on standards alignment, CCSS Literacy Reading Standards and Employability Skills Assessment in SY2011-2012
- Continuous professional development on instructional pedagogy, employability skills training, and literacy and math integration in CTE curriculum.

DCPS has served with OSSE, PCSB, WIC, UDC-CC and members of the City Council on the DC CTE Task Force. That group proposed a plan to improve participation, persistence, and completion of CTE programs of study that are aligned to high-wage and high-demand occupations in DC. DCPS and the other agency partners are continuing to work together to ensure an efficient implementation. A few highlights of that work include:

- Evaluation of all existing DCPS CTE programs of study based on the labor market demand and program quality criteria established by the CTE Task Force to consolidate the DCPS CTE program offering.
- Analysis of the school-by-school data on CTE program completion rates in SY2011-2012 and redesign the portfolio of DCPS CTE program implementation for SY2013-2014 and beyond.
- Work to increase student participation in co-curricular activities (Career Technical Student Organizations, Robotics Competitions)
- Establishment of more Articulation Agreements with postsecondary institutions

Please also refer to the list of CTE programs with their associated professional certification and/or articulation agreements that provide students with opportunities to earn college credits in the "Q57c Attachment_CTE Programs, Courses and Industry Certifications SY11-12."

Q59: Please explain any emergency response procedures in place for the DCPS as it relates to on-campus emergencies. Please discuss how DCPS receives information

from the District and/or the Homeland Security Emergency Management Agency following emergencies to help guide emergency response activities and resource support requests.

Protocols are in place to support student safety at schools. Protocols include procedures/policies related to visitor entry or access, lockdown procedures, and active or armed shooters. Although each situation is different, we ask schools to put the following procedures in place to secure students and staff:

- **Visitor Access/Entry:** We ask all schools to designate one door as the main entrance for visitors. A security guard or special police officer is assigned to man the security desk at the main entrance. Visitors are required to check in at the school security desk where they must present identification and state the purpose for their visit before entering.
- **Lockdown:** We have developed and issued protocols to “lockdown” schools in the event there is a potential danger inside or outside a school building. We ask schools to practice their lock down protocols, so staff and students are ready if an actual threat or danger presents itself.
- **Active Shooter/Armed Subjects:** DCPS has specific protocols for schools to follow in the event an active shooter or armed subject is in a school. Staff and students are instructed to move away from windows and to “lockdown, drop and cover.” In partnership with MPD, our principals participated in active shooter training this summer prior to the opening of school. This summer’s presentation can be found at Summer 2012 Active Shooter Presentation to Principals, Summer Leadership Academy <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/3xtqblg6yb9b65b/4b4m5Ajonz>

Protocols are memorialized in the School Emergency Response Plan and Management Guide, which can be found at esa.dc.gov/DC/ESA/Schools/Guides+and+Protocols/School+Emergency+Response+Plan+and+Management+Guide

We work regularly with HSEMA, MPD, and other emergency response personnel to prepare for and respond to any school based emergencies and can detail those for you as you see fit.

Q60: Please provide a full listing of the additions that DCPS is seeking to the school nurse contract. In your response, please include a detailed description of the purpose of the service, as well as the estimated cost for each service or provision. What is the timeline for releasing the RFP for the new nursing contract?

DCPS has requested the following in the new school nurse contract:

- Maintain current, full-time nursing coverage in all schools - and add coverage to the three STAY schools. This would allow students to have full-day access to a medical professional for ongoing and episodic health needs.

District of Columbia Public Schools FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- Meet federal deadlines for Head Start, including vision and hearing screenings. This requires nurses to conduct vision and hearing screenings on preschool and prekindergarten students in our Title I schools, with 45 days of enrollment, in addition to screenings for older students. In FY12, DCPS purchased vision and hearing equipment for these schools, to support the school nurse in completing these screenings.
- Monthly school nurse data to assess utilization, health status of students and health program outcomes, particularly as health relates contributes to in-seat attendance. These data must include the items Head Start must report to the federal government each month. A robust data system is needed to achieve this, as the current system (Health Office) is inadequate.
- Nurse participation in necessary meetings and screenings related to a student's IEP determination or Section 504 eligibility. When student accommodations are required for health reasons, it is essential that the school nurse participate in the planning for the child's care at school, including development of an Individualized Health Plan for each student with ongoing medical needs.
- Secure nurses or dedicated aides, as required on an IEP or 504 plan for students with special health care needs, within 24 hours notice, when the school's nurse cannot provide the appropriate and reliable services. These services are currently funded by DCPS's Office of Special Education and are provided through a separate vendor. DCPS would contribute \$1.5m of its FY14 funds towards the costs of incorporating these services into the nursing contract, to ensure coordinated nursing care for each student with special needs through one vendor.
- Improve collaboration by the school nurse program in meeting the needs of students with special health care needs when the school nurse can provide the appropriate and reliable coverage required.
- Provide a revised Administration of Medication training program to include web-based, distance learning for school staff to be trained to administer medication, an expanded list of medications that a trained school staff can administer, and implementation of an abbreviated training for the administration of emergency medications. This will allow more school staff to become trained to administer medication without needing to leave school duties to attend multi-day, offsite trainings. It also would allow staff to meet more of the medication needs of students when the nurse is unavailable. This further allows DCPS to meet its obligations to students.

DOH has advised DCPS that estimated costs for each additional service cannot be disclosed at a public hearing as the release of these estimates would compromise the solicitation process and taint the bidder pool. DOH is also the best source or an estimate on the timeline for releasing an RFP on the contract.

Q61: Please respond to the following questions regarding testing integrity.

District of Columbia Public Schools
FY12 Performance Oversight Responses

- Who in DCPS is responsible for standardized testing security and integrity?
In DCPS, the Chief of the Office of Data & Accountability (ODA) is responsible for standardized testing security and integrity.
- What procedures and policies have been put in place to improve testing integrity?
DCPS follows the protocols for test security established by OSSE, together with additional safeguards established by ODA, including:
 - DCPS required schools to have proctors in testing rooms.
 - DCPS assigned observers to observe test administration in schools and monitor the check-out and check-in of testing materials to ensure that all materials were accounted for at all times.
 - DCPS required observers to send a daily report to central office, capturing specific items about onsite test security and test administration.
- Please provide an update on the progress of implementing the D.C. Inspector General’s recommendations from its August 2012 investigative report on the DC-CAS.
In response to the DC OIG report, DCPS will implement the following practices during the 2013 DC CAS administration:
 - Placement of seals on the secure containers used to store 2013 DC CAS testing materials overnight at schools.
 - Rotation of proctors to ensure that teachers do not administer a test to their own class.
 - Assignment of additional observers in schools where test security violations have previously occurred.
 - Modifications to the content of the trainings it offers to Test Administrators to draw on lessons learned from previous years
- What training does school-based staff receive on testing integrity and security?
DCPS Test Coordinators and assistant Test Coordinators receive two DC CAS trainings; one is given by OSSE and the second by DCPS. Both trainings provide clear guidance on the secure handling and storage of materials and the confidentiality of the test content. The DCPS CAS training also includes advice on how to avoid common accidental violations of test protocols, such as checking the time on cell phones in testing areas or displaying instructional materials on classroom walls during testing. Additionally, DCPS requires Test Coordinators to train all staff involved in testing at their school. ODA provides presentation materials that the Coordinators use to build out their training materials. Test Coordinators confirm this school-level training through ODA. Finally, all DCPS employees who handle test materials must sign the OSSE security and non-disclosure agreement.

Special Education

Q62: Please provide the following information regarding students in DCPS with Individuals Education Plans (IEPs):

- What is the percentage and number of students who have Individualized Education Plans in DCPS?

There are 8,640 students with IEPs, representing 18%, districtwide.

SY11-12	Student Enrollment (DCPS & NPU)				Special Education Percentage			
	Reported Enrollment (Oct 5th)	SPED Enrollment	DCPS	NPU	Whole	One Decimal	DCPS	NPU
Child Count (12/1/11)	46,891	8,640	6,875	1,765	18%	18.4%	14.66%	3.76%
End of Year (6/14/12)	46,981	8,937	7,285	1,652	19%	19.1%	15.54%	3.52%
End of Year (6/14/12)	51,332 (Snapshot)	8,937	7,285	1,652	17%	17.4%	14.19%	3.22%

- Please provide a school-by-school, grade-level breakdown of the number of students with IEPs.

See "Q62 Attachment_Student IEP Data."

Q63: Please list all special education programs offered by DCPS and charter schools that have selected DCPS as their LEA for special education. The list should include details regarding each program, including:

- Their degree of inclusion;
- Maximum student-to-staff ratios;
- Specific pedagogical methods;
- A description of the needs of students for whom the program is designed;
- The average enrollment in each program over the past school year; and
- The maximum number of students that the program can accommodate.

The following DCPS programs serve students with special needs:

Learning Disability (LD)

- Students in LD classes (grades 3-12) have part or full-time IEPs and annual goals that include specialized instruction aligned to grade level Common Core State Standards. Students in the LD classes frequently spend part of their day included in general education classes with age appropriate peers
- Student-Teacher Ratio 15:1.
- Students in the LD program may receive specific research based interventions, or work to achieve IEP goals and objectives that align to the Common Core State Standards and support inclusion in the general

education curriculum. Students have access to interventions and materials available at the local school, such as System 44 and Read 180 or the Wilson Reading System.

- Students in the LD programs have individualized needs and enrollment varies on the individual school level. There is no maximum enrollment number. Prospect Learning Center serves approximately DCPS students who have Learning Disabilities and full-time out of general education IEPs. The academic program includes specific interventions in reading, such as SpellRead, Read 180, and Wilson Reading System. Students have access to Apagea math, Study Island and Youth Net. Community partners include George Mason University, University of District of Columbia, Kid Power, and Sherwood Recreation Center.

Intellectual Disability (ID)

- Students with Intellectual Disabilities are included with age appropriate peers according to their IEPs. They typically attend neighborhood schools.
- Student-to-ratio is 10:1.
- DCPS is building a menu including a functional life skills curriculum and specific reading and math interventions to increase the instructional rigor of our ID classrooms. DCPS is exploring instructional technology that will adapt grade level lesson plans and instructional activities.
- Students with ID tend to have needs in the areas of reading, writing, math, and functional life skills. Many students have related services; some have behavior and communication needs.
- Enrollment varies based on needs. DCPS currently serves 493 students with ID, 263 who have full time IEPs.
- Students with severe or profound ID may attend the Mamie D. Lee and/or Sharpe Health schools. The current enrollment at Mamie D. Lee is 96 students, PK-12. The current enrollment at Sharpe Health Center for students, whose primary disability is ID, is six.

Autism

- Inclusion for students with Autism in “specials,” lunch, PE, recess is approximately 60% district-wide. The Autism team does not monitor DCPS Charters so that ratio is not included.
- Student-to-staff ratios are varied from 2:1 support in dedicated classroom to 25:1 in full inclusion settings. This is indicative of the continuum of services for student on the Autism spectrum.
- Specific pedagogical methods include cooperative learning, meaningful content, formal or informal planning processes, student choices, flexible grouping, preparing for change, scheduling, alternative choices in materials, varying lesson formats and structures, active participation, cooperative learning, natural opportunities to learn new language, initiate conversations, respond to verbal directions and requests, practice turn taking, and

developing social relationships. Materials and activities address the range of reading levels/learning profiles/student interests and can provide clear directions and can be developed in a centers/station-based approach. Project-based instruction is used to address individual IEP objectives. Assessments include the VBMAPP, ABLLS, Brigance and curriculum is Direct Instruction Math and Reading.

- A description of the needs of students for whom the program is designed; Student with Autism Spectrum Disorders
- The average enrollment in each program over the past school year; Program currently consist of student with and without a primary disability classification of Autism. For students with the primary disability of Autism only, there are approximately 500 students in dedicated classrooms and 100 additional students receiving inclusion support in general education in SY12-13.
- Next year, the capacity will be 600 in dedicated classrooms with inclusion opportunities and 100+ receiving support in full time general education, in addition to 30 students in the model Asperger's program. SY 2013 should conclude with the support of approximately 800 students district-wide.

Sensory Impairment Cluster (for vision and hearing-impaired students)

- Currently, there are cluster programs for students with sensory impairments (vision and hearing). These programs include PS/PK; K-5; Middle School; and High School.
- The Vision Cluster Programs are located at Francis Stevens Educational Campus; Hardy Middle School; and Wilson Senior High School.
- The Hearing Cluster Programs are located at Payne Elementary School; Hardy Middle School; and Wilson Senior High School. These programs are for students with average to above-average cognitive abilities who have sensory impairments.
- Students with cognitive deficits and sensory impairments are served at Mamie D. Lee; Sharpe Health; and citywide ID programs by itinerant providers.
- Services and supports to include the Expanded Core Curriculum for students with sensory impairments are provided to students in cluster programs. All students in cluster programs for sensory impairments are included with non-disabled peers for an average of upwards of 80% of the school day.
- Staff to student ratios of 1 to 10 are the average, but each program can accommodate up to 15 students with a program assistant.
- Specific pedagogy for the blind and visually impaired includes the use of assistive technology to access the curriculum, Braille Literacy, Nemeth Math Code, self advocacy, social skills instruction, orientation and mobility instruction, community access instruction, daily living skills instruction, sensory efficiency skills, overview of the history of education of the blind and

visually impaired in America, and accommodations to instructional materials and the learning environment.

- Specific pedagogy for the deaf and hard of hearing includes the use of assistive technology to access the curriculum, self advocacy, auditory/oral training, cochlear implant support, American Sign Language, overview of the history of deaf education in America, sensory efficiency skills, social skills, communication skills, and accommodations to instructional materials and the learning environment.
- We currently serve 25 students with visual impairments and 30 students with hearing impairments in PK-12.

Early Childhood-Non Categorical

- The early childhood non-categorical (EC non-cat) classrooms are designed to provide intense early intervention for students aged 3-5 years old with developmental disabilities requiring specialized instruction in the areas of academic, social, communication, behavioral, and functional life skills.
- The EC non-cat classroom is considered the homeroom for students enrolled and includes opportunities for students to participate in activities with their typically developing peers as indicated on their IEP.
- EC non-cat classrooms can have a maximum of 10 students and are staffed with a special education teacher and one instructional aide.
- A modified version of the school's instructional model is utilized, including an aligned literacy block with a focus on intensive reading instruction.
- Instruction is based on the Early Childhood standards and is aligned to the Common Core where appropriate. Students are assessed using the Gold Assessment, which is utilized in all PS/PK classrooms to assess academic and developmental milestones.
- Title I schools provide Head Start comprehensive services to children including family support services and assistance in accessing health, dental, and nutrition.
- The 2012 school year opened with two additional classrooms, to total 11 EC non-cat classrooms.

Tools of the Mind Inclusion Classrooms

- Tools of the Mind Inclusion classes are comprised of 6 students with IEPs and 10 typically-developing students, all aged 3-5 years old.
- The classes are staffed with a teacher certified in both general education and special education and 2 instructional aides.
- Tools of the Mind is a curriculum focused on developing self-regulation and executive functioning skills. Students that benefit the most from Tools of the Mind have joint attention, some communication skills, and imitation skills.
- There are 6 Tools of the Mind Inclusion Classes in DC Public Schools including 2 classes added in SY12 that serve the needs of students with sensory

impairments utilizing the tools curriculum.

Behavioral & Educational Support (BES)

- BES is a district-wide program for elementary and secondary students with disabilities who exhibit behavior challenges that greatly impact their ability to learn in the classroom setting.
- The program supports students in developing appropriate behaviors, analyzing inappropriate behaviors and practicing replacement behaviors. These classes are for students in need of full-time, self-contained settings for emotional and behavioral support.
- DCPS has contracted with numerous vendors to provide additional support and professional development to the program. The vendors include: Positive Nature, Solutions Educational Consultants and Life Space Crisis Intervention. The goal for students is to develop individual skills where they can return to a lesser restrictive environment.
- Their degree of inclusion: Included as appropriate and determined by IEPs
- Maximum student-to-staff ratios: 10:3
- Specific pedagogical methods: Principles of Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports, Applied Behavior Analysis, operant conditioning, Maslow's hierarchy or reinforcement, alignment to Common Core State Standards and hybrid learning through PLATO on-line instruction.
- A description of the needs of students for whom the program is designed: significant behavior support, including transition support from a non-public setting
- The average enrollment in each program over the past school year is 75%. Students are referred; and they transition in and out of the program throughout the school year.
- The maximum number of students that the program can accommodate is 208

Q64: What are the specific plans for increasing inclusion of students with special education and related service needs in their neighborhood schools? Please provide plans for the upcoming school year and include strategies to build capacity for students returning from non-public placement. Please also explain the following:

- The number of students DCPS anticipates will be moving back into the system in SY 13-14;

DCPS anticipated the return of 184 students from non-public settings. This number is merely a projection since it is dependent on the regular review of all students in non-public settings and a determination by the IEP team as to the readiness of the student to return to a less restrictive setting. DCPS is a part of the IEP team that includes the parents and staff from the non-public school as well. The review must also entail an analysis of whether DCPS has or will have the capacity to serve the student appropriately within DCPS.

Currently, the Nonpublic Unit is supporting the transition of nearly 200

nonpublic students to less restrictive environments in local schools. DCPS realizes that the success of this initiative rests largely on community and parent support. To that end, Progress Monitors conduct monthly formal observations of students identified as potential candidates for transition to a less restrictive environment and will share information gathered from these observations at student progress meetings held three times over the course of the school year. These meetings provide parents and DCPS the opportunity to carefully review student progress and discuss parent concerns to foster productive working relationships with these important stakeholders. As part of this engagement effort, the Chief of Special Education will hold a community forum for parents of nonpublic students. This community event will provide parents the opportunity to learn about the long-term vision of the Office of Special Education, as well as hear about the specific programs and learning opportunities that will support students returning to local programs from nonpublic schools.

- DCPS’s plan to ensure their educational needs are met once they re-enter DCPS;

OSE is focusing in student achievement in reading to build inclusion opportunities. This includes the cross-functional literacy team, which will develop a criteria, guidance and support for diagnostic reading assessments, interventions and curriculum. We are increasing the access of students with disabilities to reading interventions that are available to non-disabled peers to smooth transitions into general education. We offer school-based technical support, model instructional strategies and provide professional development cycles in the areas of co-teaching and specialized instruction. Many of the middle and high school students will be moving into programs that are using blended learning to support their educational needs. This allows for better differentiation across a class. In addition, DCPS projects students from non-public settings into schools to ensure the related services needs can be met.

OSE is piloting GOALBOOK in three schools this spring. GOALBOOK is an on-line IEP goal bank aligned to the Common Core State Standards. It includes short-term objectives, instructional strategies, back-mapping to student level of functioning and Universal Design for Learning suggestions. Teachers in three schools that span grades PK-8 will receive training and provide feedback to OSE so that we can determine if a District-wide expansion is warranted. OSE believes this technology will increase IEP quality, operationalize IEP goals into instructional strategies and ultimately provide students with disabilities with greater access to the Common Core.

In addition to the academic interventions, DCPS wants to ensure the social emotional needs of all students including those returning from non-public settings are being met. Beyond the presence of social workers in DCPS schools, the Office of Special Education has been working with schools to provide several

new interventions based on the needs of students in schools. These include the Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS), designed to address acute exposure to trauma, Structured Psychotherapy for Adolescents Responding to Chronic Stress (SPARCS), designed to address the chronic exposure to stress and trauma that DCPS students experience in the community, and Cannabis Youth Treatment, designed to address marijuana abuse/dependency in students.

and

– DCPS’s parent engagement plan for this process.

Because parents serve as DCPS’ most important partners in ensuring the success of their child’s education, the Nonpublic Unit has significantly increased its engagement with these critical stakeholders over this school year. Progress Monitors communicate directly with parents as part of the special education monitoring and IEP process to ensure that IEP teams address parent concerns and incorporate their suggestions into education programs. Progress Monitors also have scheduled weekly office hours at each nonpublic school. Office hours allow parents the opportunity to meet directly DCPS staff to discuss their concerns and student progress. Progress Monitors are also available to meet with parents by appointment and by request. The Nonpublic Unit also holds quarterly parent nights as a way to help parents better support their children in the learning process. At these events, experts and community advocates have presented on topics ranging from helping students with transitions in the community and in the home to strategies that parents can use to support and inspire learning in their homes.

Q65: How many developmental screenings did the Early Stages program conduct in FY12 and FY13 to date? How many screenings required in-depth evaluations? Please list the timeframe it took to complete the evaluations (i.e. the number of evaluations that were completed within 90 days, within 120 days, and the total that took longer than 120 days).

Screenings in FY12, FY13 to date:

FY12: 4,312 screened (includes children with existing current screenings who were re-referred)

FY13: 792 screened (includes children with existing current screenings who were re-referred). We will begin to see an increase in totals once we begin Head Start screenings in April.

Screenings indicating “Evaluate”:

FY12: Of the 4,312 screened, 1,744 indicated “evaluate” (40%)

FY13: Of the 792 screened, 493 indicated “evaluate” (62%)

NOTE: the FY13 percentage will adjust down when screenings begin in April for Head Start SY13/14. For reference, the comparable numbers for FY11: 3,660/1,357 (37%).

Following is a depiction of our timeline compliance for evaluation completion:

FY12 Timeframe Data

	Total # Students
Less Than 120 days	331
Less Than 90 days	246
Over 120 days	130
Grand Total	707

FY13 Timeframe Data

	Total # of Students
Less Than 120 days	13
Less Than 90 days	28
No Elig Event	156
Grand Total	197

Q66: DCPS is responsible for overseeing the education of wards of the state who are educated outside of the District. Please describe DCPS’s mechanisms, if any, to provide this oversight of these individuals who are enrolled in public schools in other states. Does the oversight differ depending on whether the ward is identified as eligible for special education? If so, please describe how it differs.

There has been a lack of clarity in the roles of oversight for wards of the state. OSSE, DCPS and CFSA are working collaboratively to more clearly define those roles and will share those with the Council when the relationship is defined later this school year.

Student Attendance and Discipline

- Q67: Please provide the following attendance data for the entire agency by grade level and by school and by grade-level for the 2012-2013 school year to date, including any non-public school attended by students with a disability:
- The number and percent of students with 1-5 unexcused absences;
 - The number and percent of students with 6-10 unexcused absences;
 - The number and percent of students with 11-20 unexcused absences;
 - The number and percent of students with 21+ or more unexcused absences;
 - Of the truant cases for students who have missed 10+ days please state how many have been referred to CFSA and please provide a narrative describing the root causes of the unexcused absences;
 - and
 - For cases involving students 14 years and older, how many per school have been referred to CSS?

[See "Q67 Attachment_student attendance data."](#)

- Q68: DCPS uses the STARS system to collect data regarding attendance and truancy for all enrolled students. Please provide the following information regarding the data collection, data sharing, and interaction with, the STARS system:
- Who is responsible for recording attendance and inputting the data into the STARS system at each school?
 - At the central office level who is responsible for overseeing the collection of attendance data from schools and in what department are they located?
 - At what intervals does DCPS receive attendance data from individual schools?
 - How is the data provided from the STARS system to OSSE? How is the data broken down? (i.e. by school, grade, type of absence, numbers of days, etc.)?
 - How does the STARS system interact with OSSE's SLED data collection system?
 - How does DCPS utilize the interaction between STARS and other district agencies including law enforcement, the courts, and the state education agency, in order to reduce truancy at all of the District's public schools?

[We are compiling the most current information for this section and will submit to the Committee as soon as possible prior to our agency performance hearing.](#)

- Q69: Please describe in detail DCPS's programs or interventions to address students' truancy, including the high school case management program, truancy STAT, and the Byer model. Please include:
- The number of students each truancy program serves;
 - An account of any progress made in each program/initiative; and

- Plans to expand truancy prevention programs.

Q70: Please describe how DCPS is working to timely implement the provisions of the South Capitol Street Memorial Act of 2012? Please indicate DCPS' progress in implementing the following provisions of the South Capitol Street Memorial Act:

- Sec 203, That schools are collaborating with the executive to plan the expansion of school-based behavioral health programs;
- Sec 304 (a), That schools have or are adopting policies and procedures to reduce truancy rates, including implementing action plans or other strategies;
- Sec 304(b)(2), That schools are referring the appropriate students to CFSA and CSS after acquiring consecutive unexcused absences;

We are compiling the most current information for this section and will submit to the Committee as soon as possible prior to our agency performance hearing.

Q71: Please provide an update on the work of the school-based student support teams to address the needs of truant students. In your response please indicate which schools have school-based student support teams, which schools do not, and the number of students referred to and served by these teams in SY12-13.

See "Q71 Attachment_SSTs."

Q72: The "July 2012 Annual Truancy Report" submitted by *DCPS/Office of Youth Engagement* made several policy recommendations to address truancy including making transportation more affordable, improving interagency coordination, and enhancing support for students transitioning from middle to high school. What progress has DCPS made on implementing these policy recommendations?

We are compiling the most current information for this section and will submit to the Committee as soon as possible prior to our agency performance hearing.

Q73: Please provide the following data for the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school year to date by school and by grade level:

- The number and percent of students suspended for 1-10 days;
- The number and percent of students suspended more than 10 days in total, by school, and by grade-level;
- The number and percent of students expelled by school and by grade level;
- The number and percent of suspensions and expulsions that involved special education students;
- The number of students that were referred to an Alternative Educational Setting for the course of a suspension; and
- A narrative describing the types of disciplinary actions that led to the suspensions and expulsions.

See "Q73 Attachment_student discipline data."

Q74: Please describe the type of Alternative Educational Settings that are provided to suspended or expelled students and how DCPS ensures these settings are able to provide adequate education to these students.

We are compiling the most current information for this section and will submit to the Committee as soon as possible prior to our agency performance hearing.