



MURIEL BOWSER  
MAYOR

March 31, 2023

The Honorable Phil Mendelson  
Chairman  
Council of the District of Columbia  
John A. Wilson Building  
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 504  
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Chairman Mendelson:

I am pleased to submit to the Council of the District of Columbia the enclosed *Report on the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula*, which was prepared by the Office of the State Superintendent for Education ("OSSE") pursuant to section 112 of the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula for Public Schools and Public Charter Schools Act of 1998, effective March 26, 1999 (D.C. Law 12-207; D.C. Official Code § 38-2911).

This report outlines the findings and recommendations of the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula ("UPSFF") working group, convened by OSSE and composed of representatives from DC Public Schools, DC public charter schools, the DC Public Charter School Board, the public, and other government representatives. The UPSFF working group met monthly from September 2022 to January 2023 and reviewed information on the current adult school landscape, historic changes to the UPSFF weights, and the school year 2021-2022 Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers scores. Information about the working group, including meeting recordings, are available on the OSSE website at: <https://osse.dc.gov/node/1615856>.

I am available to discuss any questions you may have regarding this report. In order to facilitate a response to your questions, please contact Paul Kihn, Deputy Mayor for Education, at [paul.kihn@dc.gov](mailto:paul.kihn@dc.gov) or (202) 765-7178.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Muriel Bowser".

Muriel Bowser  
Enclosures



District of Columbia  
Office of the State Superintendent of Education

# OSSE'S REPORT ON THE UNIFORM PER STUDENT FUNDING FORMULA

March 2023

# Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Description of the 2022 UPSFF Working Group.....	2
UPSFF Overview .....	3
Working Group Process for Prioritizing Funding Formula Adjustment Options .....	5
Adult Weight Review .....	6
Current Adult Public School Landscape.....	6
Current Adult Weight .....	7
School Year 2021-22 Statewide Assessment Data Review.....	8
Working Group Recommendations.....	9
Weight Recommendations: Adult Student Weight.....	9
Weight Recommendations: Students Designated as At-Risk.....	9
Weight Recommendations: Foundation Level .....	10
Technical Recommendations: UPSFF Technical Working Group .....	10
Technical Recommendations: 2023 Adequacy Study .....	10
Appendix A: Working Group Members.....	12
Appendix B: UPSFF Foundation Level and Weights .....	13
Appendix C: Public Comment .....	15

## Introduction

Section 112(a)(2) of the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula for Public Schools and Public Charter Schools Act of 1998 (UPSFF Act), effective March 26, 1999 (DC Law 12-207; DC Official Code § 38-2911(a)(2)), requires the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) to submit, on behalf of the Mayor, a report to the Council of the District of Columbia every two years that reviews that Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) formula and includes recommendations for revisions to the formula. The Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME), with support from OSSE and other Executive Office of the Mayor offices, has and continues to analyze and review the formula, including but not limited to, student academic outcomes, local education agency (LEA) needs, at-risk funding, English learner (EL) student needs and overall fiscal impact.

Per DC Official Code § 38-2911(a)(1), OSSE convened a UPSFF Working Group (working group) with representatives of DC Public Schools (DCPS), DC public charter schools, DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB), the public, and government representatives to solicit input and recommendations regarding revisions to the formula. The Final Report compiled by OSSE and DME with recommendations from the UPSFF Working Group members regarding revisions to the formula is presented below. The working group met monthly from September 2022 to January 2023 and reviewed information on the current adult school landscape, historic changes to the UPSFF weights and the results of the 2021-22 school year Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) results. The working group also considered and discussed the challenges of the timing of convening the working group in the context of the coronavirus (COVID-19) global public health crisis, the upcoming 2023 Adequacy Study and recent increases to UPSFF weights.

## Description of the 2022 UPSFF Working Group

OSSE convened a UPSFF Working Group pursuant to DC Official Code § 38-2911(a)(2), and staff members from DME and OSSE facilitated the sessions. The members of the working group included representatives from DCPS, public charter schools, the public, and government representatives who provided input and recommendations regarding revisions to the formula.

The working group's membership included a variety of vantage points to best provide robust context to the group's discussions, and ultimately, this report. The working group was jointly facilitated by DME and OSSE staff. DCPS' representatives were from the Office of Resource Strategy, including those focused on school funding and budget strategy. From the public charter sector, representatives from Paul PCS, Academy of Hope PCS, Appletree PCS, E.L. Haynes PCS, Washington Latin PCS, KIPP DC PCS, Briya PCS, Thurgood Marshall Academy PCS and Capital City PCS were present. Government representatives included those from the Office of Budget and Performance Management (OBPM), DC PCSB, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) and DME. Other advocacy and local research individuals and groups focused on education funding participated, including the Federal City Council, DC Policy Center, Education Reform Now, DC Fiscal Policy

Institute, DC Senior High Alliance of Parents, Principals and Educators (SHAPPE), EdOps and Education Forward. Working group members are listed in Appendix A.

All meetings for the working group were public, and members of the public were invited to provide comment at each meeting. The meetings took place virtually on the following dates and times:

- Thursday, Sept. 15, 3-5 p.m.
- Thursday, Oct. 6, 3-5 p.m.
- Thursday, Nov. 10, 3-5 p.m.
- Thursday, Dec. 1, 3-5 p.m.
- Thursday, Dec. 15, 3-5 p.m.
- Thursday, Jan. 5, 3-4 p.m.

Topics for the working group's consideration focused on the adult weight and program landscape, the results of the 2021-22 school year PARCC scores and the 2023 Adequacy Study. Additional details about these topics are described below.

Membership, meeting notices, and meeting recordings for these meetings are available on the UPSFF Working Group section of OSSE's website.<sup>1</sup> In addition, OSSE published notice of the meetings in the *D.C. Register*.<sup>2</sup>

## UPSFF Overview

The District's UPSFF was first implemented in the 1999-2000 school year, following the passage of the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula for Public Schools and Public Charter Schools Act of 1998, effective March 26, 1999 (DC Law 12-207; DC Official Code § 38- 2901 et seq.), and is intended to be the mechanism to provide local funding for students in all LEAs. The funding formula is based on enrollment and sets forth a minimum foundational level required to adequately fund education; for the 2022-23 school year (fiscal year 2023, or FY23) the foundation level is \$12,419. The UPSFF allocates local funds only, but formula deliberations have taken into account levels of federal funding and other revenues that support public education in Washington, DC.

Funding amounts are determined using the foundation level and the funding weights. A weight is a multiplication factor applied to the foundation cost for student counts in certain grade levels or special needs programs to account for differences in the cost of educating these students.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2022-23 Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) Working Group, OFF. OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUC., <https://osse.dc.gov/node/1615856> (last visited Mar. 13, 2023).

<sup>2</sup> 69 D.C. Reg. 11324 (Sept. 16, 2022).

Funding weights are divided into two categories: the general education weight and supplemental weights. Each student enrolled in an LEA is designated with one, and only one, general education weight that aligns to their grade-level or school program.

The general education weights are listed below:

- Pre-Kindergarten 3
- Pre-Kindergarten 4
- Kindergarten
- Grades 1-5
- Grades 6-8
- Grades 9-12
- Alternative program
- Special Education school
- Adult Education

In addition to the general education weight, a student may also be designated as eligible for one or more supplemental weights. An LEA will receive funding for each of the supplemental weights applicable to an individual student.

The supplemental weights are listed below:

- English Learner
- At-Risk
- Special Education
- Residential

To calculate the funding amount that an LEA will receive for a student, the foundation level is multiplied by the funding weights associated with each student. For example, for a sixth-grade student enrolled in an LEA, the LEA will receive  $\$12,419 \times 1.08$ , for a total of \$13,413. If that student is also designated as an at-risk student, the LEA will also receive  $\$12,419 \times 0.24$ , for a total of \$2,981. See Appendix B for a full list of the general education and supplemental weights, along with funding amounts for the 2022-2023 school year.

In addition to the foundational funding level and percentage add-ons for particular student characteristics, the formula also provides funding to cover facilities costs at public charter schools on a per pupil basis. For the 2022-23 school year, the facilities allotment rate is \$3,413 for non-residential facilities and \$9,486 for residential facilities.

Throughout the past 20 years, the funding formula has been periodically revised, with funding categories added or removed, and funding levels adjusted. The UPSFF rates are determined each annual budgeting process by using the current fiscal year's rates as a base and building upon that by considering a variety of factors. First, the prior year's foundation amount is considered. Next, the impact of expected cost increases, including DCPS personnel costs associated with union contracts and non-personnel DCPS costs such as energy, are considered. Then, enrollment projection analysis is completed for both DCPS and the charter sector to determine the anticipated enrollment for each LEA. Finally, revenue estimates from the OCFO's Office of Revenue Analysis (ORA) are also considered, along with the overall budget for the District

government. This annual process has resulted in the foundation level increasing most fiscal years. The supplemental weights typically stay constant year to year, with moments of intentional change.

Adjustments made to the UPSFF in the fiscal year 2022 (FY22) budget included:

- A 3.7 percent increase to the foundation level from \$11,310 to \$11,730;
- An increase to the Alternative weight from 1.445 to 1.52;
- The creation of an Elementary EL and Secondary EL weight - 0.50 and 0.75, respectively. These weights replaced the EL weight.
- An increase to the At-Risk weight from .2256 to .24; and
- The creation of a High School Over-Age Supplement, with a weight of 0.06.

Adjustments made to the UPSFF in the FY23 budget included:

- A 5.9 percent increase to the foundation level from \$11,730 to \$12,419;
- An increase to the adult weight from 0.89 to 0.91;
- An increase to the Facilities Allowance for public charter schools from \$3,408 to \$3,513 for non-residential facilities and from \$9,202 to \$9,486 for residential facilities;
- The creation of a Pandemic Supplement Fund; and
- The creation of an At-Risk Concentration >40 percent and At-Risk Concentration >70 percent weight – 0.05 for both categories.

## Working Group Process for Prioritizing Funding Formula Adjustment Options

The working group first convened in early September to discuss potential priority areas for the subsequent meetings. The working group acknowledged the challenges of recommending changes to the at-risk and EL weights, given recent budget cycles have increased those weights, and it is too early to see the impact that these changes have had on school budgeting decisions and student outcomes. The working group recommended starting with a review of the adult weight and then reviewing grade level and/or special education weights. In subsequent working group meetings in the fall, members reviewed existing information about the adult public school landscape, findings from the Adequacy Study and details on the structure of the adult weight relative to the alternative and high school weights. In addition, the working group reviewed the latest District statewide assessment data from the PARCC exam, disaggregated by subpopulation, and discussed results in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Finally, the working group spent time during the final sessions discussing the challenges of the cadence and structure of the working group given limited access to data, ongoing legislative changes to school funding and the upcoming Adequacy Study. As a result, members discussed potential proposals to improve the working group structure moving forward.

## Adult Weight Review

The working group reviewed existing facts about the adult weight and the adult public school landscape. Currently, adult education is defined in DC Code as services or instruction below the college level for adults who:

- a) Lack sufficient mastery of basic educational skills to enable them to function effectively in society;
- b) Do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education and who have not achieved an equivalent level of education; or
- c) Have limited ability in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language and whose native language is a language other than English.

## Current Adult Public School Landscape

The District of Columbia is fortunate to offer free public education for learners from three years old through adulthood. The District is home to the largest concentration of adult-serving schools in the US, thus creating a unique slate of adult education offerings unlike any other state or locality in the country. Adult schools serve learners with some of the highest needs in the District, including those who have yet to complete high school, recently arrived immigrants, returning citizens, individuals seeking entry-level workforce credentials and students who have experienced interrupted education.

At the time of the FY22 enrollment audit, 5,069 students attended adult education schools—an 8 percent increase from the prior year and comparable to pre-pandemic enrollment levels.<sup>3</sup> However, current adult learners represent only a fraction of DC residents without a high school diploma and/or who may have low literacy. According to 2020 Census data, about 53,000 District adults lack a high school diploma, while around 90,000 adults are functionally illiterate, based on 2017 Washington Literacy Center estimates.<sup>4</sup>

Adult learners constitute 5.4 percent of total District public school enrollment and are spread across 13 schools: 10 public charter schools and three DCPS Opportunity Academies. In 2021, 92 percent of adult

---

<sup>3</sup> In the enrollment audit, OSSE publishes data for Audited Enrollment by Grade, which is the number of audited enrollments by grade for each District sector. This number includes UPSFF, non-public students, tuition-paying students, and unverified residents. OSSE also publishes data for District Enrollment Counts by UPSFF Category. Students that are categorized as Adult in the Audited Enrollment by Grade could be categorized in a different UPSFF category, such as High School, Adult, Alternative, or Special Education.

<sup>4</sup> Rachel M. Cohen, *Where D.C. Has Failed on Adult Education, Charter Schools Fill the Void*, Washington City Paper (July 13, 2017) <https://washingtoncitypaper.com/article/190057/where-dc-has-failed-on-adult-education-charter-schools-fill-the-void/>.



students attended DC public charter schools while the remaining eight percent attended one of DCPS's Opportunity Academies.

Public charter schools and DCPS Opportunity Academies offer pathways to high school diplomas through GED preparation or the National External Diploma Program (NEDP), which include academic and career-readiness curricula tailored to meet the needs of adult learners. Students can also take classes to improve their English and literacy skills or earn credentials in several industries, including education, construction, hospitality, healthcare, and technology.

In addition to academic offerings, adult schools meet their students' non-academic needs through extensive wraparound supports to reduce any barriers that may impede their education to help them succeed at school. These include assistance with benefits coverage, access to health care, nutritional assistance, mental health support, employment services, parenting classes, transportation, and consultation on immigration law.

## Current Adult Weight

The District's adult learner population is the only grade band currently funded below the foundation level, which for FY23 is **\$12,419** per student. Schools serving adult learners receive a weight of 0.91, which represents 91 percent of the foundation level: **\$11,301**.

In 2014, the DME completed a cost-effectiveness analysis of the District's education budget. The Adequacy Study provided recommendations for more effective and efficient funding based upon adequate staffing levels to support high-quality education. Table 1 contains a comparison of the recommended weights from the Adequacy Study with the current FY23 weights and allocations.

Working group members noted that, currently, adult education is nine percent below the recommended weight. In addition, the actual allocations for each grade band—excluding alternative—have increased by \$3,489 on average since the Adequacy Study whereas adult education has only increased by \$744.

*Table 1. Comparison between Adequacy Study and FY23 Weights*

Grade Band	2014 Rec. Weight	2014 Rec. Allocation	FY23 Weights	FY23 Allocation	Difference 2014 to 2023
PK3	1.15	\$12,141	1.34	\$16,641	+0.19 // \$4,500
PK4	1.15	\$12,141	1.30	\$16,145	+0.15 // \$4,004
K	1.00	\$10,557	1.30	\$16,145	+0.30 // \$5,588
1-5	1.00	\$10,557	1.00	\$12,419	0.00 // \$1,862
6-8	1.01	\$10,663	1.08	\$13,413	+0.07 // \$2,750
9-12	1.10	\$11,613	1.22	\$15,151	+0.12 // \$3,538
Alternative	1.73	\$18,264	1.52	\$18,877	-0.21 // \$613
SpEd Schools	1.17	\$12,352	1.17	\$14,530	0.00 // \$2,178
Adult	1.00	\$10,557	0.91	\$11,301	-0.09 // \$744

OSSE and DME requested additional data from the adult charter schools on operating and staffing models, but the working group cited challenges in providing that data across schools given time and resources. The working group was able to review the current staffing levels of one example adult charter school at the November 10, 2022, meeting.<sup>5</sup> This analysis found that total instructional staff at the school were about 40 percent lower than the Adequacy Study recommendations, including instructional aides and specialists/interventionists that were 50-60 percent lower. Similarly, student support staff was 80 percent lower than the Adequacy Study recommendations. This resulted in a student-to-instructional staff ratio of about 18-20:1, which is well above the recommended 8-10:1 ratio from the Adequacy Study.

## School Year 2021-22 Statewide Assessment Data Review

The working group reviewed data from OSSE and data visualizations from EmpowerK12 of results from the 2021-22 school year statewide PARCC assessment.<sup>6</sup> The working group looked at the results by grade band and by special population subgroups.

The working group noted the challenges of increasing a specific grade band weight, given the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic will likely have lasting impacts on a specific cohort of students, who will continuously move through grade bands. The working group discussed possible ways to target supports to these students specifically, such as continuing the Pandemic Supplement fund, which the District funded in FY23.

When reviewing the results disaggregated by special populations, the working group noted the significant gaps between students who receive special education services and students who do not. The working group discussed the complexities of special education services and related UPSFF funding, including the limitations of the current special education levels.

The UPSFF currently provides funding based on special education levels, defined by the hours of specialized services that a student receives. Several working group members noted that this may not account for costs that are independent of service level but based on need, such as testing, communication devices, administrative paperwork and instructional/behavioral aides. Additionally, the working group discussed that, particularly for students with significant needs, the funding is insufficient to cover a 1:1 aide. The working group discussed the importance of more detailed analysis to inform whether the current levels are providing the appropriate level of differentiation between student need.

---

<sup>5</sup> UPSFF Working Group – November 2022 Meeting, OFF. OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUC., <https://osse.dc.gov/node/1632381> (last visited Mar. 13, 2023).

<sup>6</sup> 2021-22 PARCC and MSAA Results and Resources: <https://osse.dc.gov/page/2021-22-parcc-and-msaa-results-and-resources>; EmpowerK12 DC PARCC Dashboard: <https://www.empowerk12.org/data-dashboard-source/dc-parcc-dash>

## Working Group Recommendations

Based on working group member discussion, materials provided before and during the working group meetings and the context of the forthcoming 2023 Adequacy Study, the working group members developed both weight-specific recommendations and recommendations for the technical approach of the working group moving forward. The working group members emphasized the complexities of developing weight-specific recommendations in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, recent changes to specific weights, the upcoming Adequacy Study and limited access to data.

### Weight Recommendations: Adult Student Weight

Working group members spent several sessions reviewing the current structure and definition of the adult weight, along with data provided by an adult public charter school. The working group discussed the population of students who qualify for the adult weight, the landscape of adult schools and programmatic offerings. The following summarizes the working group members' recommendation on the adult weight.

**Recommendation: The District should increase the funding weight for adult students to 100 percent of the foundation level**

The working group cited the challenges of conducting a full review of the operating models of multiple adult charter schools with the resource and time limitations of the working group. One adult school provided details on its staffing structure. In a review of that information and comparison to the 2013 Adequacy Study, the working group noted a significant gap between the number of support staff hired and the recommended staffing structure of the Adequacy Study. Several adult schools commented qualitatively, during the working group meetings, that they also experienced challenges maintaining competitive salary rates due to funding constraints. The working group expressed the opinion that, while the 2013 Adequacy Study findings are now 10 years old, raising the weight to 1.0 is a necessary step in equitably funding adult education in DC. Working group members also expressed that supporting adult education is an investment in DC families, as many adult students are also parents or caretakers of pre-K 3-Grade 12 public school students.

### Weight Recommendations: Students Designated as At-Risk

Working group members discussed the importance of equity and ensuring that students with higher needs receive the support they need. At the same time, the 2020 UPSFF Working Group looked closely at the at-risk weight. The FY23 budget included an increase to the at-risk weight, a supplemental weight for students who are overage in high school, and funding for schools that have a high concentration of students designated at-risk. A [recent report](#) on student attendance from OSSE noted the correlation between the percentage of students designated at-risk within a school and the average attendance at that school.

**The working group discussed several potential recommendations:**

- Increase funding for students designated at-risk to the weight of 0.37 recommended by the 2013 Adequacy Study.

- Increase funding for schools that educate a high concentration of students designated at-risk.
- Increase funding for students designated at-risk to the weight of 0.37 recommended by the 2013 Adequacy Study, with an additional increase to account for inflation.
- Explore changes and additions to the current at-risk designation criteria to ensure the definition fully captures all District students who would be income-eligible for SNAP or TANF but are not enrolled in those programs or otherwise are ineligible.

## Weight Recommendations: Foundation Level

The working group discussed potential recommendations for the foundation level in the final sessions. After briefly reviewing a few options, the working group felt that the bulk of the foundation-level recommendation should be informed by the 2023 Adequacy Study and the release of the Common Financial Reporting Standards data in 2024.

**The working group did reach consensus in recommending that the foundation-level increase, year-over-year, maintain at least growth with inflation, to cover rising costs at schools.**

## Technical Recommendations: UPSFF Technical Working Group

The working group discussed the challenges of meeting every two years, given changes to the UPSFF funding structure can happen annually. The working group cited, as examples, that the District will conduct an Adequacy Study in 2023 and the Common Financial Reporting Standards will release new information on school budgeting and expenditures in May 2024. There is an opportunity for additional small-scale studies on school funding.

**The working group recommended that the District convene a new ongoing *technical* UPSFF working group, convened by OSSE, to provide data and analysis that the larger legally mandated group could use to make recommendations to the Mayor.**

The working group offered that, in the FY24 budget, the District could include funding for a full-time staff person at OSSE and non-personnel costs to assist this new group. Having a new technical working group will provide the larger group with more information with which to make recommendations. Each year, in discussion with the larger group, the technical group could pursue small-scale studies on aspects of school funding. The working group discussed the size and make-up of the proposed technical group, recommending that it should remain small – about five people – with representatives across sectors, and include content-specific experts based on the topic areas for study.

## Technical Recommendations: 2023 Adequacy Study

The working group explored several larger topics during its time together but felt it did not have adequate information to provide recommendations. The working group, instead, felt that these questions were appropriate for the 2023 Adequacy Study to address.

**The working group recommended that the 2023 Adequacy Study address two questions raised by the working group:**

- (1) What are the full costs of educating students with disabilities in the District?
- (2) What would it cost the District to expand the at-risk criteria definition and encompass families whose income would qualify them for SNAP or TANF but for whatever reason do not receive those benefits?

On special education funding, there was a robust discussion during one working group meeting about this topic. Participants discussed the fact that schools incur costs for educating students with disabilities beyond the number of hours for which a student receives services. The 2023 Adequacy Study should ensure that it is evaluating the full costs of educating students with disabilities and developing a funding structure that recognizes the varying levels of supports that may be needed within each level.

Additionally, there are two schools in the District – River Terrace and St. Coletta – that serve an exceptionally high-needs population and are funded through the special education school weight.

On the at-risk criteria definition, working group members raised the concern that many students in the District may not receive SNAP or TANF benefits even though their family's income would qualify them for such benefits. In the 2021-22 school year, 46 percent of public school students (42,525 students) who were designated as at-risk meet the criteria because their families receive SNAP/TANF benefits. Families can access SNAP benefits if their income is at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level (\$55,500 for a family of four). TANF is available to families earning a lower income level. Families do not automatically qualify for these benefits and must enroll. Undocumented residents are ineligible for SNAP. However, residents who earn at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level are eligible for the DC Healthcare Alliance Program (the Alliance) and may be eligible for other programs through the District government. The at-risk weight was created to help close the gap between students from families with lower incomes and those from families with higher incomes. While the current eligibility criteria are a useful proxy for income, several working group members expressed concerns that many students whose families have low incomes do not qualify for these programs and therefore their schools do not receive the additional at-risk funding. The working group recommended that the 2023 Adequacy Study determine what it would cost if students could qualify for the at-risk designation through the Alliance or similar programs.

**The working group also recommended that the 2023 Adequacy Study incorporate, in its cost estimates, consideration of the non-academic functions that a school provides to support students.**

The working group noted that there has been an increase in expectations for what non-academic supports are offered in schools. Some of these are funded through citywide resources, such as DC Health nurses and Department of Behavioral Health clinicians, and some are funded by the school, such as school psychologists, additional school security staff, or administrative staff to support with background checks. The working group recommended that the Adequacy Study take these costs into consideration, as part of its analysis of the foundation level.

The working group also expressed a desire to remain engaged with the 2023 Adequacy Study during the length of the study, to inform future recommendations.

## Appendix A: Working Group Members

### Facilitators

Ryan Aurori, Office of the State Superintendent for Education  
Michelle Yan, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education  
Patrice Swift-Taylor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education

### Members

Michael Bayuk, DC Public Charter School Board  
Josh Boots, EmpowerK12  
Abraham Clayman, Federal City Council  
Chelsea Coffin, DC Policy Center  
Jenn Comey, Deputy Mayor for Education  
Jeannette Fernandez, Office of Budget and Performance Management  
Allen Francois, District of Columbia Public Schools  
Sharon Gaskins, District of Columbia Public Schools  
Jessica Giles, Education Reform Now  
William Henderson, Paul PCS  
Qubilah Huddleston, DC Fiscal Policy Institute  
Leicester Johnson, Academy of Hope PCS  
Mary Levy, Independent  
Jack McCarthy, Appletree PCS  
Alonso Montalvo, Office of the Chief Financial Officer  
Stephen Regis, Office of the Chief Financial Officer  
Cathy Reilly, DCSHAPPE  
Allison Rohde, District of Columbia Public Schools  
Justin Rydstrom, E.L. Haynes PCS/Washington Latin  
Nate Schwartz, KIPP DC PCS  
Atima Shahi, EdOps  
Ashley Simpson Baird, Briya PCS  
Drew Snyder, DC Public Charter School Board  
Raymond Weeden, Thurgood Marshall Academy PCS  
Jonathan Weinstein, Capital City PCS  
Kevin Wenzel, District of Columbia Public Schools  
Margie Yeager, Education Forward DC

## Appendix B: UPSFF Foundation Level and Weights

FY23 UPSFF Rates		
<b>Foundation level per pupil</b>		<b>\$ 12,419</b>
<b>Non-Residential Facilities Allotment:</b>		<b>\$ 3,513</b>
<b>Residential Facilities Allotment:</b>		<b>\$ 9,486</b>
<b>General Education</b>		<b>Per Pupil</b>
<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
Pre-Kindergarten 3	1.34	\$ 16,641
Pre-Kindergarten 4	1.30	\$ 16,145
Kindergarten	1.30	\$ 16,145
Grades 1	1.00	\$ 12,419
Grades 2	1.00	\$ 12,419
Grades 3	1.00	\$ 12,419
Grades 4	1.00	\$ 12,419
Grades 5	1.00	\$ 12,419
Grades 6	1.08	\$ 13,413
Grades 7	1.08	\$ 13,413
Grades 8	1.08	\$ 13,413
Grades 9	1.22	\$ 15,151
Grades 10	1.22	\$ 15,151
Grades 11	1.22	\$ 15,151
Grades 12	1.22	\$ 15,151
Alternative	1.52	\$ 18,877
Special Ed Schools	1.17	\$ 14,530
Adult	0.91	\$ 11,301
<b>Subtotal General Education</b>		
<b>Special Education</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
Level 1	0.97	\$ 12,046
Level 2	1.20	\$ 14,903
Level 3	1.97	\$ 24,465
Level 4	3.49	\$ 43,342
<b>Subtotal for Special Ed</b>		
Special Education Compliance	0.099	\$ 1,229
Attorney's Fees Supplement	0.089	\$ 1,105
<b>Subtotal Special Ed Compliance</b>		<b>\$ 2,334</b>

OSSE's Report on the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula

<b>English Language Learners</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
Elementary - EL	0.50	\$ 6,210
Secondary - EL	0.75	\$ 9,314
<b>Special Education-Residential</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
Level 1 Residential	0.370	\$ 4,595
Level 2 Residential	1.340	\$ 16,641
Level 3 Residential	2.890	\$ 35,891
Level 4 Residential	2.890	\$ 35,891
<i>Subtotal for Special Ed Residential</i>		
<b>English as a Second Language Residential</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
LEP/NEP Residential	0.668	\$ 8,296
<b>Residential</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
Residential	1.67	\$ 20,740
<b>At-Risk</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
At-Risk Students	0.24	\$ 2,981
HS Over-Age Supplement	0.06	\$ 745
<b>Special Education Add-ons &amp; (ESY)</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
Level 1 ESY	0.063	\$ 782
Level 2 ESY	0.227	\$ 2,819
Level 3 ESY	0.491	\$ 6,098
Level 4 ESY	0.491	\$ 6,098
<b>At-Risk Concentration</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>Allocation</b>
At-Risk Concentration > 40%	0.05	\$ 621
At-Risk Concentration > 70%	0.05	\$ 621
<b>Facilities Allowance (Charter Schools only)</b>		
Non-Residential Facilities Allotment		\$ 3,513
Residential Facilities Allotment		\$ 9,486
Pandemic Supplemental Fund		\$ 183.74



## Appendix C: Public Comment

January 18, 2023

**TO: Members of the UPSFF Working Group, Michelle Yan, Ryan Aurori**

**FR: Julie Camerata, Executive Director**

**RE: Recommendations for consideration**

We are fully in support of the adequacy study looking at special education funding - bothweighting andwhetherornotthecurrent “level” systemaccuratelycaptures the true costs of educating students withdiffering hours of service. Additionally, we’d like to offer the following items for consideration. All three are directly related to special education and if funded properly, have the potential to dramatically improve the quality of service provided to our students.

Funding for students placed in non-public settings. Currently, LEAs only receive IDEA Part B money for students placed in nonpublics. This is formula funding and is significantly less than the cost of providing oversight and monitoring to ensure that these students are receiving a quality education and whenever possible, are transitioned back to the LEA.

Recommendation: Createanadditionalfundingstreamsimilar to the compliance line and give each LEA a flat rate fee that covers the true costs of serving these students. The Co-op is piloting a nonpublic monitoring program for four LEA and would be happy to share time/expense data with the working group.

1. **Funding for Secondary Transition.** Currently, the mandate to provide secondary transition services to students with disabilities ages 14+ is unfunded. Transition services are separate and distinct from academic supports (specialized instruction) and related services and are not accounted for in the hours calculations on the IEP. Data shows that post secondary outcomes for our students with disabilities are bleak. Nearly 50% of these students are not enrolled in postsecondary education or employed one year after high school. This mirrors national unemployment numbers for people with disabilities. If the city is committed to dramatically increasing the number of students with disabilities who are self-sustaining, it must invest at the secondary level.

**Recommendation:** Create weighted secondary transition funding for each student with a disability beginning at age 14+. As students progress through the grades, the weight increases.

3. **Funding for Multi-tiered systems of supports (MTSS).** Post-pandemic, we've seen a rise in the number of students being referred for special education evaluations. Based on what post-Katrina New Orleans experience, our city will most likely be in a recovery posture for years to come. Investing in strong MTSS at each LEA will not only increase the likelihood of each student receiving the intervention that they need, it will prevent students from inappropriately being diagnosed with a disability (which unfortunately, at this moment, means they will chronically underperform nondisabled peers, graduate at lower rates, etc.)

**Recommendation:** For the purpose of supporting all students with a Multi-tiered system of supports, increase the base level of Per Pupil Funding for each student.