



**Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Enrollment Audit Stakeholders Working Group Introductory Meeting Notes
June 18, 2012
3:30pm to 5:00pm
810 First Street, NE, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20002**

Present Members

Ann Willemsen, Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Jeff Noel, Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Mary Lord, DC State Board of Education
Joshua Thompson, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
Robert Cane, Friends of Choice in Public Schools
Lauren Outlaw, Friends of Choice in Public Schools
Kari Smith, Friendship Public Charter School
Ino Okoawo, DC Public Charter School Board
John Petersen, DC Public Schools
Giovannie Rivera, Office of the State Superintendent of Education

Absent Members

Carl Kullback, Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Vanessa Carlo-Miranda, EL Haynes Public Charter School
Dwight Franklin, Office of the State Superintendent of Education
Scheherazade Salimi, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
Irene Holtzman, KIPP Public Charter School
Naomi DeVeaux, DC Public Charter School Board
Julie Meyer, The Next Step Public Charter School
Russ Williams, Apple Tree Public Charter School
Brittney Autry, Apple Tree Public Charter School (transitioning to replace Russ Williams)
Elisabeth Morse, Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services



Absent Members (cont'd)

Ramona Edelin, DC Association of Chartered Public Schools

Keisha Hutchinson, Thurgood Marshall Academy Public Charter School

Updates on the School Year 2012 – 2013 Enrollment Audit

- The enrollment audit vendor contract solicitation remains on schedule.

Sample-Style Enrollment Audit Pilot

- OSSE will execute a pilot this upcoming school year to test the accuracy, effectiveness, and efficiency of a sample-style enrollment audit process. The agency seeks the Working Group’s input as to how this pilot should be developed. The underlying reason to move to a sample-style enrollment is to shorten the overall timeline to complete the annual student enrollment audit process in future years and to decrease the LEA level of effort to complete the audit for LEAs that consistently submit accurate enrollment data in their student information system (SIS).
- DC Code currently requires a census audit. This pilot is to test the feasibility of moving to a sample audit. If successful, the results will be used as evidence to support a process modification. However, it will take a change in the code to ultimately alter the current census requirement.
- OSSE presented the following benefits and concerns of a sample-style enrollment.

Potential Benefits	Areas of Concern
Shorten timeline to complete the enrollment audit (results earlier than February)	Limited benefit in early years as LEAs work to develop processes to submit accurate data in the SIS in time for October 5 th count
Reduce burden on the LEAs to demonstrate enrollment (provided they have submitted accurate data into the SIS)	Upfront “costs” of change (involves re-educating LEAs on a new process which leaves open the risk of misunderstanding and execution errors)
Potential reduction in auditor contract cost	



The underlying question is ACCURACY. Will the sample audit produce accurate results? The pilot's *primary* purpose is to address this question.

- Proposed process: OSSE sketched out an idea of how the sample audit could be performed. This sketch serves as a jumping-off point for discussion.
 - A random sample (sample size yet to be determined) would be taken of each *school's* student population. The sample would be based on an identified % of students, with a minimum floor in place to ensure precision. OSSE believes this sample floor could potentially be smaller than 50 students. In addition to the random sample of students, all students who show up as duplicates (enrolled in two or more schools) would also be added to the sample.
 - A low, acceptable “error threshold” would be established. This could be as few as one or two students, depending on sample size.
 - The audit of the sample may be performed as a head count or may use some other means to ensure enrollment.
 - If the number of errors in a school’s audited sample exceeded the error threshold, the school would then receive a full, census audit.
 - A school that had errors but did not exceed the threshold would not receive funding for the error students, however, the error rate would not be extrapolated across the total student population. Thus, all students on the roster, with the exception of an error student found in the audit, would be funded.
 - The proposed methodology leaves LEAs either at the same burden level (if their error rate triggers a census audit) or better off than the methodology currently used (if they have a low error rate that requires only the sample).

- The June 18th meeting is only the *beginning* of the discussion. We will use the upcoming working group meetings to discuss and shape the pilot.

Next Meeting

The next working group meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 16, 2012, at 3:30 pm in Room 5014 (810 First Street NE).