



**Cost of Student Achievement:
Report of the DC Education
Adequacy Study**

Final Report

Prepared by:

The Finance Project

**Cheryl D. Hayes
Shawn Stelow Griffin
Nalini Ravindranath
Irina Katz**

Augenblick, Palaich and Associates

**Justin Silverstein
Amanda Brown
John Myers**

**Delivered to the District of Columbia Deputy Mayor for Education
[In partial fulfillment of the terms of Contract Document #77318]**

December 20, 2013

About The Finance Project

Helping leader finance and sustain initiatives that lead to better futures for children, families, and communities.

The Finance Project is an independent nonprofit research, consulting, technical assistance, and training firm for public-and private-sector leaders nationwide. It specializes in helping leaders plan and implement financing and sustainability strategies for initiatives that benefit children, families, and communities. Through a broad array of tools, products, and services, The Finance Project helps leaders make smart investment decisions, develop sound financing strategies, and build solid partnerships. To learn more, visit www.financeproject.org.

About Augenblick, Palaich and Associates

Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA) is a Denver based education policy consulting firm. Over the firm's 30 year history APA has worked in all fifty states and the District of Columbia. It provides consulting on school finance, teacher quality, and early-childhood education along with providing evaluation services for large and small scale programs. APA is also a partner in the Central States Regional Education Lab (REL Central).

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	ES1
1. Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Background and Context for the Study.....	3
Guiding Principles.....	6
Advisory Group.....	7
Timeline and Work Plan.....	7
Organization of the Report.....	7
2. Overview of the Methodology	9
Defining Adequacy.....	9
Measuring Adequacy.....	12
Using the Professional Judgment Approach.....	15
Using the Successful Schools Approach.....	21
Comparing Expenditures Within and Outside the UPSFF.....	24
Blending Results Based on Multiple Methods.....	25
3. School-Level Findings.....	27
Elementary Schools.....	28
Middle Schools.....	38
High Schools.....	45
Adult Education and Alternative Schools.....	56
Costs of Education in Schools of Different Size.....	63
Summary.....	64
4. System-Level Findings	66
Comparison of DCPS and Public Charter Schools	67
District of Columbia Public Schools.....	72
Public Charter Schools.....	75
Facilities.....	78
Funding Within and Outside the UPSFF.....	84
Implications for Per-Student Costs.....	92
Summary.....	93
5. Cost of Education Adequacy in the District of Columbia.....	95
Base-Level Cost for Instructional Needs.....	96
Weights for Students at Different Grade Levels and with Identified Learning Needs.....	97
Adjustment for Federal Funding.....	98
Costs for Facilities Maintenance and Operations	102
Comparison of the Current and Recommended Structure for the UPSFF.....	105
Current Per-Student Spending Compared with the Estimated Cost of Education Adequacy.....	107
Fiscal Impact of Proposed Changes to the UPSFF.....	108
Analysis of Net Fiscal Impact.....	110

CONTENTS

6. Recommendations	112
Restructuring the UPSFF to Explicitly Address M&O Costs.....	113
Resetting Instructional Education Funding Levels Through the UPSFF.....	115
Maintaining the Capital Facility Allowance for Public Charters.....	119
Ensuring Local Funding Flows Through the UPSFF.....	120
Creating Greater Transparency and Accountability in Education Budgeting, Resource Allocation, and Reporting.....	121
Updating the UPSFF Regularly.....	121
Implementing the Study's Recommendations.....	122
 Appendices	
Appendix A: Advisory Group Members	123
Appendix B: DC Educational Standards Framework.....	124
Appendix C: Data Sources for Cost Estimation Areas	133
Appendix D: Focus Group Participants	136
Appendix E: Individual Interviewees	139
Appendix F: Guidance to Professional Judgment Panels	141
Appendix G: Professional Judgment Panels Members	143
Appendix H: Successful Schools Selection Criteria	148
Appendix I: Successful Schools Sample Profile Information Summary.....	149
Appendix J: Successful Schools Budget Template	151
Appendix K: Functions and Services Provided to District of Columbia Public Schools.....	159
Appendix L: District of Columbia Public Schools System Costs for Base and Identified Needs Weights	161
Appendix M: Functions and Services Provided to Public Charter Schools	162
Appendix N: Projected Costs for School Year 2013–2017 with Proposed Changes to the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula.....	163
Appendix O: Projected Costs for School Year 2013–2017 with No Changes to the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula.....	167

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the past two decades, increased accountability for student, school, and district performance has increased pressure on public education systems to ensure *all* students enter school ready to learn and leave school with the tools and skills they need to succeed in life. In this environment of increased rigor and accountability, the adequacy of public education funding is being debated across the nation. More recently, states that have adopted the Common Core State Standards are grappling with the relationship between higher performance expectations and the adequacy of public education funding.

The District of Columbia (DC), which adopted the common standards in 2010, is no stranger to this debate. As in many states, DC officials have developed academic standards and timetables to achieve performance expectations. They also have created accountability systems with consequences for schools that fail to meet the targets. Unfortunately, however, these expectations and ramifications have been created without a sound, data-driven understanding of what it actually costs for schools to meet desired outcomes based on current standards and, when they are fully implemented, the new Common Core State Standards.

The District is at the forefront of another emerging trend—namely, the growth of the public charter school sector. In 2013, charter schools are educating nearly half of the public school population. For several years now, differences in the level of resources allocated to District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter schools have been particularly concerning. DC law requires the use of a uniform enrollment-based funding formula for operating expenses that is applicable to both sectors, the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF).¹ Additionally, it requires that any costs funded within the formula should not also be funded outside the formula. Moreover, services provided by DC government agencies outside the UPSFF must be equally available to DCPS and public charter schools.² Charter school advocates and leaders have expressed concern that DC officials have not always followed these mandates.

This education adequacy study addresses the fundamental question of what it actually costs to provide an educational experience that will enable all DC three-year-olds in prekindergarten (pre-K3 and pre-K4), students in kindergarten, students in grades 1 through 12, and adult learners to meet not only current academic performance standards, but also the new common standards. It also addresses the issue of equity between DCPS and public charter schools and gives policymakers recommendations for meeting the District's obligation to provide equitable funding across sectors. Finally, the study aims to ensure that transparency exists on what costs are included in the UPSFF and what costs are covered outside the formula in the District of Columbia.

The Deputy Mayor for Education (DME) selected The Finance Project (TFP), a Washington, DC-based social policy research and technical assistance firm, in partnership with Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc. (APA), a Denver-based education consulting firm, through a request for proposal process to undertake the education adequacy study. The study was recommended by

¹ DC Official Code §1804.01.

² DC Official Code § 38-2913.

the DC Public Education Finance Reform Commission in its February 2012 report to the Mayor and the DC Council. The TFP/APA study team produced the findings in this report based on a rigorous 15-month study.

Background and Context

The UPSFF was established pursuant to legislation enacted in 1996 that mandated uniform funding for all public education students, regardless of the school they attend. The funding formula calculates funding based on students and their characteristics, not on school or local educational agency (LEA) differences or sector differences. This uniformity requirement applies only to local funding, not to federal or private funding. It only affects the operating budgets of DCPS and public charter schools, not capital budgets and investments.

The UPSFF is intended to fund all the school-level and system-level operations for which DCPS and public charter schools are responsible, including instructional programs, student support services, noninstructional services (e.g., facilities maintenance and operations), and administrative functions. It is not, however, the only local source through which DCPS or public charter schools are funded. Both sectors also receive services—and the related monetary benefit—from other DC government agencies, though DCPS receives a significantly larger share, in total and on a per-student basis. Additionally, both DCPS and charter schools receive federal categorical program funding, private funding, and in-kind benefits from foundations, private donors, and community partner organizations that supplement funding through the UPSFF.

Beginning in 1996, DC education and other government officials, along with local education experts and advocates and representatives of the OCFO, the Mayor’s office, the DC Council, conducted several common practice studies to calculate the costs of a market basket of educational goods and services to be covered by the UPSFF foundation amount. The market basket had nine general categories of expenses:³

- Classroom staff: teachers and aides;
- School administration: principal, assistant principal, administrative aide, business manager, and clerks;
- Direct services to students: texts, instructional technology, sports/athletics, and student services;
- Facility operations support: utilities, maintenance, custodial, and security;
- Central management: central administration, instructional support, business, and noninstructional services;
- Schoolwide staff: substitute teachers, coaches, librarian, program coordinator, counselors, social workers, and psychologists;
- Nonpersonal services/programs: field trips and supplies and materials;
- Instructional support: professional development and school improvement efforts; and
- Other school-based costs: technology, food service, and miscellaneous.

These common practice studies provided a rough baseline for per-student education funding, but they had several significant weaknesses. For example, they illustrated but did not define

³ Deborah Gist, Office of the State Superintendent of Education, “The Uniform Per Student Funding Formula,” PowerPoint presentation to the Executive Office of the Mayor, January 30, 2008.

functions that should be covered by uniformity and adequacy. Most importantly, they did not take into consideration educational requirements to adequately prepare students with different characteristics and learning needs to meet District academic standards. The DC Education Adequacy Study marks the first time the DC government has commissioned a methodologically rigorous analysis of the costs of providing an educational program that supports *all* students in meeting academic performance standards.

Methodology

The TFP/APA study team employed a blend of two nationally recognized and accepted methodologies and incorporated elements of a third methodology:

- A professional judgment panel (PJ), which relies on the expertise and experience of professional educators to specify the resources, staff, and programs that schools at each level need to enable students to meet academic performance expectations as well as the system-level resources to support effective educational operations in single and multicampus systems. Ten PJ panels were convened to address school-specific resource needs for general education students and for students with identified learning needs. Three additional system-level panels were convened to identify sector-specific resources. This approach also incorporated elements of the evidence-based approach (EB), which draws on education research to help determine how resources should be deployed in schools so students can best meet performance expectations. Resource specifications documented in educational research were used as a starting point for the PJ panel deliberations and to benchmark results.⁴ However, the study team did not undertake a full independent review of the evidence base.
- A successful schools study (SS), which provides information about the cost of serving students without identified learning needs in a general education setting with no special circumstances; the SS study does not provide information on students with identified learning needs. This approach was used to examine the spending of high-performing schools—both DCPS and public charter schools—as measured against DC academic performance standards, growth in student performance, and the whole school environment.

Additionally, the study team conducted several focus groups and individual interviews with key stakeholders, who contributed specific information to help fill gaps, clarify issues, and verify findings from other sources. Additional revenue and cost analyses were conducted using data provided by DCPS, the Public Charter School Board (PCSB), and various city agencies, including the :

- Department of General Services (DGS),
- Department of Health (DOH),
- Department of Behavioral Health (DBH),
- Department of Transportation (DDOT),
- Metropolitan Police Department (MPD),

⁴ Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, “Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy,” *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

- Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO),
- Office of the Attorney General (OAG),
- Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP),
- Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), and
- Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE).

The study also ensured broad outreach and participation among DC education audiences and constituencies at all stages of the work, including public officials in relevant positions across DC government (e.g., including the Executive Office of the Mayor, the DC Council), OCFO, OSSE, DCPS, PCSB, public charter school leaders and administrators, professional educators at all levels, and public and charter school advocates. Finally, the study team relied on an Advisory Group of national and local experts in education policy, education programs, and education finance to provide input on the design and execution of the study and on the interpretation of the findings.

School-Level Resource Specifications

The school-level professional judgment panels—informed by the evidence base—developed specifications on the quantity and types of resources required to provide an adequate education to all DC students at each school level⁵:

- Elementary Schools—prekindergarten for three- and four-year-olds, kindergarten, and grades 1 through 5
- Middle Schools—grades 6 through 8
- High Schools—grades 9 through 12
- Adult Education Programs
- Alternative Schools

For each school level, the panelists worked together to achieve consensus on resource requirements, including instructional staff, student support staff, and administrative staff, as well as other educational resources and technology hardware, for representative schools at each level. Throughout the panels’ deliberations, DCPS and public charter school educators and administrators consistently agreed on the general quantity, quality, and types of resources required for all students to succeed in representative schools, even though no one panelist might allocate resources specifically as they are listed. These resource specifications are not intended to serve as a prescription for how individual schools should be staffed and how school leaders should expend their budget. Instead, the resources identified by the PJ panels are specifications for the purpose of costing out education adequacy. In the best-case scenario, LEAs would receive adequate funding and school leaders would have discretion to allocate resources for staff and other direct costs according to their school’s specific needs and priorities.

The school-level PJ panels, using the education research evidence base as a point of departure, developed detailed resource specifications for instructional programs, student support services, administration, technology hardware, and other educational resources at each school level (i.e., elementary, middle, high, adult, and alternative). PJ panels for students with identified needs were appointed to specify additional school-level and other resources needed to educate students

⁵ The professional judgment panels did not develop specifications for special education schools. The weight for special education schools was held constant.

with identified learning needs, including English language learners (ELLs), students at risk of academic failure, and special education students, Levels 1-4.⁶ The judgments of these panels were supplemented with information from interviews and additional data analysis.

These school-level PJ panel resource specifications were subsequently reviewed by the system-level panels (the DCPS- and public charter school-specific panels that were composed of central office staff and other individuals who provide administrative support to DCPS and public charter schools). The results of all 10 PJ panels were subsequently reviewed by the Advisory Group. In some cases, the school-level specifications were adjusted based on the recommendations of other panels. The resource specifications were finalized based on the Advisory Group review and were adopted as the study recommendations for costing out purposes. They include extended-day and extended-year programs for at-risk students, summer bridge programs for transitioning 9th graders, and comprehensive technology to support differentiated classroom instruction (see Table 1).

**Table ES1: Instructional and Student Support Specifications
Included in the Proposed UPSFF Base Funding Level and Weights***

• Small class sizes: 15:1 in K–grade 3 and 25:1 in all other grades (consistent with evidence-based work).
• Block schedule in middle schools and high schools.
• Teacher planning time (through use of nonclassroom teacher staffing at elementary schools and block schedule in secondary schools).
• Librarians and media specialists.
• Support for embedded educator effectiveness, including 3 to 5 additional days (13 to 15 days total) of professional development and instructional coaching for teachers.
• A high level of noninstructional pupil support (counselors, social workers, and psychologists) for all students (280:1 in elementary school to 140:1 in high school).
• School-level administration, including principals and at least a 0.5 assistant principal at each school (1.0 at high school), plus deans, department chairs, and data managers at the high school level.
• Office support, including office managers, business managers, registrars, and additional clerical staff.
• Full-time substitutes at the elementary school and middle school levels.
• Additional staff to support special needs students---at-risk students, English language learners, and special education students.
○ At-risk students: additional teachers to lower class sizes for at-risk students in secondary schools; additional pupil support positions (roughly 100:1); interventionists (100:1); and district-level services.
○ English language learners: ELL teachers (15:1 for Levels 1 and 2, 22:1 for Level 3); pupil support positions (100:1); bilingual aides (50:1); bilingual service provider (ELL coordinator) positions; and district-level services.

⁶ Special education students are categorized into four levels of need, according to the number of hours per week they require specialized services.

Table ES1: Instructional and Student Support Specifications
Included in the Proposed UPSFF Base Funding Level and Weights, continued*

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Special education students: Special education teachers (ranging from 22:1 to 8:1 by level of need); instructional aides for higher need levels; additional pupil support (psychologists and social workers) and therapist support (speech, occupational, and physical therapy); school-level special education coordinators; and district-level services.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Before- and after-school programs for at-risk students and ELL students (100% of at risk and Level 1 and Level 2 ELL students).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Summer school for at-risk and ELL students (100% of at-risk students and all Level 1 and Level 2 ELL students); and summer bridge programs for students entering 9th grade.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prekindergarten for three- and four-year-olds (program the same for both age groups).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A technology-rich environment, including all classrooms with computer(s), document cameras, and SMART Boards/projectors; fixed and mobile labs; faculty laptops; and 1:1 mobile devices (tablets/netbooks) for high school students that can be used, for example, for blended learning and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● District- level administration and services at current levels.

Note: * These specifications are not intended to be prescriptive for how individual schools should be staffed or how school leaders should expend their budget.

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

School Sizes and Profiles for Costing Out

The PJ panels developed resource specifications for representative schools of two sizes at each level: elementary, middle, and high school. They also developed specifications for adult education and alternative schools/programs. These sizes were determined based on an initial review of DCPS and public charter schools at each level, which showed the size range and distribution. For example, the PJ panels provided resource specifications for an elementary school with 210 students (i.e., a small elementary school) and another for 420 students (i.e., a large elementary school).

Based on the profile of DC students citywide, these representative schools were assumed to have students with the following characteristics:

- 70 percent of students eligible for free and reduced-price school meals;
- 9 percent of students who are English language learners; and
- 17 percent of students who are identified as requiring special education and having individualized education plans (IEPs) designed to address their learning needs.

Class Sizes

Using a combination of information from the evidence base, legal mandates, and professional judgments, class sizes were identified for each grade level for costing out purposes. For elementary students, the PJ panel called for class sizes in pre-K3 and pre-K4 of 15:1, with a teacher and an aide. For kindergarten through grade 3, the panels specified a student class size of 15:1. For grades 4 and 5, the panelists called for a class size of 25:1. The middle school and high school panels also specified a class size of 25:1, with a block schedule that enables teachers to

have ample time for planning and coordinating with other teachers and specialists. For adult learning centers and alternative schools and education programs for students who have not been successful in regular high schools, panelists specified small class sizes of 15:1. In calculating the school-level base cost, the study team used the DCPS average salary scale.

Students At Risk of Academic Failure

Each school-level and identified learning needs panel specified additional instructional and student support resources for students at risk of academic failure because of different risk factors, including economic disadvantage and disconnection from families and other key institutional supports. Typically, in studies of this kind, these at-risk students are identified by low-income status based on their eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals. In the District, however, using such eligibility as a proxy for at risk is problematic. Many DC schools have a very high proportion of students who qualify for free and reduced-price school meals. Moreover, in recent years, the city has moved toward the Community Eligibility Option (CEO) under the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP) and away from identifying individual students' eligibility for free and reduced-priced school meals. Adopting a presumptive community eligibility policy declares that entire schools can qualify to receive free meals if 40 percent or more of their student population receives Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP or food stamps), are homeless, or are in foster care.

As a result, the study team determined that a more targeted definition of at risk of academic failure is needed for purposes of allocating additional education funding beyond the base-level amount. Accordingly, the study team recommended a working definition based on three relevant criteria:

- Students who are in foster care;
- Students who are homeless; and
- Students who live in low-income families eligible for TANF.

Many stakeholders have expressed concern that these criteria are too narrow and will exclude some students who are genuinely at risk. Others remarked that using eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals as a proxy for at risk would overfund schools that have a high percentage of low- and moderate-income students who would qualify for subsidized meals but are not truly at risk of academic failure. The study team recognizes the deficiencies in the proposed working definition. Therefore, as it is ultimately a policy decision for the Mayor and the DC Council to define at-risk status, the study team urges DC education leaders to engage stakeholders further to help refine the definition of at risk so it is targeted to the District's needs; and align the criteria for determining eligibility with the early warning system for identifying students at risk of academic failure that OSSE is developing.

Across elementary, middle, and high schools, the PJ panels specified significant additional instructional, student support, administrative, and other personnel to be dedicated to serving and supporting students at risk of academic failure.

Students with Other Identified Learning Needs

Developing resource specifications for Levels 1–4 special education students proved difficult. In part, this reflects different professional perspectives on the levels and balance of additional instructional programming, student support, and therapeutic services these students need to be successful learners. However, based on the PJ deliberations; significant additional information and review by staff at OSSE, DCPS, and PCSB; and review by outside experts in special education programs, the study team concluded that increases above the base level of funding for general education students are needed to pay for additional instructional staff—special education teachers, instructional aides, and a part-time adaptive physical education teacher—as well as student support staff—social workers and specialized therapists (e.g., behavioral, occupational, and speech therapists) for Levels 1–4 special education students. Panelists also called for additional administrative support from a special education coordinator.

The PJ panel went through the same process for English language learners and adult education and alternative students, identifying specific resources needed to effectively support successful learning. This included adding additional instructional and student support resources as well as administrative resources.

The elementary and middle/high school identified learning needs PJ panels highlighted the importance of offering appropriate educational opportunities to gifted and talented students at each grade level as well as to those with other learning needs. Although the panelists did not offer detailed resource specifications for this category of students, they urged greater attention and investment in developing appropriate programs and learning opportunities for exceptionally able students and ensuring that adequate resources are available to fully implement them.

Technology and Hardware

All of the school-level PJ panels highlighted the importance of significant investments in computer technology hardware, software, and wireless capacity. Students need to develop computer literacy to be successful in a digital age. Technology plays an increasingly greater role in the classroom, in the workplace, and in all domains of daily life. The PJ panels for all school levels and for students with identified learning needs recognized that the use of technology can be an effective tool for instructional differentiation and engagement for students with different learning needs. Also, the elementary, middle, and high school PJ panels noted that, to administer the new Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) exams, schools will need the capacity to have all students complete the assessments online. The adult education and alternative schools PJ panel called for the development of hybrid learning programs that enable students to complete coursework and testing virtually as well as in the classroom.

System-Level Resource Specifications

The system-level PJ panels were charged with identifying LEA support, services, and resources that are needed above those specified at the school level to ensure schools can address the learning needs of general education students and students with identified learning needs. All LEAs, regardless of size, have the same responsibilities to provide management, administrative, and oversight functions, such as governance, budgeting and financial management, human resources management, professional development, curriculum and program support, procurement

of textbooks and supplies, communications and outreach, risk management, and legal assistance. In addition, large LEAs also need funding for responsibilities related to coordination and communication across schools in a multicampus system.

Because DCPS and public charter schools are structured and managed so differently, the system-level PJ panels reviewed the work of the school-level panels and developed separate specifications for costing out resources needed for each sector rather than developing a single unified system-level cost estimate. The LEA-level resource specifications developed by the two system-level PJ panels were reviewed by the Advisory Group. Where the Advisory Group raised questions, the study team tried to gather relevant comparative data to refine the resource specifications that were the basis for the cost estimates. To develop uniform system-level costs across the sectors for the overall UPSFF base funding level, the study team calculated the average of projected system costs for DCPS and charter schools.

Facilities Maintenance and Operations Costs

The study team's analysis of system-level costs shows that facilities maintenance and operations (M&O) costs are a significant cost driver. Additionally, these costs vary significantly between DCPS and public charter schools, with DCPS M&O costs being much higher than those of public charter schools.

Some of this difference may be due to the fact that LEAs in the District do not use a uniform accounting protocol for categorizing M&O costs, which makes it difficult to isolate relevant expenditures and compare levels of spending across LEAs. For example, custodial services are underestimated in public charter school calculations because often they cannot be isolated from lease costs or other vendor contracts. Similarly, M&O costs are likely overestimated for DCPS because they include expenses for vacant and underutilized space in schools (see Table 2).

To some extent, M&O cost differences between the two sectors may also reflect the fact that DCPS uses union labor for all engineers, technicians, custodians, and other maintenance personnel and is subject to collective bargaining on compensation and work rules. In contrast, public charter schools have the flexibility to negotiate contracts with outside vendors based on lower wage rates.

To develop a uniform basis for calculating space costs for DCPS and public charter schools, the study team developed a per-square-foot M&O cost rate based on the current rate for DCPS schools. To derive an equitable per-student M&O cost at each school level, the study team applied the per-square-foot rate to the number of square feet of space recommended for students at each grade level in the DCPS design guidelines. It then used student enrollment data to determine the amount of funding that should be allocated to DCPS and public charter schools.

The study team used DCPS design guidelines⁷ to identify the number of square feet of school facility space per student that is needed to support an adequate education. These recommended space requirements, which differ depending on the school level, are based on space specifications that were developed for DCPS in conjunction with the DGS and are used to guide the construction of DCPS buildings. Following are total per-student space requirements:

⁷ "District of Columbia Public Schools Design Guidelines: 2009," as amended in 2012, www.dcps.dc.gov.

- Elementary schools: 150 square feet per student
- Middle schools: 170 square feet per student
- High schools: 192 square feet per student
- Adult education and alternative schools/programs: 170 square feet per student
- Special education schools: 192 square feet per student.⁸

The study team collected available M&O cost data for DCPS and public charter schools. Charter school M&O costs also include property taxes and property insurance that are not charged to DCPS. However, not all categories of maintenance and operations are reported uniformly for charters. Because it was not possible to calculate an accurate actual M&O cost for public charter schools, the study team used the DCPS average cost per weighted square foot for an average elementary, middle, and high school to determine the relevant facilities M&O costs that should be factored into the UPSFF. The cost was weighted by the total square feet for each school-level building.

The study team developed an average M&O cost for three grade levels: elementary, middle, and high school. (It applied either the middle school or the high school rate to other types of programs that were not specifically called out in the DCPS design guidelines, such as alternative and adult education programs/schools and stand-alone special education schools.) Following are the average M&O costs:

- \$1,071 for each elementary school student;
- \$1,209 for each middle school student;
- \$1,342 for each high school student;
- \$1,209 for each adult education and alternative student; and
- \$1,342 for students who attend stand-alone special education schools.

⁸ The design guidelines do not include a recommended amount of square feet per adult education or alternative student. After consulting with education experts, the study team determined the middle school specification was sufficient, because these programs do not require the larger space requirements of a full high school education. Stakeholders recommended that the high school specification be applied to special education schools.

**Table ES2: Total Facilities Maintenance and Operations Costs for
District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
(Fiscal 2013 and Fiscal 2014 Budgeted Amounts)**

Maintenance and Operations	DCPS		Charter School Leased and Owned Buildings	
Cost Category	Total Cost	Cost Per Student ¹	Total Cost	Cost Per Student ²
Custodial ³	\$22,705,916	\$493	N/A	N/A
Facility maintenance and Operations ³	\$45,503,000	\$988	\$12,620,844	\$263
Utilities	\$28,385,637 ⁴	\$616	\$7,542,441	\$440
Real Estate Taxes (if applicable)			\$553,784	\$19
Property Insurance			\$1,053,241	\$37
Total Maintenance and Operations	\$96,594,553	\$2,097*	\$21,770,310+	\$759

Notes:

1 Figure is based on projected DCPS enrollments for school year 2013–2014 of 46,059.

2 Figure is based on public charter school enrollment for school year 2012–2013 of 28,667 for schools with data.

3 Charter total M&O costs are underestimated, because custodial costs cannot accurately be determined.

4 Figure reflects costs for custodial and utilities in DCPS fiscal 2014 budget; utilities cost represents total for gas, water, and electricity for DCPS portfolio, excluding main office.

Sources: Department of general services fiscal 2014 budget for Facilities—Public Education; and public charter facilities data from the local educational agency’s annual report to the Public Charter School Board for 2012–2013.

Capital Investments

Although the study team examined information on facility and capital investments by DCPS and public charter schools, available financial data were insufficient to fully assess public charter school costs and develop a meaningful assessment of their adequacy. It was also impossible to develop a sound comparison to DCPS spending.

DGS provides funding for new DCPS construction, renovation, and upgrading of school buildings and grounds based on a capital improvement plan that prioritizes school improvement projects. During the 22-year period for which actual and projected expenditure information is available, the study team estimates DCPS capital investments of approximately \$4,961 per student per year.

Public charter schools receive an annual charter facilities allowance of \$3,000 per student to cover the acquisition, lease, and improvement of school facilities. Available data suggest that facility-associated investments and indirect costs in leased and owned buildings and grounds are approximately this amount on an annual per-student basis. However, facility investment and lease costs for public charter schools are much more difficult to discern, because no standard approach to investment or accepted method of accounting for costs exists. The lack of a single accepted chart of accounts for presenting expenditures, including those for facility and capital investment and leases, as well as facilities M&O, made it impossible for the study team to develop a reliable facility and capital cost estimate for public charter schools.

Due to these constraints, the study team determined it is not possible to effectively assess the adequacy of current levels of capital investment for DCPS and facilities capital investment and leases for public charter schools. Therefore, the District should maintain the current public charter school facilities allowance pending further financial analysis based on uniform data reporting by charter LEAs on their facility and capital expenditures.

Funding Outside the UPSFF

The system-level analysis examined how costs related to instructional operations and facilities M&O for both sectors are currently covered within and outside the UPSFF. Several school-level and system-level costs are covered—in whole or in part—by other DC government agencies for both sectors, including student health and mental health personnel, crossing guards, and school resource officers. Despite DC legal requirements that costs funded through the UPSFF should not also be funded outside the formula, DCPS receives additional outside funding for various administrative services. Moreover, DGS funds approximately 40 percent of DCPS facilities M&O costs (see Table 3). Table 3 shows that DCPS is projected to receive more support overall from these sources in school year 2013–2014, and it receives more than twice as much on a per-student basis as public charter schools. These differences affect system-level resource specifications and costs for DCPS and public charter schools.

**Table ES3: Comparison of Benefits Provided by DC Agencies to
District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
(Projected Total Value and Per-Student Share in Fiscal 2013 and Fiscal 2014)***

DC Government Agency	Cost of Benefits Provided to DCPS	Cost of Benefits Provided to Public Charter Schools	Total
Department of Health	\$12,750,000 (\$277)	\$4,250,000 (\$114)	\$17,000,000
Department of Health and Behavioral Health	\$3,420,594 (\$74)	\$1,026,177 (\$27)	\$4,446,771
Office of the Attorney General	\$2,442,000 (\$53)		\$2,442,000
Office of Contracts and Procurement	\$2,280 (\$0.05)		\$2,280
Office of the Chief Technology Officer	\$1,914,110 (\$42)		\$1,914,110
Department of General Services	\$45,503,000 (\$988)		\$45,503,000
Public Charter School Board Appropriation		\$1,161,000 (\$31)	\$1,161,000
Total	\$66,031,984	\$5,276,177	\$71,308,161
Per-Student Share of Cost**	\$1,434	\$141	\$854

Notes:

*Additional resources to remain outside the UPSFF include school resource officers (SROs) allocated cross-sector, totaling \$8,186,239 in fiscal 2013; this includes 26 SROs allocated to DCPS, totaling \$2,149,921; 15 SROs allocated to public charter schools, totaling \$1,240,339; and 58 roving officers and officials assigned cross-sector, totaling \$4,795,979. It also includes department of transportation crossing guards allocated cross-sector, totaling \$3,050,000 in fiscal 2013.

**Figures are calculated based on 2013–2014 projected enrollment numbers.

Sources: Data from office of contracting and procurement based on annual costs; data from department of health and department of behavioral health based on fiscal 2013 costs; and data from Public Charter School Board, Office of the Attorney General, Office of the Chief Technology Officer, and Department of General Services based on fiscal 2014 budget.

Recommendations

At each stage of its work, from study design through data collection, analysis, and formulation of findings and recommendations, the TFP/APA study team was guided by the principles outlined in the introduction to this report. Of particular concern in formulating the recommendations was ensuring that suggested changes in the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula are clearly focused on achieving adequacy, equity, and transparency in education funding in the District of Columbia.

The Mayor and DC Council have increased funding for general education and for special education during the past several years. However, as shown in the successful schools study and the cost estimation based on the professional judgment panels, current funding through the UPSFF has not kept up with the cost of educating students in DCPS and public charter schools. This is due to several factors that impact education costs:

- Characteristics of the student population. The District has a high proportion of students from low-income, severely disadvantaged, and non-English-speaking families. These students require additional instructional resources and student support services to be successful learners.
- High labor costs. The high cost of living in the city and metropolitan area and the predominance of a unionized workforce in DCPS means the District has a relatively high wage scale for educators.
- Education reform. The District of Columbia, along with many states across the nation, is taking steps to implement the Common Core State Standards for kindergarten through grade 12. This will require significant investments in new and upgraded curricula, instructional programs, assessment, and professional development. It will also require increased coordination across grade levels and schools.
- Commitment to equity between sectors. By law, the District must provide operating funds through the UPSFF to both DCPS and public charter schools. Meeting this obligation requires additional resources because of past differences in funding between the sectors.

Despite the current level of education funding, the UPSFF will need to be increased to ensure all schools have the resources they need to enable students to successfully meet DC academic performance standards. The UPSFF should also include additional funding to address the learning needs of students at risk of academic failure.

DC education funding also is inequitable, as shown in the study team's analyses of current spending on DCPS and public charter schools. The School Reform Act requires uniform funding of operating expenses for both DCPS and public charter schools.⁹ Both DCPS and public charter schools depend on additional resources provided by other DC government agencies to cover the costs of some school-based programs and services (e.g., school nurses, social workers, school crossing guards, and school resource officers). To the extent additional services are available to DCPS, they must be equally available to public charter schools. However, DCPS receives

⁹ As noted in this report, there is no such requirement for capital expense.

significantly more than public charter schools, in total and on a per-student basis. Additionally, DGS funds approximately 40 percent of facilities maintenance and operations costs for DCPS schools and some of its administrative offices. Other city agencies subsidize or perform various central office functions for DCPS.

These disparities in funding are contrary to DC law, which mandates that DCPS and public charter schools be funded through the UPSFF for operating expenses, that services be provided by DC government agencies on an equal basis, and that costs covered by the UPSFF should not also be funded by other DC agencies and offices.¹⁰ The differences also have become a source of significant tension between the two sectors. Against this backdrop, the study team was keenly focused on ensuring that its recommendations for restructuring and resetting the UPSFF address these issues and create greater equity between DCPS and public charter schools. The study team also sought to ensure all schools are funded at a level that will enable *all* students to meet academic performance standards.

Recommendations based on the findings of the DC Education Adequacy Study are organized under six broad headings:

- Restructuring education funding through the UPSFF to explicitly address facilities maintenance and operations costs;
- Resetting the UPSFF base level and weights;
- Maintaining the capital facilities allowance for public charter schools pending further analysis;
- Ensuring local funding flows through the UPSFF with specific and limited exceptions;
- Creating greater transparency and accountability in education budgeting, resource allocation, and reporting; and
- Updating the UPSFF regularly.

Restructuring the UPSFF to Explicitly Address Facilities Maintenance and Operations Costs

Currently, the UPSFF includes funding to cover the per-student costs for both instructional operating allocations and facilities M&O allocations, though they are not disaggregated. However, to understand the relative impact of these costs, the study team analyzed the two components independently.

To develop a uniform basis for calculating space costs for DCPS and public charter school LEAs as required by law, the study team developed a per-square-foot M&O cost rate based on the current costs for DCPS schools at each grade level—elementary school, middle school, high school, and adult/alternative school. No established space standard exists for adult learning centers, alternative schools, and special education schools where students are ungraded, so the study team applied the middle school M&O cost rate for adult and alternative schools and the high school cost rate for stand-alone special education schools.

To derive a uniform per-student M&O cost at each school level, the study team applied the grade-level-specific per-square-foot cost rate to the number of square feet of space recommended

¹⁰ DC Official Code §§38-1804.01, 2902, and 2913.

for students at each school level in the DCPS design guidelines.¹¹ It is this grade-level-specific per-square-foot cost rate that is applied in the UPSFF and used to determine the amount of funding that should be allocated to DCPS and public charter school LEAs for each student. This approach provides the foundation for several related recommendations to restructure the UPSFF to explicitly address facilities M&O costs:

- The study team recommends that the two components of the UPSFF per-student payment (i.e., the instructional operating allocation and the facility M&O allocation) should be calculated and presented separately within the formula. The instructional operating allocation is structured as a base funding level. Weights added to the base address cost differences for students at different grade levels and students with identified learning needs (similar to the current configuration). The M&O allocation is structured as an actual grade-level-specific dollar amount to be added to the amount of the instructional base funding and weights for each student. Table 4 presents the recommended UPSFF, including both the instructional and facility M&O costs.
- The study team recommends that school-level-specific M&O costs should be structured as an actual per-student dollar amount rather than as a weight. Based on DCPS actual and fiscal 2014 projected M&O costs, the study team recommends the following per-student facilities M&O costs as a component of the UPSFF:
 - \$1,071 for each elementary school student;
 - \$1,209 for each middle school student;
 - \$1,342 for each high school student;
 - \$1,209 for each student attending an adult education program or alternative school; and
 - \$1,342 for each student attending a stand-alone special education school.
- Calculating the M&O costs in this way, based on actual costs applied to recommended space criteria, enables funding to flow through the formula on a per-student basis in a transparent way. However, given the different cost structures for DCPS and public charter schools, the study team recommends that DC leaders develop a uniform reporting structure for facilities M&O costs in both sectors so, going forward, the M&O payment can be built on cost estimates that include actual costs for DCPS and public charter schools.
- Paying facility M&O costs using the recommended per-square-foot-per-student allocation approach through the UPSFF will not cover the full costs of DCPS facilities M&O expenses, mostly due to the large amount of underutilized space in city-owned school buildings and grounds that must be maintained. Applying the recommended square footage per student to the school year 2012–2013 audited enrollment for DCPS shows that DCPS requires only about 7.4 million square feet, or roughly 70 percent, of the

¹¹ According to the “District of Columbia Public Schools Design Guidelines: 2009,” as amended in 2012, the total per-student space requirements are as follows: elementary schools: 150 square feet per student; middle schools: 170 square feet per student; and high schools: 192 square feet per student. The study team assigned adult education and alternative schools to the middle school rate of 170 square feet per student and special education schools to the high school rate of 192 square feet per student. See www.dcps.dc.gov.

approximately 10.6 million square feet of active school building space in its current portfolio.¹²

Yet DCPS operates as a system of right, which requires that schools be available across the city to serve every neighborhood at every grade level. In addition, though it is difficult to quantify the monetary value of benefits, DCPS school buildings and grounds represent community assets that serve diverse purposes for community residents beyond educating neighborhood children and youth. DCPS's pools, fields, and athletic spaces provide community recreation resources. Auditoriums, multipurpose rooms, and classrooms provide community performance and meeting space. Schools also house other community services, such as health care and child care, in school-based facilities, with their M&O costs attributed to DCPS.

Beyond increasing enrollment in DCPS schools, the study team recommends that city leaders aggressively pursue policies to use underutilized space in DC-owned school buildings and grounds more efficiently. Not only will this help defray DCPS's M&O costs in the long term, but it will also benefit the communities surrounding underutilized DCPS schools. As the first and most important step in this direction, DCPS should, where appropriate, collocate with other LEAs, city agencies, or community-based organizations. Although collocation requires substantial management and oversight, the city should aggressively move to lease space in underutilized DCPS buildings to other appropriate entities. It should also support DCPS and prospective tenants in planning for successful collocations.

- The study team recommends a strong focus on more efficient use of DCPS buildings by releasing surplus buildings for use by charter schools and aggressively pursuing collocation opportunities, even as DCPS continues to work to build its enrollment. During a reasonable transition period, DGS should provide M&O services to make up the difference for some portion of DCPS's facilities M&O costs.

Resetting Instructional Education Funding Levels Through the UPSFF

The process for developing the proposed instructional base funding level and weights was the result of a rigorous, multimethod analysis that included input and review by multiple local and national experts. The recommended formula is structured to take account of the resource needs of general education students and students with identified learning needs at every grade level—from prekindergarten for three-year-olds through grade 12—and the needs of adult learners. The UPSFF base-level funding and weights for students at different grade levels and students with identified needs are the same for all DC students, regardless of whether they attend DCPS or public charter schools. This includes costs for the full range of resources that students need to be successful in light of the District's performance standards, including those currently provided outside the UPSFF. Accordingly, the study team offers several related recommendations for resetting the UPSFF:

- The study team recommends that the proposed UPSFF base funding level should reflect a combined cost of \$10,557 per student for instructional purposes and \$1,071 per student for facility maintenance and operations, totaling \$11,628 (see Table 4). This is equal to

¹² DCPS has approximately another 1.5 million square feet of space for DCPS future use, swing space, and administrative space.

the per-student base cost at the least costly grade level—kindergarten through grade 5. The instructional and facility M&O portions of the UPSFF are reported separately for purposes of transparency.

- The study team recommends that the instructional portion of the UPSFF should be adjusted in two fundamental ways:
 - The new instructional base funding level and weights should provide adequate resources to address the needs of all students to meet current academic performance standards and the new Common Core State Standards. This includes instructional programs, student support services, administrative capacity, and other educational resources, as described in Chapters 3 and 4.
 - The total costs of serving students, including those with identified learning needs, should be partially offset by federal categorical funding that flows from federal entitlement programs, formula grant programs, and other categorical programs that benefit students with particular needs and characteristics. As a result, in calculating the new UPSFF base funding level and weights, the study team deducted the projected amount of these federal funds from the estimated costs.
- Weights beyond the base level of funding represent additional percentages of the base for students at other grade levels and for students with identified learning needs that entail costs above the base. In addition to grade-level weights, the study team recommends maintaining the current categories of special education and English language learners. These weights should continue to be cumulative.

The recommended weights and levels of required funding, based on the cost analysis, are higher than current levels for English language learners. They also are significantly higher for adult education and alternative school students. These higher weights reflect the need for increased specialized resources. The special education Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 weights are approximately the same as current funding levels. The weights appear higher than the current weights, but that is mostly due to the fact that they now incorporate the special education capacity fund weight that is consequently recommended to be eliminated. The total costs of serving students with identified learning needs is partially offset by federal categorical funding that flows from several federal entitlement programs, formula block grants, and other nonlocally funded categorical programs benefiting students with particular needs and characteristics. In calculating the net new base-level cost and weights, the study team deducted these funds from the gross cost figures.

- The study team recommends adding a new weight of 0.37 for students at risk of academic failure. An initial working definition of at risk should focus on three primary criteria:
 - Students who are in foster care,
 - Students who are homeless, and
 - Students who are living in low-income families eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

This weight can be combined with weights for other applicable identified learning needs, except for alternative or adult education students because, by definition, these students are at risk and additional resources have been factored into their relevant weights.

Many stakeholders have raised questions about whether this set of criteria too narrowly limits the definition of educational risk, particularly the use of TANF eligibility, because the program sets income limits at 100 percent of the federal poverty level and families will eventually time out of the program. However, use of the traditional metric for low-income status—eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals—may be overly broad and result in overfunding some schools as the District moves toward the new community eligibility system. Under this system, information on students' income levels is no longer collected. Instead, the entire school population is deemed eligible when 40 percent or more of the students are eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or are identified as homeless or in the Child and Family Services system.

The study team recognizes the deficiencies in the proposed working definition. As it is ultimately a policy decision for the Mayor and the DC Council to determine the definition of at risk, the study team recommends that education leaders engage stakeholders further to decide on a definition of at risk that is targeted to the District's needs and that is based on available data sources. Additionally, as work by OSSE to develop an early warning system for identifying students at risk of academic failure is completed, the at-risk definition should take account of relevant evidence-based indicators that will be tracked (e.g., truancy, over-age, and behind-grade).

- The study team recommends excluding two current weights and instead accounting for these needs in other weights: the current summer school weight, which is accounted for in the new at-risk weight and in the ELL weight in the proposed UPSFF; and the special education capacity fund weight, because it is now accounted for in the proposed special education weights.
- The study team recommends developing a weight for gifted and talented students. The PJ panels did not outline comprehensive resource specifications for high-performing students as they did for other students with identified learning needs, though such a weight frequently is a component of a comprehensive weighted student funding formula. Accordingly, the study team recommends that the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education explore the feasibility of developing and costing out specifications for additional specialized educational resources and opportunities for gifted and talented students.

**Table ES4: Recommended UPSFF Base Funding Level and Weights
(With Facilities Maintenance and Operations Payments)**

GENERAL EDUCATION AND ADD-ON WEIGHTING INCLUDING M&O						
Category	Current UPSFF Weight	Current UPSFF Per-Pupil allocation	Proposed UPSFF Weight After Revenue Adjustments	Proposed UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Revenue Adjustments	Facility M&O UPSFF Per Pupil Allocations	Proposed UPSFF Per Pupil Allocations After Revenue Adjustments with M&O
Foundation		\$9,306		\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
General Education						
Preschool	1.34	\$12,470	1.15	\$12,141	\$1,071	\$13,212
Prekindergarten	1.30	\$12,098	1.15	\$12,141	\$1,071	\$13,212
Kindergarten	1.30	\$12,098	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 1–3	1.00	\$9,306	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 4–5	1.00	\$9,306	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 6–8	1.03	\$9,585	1.01	\$10,663	\$1,209	\$11,872
Grades 9–12	1.16	\$10,795	1.10	\$11,613	\$1,342	\$12,955
Alternative ¹	1.17	\$10,888	1.73	\$18,264	\$1,209	\$19,473
Adult Education ²	0.75	\$6,980	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,209	\$11,766
Special Education Schools	1.17	\$10,888	1.17	\$12,352	\$1,342	\$13,694
Special Needs Add-on Weightings						
Special Education Level 1	0.58	\$5,397	0.88	\$9,290		
Special Education Level 2	0.81	\$7,538	1.08	\$11,402		
Special Education Level 3	1.58	\$14,703	1.77	\$18,686		
Special Education Level 4	3.10	\$28,849	3.13	\$33,043		
Special Education Capacity Fund	0.40	\$3,722	N/A			
English Language Learners	0.45	\$4,188	0.61	\$6,440		
At Risk	N/A	N/A	0.37	\$3,906		

Table ES4: Recommended UPSFF Base Funding Level and Weights, continued

SUMMER SCHOOL, EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR, AND RESIDENTIAL				
Category	Current UPSFF Weight	Current UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocation	Proposed UPSFF Weight After Revenue Adjustments	Proposed UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Revenue Adjustments
Foundation		\$9,306		\$10,557
Special Education Compliance				
Blackman-Jones Compliance	0.07	\$651	0.06	\$651
Attorneys' Fee Supplement	0.09	\$838	0.08	\$838
Summer School				
Summer School ³	0.17	\$15,820	N/A	N/A
Extended School Year Level 1	0.064	\$596	0.056	\$596
Extended School Year Level 2	0.231	\$2,150	0.204	\$2,150
Extended School Year Level 3	0.500	\$4,653	0.441	\$4,653
Extended School Year Level 4	0.497	\$4,625	0.438	\$4,625
Residential Add-Ons				
Residential Weight	1.70	\$15,820	1.50	\$15,820
Special Education Residential				
Level 1	0.374	\$3,480	0.330	\$3,480
Level 2	1.360	\$12,656	1.199	\$12,656
Level 3	2.941	\$27,369	2.592	\$27,369
Level 4	2.924	\$27,211	2.578	\$27,211
English Language Learner Residential	0.68	\$6,328	0.60	\$6,328

Notes:

1 The proposed weight assumes alternative school students would not receive an at-risk weight.

2 The proposed weight assumes adult education students would not receive an at-risk weight. The adult weight was also prorated to take into account that an adult full-time equivalent (FTE) student requires fewer hours and weeks in school than a full-time general education student.

3 Summer school is not assigned a specific weight in the proposed UPSFF because it is included in the at-risk and English language learner weight.

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Maintaining the Capital Facility Allowance for Public Charters Pending Further Analysis

Although the study team examined information on capital investments by DCPS and public charter schools, available financial data were insufficient to fully assess public charter school costs and develop a meaningful comparison to DCPS spending. DGS provides funding for new DCPS construction, renovation, and upgrading of school buildings and grounds based on a capital plan that prioritizes school improvement projects. Public charter schools receive an annual facilities allowance of \$3,000 per student to cover the acquisition, lease, and improvement of school facilities. However, capital investment and lease costs for public charter schools are much more difficult to discern, because no standard approach for investment or accepted method of accounting for costs exists. The lack of a single accepted chart of accounts for presenting expenditures, including those for capital investment, leases, and facilities M&O, made it impossible for the study team to develop a reliable capital cost estimate for public charter schools. Due to these constraints, the study team recommends that:

- The Mayor and DC Council should maintain the current capital allowance for public charter schools, pending further financial analysis based on uniform data reporting by charter LEAs on their capital and facility expenditures.

Ensuring Local Funding Flows Through the UPSFF with Specific and Limited Exceptions

To comply with current DC law, which requires that costs covered by the UPSFF should not also be funded by other DC agencies and offices, and to achieve greater funding equity between DCPS and public charter schools, the study team worked with the PJ panels to examine the flow of funding within and outside the UPSFF. One goal was to determine which student support services currently funded outside the UPSFF should be covered by funds that flow through the formula. A second goal was to determine whether any benefits should continue to be funded outside the UPSFF by other DC government agencies.

The study team recommends that the UPSFF provide comprehensive funding for all DC students that adequately covers instructional programs, student support services, administrative services, and other educational resource needs at the school and system levels as well as funding for facilities M&O costs. To ensure this happens, the study team recommends the following modifications to current arrangements that provide resources to DCPS and public charter schools through other DC government agencies:

- Most resources currently provided by city agencies to both DCPS and/or charter schools should be funded through the UPSFF. These resources are included in the recommended new base funding level for all students and in weights for students with identified learning needs. These services include:
 - School nurses for DCPS and public charter schools (Department of Health);
 - School social workers for DCPS and public charter schools (Department of Behavioral Health);
 - Public Charter School Board appropriation for charter schools (Public Charter School Board);
 - Technology systems for DCPS (Office of the Chief Technology Officer);
 - Procurement services for DCPS (Office of Contracting and Procurement);
 - Legal services for DCPS (Office of the Attorney General); and
 - Facilities maintenance and repairs for DCPS (Department of General Services).

In the future, DCPS and public charter school LEAs should be responsible for purchasing these services for their schools using UPSFF funds. If mutually agreeable arrangements are in place for other DC government agencies to supply services, DCPS and/or public charter schools can enter into a memorandum of understanding or contract with these agencies to continue the arrangements. LEAs should cover the costs through an interagency transfer.

- School safety resources provided to both DCPS and public charter schools should continue to be paid for and allocated by city agencies, outside the UPSFF. These include school resource officers supplied by the Metropolitan Police Department to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and school violence and school crossing guards supplied by the Department of Transportation to reduce pedestrian injuries and fatalities in traffic accidents. Because decisions on the allocation of these resources are based on considerations for student safety, local traffic patterns, neighborhood environments, school culture, and imminent threats of violence that have little to do with a per-student share of costs, they are less amenable to allocation through the UPSFF. Therefore, MPD and DDOT should continue to provide these services and should be accountable for funding them at a level that is adequate to meet the needs of DCPS and public charter schools citywide. In addition, MPD and DDOT should develop clear criteria to determine which LEAs or schools qualify for these services in order to reduce confusion and inequity between the two sectors.

Creating Greater Transparency and Accountability in Education Budgeting, Resource Allocation, and Reporting

The purpose of this research was not to undertake an audit of DCPS or public charter school income and expenditures. Nevertheless, the study team spent considerable time gathering and analyzing financial data and information provided by DCPS, PCSB, individual charter schools, and other DC government agencies and executive offices to inform the cost estimates presented in this report. As the study team learned in the course of its work, education budgeting, resource allocation, and financial reporting are not clear and easily traceable processes in DCPS or public charter schools. The state of financial recordkeeping makes it difficult to determine the total amount spent by cost category or to assess cost drivers and cost variations within and among DCPS and public charter schools. It is also difficult to trace funding from the source to the student and to understand the total amount of education spending in the city and how it is allocated to individual schools and to central office functions. These issues are particularly pronounced for facilities maintenance and operations costs and capital investments. Accordingly, the study team recommends that:

- The Public Charter School Board should require all charter schools to adopt a standardized chart of accounts that provides clarity and accountability and enables comparisons among charters and between DCPS and the charter school LEAs. Currently, all charter schools submit annual financial reports to the PCSB, but these reports are not standardized and account for spending inconsistently.

- The city should establish an online public education funding reporting system that provides annual education budget information (e.g., local and nonlocal sources of funding; allocation of resources to LEAs and from LEAs to individual schools; and individual school-level expenditures for instruction, student support services, administration, and other educational resources).

Updating the UPSFF Regularly

This education adequacy study represents the DC government's first effort to undertake a rigorous analysis to develop a data-driven estimate of the costs of providing pre-K 3 through grade 12 students and adult education and alternative school students in the District of Columbia with an educational experience that will enable them to meet academic standards. To keep the UPSFF formulas and funding levels up to date, adequate, and equitable, the study team offers three related recommendations:

- OSSE should reconvene the technical work group (TWG) to monitor the base and weights of the UPSFF and identify, study, and make recommendations on any issues that impact the effectiveness and efficiency of these mechanisms and any concerns that raise questions about their adequacy, equity, uniformity, and transparency. The TWG should be composed of local educators, education finance experts, DCPS and public charter school representatives, DC government officials, and community leaders. It should serve as an advisory group to OSSE and the DME.
- The DC government should undertake a rigorous assessment of the adequacy of education funding through the UPSFF every five years. As conditions change in the city and as educational practice advances, city leaders should periodically assess the alignment of education funding with the city's education goals and the adequacy of funding to achieve them. The Mayor and DC Council should consider restructuring and resetting the UPSFF based on changing economic and demographic conditions, evolving educational norms and best practices, and information on educational resource needs and spending. On a more frequent basis, the city should review the facility M&O costs portion of the UPSFF in order to update them based on actual costs for DCPS and public charter schools.
- In the interim years, the UPSFF should be updated based on an indexed cost-of-living adjustment that is relevant to the cost of living in the District of Columbia.

Implementation

Under any scenario, the path toward funding the study team's recommendations will require a significant new financial commitment to education. Fully implementing these provisions is likely to be a multiyear process. The city's leaders will have to wrestle with the real limitations of fiscal feasibility and educational need. As they consider a phase-in approach, they should take into account the parallel priorities of increasing the foundational level of resources to address new standards, targeting the highest-need students, and increasing equity between DCPS and public charter schools.

1. INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades, increased accountability for student, school, and district performance has increased pressure on public education systems to ensure *all* students enter school ready to learn and leave school with the tools and skills they need to succeed in life. Such increased pressure can have a positive influence on performance, but only if policymakers and school officials can ensure that schools have the resources they need to meet performance expectations.

Concepts of education adequacy have shifted dramatically in recent years. Prior to the 1990s, common presumptions were that median spending was adequate and that states should strive to bring all districts and schools up to the average or median level of expenditure. With the growing prevalence of state standards and assessments, however, policymakers, educators, and advocates have redefined adequacy to mean the average level of spending required by districts and schools to meet prescribed academic outcome standards.¹

The adequacy of education funding is hotly debated in the District of Columbia (DC) and across the nation. Some observers believe public schools already have considerable resources to fulfill their missions and, as evidence, they point to the significant increases in education funding during the past decade. Others, however, believe schools need additional funds to address uncontrollable and rapidly growing cost pressures. Still others assert that while some schools need more resources to successfully carry out their missions, other schools are already sufficiently funded.² Moreover, differences in the level of resources allocated to traditional public schools and public charter schools are a source of significant tension in the District of Columbia, where both sectors must be funded on an equal basis by law.³

Regardless of one's view on the current condition of school funding, what is true is that, until now, DC policymakers and education leaders have not addressed in a rigorous way the question of what it costs to meet performance expectations for students in District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter schools. As in many states, DC officials have developed academic standards and timetables to achieve performance expectations and have created accountability systems with consequences for schools that fail to meet the targets. Unfortunately, however, these expectations and repercussions have been crafted without a sound, data-driven understanding of what it costs for schools to meet desired outcomes based on current academic standards and, when they are fully implemented, the new Common Core State Standards.

Purpose of the Study

Accordingly, this costing out study aims to develop a sound basis for policymakers and education leaders to understand what it will cost for all schools in the city—DCPS and public charter schools—to achieve expected performance targets. To do so, it focuses on:

¹ Bruce Baker, Lori Taylor, and Arnold Vedlitz, *Measuring Educational Adequacy in Public Schools: Report to the Texas Legislature Joint Committee on Public School Finance* (College Station, TX: George Bush School of Public Service, Texas A&M University, September 2005).

² Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc., *Costing Out the Resources Needed to Meet Pennsylvania's Public Education Goals* (Denver, CO: Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc., December 2007), i.

³ DC Official Code §38-1804.01.

- Estimating the resources needed so all DC students can meet academic performance standards, including the Common Core State Standards;
- Identifying needed changes in the structure and policies governing education funding to ensure equity between DCPS and public charter schools as required by law in all areas of funding, except for capital investment in school buildings and grounds and pensions for certified educators; and
- Ensuring transparency with regard to what costs are included in the District's Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) and with regard to local funding to DCPS and public charter schools that flows outside the UPSFF.

Do schools have the resources they need to meet performance expectations? In the District's case, this means estimating the resources needed so all elementary, middle, and high school students can achieve proficiency in reading and mathematics. It also means ensuring that funding to DCPS and public charter schools is allocated equally in all areas, except capital investment and pensions for certified educators.

The findings in this report were produced based on a rigorous 15-month study initiated by the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME) at the recommendation of the Public Education Finance Reform Commission (PERFC) in its February 2012 report to the Mayor and City Council. In response to a request for proposals, The Finance Project (TFP), a Washington, DC-based social policy research and technical assistance firm, in partnership with Augenblick, Palaich and Associates, Inc. (APA), a Denver-based education consulting firm, proposed a comprehensive research study to:

- Develop a data-driven estimate of the cost of an adequate prekindergarten (pre-K) through grade 12 education in the District of Columbia in order to meet DC academic standards and Common Core State Standards;
- Recommend changes to the structure and level of foundation funding in the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula as well as to the weightings for students with identified learning needs who require services that entail additional costs;
- Recommend changes to the way capital investments, maintenance, utilities, and custodial services for school buildings and facilities are financed and managed; and
- Develop guidance for updating the study's basic elements on a continuing periodic basis.

The TFP/APA study team used nationally recognized research methodologies—described in more detail in Chapter 2—to examine the cost of all resources required for DCPS and public charter schools to meet DC academic standards, including:

- Cost analyses of school-level resource requirements (i.e., related to instructional programs and activities, student support services, administrative services, and other

educational resources in individual schools) and system-level resource requirements (i.e., related to governance, policy-setting, program support, coordination, and communications across schools in a multicampus system) for *students without identified learning needs*;

- Cost analyses of school-level and system-level resource requirements to serve *students with identified learning needs who require specialized instruction, resources, and staff that entail additional costs* (e.g., special education students, students with limited English language proficiency, and students at risk of academic failure);
- Cost analyses of system-level and school-level data on *facilities maintenance, utilities, and custodial services for school buildings and grounds* and a review of *capital investments* for DCPS and public charter schools; and
- Analysis of the *anticipated fiscal impact*—over a three-year period from fiscal 2015 through fiscal 2017—of recommended policy, program, and system changes to achieve education adequacy for all DC students.

Background and Context for the Study

The requirement that education for all students be funded on a uniform per-student basis, with the dollars following students into and out of whatever school they attend, was enacted into DC law in 1995.⁴ The UPSFF was established to carry out the mandate. The formula calculates funding based on students and their characteristics, not on school or local educational agency (LEA) differences. This uniformity requirement applies only to local funding, not to federal or private funding. It affects only DCPS and public charter school operating budgets, not capital budgets and investments. The UPSFF is intended to fund all traditional school-level and system-level operations for which DCPS and public charter schools are responsible, including instructional, noninstructional (facilities maintenance and operations), and administrative operations.

The UPSFF is not the only local source through which DCPS or public charter schools are funded, however. Schools also receive benefits from local funding that flows through other DC government agencies. Additionally, they receive federal categorical program funding, private funding, and in-kind benefits from foundations, private donors, and community partner organizations.

Unlike many states, the District of Columbia has never commissioned a methodologically rigorous analysis of the costs of providing an adequate education. Beginning in 1996, several studies were conducted by DC education officials; other government officials (e.g., representatives from the OCFO, the Mayor's office, the City Council and local education experts and advocates to calculate the costs of a market basket of educational goods and services to be covered by the USPFF foundation amount. The market basket included nine general categories of expense:⁵

- Classroom staff: teachers and aides;

⁴ DC Official Code § 38-1804.01.

⁵ Deborah Gist, Office of the State Superintendent of Education, "The Uniform Per Student Funding Formula," PowerPoint presentation to the Executive Office of the Mayor, January 30, 2008.

- School administration: principal, assistant principal, administrative aide, business manager, and clerks;
- Direct services to students: texts, instructional technology, sports/athletics, and student services;
- Operations support: utilities, maintenance, and security;
- Central management: central administration, instructional support, and services;
- Schoolwide staff: substitute teachers, coaches, librarians, program coordinator, counselors, social workers, and psychologists;
- Nonpersonal services/programs: supplies and materials, field trips, and career and technological education;
- Instructional support: professional development and school improvement efforts; and
- Other school-based costs: technology, food service, and miscellaneous.

These common practice studies provided a rough baseline for per-student education funding, but they had several weaknesses. For example, they illustrated but did not define functions that should be covered by uniformity and adequacy. They did not address the dramatic differences between DCPS and public charter schools in funding for maintenance, utilities, and custodial services for school buildings and facilities. Most importantly, they did not take into account the requirements for schools to adequately prepare students with different characteristics and learning needs to meet the DC academic standards.⁶

The most immediate and urgent recommendation of the District's Public Education Finance Reform Commission was commissioning a full-scale education adequacy study to enable the Mayor and DC City Council to reassess the structure and level of foundation funding specified in the UPSFF.

In July 2010, the D.C. City Council passed legislation to establish a Public Education Finance Reform Commission in order to study and report on revisions to the UPSFF that would lead to improvements in equity, adequacy, affordability, and transparency.⁷ The commission was not tasked with conducting a full-scale adequacy study because of time and resource limitations. Nevertheless, it identified several issues regarding the structure of the UPSFF that affect funding adequacy for DC students. Among the most important of these issues was the lack of provision for:⁸

- Identified learning needs of students at risk of academic failure because they are in low-income families or face other conditions that affect their school performance;
- Identified learning needs of students returning to DC schools after leaving the public education system for a period;

⁶ District of Columbia Public Education Finance Reform Commission, *Equity and Recommendations Report* (Washington, DC, February 17, 2012), 23–24.

⁷ DC Official Code §38-2916

⁸ District of Columbia Public Education Finance Reform Commission.

- Adult education, alternative education programs, and summer school programs;
- Special programs for gifted and talented students;
- Students enrolled in virtual learning programs; and
- Processes for updating the cost basis for the UPSFF.

Assessing the adequacy of facilities occupied by DCPS and public charter schools, as well as policies governing space allocation in DC school buildings and capital investments in renovations and new construction, also was beyond PEFRC's mandate. However, the commissioners agreed that space costs and facilities maintenance and operations are some of the most significant, complicated, and urgent education financing issues facing city leaders.

PEFRC found that the DC government needs to make significant financial investments in the maintenance and modernization of its aging stock of school buildings and grounds as well as construct new facilities to meet changing educational needs and ensure high-quality programs are located in all neighborhoods across the city. The commission also found that as the DC government consolidates and closes DCPS schools that are underutilized, city officials need to create and manage more effective, efficient, timely, and transparent processes for making the best use of excess space in DC-owned school properties and covering the costs of maintenance, utilities, and custodial services. This can include making vacant school buildings and space in under-occupied buildings available to charter schools and nonprofit organizations that serve the community through a request for offers process. Alternatively, it can mean selling vacant buildings to developers for other purposes.

Additionally, even though facilities maintenance and operations (M&O) funding flows through the UPSFF, DCPS cannot independently cover the M&O costs related to its large stock of buildings and grounds, including those that are not in use. Consequently, it receives a significant subsidy from the Department of General Services to cover these costs outside the formula, which public charter schools do not receive. Against this backdrop, the topic of facilities funding raises several important questions on whether the current allocation of resources equitably and adequately supports the learning needs of students in both DCPS and public charter schools.

The District of Columbia Public Education Finance Reform
Commission agreed that space costs and facilities maintenance and operations are some of the most significant, complicated, and urgent education financing issues facing city leaders.

PEFRC completed its work in two phases between September 2011 and February 2012, and it made several recommendations to address these education financing issues. The most immediate and urgent among them was commissioning a full-scale education adequacy study. Based on the results of this study, the commission recommended that the Mayor and the City Council reassess the structure and level of foundation funding specified in the USPFF to ensure all DC schools have adequate funding to provide students with an education that will enable them to meet DC academic standards. It also recommended that weightings for students with identified learning needs be revised based on the study findings and recommendations. In addition, PEFRC urged

city leaders to consider revising and restructuring the basis on which maintenance, utilities, and custodial services for school buildings and grounds are set to ensure all school facilities are adequate to meet student learning needs. Finally, the commission recommended that a plan be created for ongoing review of what constitutes adequate funding for DC students and for a process for updating the UPSFF foundation funding level and weightings periodically over time.

The DC Education Adequacy Study, initiated by DME, was a direct result of PEFRC recommendations. The study offers an important opportunity for city leaders and educators to develop a sound understanding of the financial requirements for providing an adequate education for all students in the District of Columbia and setting a path toward achieving this funding level. To the extent the study lays the groundwork for a fair distribution of funding for education programs and school facilities, it may also help reduce tension and competition between DCPS and public charters for limited resources and foster more collaborative relationships that benefit students across the city.

The DC Education Adequacy Study addresses key issues related to the adequacy and equality of education funding. Not all these issues can be remedied by making adjustments to the UPSFF and changing the flow of funds to LEAs.

The DC Education Adequacy Study addresses key issues related to the adequacy and equity of education funding in the District of Columbia. It also presents recommendations for addressing these issues through restructuring and resetting the UPSFF and taking other financial steps. However, not all the issues and challenges highlighted in this introduction can be remedied by adjustments to the funding formula and the flow of funds to LEAs. Accordingly, in addition to the findings and recommendations from this study on the adequacy of education funding, the Mayor and the City Council need to consider other policy proposals to address concerns about educational programming, facilities allocation and management, and student support.

Guiding Principles

Several key principles guided this study at every stage—from design and data collection through analysis, formulation of findings and recommendations, and report drafting and dissemination.

Of primary concern was ensuring the findings and recommendations:

- *Reflect the resources that all schools—DCPS and public charter schools—need to ensure students can meet desired performance standards;*
- *Are data-driven and are based on sound analysis of information from multiple sources;*
- *Are aimed at achieving adequacy, equity, and transparency in education funding for DCPS and public charter schools;*
- *Reflect broad outreach and participation among DC education audiences and constituencies at all stages of the work, including public officials in relevant positions across DC government (e.g., the Mayor, the D.C. City Council, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, the Office of the State Superintendent of Schools (OSSE), DCPS officials, the DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB) and public charter school leaders*

and administrators, professional educators at all levels, public school and charter school advocates, and parents;

- *Incorporate input from local and national experts engaged as advisors on all aspects of the study;*
- *Can be used by the Mayor and DC City Council to update the UPSFF and its weights to properly align education spending in the District of Columbia with resource requirements to enable all DC students to meet academic performance standards; and*
- *Offer a plan for phasing in recommended funding levels and policy changes over a period of up to five years, if needed.*

Advisory Group

To ensure diverse and regular stakeholder and expert input in the study design and implementation, as well as the study findings and recommendations, the study team appointed an Advisory Group that brought together 12 national and local experts to provide advice, guidance, and feedback on all aspects of the DC Education Adequacy Study. Advisory Group members included educators and education policy and finance experts from universities, national and local leadership organizations, DCPS, and local public charter schools. (A list of Advisory Group members is presented in Appendix A.) This group reviewed the results from professional judgment panels that were informed by evidence-based research, a successful schools study, and data collected from DC government agencies, PCSB, and schools. It helped the study team integrate the school-level and system-level findings and develop relevant conclusions.

Throughout the study, the Advisory Group convened regularly by phone conference to review and comment on the methodology, data collection, and analysis. Members also met in person to review and comment on findings from the data analyses from each component of the study and to weigh in on the implications for recommendations.

Timeline and Work Plan

The DC Education Adequacy Study was conducted over a 15-month period beginning in September 2012 and continuing through December 2013. The TFP/APA study team worked closely with the DME staff in planning, designing, and implementing the study to ensure it would meet the needs of the Mayor and DC City Council as they make decisions on changes to the UPSFF and other related policies governing education financing.

Organization of the Report

This report presents the findings and recommendations that flow from the study. It is organized into six chapters. An executive summary that highlights the findings, conclusions, and recommendations is presented at the beginning of the report. Appendices at the end of the report provide detailed background information related to the DC Education Adequacy Study.

1. *Introduction*: provides an overview of the purpose, origins, and context for the DC Education Adequacy Study.
2. *Overview of the Methodological Approach*: describes the complementary blend of research approaches that were used to gather and analyze cost data and other relevant information on the resources required to adequately fund education in the District of Columbia. These included professional judgment panels informed by evidence-based

research, a successful schools study, focus groups, and extensive analysis of budget and expenditure data provided by DC agencies and schools.

3. *School-Level Findings*: presents the findings related to the school-level resource requirements and associated costs for providing an adequate education to students at different grade levels without and with identified learning needs in DCPS and public charter schools.
4. *System-Level Findings*: presents the findings related to the system-level resource requirements and associated costs for DCPS and public charter schools.
5. *Cost of Education Adequacy*: offers conclusions on the appropriate UPSFF base funding level and the weights for serving students with identified learning needs, including costs that are and are not covered by the UPSFF. It also offers conclusions on the appropriate funding level and formula for facilities M&O costs and conclusions on the allocation of costs within and outside the UPSFF. In addition, this chapter contains three-year cost projections and fiscal impacts based on anticipated enrollment trends and other foreseeable factors that are likely to drive education costs.
6. *Recommendations*: makes recommendations on restructuring the UPSFF formula; resetting the UPSFF base level and weights to ensure they cover the current cost of education adequacy in the District of Columbia; ensuring local funding flows through the UPSFF with specific and limited exceptions in order to ensure equity between DCPS and public charter school LEAs; creating greater transparency and accountability in education budgeting, resource allocation, and reporting; and updating the UPSFF on a periodic basis.

2. OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY

The Finance Project (TFP), with its partner Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA), developed a rigorous methodological approach to analyze the adequacy of public education funding at the system and school levels for public schools and public charter schools in the District of Columbia (DC). Over a 15-month period beginning in September 2012, the TFP/APA study team created and implemented a complex, multimethod study design aimed at developing a sound, data-driven assessment of the costs of providing an adequate public education to all DC students, prekindergarten (pre-K) through grade 12, including those with identified learning needs who require specialized resources that entail additional costs.

Defining Adequacy

As a first step toward defining and measuring the costs of required resources, the study team addressed the question of what constitutes adequacy and what this term means in the context of funding for District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter schools. DC policymakers and education leaders wanted to study education adequacy as a basis for resetting the parameters of the District's Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF). Their aim was to clearly define educational standards and requirements and the inputs needed to meet them. Inputs include all school-level and system-level instructional, student support, and administration resources, as well as other education resources (e.g., course requirements, time objectives, educational experiences, strategic planning, and coordination), so all schools have a sufficient amount of funding and other resources to achieve educational outcomes (e.g., achieving certain proficiency levels in core subjects and earning a high school diploma). Based on this definition, the specification of standards for measuring student performance was a critical first step to conduct the costing out analysis.

“Adequacy” is defined as the educational input requirements to achieve desired student outcomes, based on specified performance objectives.

For costing out purposes, the study team determined the cost of ensuring that DCPS and public charter schools at all grade levels have adequate resources to meet the expectations associated with the specified standards and to avoid any consequences associated with not meeting those standards. Two widely accepted, but philosophically different, approaches to determining relevant costs exist:

- The first approach focuses on the *costs of providing necessary inputs associated with standards and requirements* (e.g., schools are required to ensure certain services can be provided or certain procedures can be implemented). The costs of compliance express the burden of meeting those requirements. However, compliance does not ensure that the basic objectives are fulfilled.
- The second approach focuses on the *costs of achieving desired academic outcomes* (e.g., that student performance increases at a particular rate, or that schools will avoid the sanctions created as part of standards-based reform, which are designed to sanction

schools that fail to meet those objectives). If schools are to fulfill the underlying objectives of DC law that all students receive “adequate regular [general] education services,”¹ student performance must increase sufficiently across all schools, grade levels, and neighborhoods throughout the city. Although student performance results cannot be guaranteed, sufficient resources can be provided so all students have a meaningful opportunity to meet the objectives.

The TFP/APA study team employed the second approach. The DC Education Adequacy Study focused on clarifying resources required to reasonably prepare all students to achieve proficiency based on DC academic standards at each grade level, as measured through the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) and the additional quality school assessment for public charter schools implemented by the District’s Public Charter School Board (PCSB). It also took into account requirements for meeting the Common Core State Standards and the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC),² when they are implemented beginning in school year 2014–2015. The study team worked closely with multiple stakeholders, including the Advisory Group, DCPS, PCSB, the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), and the state board of education, to specify the standards that guided the study. The detailed standards framework the study team adopted is presented in Appendix B.

The standards set clarified the resources required to reasonably prepare all students to achieve proficiency based on DC academic standards at each grade level.

The standards guiding the study encompassed requirements for all students and additional provisions and requirements for students with identified learning needs. Following are requirements for all students:

- Instructional inputs, including mandated services or programs that must be provided (e.g., the minimum number of days students must attend school), curricula that must be taught, and educational experiences that must be offered.
- Student achievement outputs/outcomes, including requirements focused on the completion of academic programs of study and the level of proficiency students must achieve on standardized tests, such as the DC CAS assessments and the anticipated PARCC.
- Additional system-level requirements, including requirements that affect educational operations across schools in a multicampus system (e.g., those related to student services, data systems, strategic planning, and coordination).

¹ DC Official Code §38.2901, definitions paragraph 5.

² PARCC is one of two assessment consortia that have developed achievement tests aligned to the Common Core Standards.

Additional requirements for students with identified learning needs include provisions for instructional inputs, adaptive educational programs and technology, student achievement outputs/outcomes, and system-level requirements for:

- Special education students, including students with varying physical, psychological, social-emotional, communication, and learning disabilities or challenges who require different approaches to teaching, the use of technology, and a specifically adapted classroom or other facilities to be a successful learner. These students are categorized into four levels of need, according to the number of hours per week they require specialized services. Developing resource specifications for these special education students at all school levels—elementary through high school—proved difficult. The difficulty arose, in part, because of different professional perspectives on the levels and balance of additional instructional programming, student support, and therapeutic services these students need to be successful learners. It also reflects the challenges of assigning system-level resources to specific special education levels of need. In some cases, adjustments were made to the recommended staffing or supports based on additional stakeholder input.
- English language learners, including students who are not proficient in English. These are students with difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, and understanding English because they were born outside the United States, their native language is not English, and/or their home or community environment has made it difficult for them to develop English proficiency.
- Students at risk of academic failure, including students from poor and severely economically disadvantaged families and communities. The study team initially used students' eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals (FARM) as a proxy to identify those with multiple academic or behavioral risk characteristics. A direct one-to-one correlation between low-income status and risk of academic failure does not exist; however, poverty and poor school performance are closely associated, as is experience in the child welfare system. Initially, the study team used this proxy to develop the resource specifications that were costed out to develop the at-risk weight. However, three other criteria were later used to calculate and project funding amounts using a more targeted definition of at risk that identifies students with the lowest income levels who are more likely most at risk:
 - Students who are in foster care;
 - Students who are homeless; and
 - Students who are living in low-income families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

Several stakeholders have raised concerns that these criteria are too narrow and would significantly under-count the number of students who are truly at-risk of academic failure. Others remarked that using eligibility for FARM as a proxy for at-risk status—which was a definition initially considered by the study team—would over-fund schools with a high percentage of low- and moderate-income students who will qualify for subsidized meals but are not truly at -risk of academic failure. The study team recognizes that these deficiencies exist in the proposed working definition. Therefore, as it is

ultimately a policy decision for the Mayor and the City Council to define at-risk status, Therefore, the study team urges DC education leaders to:

- Engage stakeholders further to help refine the definition of at-risk, so that it is targeted to the District's needs; and
- Align eligibility determination criteria the criteria for determining eligibility with the OSSE's early warning system for identifying students at risk of academic failure., when it is completed.
- Alternative schools students, including students who have multiple risk characteristics that cause them to be over-age, under-credited, and behind-grade in academic performance. The study team relied on OSSE's proposed definition to define eligible alternative education students. They are students who are eligible for a public school education and are not academically proficient and fit one of the of the following descriptions:
 - Are under court supervision because of neglect, abuse, or a need for supervision;
 - Have been incarcerated in an adult correctional facility;
 - Are committed to the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services as a delinquent;
 - Have received multiple short-term suspensions from DCPS or public charter schools;
 - Are on long-term suspension from a DCPS or public charter school;
 - Have been expelled from a DCPS or public charter school, or another jurisdiction, after the required expulsion period has expired;
 - Are seeking admission to a DCPS or public charter school after withdrawing for a period of one or more terms, during which they received no public or private instruction;
 - Are receiving treatment for drug abuse;
 - Have a history of violence;
 - Are chronically truant;
 - Are under-credited;
 - Are pregnant or parenting; or
 - Meet other criteria for at-risk status as defined by OSSE.
- Adult education students, including students who are at least 18 years of age and have family and work responsibilities that make it difficult for them to attend regular high schools. These students require specialized supports and services to earn a high school diploma or equivalency certificate, including a flexible school schedule.

Measuring Adequacy

To cost out the level of funding needed to meet performance expectations, the TFP/APA study team gathered and analyzed data and information using two nationally recognized and accepted methodologies and incorporated elements of a third methodology:

- A professional judgment panel (PJ), which relies on the expertise and experience of professional educators to specify the resources, staff, and programs that schools at each level need to meet performance expectations and the system-level resources to support effective educational operations in multicampus systems. In the DC Education Adequacy Study, PJ panels used information from the education research—evidence base (EB)—to

help answer questions about how resources should be deployed in schools so students can meet performance expectations. This approach was used as a starting point for the PJ panels and to benchmark results, but it was not fully implemented to produce independent results. The evidence-based approach examines the academic research related to resource allocation and student performance. Resource levels for personnel and other costs are identified for resources that have been shown to contribute to significant statistical improvements in student achievement.

- A *successful schools study* (SS), which provides information on the cost of serving students in a general education setting with no special circumstances; the SS study does not provide information on students with identified learning needs. This approach was used to examine the spending of high-performing schools—both DCPS and public charter schools—as measured against DC academic performance standards, growth in student performance, and the whole school environment.

Each approach has strengths and weaknesses in producing information that can support sound decisions on adequate education funding levels, but none is perfect. Consequently, the TFP/APA study team employed a *blended methodology* that includes both the professional judgment panels and the successful schools study and that incorporates elements of the evidence-based approach. These approaches were used to analyze resource needs from different perspectives and to triangulate findings in order to produce a single cost estimate. The results of data collection and analysis employing these complementary methods were then compared, combined, and interpolated to derive the most reasonable, reliable, data-driven cost estimates.

The study team employed a blend of nationally recognized research approaches: a professional judgment (PJ) approach that brought together professional educators to specify resource needs using evidence-based research (EB) as a starting point and a successful schools (SS) approach that examined spending by high-performing DCPS and public charter schools.

Data collected through these established methods was supplemented with information from focus groups and individual interviews.

Both PJ and SS approaches enable practitioners to examine the base cost of educating a student (i.e., the cost of serving a student without identified learning needs in a general education setting with no special circumstances) in two ways so the cost can be compared and validated. However, these approaches vary in their capacity to identify additional resources needed to serve students with identified learning needs and in their ability to identify the difference in resource costs associated with different educational settings.

For the District of Columbia, the successful schools study could not produce reliable information on the costs of serving students with different types of identified learning needs because the sample sizes for each category of need were too small. In contrast, the PJ panels were able to focus extensive attention on each category of need and develop targeted resource specifications. These specifications were then reviewed; adjustments were made based on input from subsequent panels and data and information from interviews with OSSE, DCPS, and charter school leaders. By employing multiple methods, the study team was able to ensure at least two sources of relevant data and information for all critical cost estimation areas addressed in the study (see Appendix C).

The study team also conducted several focus groups and held individual interviews with key stakeholders. These sessions contributed additional information to help fill gaps, clarify issues raised by the PJ panels and the SS study, and verify findings from other sources.

Additional fiscal analyses were conducted using data provided by DCPS, PCSB, and various city agencies, including the:

- Department of General Services (DGS);
- Department of Health (DOH);
- Department of Behavioral Health (DBH),
- Department of Transportation (DDOT),
- Metropolitan Police Department (MPD),
- Chief Financial Officer (OCFO),
- Attorney General (OAG),
- Contracting and Procurement (OCP),
- Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), and
- Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE).

These sources provided primary data relevant to other key costing issues, such as student support staff (e.g., school nurses and social workers), school resource officers, facilities management, and maintenance costs. These sources also provided information on funding that benefits DCPS and public charter schools but flows through District agencies and DCPS/charter school-driven cost differences.

Data and information from all of these sources were analyzed and synthesized with the results from the analytic methods discussed earlier. (See Appendix D for a list of focus group participants. See Appendix E for a list of individuals who provided data and information through phone and face-to-face interviews and meetings.)

Together, all these data sources and analyses enabled the study team to identify the following key cost elements for DC schools to meet performance expectations:

- The *base cost* of educating an average student to meet state performance expectations; this base cost does not include capital costs, such as school building construction costs, pension costs for certified educators, or debt service costs;
- Cost *weights* for educating students at different grade levels and with identified learning needs (e.g., special education students, English language learners, and students at risk of academic failure) to meet performance standards; and

- Additional *cost factors* associated with differences between schools in terms of their size and whether they are DCPS or public charter schools, including facilities maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.

Using the Professional Judgment Approach

The professional judgment approach generally is regarded as the most robust methodology for costing out education adequacy. It can be used to identify the base cost figure and adjustments for students with identified learning needs and schools in unique settings. It relies on the expertise and experience of practicing professional educators to specify the resources that schools need to serve all students.

One of the approach's greatest strengths is it brings together educators with diverse experiences, expertise, and authority to address the question of which programs can provide an adequate education and what resources would be required to do so. Panelists pool their talents, starting with teachers and specialists articulating the standards of their field and their experience in adapting to the needs of different students and different learning environments. This is followed by resource specialists translating programs into personnel and is capped by administrators focusing on the trade-offs among alternative programs. The outcome is not what any one individual would have foreseen. Instead, it reflects a blending of diverse expertise from professionals who are most aware of the academic standards and performance goals as well as the types of resources and programs students need most to achieve those goals. The costs of all resources are then determined based on locality-specific prices. (See Appendix F for a summary of guidance to PJ panelists.)

The professional judgment approach is based on the idea that panels of experienced educators can identify the programs and resources that schools need to meet DC performance expectations.

Panel Composition

The Finance Project invited a wide array of current education practitioners in DCPS and public charter schools, as well as other local education administrators and experts, to serve on the PJ panels (see Table 2.1). These individuals were selected based on their professional experience and areas of professional expertise.³ Each panel was composed of five to eight members who

³ Professional judgment panel members were all DC educators and/or education support personnel currently working in DCPS or public charter schools. They included individuals with experience and expertise in the following areas:

- Teachers, all grade levels, public school and public charter schools;
- Teachers in magnet programs;
- Teachers in competitive and/or specialized school programs (e.g., Duke Ellington School for the Arts and McKinley Technology High School);
- Teachers in alternative school programs;
- Teachers certified to teach special education;
- Teachers certified to teach English language learners;
- Teachers with experience teaching in adult education programs;

worked collaboratively to specify resource needs. The study team sought educators with experience working in schools with small and with large enrollments as well as experience with specialized curricula and programs, such as magnet schools, alternative schools, adult education programs, or special subject focuses. (See Appendix G for a list of professional judgment panel members.)

Ten PJ panels were used for the DC Education Adequacy Study.

- *School-level panels*: These three panels identified the resources needed at each school level—elementary school, middle school, and high school. The panel members included teachers, principals, instructional experts, and others most familiar with critical resource needs.
 - Elementary School Panel (prekindergarten for three- and four-year-olds [pre-K3 and pre-K4] and kindergarten [K] through grade 5)
 - Middle School Panel (grades 6 through 8)
 - High School Panel (grades 9 through 12)
- *Identified learning needs panels*: These four panels focused on the additional resources needed for students with identified learning needs, including students enrolled in special education, English language learners, alternative and adult education students, and students at risk of academic failure. This enabled a careful review of needs for different categories of students and how they can best be met within DCPS and public charter schools. Panel members included personnel familiar with the resources required to ensure students with identified learning needs can meet education standards.
 - Identified Learning Needs Panel, Elementary School
 - Identified Learning Needs Panel, Middle School and High School
 - Identified Learning Needs Panel, Adult Education and Alternative Schools
 - Identified Learning Needs Panel, Levels 1–4 Special Education
- *System-level panels*: These two panels reviewed the work of the school-level panels and the identified learning needs panels. In addition, they specified the resources needed at the central local educational agency (LEA) office level to ensure DCPS and public charter schools are supported in a manner that ensures students can meet academic standards. These panels included several system-level experts with deep knowledge of the resources needed at the LEA level to ensure effective and efficient system-level management for public schools and public charter schools.
 - District of Columbia Public Schools System Panel
 - Public Charter Schools System Panel
- *Facilities management and maintenance panel*: Facilities management and maintenance is an important education cost driver, so the study team appointed a PJ panel to focus specifically on resource needs and related costs for school building and grounds. This

-
- Principals, all levels, public school and public charter schools;
 - Chief financial officers/school business managers, public school and public charter schools; and
 - Other school support staff, such as school counselors, social workers, nurses, academic deans, and school resource officers.

panel was composed of DCPS and public charter school officials with deep knowledge of facilities cost issues and policy. It also included Department of General Services (DGS) officials who manage portions of DCPS school maintenance.

- *Overall review:* The Advisory Group was responsible for reviewing all of the work done during the course of the study and making final adjustments to the resource specifications at the school and system levels. This group reviewed the work of all the PJ panels, discussed resource prices, examined preliminary cost figures, and attempted to resolve some of the inconsistencies that arose across panels in order to derive aggregate and per-student costs for the representative schools.

Table 2.1: Composition of the Professional Judgment Panels

PANELS	PANELISTS
School-Level Panels <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elementary: Pre-K–Grade 5 2. Middle School: Grades 6–8 3. High School: Grades 9–12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Principals • Instructional experts working in the schools (e.g., resource teachers, mentor teachers, and accountability specialists)
Identified Learning Needs Panels <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elementary school identified learning needs 2. Middle school/high school identified learning needs 3. Adult/alternative school identified learning needs 4. Students in special education Levels 1–4 (with individualized education plans) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers • Principals • Special education resource staff and instructional experts • Adult educators • Instructors and resource staff with expertise serving English language learners and economically disadvantaged children
District of Columbia Public Schools System Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DCPS instructional support staff • System-level administrative staff members • System-level budget office staff members • DCPS principals and/or administrators • Staff from the office of the chancellor and DCPS central office staff
Public Charter Schools System Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC public charter schools instructional support staff • DC public charter school principals and/or administrators • Contractors to charter management organizations that provide administrative and financial management support • Public Charter School Board staff
Facilities Management and Maintenance Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC department of general services staff • DCPS budget office staff • DC public charter school principals/chief executive officers/chief financial officers • DCPS school principals/chief financial officers • DCPS, office of the chancellor
Advisory Group	<p>National experts in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education policy • Education programs • Education finance <p>Members of key DC stakeholder groups</p>

Professional Judgment Panel Process

The panels followed a prescribed procedure in doing their work that included the following steps:

- *Setting student performance standards.* With input from DC education officials, the study team developed a standard set of required instructional, student support, administrative, technology, and other educational resources to guide the PJ panels. The document catalogs the expectations for educational inputs to enable all DC students to achieve outcomes that match state and federal performance levels (see Appendix B).
- *Launching and facilitating the PJ panels' deliberations.* Using uniform procedures, the study team reviewed the student performance standards with each PJ panel and outlined the task of creating representative schools. With facilitation support from the study team, each panel convened for approximately one day to create representative schools and specify resource needs. Panelists were instructed *not* to build their dream school, but to identify the resources specifically needed to meet DC performance standards. However, to the extent existing school resources are not adequate or up to date (e.g., technology), they were encouraged to think broadly about resources that will be needed to provide students with an adequate education in the coming years based on findings from existing educational research and from their experience in DC schools and classrooms. Panelists were instructed to “create a set of programs, curricula, or services designed to serve students with particular needs in such a way that the indicated requirements/objectives can be fulfilled,” and to “use [their] experience and expertise to organize personnel, supplies and materials, and technology in an efficient way [they] feel confident will produce desired outcomes” (see Appendix F).
- *Creating representative schools.* As described in greater detail in Chapter 3, the study team worked with the PJ panels to construct representative schools that reflect current service levels, sizes, and student composition in DC public schools and public charter schools, using available evidence-based research on resource needs as a starting point for their deliberations. Panelists had access to actual quantities and monetary values where these were found in the research literature. Where the research literature did not address specific resources, panelists formed their own judgments. Panelists were instructed to identify the types and amount of resources (e.g., number of teachers) needed to meet the performance expectations, not to estimate the actual costs of providing those resources. Each panel reached consensus on resource specifications, though not every member would allocate funds strictly according to the specifications. At the time of the meetings, no participant (either panel members or the study team) had a precise idea of the costs of the resources that were being identified. This is not to say that panel members were unaware that higher levels of resources would produce higher base cost figures or weights. Yet, without specific price information and knowledge of how other panels were proceeding, it would have been impossible for any individual or panel to suggest resource levels that would have led to a specific base cost figure or weight, much less a cost that was relatively higher or lower than another.
- *Synthesizing the results of multiple PJ panels.* Each of the school-level and identified learning needs panels, as well as the facilities panel, met with members of the TFP/APA

team for approximately one day each to design initial representative schools and/or program specifications. Subsequent system-level panels reviewed the conclusions of the school-level panels and built in resources for central administration, management, oversight, and support. The Advisory Group then reviewed, reconciled, and finalized the specifications developed by all the other panels.

- *Costing out the school-level resources needed to meet the District's public education goals.* Based on the consensus achieved by each school-level panel on required resources, the study team developed estimated costs based on current DC wage and price information. School-level cost categories include:
 - *Instructional staff*, including classroom teachers, other resource teachers, media specialists, teacher aides, and substitute teachers;
 - *Student support staff*, including school nurses, psychologists, counselors, social workers, and family liaisons;
 - *Administrative staff*, including principals, assistant principals, deans, technology managers, business managers, registrars, and clerical staff;
 - *Technology*, including hardware, software, local area and wireless networks, and licensing fees;
 - *Other educational resources*, including textbooks, supplies, and other consumables; extra-curricular programs such as sports, music and performing arts, and student-run clubs; and professional development;
 - *Additional programs* to strengthen academic success, including preschool, extended-day and extended-year programs, bridge programs, and college preparation programs; and
 - *Other costs*, including security.

The identified learning needs panels added to the resource specifications developed by the regular school-level panels to address the needs of English language learners and at-risk, adult, alternative, and special education students.

- *Costing out the system-level resources needed to meet the District's public education goals.* Based on the deliberations of the two system-level panels concerning required resources, the study team developed estimated system costs for DCPS and public charter schools. DCPS cost estimates were based on the DCPS fiscal 2014 budget. Public charter school costs were based on panel specifications of resources for LEAs that serve one or a small number of charter schools. A cost estimate was then developed based on current DC wage and price information. System-level resources include maintaining key capacities related to managing programs at multiple campuses, including:
 - *Strategic planning and management*;
 - *Financial management*;
 - *Procurement*;
 - *Academic programming and support*, including curriculum development, professional development, and resources;
 - *Outreach and coordination of programs and resources for students with identified learning needs*;
 - *Food service* (resources needed above generated revenues);
 - *Youth engagement and support*;

- *Family and public engagement;*
- *Legal support and services,* including risk management;
- *Human resources management,* including personnel policies and procedures, recruitment, hiring, performance review, and recordkeeping; and
- *Data management and accountability,* including student tracking.

Panelists were instructed *not* to build their dream school, but to identify the resources needed to meet DC performance standards, including the Common Core State Standards when they are fully implemented.

In sum, the PJ approach enabled the study team to specify the resources needed for base-level education spending, additional resources for students with identified learning needs, and the resource costs associated with alternative settings. Convening multiple panels offered several significant strengths:

- Convening multiple panels enabled the *separation of school-level resources from system-level resources.*
- Multiple panels focused on *schools at different levels and of different sizes and composition, as well as students with different learning needs,* so the study team could determine whether and to what extent these factors impact school- and system-level costs.
- Each panel’s work was reviewed by at least one other panel, which ensured *broad inclusiveness in the deliberative process* and greater accountability for the final cost estimates.

Incorporation of the Evidence-Based Approach

Although the TFP/APA study team did not undertake an independent analysis of relevant evidence-based research as a component of the DC Education Adequacy Study, the evidence-based approach was an integral part of the PJ approach. Built on the premise that education research has reached certain conclusions on how resources should be deployed in schools to improve student performance, it uses existing educational research to identify strategies that are most likely to produce desired student performance outcomes. Strategies may include class size reductions, interventions for special student populations, summer school, professional development, changes in school-day and school-year scheduling, and supplementary support services for students and their families.

The study team drew heavily on the work of other researchers who are reported in the seminal meta-data research paper by Goetz, Odden, and Picus.⁴ These authors located, read, evaluated, and synthesized the findings from hundreds of studies, reports, and other sources on effective educational strategies and practices. This included research that identified educational programs

⁴ Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, “Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy,” *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

and practices that demonstrate *direct effects* on improving academic performance. It also included research on strategies that may have *indirect effects* on performance, such as behavioral support programs that increase time on task. Although most of the research literature is state-specific, this meta-analysis offered the most relevant evidence base for the DC Education Adequacy Study.

The study team used this information as a starting point for the PJ panels' efforts to develop representative schools at each level (pre-K/elementary school, middle school, and high school) and guide their deliberations on resource requirements for students without and with identified learning needs. To overcome the disadvantages of using the EB approach alone—one being that it speaks only to limited types of resources and treats all situations generically—the study team incorporated the EB approach into the PJ panels' design and work.

Using the Successful Schools Approach

The successful schools approach examined levels of spending in DCPS and public charter schools that were identified as high-performing. The study team:

- *Identified successful schools*. The selection of schools for the SS study was not an attempt to identify a representative sample of all DC schools. Instead, it was an effort to identify schools presently regarded as successful compared with other schools. Both DCPS and the District's Public Charter School Board have created frameworks to assess the overall performance of their schools. Each framework uses indicators to determine the extent to which its schools, and the students enrolled in them, are meeting standards set by the District of Columbia and the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The frameworks' indicators consider academic achievement data and other data, such as graduation rates, re-enrollment rates, and attendance rates. They afford a balanced view of school success, both in terms of student achievement and satisfaction. In consultation with staff from the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education, DCPS officials, PCSB staff, and other relevant stakeholders, the study team determined characteristics demonstrated by high-performing DCPS and public charter schools. These criteria varied slightly for the two sectors, but generally focused on a combination of:
 - Student academic performance;
 - Student growth over time;
 - Graduation rates;
 - Gateway measures; and
 - Leading indicators.

These characteristics were used to identify schools in each sector that were asked to provide detailed school- and system-level revenue and expenditure data to enable the study team to analyze the current costs of educating students without identified learning needs in high-performing schools. Not all schools that would be considered successful by these criteria participated in the study. (For more details on selection criteria and how they were applied to select DCPS and public charter schools, see Appendix H.)

This approach offered the inherent advantage of focusing the analysis on a selection of schools across the city whose leaders have found ways to successfully educate students to meet performance expectations. It was very helpful in clarifying expenditure levels for students *without* identified learning needs. It did not, however, provide insight into the

costs of serving students with identified learning needs who require specialized instruction, resources, and staff that entail additional costs. Table 2.2 summarizes the key characteristics of schools selected for the SS study. (Appendix I contains a profile of each school in the SS study.)

Table 2.2: Key Characteristics of Schools Selected for the Successful Schools Study

Sector Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District of Columbia Public Schools: 16 ▪ Charter Schools: 21
Geographic Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward 1: 5 schools (2 Charter, 3 DCPS) ▪ Ward 2: 1 school (Charter) ▪ Ward 3: 6 schools (DCPS) ▪ Ward 4: 9 schools (7 Charter, 2 DCPS) ▪ Ward 5: 3 schools (2 Charter, 1 DCPS) ▪ Ward 6: 3 schools (2 Charter, 1 DCPS) ▪ Ward 7: 6 Schools (3 Charter, 3 DCPS) ▪ Ward 8: 4 Schools (4 Charter)
Grades Served	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-K3 to Grade3/Pre-K3 to Grade 5/Pre-K4 to Grade 5: 15 schools ▪ Pre-K3 to Grade 8/Pre-K4 to Grade 8: 4 schools ▪ Grades 4–8/Grades 5–8: 8 schools ▪ Grades 6–8/Grades 6–9: 3 schools ▪ Grades 6–12: 2 schools ▪ Grades 9–11/Grades 9–12: 5 schools
Number of Students Enrolled School enrollment ranges from 200 to more than 1,200, with most of the schools enrolling 250–450 students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 200–400: 26 schools ▪ 400–600: 7 schools ▪ 600–800: 2 schools ▪ 800–1000: 0 schools ▪ 1,001 and above: 2 schools
Identified Learning Needs	<p>Low Income: In schools across the District, the average rate of low-income students, as measured by eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals, is 71%. Among the identified successful schools, low-income students account for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 45% of the student population in DCPS ▪ 64% of the student population in Public Charter Schools <p>Special Education: DCPA notes that approximately 17% of students receive special education services. Among the identified successful schools, special education students account for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 9% of the student population in DCPS ▪ 12% of the student population in Public Charter Schools <p>English Language Learners: The number of English language learners (ELLs) varies across the identified successful schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 28 schools have an ELL population that accounts for up to 15% of students. ▪ 7 schools have an ELL population that accounts for 15%–35% of students. ▪ The remaining 2 schools have an ELL population that accounts for 36% and 58% of students, respectively.

Sources: Successful School Study data collection

- *Gathered school-level and system-level expenditure data.* The study team prepared a data collection template to gather detailed income and expenditure data from each of the selected schools for school year (SY) 2011–2012. To the extent possible, charter school LEAs successfully completed the templates to produce school-specific spending data that included system-level costs associated with schools with multiple campuses. As needed, this data was supplemented with PCSB audited information for all charter schools. (PCSB audited information also was used for a few charter schools that did not report complete data.) For the DCPS schools in the sample, the Office of the Chancellor provided revenue and expenditure data for all schools. Total school spending was divided by the number of students in each school to calculate per-student school costs. (Appendix J presents the template and guidance for the collection of school-level and system-level expenditure data for the SS study.)

- *Collected data on supplemental funding and other resources.* Leaders at each of the schools participating in the successful schools study were asked to provide information on additional cash, grants, and in-kind resources available to the school for the benefit of all students and/or for categories of students. This includes, for example, contributions of money, supplies, and volunteer time. It includes supplemental funding for additional academic programs, such as after-school programs, summer school, and/or dual-credit programs with local colleges and universities. Some school leaders were able to provide this information; for others, the task was more challenging. By supplementing the basic information on school revenues with information from the DC Office of Partnerships and Grant Services and the DC Public Education Fund, the study team was able to identify additional sources of revenue available to schools in the successful schools study. With this information, the study team calculated a per-student supplemental spending estimate that was added to the base level of per-student spending on education programs for successful schools. (Appendix J provides a summary of guidance to leaders of successful DCPS and public charter schools participating in the SS study.)

- *Determined a base cost.* To determine the base cost for educating students in high-performing DCPS and public charter schools, the initial study design called for separating expenditures related to serving students with identified learning needs from those related to serving general education students. However, because the identification of these expenditures was inconsistent across sectors and schools, the study team determined that it was preferable to employ a weighted student approach that is often used for SS studies where disaggregating costs for particular students or programs is difficult. Employing this approach, weights were identified for each of the identified learning needs categories and applied to total spending in order to derive a reasonable estimate of the amount of funding that was allocated to students with identified learning needs in the SS study schools.

To generate a base cost for educating students without identified learning needs, the study team divided the total of identified expenditures by the weighted student counts. Importantly, these expenditure totals included all spending by DCPS and public charter schools in the SS study, not just spending that was specific to local UPSFF funding. All

available funding from DC education appropriations, other city agencies, federal programs, and private funds are taken into account in the SS study calculations.

The successful schools approach provided a sound estimate of the amount high-performing DCPS and public charter schools currently spend per general education student.

In sum, the SS approach provided a sound estimate of the amount high-performing DCPS and public charter schools currently spend per student to achieve results for general education students who do not have identified learning needs and, therefore, do not require specialized resources that entail additional costs.

- This estimate provides an *important point of comparison to the estimated costs of required resources identified by the PJ panels and confirms the results of the PJ cost analysis.*
- This component of the study did not address *the costs of serving students with identified learning needs.*
- This approach did not allow for the *separation of school-level resources from system-level resources.*

Comparing Expenditures Within and Outside the UPSFF

In addition to examining cost estimates resulting from the work of the PJ panels and from the SS study, the TFP/APA study team carefully analyzed current education spending within and outside the UPSFF for both DCPS and public charter schools to understand the level of current per-student education spending. Although the formula was intended to cover all instructional and noninstructional costs for educating DC students, both DCPS and public charter schools receive supplemental benefits from other city agencies, though not on an equal per-student basis, including the:

- Department of Health (DOH) for school nurses;
- Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) for social workers;
- Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) for school resource officers; and
- Department of Transportation (DDOT) for school crossing guards.

DCPS receives additional supplemental support from other DC agencies, including the:

- Office of the Attorney General (OAG) for legal support services;
- Office of Contracting and Procurement (OCP), for procurement services;
- Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO) for computer systems, and
- Department of General Services (DGS) for facilities maintenance.

These benefits do not show up as DCPS school-level or system-level expenses, because they are paid directly by the referenced DC government agencies.

In addition to UPSFF funding, public charter schools also receive an annual \$3,000 per-student facilities allowance. These funds are intended to cover capital investments and lease obligations. However, public charter schools have wide discretion in how they allocate these nonlapsing funds.

Differences in how the two systems are funded and what funds cover each expenditure category complicate efforts to compute and compare costs between DCPS and public charter schools. They also complicate efforts to develop a reasonable, standard, data-based estimate of the costs of providing an adequate education to all DC students.

To address these complexities, the study team designated all expenditures for DCPS and public charter schools by whether they were covered within or outside the UPSFF. The team also assessed whether the expenditures were covered at the school level or the system level. For public charter schools, this analysis included the facilities allowance. For both systems, the study team identified funding from other public sources, including federal program funds and supplemental appropriations, to take full account of all relevant sources of revenue and all relevant expenditures in order to determine current per-student spending and compare it with calculations on the required base and weights for spending to ensure all students can receive an adequate education.

Blending Results Based on Multiple Methods

To develop sound data-driven cost estimates for the full range of costs associated with providing an adequate education, the study team conducted a comprehensive analysis of data and information from multiple sources, using multiple analytic methods. The study design was created to measure adequacy as it is reflected in three fundamental cost components:

- *A base cost per pupil common to all schools*—the parameter that can be used to establish the foundation per-student aid amount that is distributed under the District’s UPSFF;
- *Adjustments to the base cost to reflect the cost pressures associated with different students, different education programs, or different characteristics of schools reflected in the weights; and*
- *Adjustments to the base cost to reflect cost pressures associated with maintenance and operations, including utilities and custodial services for school facilities.*

Data and information were gathered, aggregated, analyzed, and synthesized, with significant input from the Advisory Group, to develop sound cost estimates for providing an adequate education to all DC students. In some cases, this required reconciling differences in the results produced using different research methods to present a single reasonable cost figure. Of particular note:

- The new Common Core State Standards are just now being implemented nationwide, so no reliable past experience exists to help set student performance benchmarks aligned with the new approach. The SS study contributed important insights into how successful schools can help boost student performance based on current standards, but it could not shed light on the resource needs and related costs for meeting the new standards. Accordingly, the PJ panels played an important role in helping the study team anticipate

modifications and enhancements in educational programs, services, assessments, and other resources that will be required and the related costs.

- Developing specifications for students with identified learning needs is challenging, because it is difficult to distinguish the base level of resources needed by all students from additional resources needed only by students with specific categories of identified learning needs.

In addition, the study team started with identifying students at-risk of academic failure using eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals. The study team recognized the need to identify additional relevant low-income proxies because of the complication the community eligibility option⁵ introduces in identifying students qualifying for these subsidized meals. The study team also recognized that a direct correlation between poverty and educational risk does not exist but it decided to rely on low-income proxies until the Office of the State Superintendent of Education fully develops and implements an early warning system for identifying students at risk of academic failure. In the short term, the study team determined that being in foster care, being homeless, and living in a family that is TANF-eligible were reasonable factors identifying at-risk students.

- The specifications from the PJ panels, with some adjustments based on research evidence and other data analyses, became the driving force for the recommended new base level of UPSFF funding and the additional weights.
- The SS results provided an important point of comparison for determining the base level of UPSFF funding and validated the findings of the PJ panels.

Employing multiple analytic methods enabled the study team to gain a broad perspective on diverse factors that affect education costs and cost differences between DCPS and public charter schools. It also afforded insights into possible strategies for reconciling differences to achieve adequacy, equity, and transparency in DC education funding. To the extent the conclusions of the PJ panels track closely to the findings in the existing educational research literature and are reinforced by the SS study, DC policymakers who are faced with competing priorities and limited budgets can have significant confidence in the study results.

⁵ The Office of the State Superintendent of Education defines schools as eligible to participate in the community eligibility option based on whether they have 40 percent or more of identified students who are direct certified for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance, are homeless, or are in foster care, according to data reported in the District of Columbia's Direct Certification System, by the state agency homeless coordinator, and/or by the department of child and family services as of April 1st of each year.

3. SCHOOL-LEVEL FINDINGS

The professional judgment (PJ) panels—informed by the evidence base—sought to identify the quantity and types of resources required to provide an adequate education to all District of Columbia (DC) students at each school level. Their findings are an important foundation for conclusions on the cost of education adequacy in the District, which are presented in Chapter 5, as well as recommendations for restructuring and resetting the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) base and weights for students with identified learning needs, which are presented in Chapter 6.

Importantly, the school-level PJ panelists worked together to achieve consensus on school-level resource requirements, including instructional staff, student support staff, and administrative staff, as well as other educational resources and technology hardware, for representative schools at each level. Throughout the panels' deliberations, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter school educators and administrators agreed generally on the quantity, quality, and types of resources required for all students to succeed in representative schools, even though no panelists might allocate resources specifically as listed in this chapter.

The study team does not intend for these resource specifications to be a rigid prescription for how individual schools should be staffed and how school leaders should expend their budget. Instead, the resources identified by the PJ panels are the foundation for estimates of the costs of effectively serving students. In the best-case scenario, schools would receive adequate funding and school leaders could allocate resources for staff and other direct costs according to the school's needs and priorities. For example, the elementary school panel specified staffing levels and student-teacher ratios at each grade level for costing purposes, but panelists unanimously agreed that principals should have discretion in determining the most effective assignment of teachers and instructional aides to classrooms based on school conditions and student learning needs.

The resource specifications are estimates of the costs of effectively serving students, not prescriptions for how individual schools should be staffed and how school leaders should expend their budget. In the best scenario, schools would receive sufficient funding and school leaders would have discretion to allocate resources according to the school's needs and priorities.

Resource specifications for representative DCPS and public charter schools are organized as follows:

- Elementary School—Prekindergarten for three-year-olds (Pre-K3), Prekindergarten for four-year-olds (Pre-K4), Kindergarten, and Grades 1 through 5
- Middle School—Grades 6 through 8

- High School—Grades 9 through 12
- Alternative and Adult Education Schools

Each school-level section (elementary, middle, and high school) presents:

- Base-level resource requirements for regular students *without* identified learning needs that call for specialized supports and services;
Additional resource requirements for students *with* identified learning needs who fall into several categories (English language learners, at risk of academic failure,¹ and special education Levels 1–4);²
Additional school programs beyond the regular instructional program to boost academic performance during the school year and prevent summer learning loss (e.g., before- or after-school programs, summer school, and bridge programs for rising 9th graders); and
- Cumulative resource requirements at each level for representative schools of different sizes.

The alternative and adult education schools section presents:

- Summary profiles of alternative and adult education programs in the District of Columbia;
- A summary of alternative and adult education needs; and
- Resource requirements for alternative and adult education programs.

These school-level PJ panel resource specifications were subsequently reviewed by the identified learning needs panels, the system-level panels, and the Advisory Group. Results were also reviewed by focus groups and through individual interviews with other stakeholders. In some cases, these specifications were adjusted based on the recommendations of subsequent panels and stakeholders (e.g., additional staffing to serve students with identified learning needs or administrative costs specified at the local educational agency (LEA) level). Most resource specifications were finalized based on the Advisory Group review and were adopted as the study recommendations for costing out purposes.

Elementary Schools

DC elementary schools vary in size, with student enrollment ranging from 150 to 700. An initial study team review showed that DCPS and public charter elementary schools seem to cluster at two size levels, with larger schools of about 420 students and smaller schools of about 210 students for prekindergarten through grade 5. Accordingly, in developing profiles of

¹ A direct correlation between low-income status and risk of academic failure does not exist; however, poverty and poor school performance are closely associated. The PJ panels used eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals as the proxy for students at risk of academic failure. Later in the process, after the PJ panels completed their work, the study team—in consultation with advisors and the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education—modified the proxy for students at risk of academic failure to include students who are in foster care, who are homeless, and/or who live in low-income families qualifying for federal aid through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. These three factors were selected as a reasonable and relevant proxy for targeting educational risk until the Office of the State Superintendent of Education implements its early warning system to identify students at risk of academic failure.

²Special education students are categorized into four levels of need, according to number of hours per week they require specialized services using 1-4 levels.

representative schools for costing out purposes, the elementary PJ panel used these two school sizes and determined student characteristics based on demographic data for school year 2012–2013. Table 3.1 profiles the representative elementary schools.

The PJ panel developed resource specifications for larger elementary schools with 420 students and smaller schools with 210 students.

Table 3.1: School and Student Characteristics—Elementary School

Sample School	Elementary School 1: (420 Students— K–Grade 5)*	Elementary School 2: (210 Students— K–Grade 5)*
Total Enrollment	420	210
Enrollment Per Grade	70	35
Students Receiving Free and Reduced-Price School Meals—At Risk (70%)	294	147
English Language Learners (9%)	38	19
Gifted/Talented Students (5%)	21	11
Special Education (17%)		
Special Education Students—Level 1	26	13
Special Education Students—Level 2	23	12
Special Education Students—Level 3	8	4
Special Education Students—Level 4	15	7
Pre-K3 and Pre-K4 Classrooms**	6	3

Note: *All figures are for kindergarten through grade 5; additional staff and resources for prekindergarten students were analyzed separately.

Source: District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education, “FY 13 LEA and School Level Enrollment Audit Reports,” <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/fy13-Lea-and-school-level-enrollment-audit-reports>.

Instructional Personnel

In determining resource requirements for students without identified learning needs, the elementary PJ panel identified small class sizes in kindergarten and grades 1 through 3 as key to successful academic performance for general education students without identified needs requiring additional specialized support and services. The panelists felt that class ratios of 15:1 in these lower grades would provide high-quality learning environments to ensure students are performing at grade level by grade 3. For grades 4 and 5, panelists felt that higher class sizes of 25:1 were appropriate, depending on the level of other instructional staff in the school. However, panelists agreed that principals should have flexibility to determine appropriate class sizes in their school.

Panelists endorsed current DC school policy that provides full-day kindergarten for all students, and they specified staff and other resources to support these programs in all elementary schools. They also specified full-day early childhood education programs for three- and four-year olds in

pre-K3 and pre-K4 classes, with class sizes of no more than 15 and a teacher and an instructional aide in each classroom. This complies with the DC Official Code governing prekindergarten education, which requires an adult-to-child ratio of 8:1 for children age three and 10:1 for children ages four and older.³ Schoolwide, panelists also identified the need for a full-time roving substitute teacher for larger schools and a half-time roving substitute teacher for smaller schools.

Student Support Personnel

The PJ panel recognized that student support services are important, even among students without any identified learning needs. During the school day, children need to have medications administered and, inevitably, there are incidents of illness, injury, trauma, and family stress that require the services of school nurses and mental health professionals, counselors, social workers, and family liaisons. Panelists noted that family liaisons are especially important for prekindergarten students and their families who are new to the education system and often need help with responding to administrative requirements and ensuring their children's individual learning needs are properly identified and addressed.

The panel highlighted the important role that family liaisons play in helping parents of prekindergarten students who are new to the education system.

In addition, the D.C. Department of Transportation (DDOT) provides crossing guards at elementary schools during morning arrival and afternoon dismissal hours, based on neighborhood conditions, including traffic around the school. Similarly, schools have private unarmed security guards who provide day-to-day protection and monitor access to school buildings. DCPS has 253 security guards for schools at all levels. These guards are hired under a \$17.2 million contract secured by the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) that is paid for through an interagency transfer using UPSFF funds from the DCPS budget. Public charter schools hire security officers independently.

Administrative Personnel

To meet the leadership and administrative needs of elementary schools, the PJ panel felt that a full-time principal, a half-time assistant principal, a half-time office manager, and two full-time clerical staff are required for larger schools (one for smaller schools). This level of staffing is needed to ensure high performance and sound management, especially if school leaders take on more direct responsibility for budgeting and resource allocation.

Staffing for Students with Identified Learning Needs

The elementary identified learning needs PJ panel and the Levels 1–4 special education PJ panel noted that the resources specified for general education students without any identified learning needs provide a well-resourced base for all students in elementary schools. The panels also identified additional resources to serve students with identified learning needs that require specialized staff, programs, and other supports. Additional resources for English language learners (ELLs) primarily include additional teachers. Students who are at risk of academic

³ DC Official Code § 38-272.01.

failure⁴ require other resources, including intervention teachers and instructional aides, counselors, social workers, and family liaisons.

Schools with a large at-risk student population also need additional security staff. The panels also specified the need for a dean for students with identified learning needs; this dean would serve as an administrative point person to ensure all documentation and reporting requirements are met and coordinate special learning supports and services with regular classroom instruction. For the representative elementary schools with the demographics previously described, more than 15 percent of the specified staff is dedicated to addressing the needs of at-risk students; just below 4 percent is dedicated to addressing the needs of ELL students.

For students with special education designations with individualized education plans (IEPs), panelists called for significant additional instructional staff—special education teachers, instructional aides, and a part-time adaptive physical education teacher—as well as student support staff—social workers and specialized therapists (e.g., behavioral therapy, occupational therapy, and speech therapy). They also called for additional administrative support from a special education coordinator. Approximately 21 percent of specified representative elementary school staffing is for Levels 1–4 special education students. In addition to these school-level resources, additional resources, such as dedicated aides, specialized therapists, and adaptive technology, are provided at the system level for special education students.

Developing resource specifications for Levels 1–4 special education students at all school levels proved difficult. In part, this reflects different professional perspectives on the levels and balance of additional instructional programming, student support, and therapeutic services these students need to be successful learners. Panelists found it challenging to model these resources, because the needs of special education students vary widely depending on their IEP. Moreover, the distribution of students in Levels 1–4 is not consistent from school to school or year to year. To ensure the necessary resources were identified, the study team assembled a PJ panel that reviewed resources for Levels 1–4 special education students at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. In addition, a focus group was convened to review the resources identified by this special education PJ panel. In some cases, this led to changes in the estimates of required staffing.

As shown in Table 3.2, additional staffing allocations vary depending on the category of need among elementary school students. However, approximately 40 percent of representative elementary school staff is dedicated to serving students with identified learning needs.

Staffing Summary

For an elementary school with 420 students, the school-level, identified learning needs, and Levels 1–4 special education PJ panels called for 67.4 staff members. For a school with 210 students, the panels called for 37.6 staff members (see Table 3.2) Notably, the PJ panels’

⁴ A strong association between low-income status and risk of academic failure exists. For this reason, poverty as determined by eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals is commonly used as a proxy for educational risk. However, the correlation is not one-to-one. Not all low-income students are at risk, and some affluent students are at risk and require additional support and resources. The PJ panels worked with the assumption that 70 percent of students at the average elementary school are at risk.

specifications were closely aligned with the documented levels of resources required for education adequacy found in education research studies. Although a significant number of small DCPS and public charter elementary schools are operating, the clear implication is that based on the PJ panels' specifications, it is more expensive to operate schools of this size because the ratio of instructional staff to students is lower than for larger elementary schools. As shown in Table 3.2, the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio for larger elementary schools are 8.8:1 and 6.2:1, respectively. The comparative ratios for small elementary schools are 8.3:1 and 5.6:1, respectively.

Table 3.2: Recommended Personnel Specifications—Elementary School

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
Elementary School 1: 420 Students						
Classroom Teachers	24.3		2.0	0.2	5.5	32.0
Specials Teachers	4.0					4.0
Intervention Teachers		2.9				2.9
Adaptive Physical Education Teachers					0.5	0.5
Librarians/Media Specialists	1.0					1.0
Technology Specialists	0.5					0.5
Instructional Aides		3.0			3.0	6.0
Full-Time Substitutes	1.0					1.0
Additional Substitutes	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	
Subtotal: Instructional Staff	30.8	5.9	2.0	0.2	9.0	47.9
Student Support Staff			0.4			0.4
- Counselors	0.5	0.5				1.0
- Nurses	1.0					1.0
- Psychologists	0.5	0.5			0.6	1.6
- Social Workers/Behavior Therapists	0.5	1.0			0.6	2.1
- Family Liaisons		0.5				0.5
- Speech, Occupational, and Physical Therapists					2.8	2.8
Subtotal: Student Support Staff	2.5	2.5	0.4		4.0	9.4
Principals	1.0					1.0
Assistant Administrators	0.5					0.5
Deans		1.0				1.0
Special Education Coordinators					0.7	0.7

Table 3.2: Recommended Personnel Specifications—Elementary School, continued

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
English Language Learners Coordinators			0.1			0.1
Office Managers	0.5					0.5
Clerical/Data Entry Personnel	2.0					2.0
Subtotal: Administrative Staff	6.0	1.0	0.1		1.2	8.3
Security Personnel	1.0	1.0				2.0
Subtotal: Other Staff	1.0	1.0				2.0
Total Staff	40.3	10.4	2.5		14.2	67.4
Students Per Instructional Staff						8.8:1
Students Per Total Staff						6.2:1
Elementary School 2: 210 Students						
	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
Classroom Teachers	12.2		1.0	0.1	2.7	16.0
Specials Teachers	3.0					3.0
Intervention Teachers		1.5				1.5
Adaptive Physical Education Teachers					0.3	0.3
Librarians/Media Specialists	0.5					0.5
Technology Specialists	0.5					0.5
Instructional Aides		1.5	0.1		1.4	3.0
Full-Time Substitutes	0.5					0.5
Additional Substitutes	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	
Subtotal: Instructional Staff	16.7	3	1.1	0.1	4.4	25.3
Student Support Staff			0.2			0.2
- Counselors	0.3	0.5				0.8
- Nurses	1					1
- Psychologists	0.3	0.3			0.3	0.9
- Social Workers/Behavior Therapists	0.3	0.5			0.3	1.1
- Family Liaisons		0.3				0.3
- Speech, Occupational, and Physical Therapists					1.4	1.4

Table 3.2: Recommended Personnel Specifications—Elementary School, continued

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
Subtotal: Student Support Staff	1.9	1.6	0.2		2.0	5.7
Principals	1.0					1.0
Deans		1.0				1.0
English Language Learners Coordinators			0.1			0.1
Instructional Facilitators (Coaches)	1.0				0.2	1.2
Office Managers	0.5					0.5
Clerical/Data Entry Personnel	1.0					1.0
Subtotal: Administrative Staff	3.5	1.0	0.1		0.5	5.1
Security Personnel	1	0.5				1.5
Subtotal: Other Staff	1	0.5				1.5
Total Staff	23.1	6	1.4	0.1	6.9	37.6
Students Per Instructional Staff						8.3:1
Students Per Total Staff						5.6:1

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Other Educational Resources

The elementary school PJ panel, the elementary identified learning needs PJ panel, and the Levels 1–4 special education PJ panel also specified nonpersonnel resources that are required to provide quality instructional programs and services in the early grades. These other resources include professional development, student activity fees, textbooks, library resources, and supplies. The specifications shown in Table 3.3 were adopted as the study recommendation for costing purposes.

Table 3.3: Recommended Nonpersonnel Resources—Elementary School

	Elementary School 1: 420 Students	Elementary School 2: 210 Students
Additional Resources		
Professional Development	15 days/teacher	15 days/teacher
	\$100/student	\$100/student
Supplies and Materials	\$165/student	\$165/student
Textbooks		
Equipment		
Assessment		
Technology Licensing	\$30/student	\$30/student
Student Activities	\$200/student	\$200/student

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Technology Hardware

Acknowledging that technology plays an increasingly prominent role in classroom learning from the earliest grades, the elementary PJ panel highlighted technology hardware upgrades as a high priority for elementary schools. The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) will replace the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) in 2015, which will require that students use computers rather than paper and pencil for testing.

Accordingly, as shown in Table 3.4, panelists called for a computer for every professional staff member. In addition, for each classroom, they called for one computer for every four students, a printer, an LCD projector, and a document camera. Panelists also specified the need for a well-equipped media center and a fixed computer lab in every DC elementary school. These specifications were adopted by the study team as the recommended resource levels for costing purposes.

Table 3.4: Recommended Technology Hardware—Elementary School

	Elementary School 1: 420 students	Elementary School 2: 210 students
Administrative Computers		
Computers	1 per staff	1 per staff
Printers	1 per staff	1 per staff
Copiers	3	2
Servers	2	1
Faculty Laptops	1 per staff	1 per staff
Classroom		
Computers	1 per 4 students	1 per 4 students
Printers	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
LCD Projectors	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Document Cameras	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Computer Lab(s)—Fixed		
Computers	25	25
Printer/Scanners	1	1
SMART Boards	1	1
Computer Lab(s)—Mobile		
Laptops	52	26
Media Center		
Computers	5	5
Digital Video Cameras	5	3
Digital Cameras	5	3
Printers	2	2
Tablets	26	26
Switches and Routers	Sufficient to support identified technology	Sufficient to support identified technology

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations. Currently, no evidence base from education research exists on adequate technology for students.

Additional Programs

The elementary PJ panel and the elementary identified learning needs PJ panel also highlighted the need for other specialized school-based programs that entail additional costs. Full-day prekindergarten for all three- and four-year-olds was deemed necessary to ensure young children are cognitively, socially, and emotionally ready for full-day school beginning in kindergarten. The panels also identified the need for extended-day and extended-year programs for at-risk students to help boost academic performance. Extended-time programs are needed to provide specialized tutoring, homework help, and enrichment before and after school during the regular school year; summer and year-round programs help prevent summer learning loss. The additional resource specifications related to these programs are presented in Tables 3.5 and 3.6 and include personnel and other direct educational costs. The study team adopted these specifications developed by the PJ panels—and informed by the education research literature—for costing purposes.

Table 3.5: Recommended Additional Programs—Elementary School

	Elementary School 1: 420 Students		Elementary School 2: 210 Students	
Program Name	Before- or After-School Program	Summer School	Before- or After-School Program	Summer School
Number of Pupils Served	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students
Types of Students Served	At risk	At risk	At risk	At risk
Program Specifics	2.5 hours	6 weeks, full day	2.5 hours	6 weeks, full day
Personnel*				
Teachers	25:1	15:1 K–3 20:1 otherwise	25:1	15:1 K–3 20:1 otherwise
Social Workers		1.0		1.0
Instructional Aides	25:1	2.0	25:1	2.0
Coordination Personnel	0.5		0.5	
Security Personnel		1.0	1.0	1.0
Other Costs^				
Instructional Supplies, Materials, and Equipment	\$165/student		\$165/student	
Interventions		\$500/student		\$500/student

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Table 3.6: Recommended Additional Programs—Preschool

	Elementary School 1: 420 Students	Elementary School 2: 210 Students
Program Name	Preschool	Preschool
Number of Pupils Served	6 Pre-K3/Pre-K4 Classrooms	3 Pre-K3/Pre-K4 Classrooms
Types of Students Served	15 to 1 General Education	15 to 1 General Education
Personnel		
Classroom Teachers	6.0	3.0
Specials Teachers	1.2	
Instructional Facilitators	0.5	0.5
Instructional Aides	6.0	3.0
Other Costs		
Professional Development	15 days/teacher \$100/student	15 days/teacher \$100/student
Instructional Supplies and Materials	\$165/student	\$165/student
Equipment		
Technology		
Assessment		
Student Activities	\$200/student	\$200/student

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Middle Schools

DC middle schools vary in size, with student populations ranging from approximately 250 to 1,175. The study team's initial review showed that DCPS and public charter middle schools seem to cluster at two levels, with larger schools of about 600 students and smaller schools of about 300 students for grades 6 through 8. Although some combined elementary/middle schools and middle/high schools are operating in the city, for costing purposes, the study team focused on middle schools serving only grades 6 through 8. Accordingly, in developing representative school profiles for costing out purposes, the PJ panel used these two school sizes and determined student characteristics based on demographic data for school year 2012–2013. Table 3.7 profiles the representative middle schools.

Table 3.7: School and Student Characteristics—Middle School

Sample School	Middle School 1: (600 Students— Grades 6–8)	Middle School 2: (300 Students— Grades 6–8)
Total Enrollment	600	300
Enrollment Per Grade	200	100
Students Receiving Free and Reduced- Price School Meals—At Risk (60%)	360	180
English Language Learners (9%)	54	27
Gifted/Talented Students (5%)	30	15
Special Education Students (17%)		
Special Education Students—Level 1	37	19
Special Education Students—Level 2	33	12
Special Education Students—Level 3	12	6
Special Education Students—Level 4	21	11

Source: District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education, “FY13 LEA and School Level Enrollment Audit Reports,” <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/fy13-Lea-and-school-level-enrollment-audit-reports>.

The PJ panel developed resource specifications for larger middle schools with 600 students and for smaller middle schools with 300 students.

Instructional Personnel

The middle school PJ panel emphasized the different characteristics and circumstances that affect students' academic performance at this age and the need to address them in a well-coordinated way. Accordingly, the panel specified class sizes of 25:1 to enable all students in grades 6 through 8 to meet DC performance standards. Further, panelists recommended that staffing be at a level to support schools operating on a block system with four academic blocks per day. Teachers are assumed to teach in three of the four blocks, reserving the fourth for planning and preparation time. Schoolwide, panelists identified the need for additional instructional aides. They also specified the need for two full-time roving substitute teachers for larger middle schools and one full-time roving substitute teacher for smaller schools.

Student Support Personnel

The middle school PJ panel determined several student support services as essential for all students, not just those with identified learning needs. These include school nurses who can address students' routine health needs (e.g., diabetic testing and medication administration) and inevitable illnesses and/or injuries requiring immediate first aid or other treatment. Similarly, mental health professionals, counselors, social workers, and family liaisons are needed in cases of trauma or family stress that require student support and assistance for their families. Counselors also are needed to help students with course selection and assignment in order to ensure students satisfy course requirements and start courses in required subjects early enough to provide for high school continuation.

Although panelists were specific about the need for a school nurse in every school, they acknowledged that different combinations of other student support personnel (e.g., psychologists, social workers, counselors, and family liaisons) may be needed in different school settings and agreed that principals should have discretion to make those staffing decisions based on the conditions in their school and their students' learning needs. In public charter schools, principals have broad discretion to make these staffing decisions. DCPS principals do not have discretion in hiring these types of student support personnel. Nurses are assigned to all middle schools, as are other student support personnel, based on staff allocation decisions made at the system level to ensure student health and safety.

Additionally, as highlighted in the elementary school discussion, DDOT provides crossing guards at DCPS and public charter middle schools during morning arrival and afternoon dismissal hours, based on neighborhood conditions, including street traffic around the school. Similarly, MPD provides school resource officers (SROs), as needed, to prevent juvenile delinquency. The MPD assigns SROs to geographic clusters of DCPS and public charter middle and high schools, based on neighborhood and school conditions, and they may serve more than one school. In addition, schools have private unarmed security guards who provide day-to-day protection and monitor access to school buildings. DCPS has 253 security guards for schools at all levels. Some middle schools and high schools have up to 11 assigned security guards. These guards are hired under a \$17.2 million contract that is paid for through an interagency transfer from DCPS to MPD. Public charter schools hire security officers independently.

Administrative Personnel

To meet the leadership and administrative needs of larger middle schools, the school-level PJ panel felt that one full-time principal, one assistant principal, one office manager, and a half-time business manager are needed. Panelists also specified a full-time registrar to address new DC attendance monitoring and follow-up requirements and a full-time clerical staff member in larger schools. In smaller schools, the panelists specified half-time positions for the assistant principal, office manager, business manager, and registrar. These levels of administrative staffing were identified by the PJ panel to ensure high performance and sound management, especially in schools that take on more direct responsibility for budgeting and resource allocation.

Staffing for Students with Identified Learning Needs

The middle/high school identified learning needs PJ panel and the Levels 1–4 special education PJ panel felt that the resources specified for general education students without any identified learning needs provide a well-resourced base for middle schools. The panels also identified

additional resources needed to serve students with identified learning needs that require specialized staff, programs, and equipment. Additional resources for English language learners primarily included additional teachers.

For ELL and at-risk students, panelists called for additional student support staff. For students who transfer in and out of schools during the school year, panelists felt that social workers, counselors, and family liaisons are needed to serve as education advocates to ensure proper class placement and academic continuity and ensure students' individual learning needs are properly identified and addressed. Panelists indicated that these staff can be counselors, social workers, and/or family liaisons, depending on students' specific needs and the staffing preferences in individual schools. They also specified additional security staff in schools with a large at-risk student population. Approximately 18 percent of the specified middle school staff is dedicated to addressing the needs of at-risk students and 4 percent to addressing the needs of ELL students.

For students with special education designations and IEPs, panelists recommended more intensive support and services by specially trained school staff, including additional special education teachers and instructional aides, an adaptive physical education teacher, and additional student support staff. They also called for specialized therapists, transition specialists, a special education coordinator, and a facilitator/coach to support teachers and ensure effective coordination between specialized programs and regular classroom instruction. Approximately 20 percent of the specified middle school staff is dedicated to addressing the needs of Levels 1–4 special education students.

As shown in Table 3.8, these additional staffing needs vary depending on the category of need among middle school students. However, more than 40 percent of the specified middle school staff is dedicated to serving students with identified learning needs.

Staffing Summary

For a middle school with 600 students, the PJ panel called for 88.6 staff members. For a middle school with 300 students, the panel called for 50.2 staff members. In some cases, the PJ panel specifications varied from the evidence base. In particular, panelists called for more student support personnel than is reflected in the research literature, mostly because so many DC students are low income. To a large extent, this also reflects differences in student and teacher schedules; some schools have several class periods per day while others have an individual teacher in each classroom. Accordingly, the study recommendation reflects the number of teachers in a school of each size that would be required to satisfy the specified 25:1 ratio on a block schedule.

As with elementary schools, the clear implication is that regardless of whether it may be desirable from an educational perspective, it is more expensive to operate small middle schools because the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio are lower than for larger schools. As shown in Table 3.8, the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio for larger middle schools are 9.7:1 and 6.8:1, respectively. The comparative ratios for small middle schools are 8.9:1 and 6.0:1, respectively.

Table 3.8: Recommended Personnel Specifications—Middle School

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
Middle School 1: 600 Students						
Teachers	32.0	7.5	2.8		7.9	50.2
Intervention Teachers		3.6		0.3		3.9
Adaptive Physical Education Teachers					0.5	0.5
Librarians/Media Specialists	1.0					1.0
Technology Specialists	1.0					1.0
Instructional Aides			0.5		2.6	3.1
Full-Time Substitutes	2.0					2.0
Additional Substitutes	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	
Subtotal: Instructional Staff	36.0	11.1	3.3	0.3	11.0	61.7
Student Support Staff		3.6	0.4			4.0
- Counselors	2.4					2.4
- Nurses	1.0					1.0
- Psychologists					0.8	0.8
- Social Workers/Behavior Therapists	0.5				0.8	1.3
- Speech, Occupational, and Physical Therapists					2.3	2.3
Subtotal: Student Support Staff	3.9	3.6	0.4		3.9	11.8
Principals	1.0					1.0
Assistant Administrators	1.0					1.0
Special Education Coordinators					1.0	1.0
English Language Learner Coordinators			0.1			0.1
Instructional Facilitators (Coaches)	2.0				0.7	2.7
Office Managers	1.0					1.0
Business Managers	0.5					0.5
Registrar/Attendance Personnel	1.0					1.0
Clerical/Data Entry Personnel	1.0					1.0
Subtotal: Administrative Staff	7.5		0.1		1.7	9.3
Security Personnel	3.0	1.0				3.0
Subtotal: Other Staff	3.0	1.0	0.1		1.7	5.8
Total Staff	50.4	15.7	3.9	0.3	18.3	88.6
Students Per Instructional Staff						9.7:1
Students Per Total Staff						6.8:1

Table 3.8: Recommended Personnel Specifications—Middle School, continued

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
Middle School 1: 600 Students						
Teachers	16.0	3.7	1.4		3.7	24.8
Intervention Teachers		1.8		0.2		2.0
Adaptive Physical Education Teachers					0.3	0.3
Librarians/Media Specialists	1.0					1.0
Technology Specialists	0.5					0.5
Instructional Aides			0.3		1.4	1.7
Full-Time Substitutes	1.0					1.0
Additional Substitutes	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	5 days/teacher	
Subtotal: Instructional Staff	18.5	5.5	1.7	0.2	5.4	31.3
Student Support Staff		1.8	0.2			2.0
- Counselors	1.2					1.2
- Nurses	1.0					1.0
- Psychologists					0.4	0.4
- Social Workers/Behavior Therapists	0.3				0.4	0.7
- Speech, Occupational, and Physical Therapists					1.1	1.1
Subtotal: Student Support Staff	2.5	1.8	0.2		1.9	6.4
Principals	1.0					1.0
Assistant Administrators	0.5					0.5
Special Education Coordinators					0.6	0.6
English Language Learners Coordinators			0.1			0.1
Instructional Facilitators (Coaches)	2.0				0.3	2.3
Office Managers	0.5					0.5
Business Managers	0.5					0.5
Registrar/Attendance Personnel	0.5					0.5
Clerical/Data Entry Personnel	1.0					1.0
Subtotal: Administrative Staff	6.0		0.1		0.9	7.0
Security Personnel	2.0	1.0				3.0
Subtotal: Other Staff	2.0	1.0				3.0
Total Staff	29.0	8.3	2.0	0.2	8.2	47.7
Students Per Instructional Staff						9.6:1
Students Per Total Staff						6.3:1

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Other Educational Resources

In addition to personnel resources that are needed to provide instructional programs, student support services, and management/administrative support, the middle school PJ panel, the middle/high school identified learning needs PJ panel, and the Levels 1–4 special education PJ panel specified other resources that are required to provide quality instructional programs and services. These included nonpersonnel resources such as professional development, student activity fees, textbooks, library resources, and supplies. These specifications were adopted as the study recommendation for costing purposes and are displayed in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9: Recommended Nonpersonnel Resources—Middle School

	Middle School 1: 600 Students	Middle School 2: 300 Students
Additional Resources		
Professional Development	15 days/teacher	15 days/teacher
	\$100/student	\$100/student
Supplies and Materials	\$225/student	\$225/student
Textbooks	\$60/student	\$60/student
Equipment	\$50/student	\$50/student
Technology Licensing	\$30/student	\$30/student
Student Activities	\$300/student	\$300/student

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Technology Hardware

Because developing strong computer skills is such a high priority for all students, the PJ panelists highlighted technology hardware specifications for middle schools to enhance classroom learning. As noted in the discussion of elementary school technology priorities, PARCC will replace the DC CAS in 2015, which will require that students use computers rather than paper and pencil for testing. Accordingly, as shown in Table 3.10, for every middle school, panelists called for a computer for every professional staff member and a classroom setup that includes five printers, one LCD projector, one SMART Board, and one document camera. They also specified the need for a well-equipped media center for every middle school. Moreover, they specified a fixed computer lab with 25 computers, 2 printers, 1 SMART Board, and 8 mobile labs with 200 computers for a large middle school (1 for every 3 students) as well as a fixed computer lab with 25 computers, 2 printers, 1 SMART Board, and 4 mobile labs with 100 computers for a small middle school (1 for every 3 students).

Table 3.10: Recommended Technology Hardware—Middle School

	Middle School 1: 600 Students	Middle School 2: 300 Students
Administrative Computers		
Computers	1 per staff	1 per staff
Printers	1 per administrator	1 per administrator
Copiers	3	2
Servers	2	2
Faculty Laptops	1 per staff	1 per staff
Classroom		
Computers	5 per classroom	5 per classroom
SMART Boards	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Document Cameras	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Computer Lab(s)—Fixed	1 fixed lab	1 fixed lab
	Middle School 1: 600 Students	Middle School 2: 300 Students
Printer/Scanners	1	1
SMART Boards	1	1
Computer Lab(s)—Mobile	8 mobile labs	4 mobile labs
Laptops	25 per mobile lab	25 per mobile lab
Printers/Scanners	1 per mobile lab	1 per mobile lab
Media Center		
Computers	3	3
Flip Cameras	21	21
Copiers	1	1
Switches and Routers	Sufficient to support identified technology	Sufficient to support identified technology

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations. Currently, no evidence base from education research exists on adequate technology for students.

Additional Programs

The middle school PJ panel and the middle/high-school identified learning needs PJ panel specified the need for other specialized school-based programs that entail additional costs to support and help boost academic performance for at-risk students. These include extended-day programs and extended-year programs that offer specialized tutoring, homework help, and enrichment during the school year and help prevent learning loss over the summer. The additional costs related to these programs are presented in Table 3.11. They include personnel and other direct costs.

Table 3.11: Recommended Additional Programs—Middle School

	Middle School 1: 600 Students		Middle School 2: 300 Students	
Program Name	Before- or After-School Program	Summer School	Before- or After-School Program	Summer School
Number of Pupils Served	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students
Types of Students Served	At risk	At risk	At risk	At risk
Grade Level	6–8	6–8	6–8	6–8
Program Specifics	2 hours	6 to 8 weeks, full day	2 hours	6 to 8 weeks, full day
Personnel				
Teachers	30:1	30:1	30:1	30:1
Social Workers		1.0		1.0
Instructional Aides				
Coordination Personnel	0.5		0.5	
Security Personnel		1.0		1.0
Other Costs				
Interventions		\$500/student		\$500/student

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations.

High Schools

DC high schools also vary in size, with the smallest school having only 100 students and the largest one 1,700 students. An initial review and analysis by the study team showed that DCPS and public charter high schools seem to cluster at two size levels, with larger schools of about 1,000 students and smaller schools of about 400 students for grades 9 through 12; some combined middle and high schools also are operating. Accordingly, in developing representative school profiles for costing out purposes, the high school PJ panel used these two school sizes and determined student characteristics based on demographic data for school year 2011–2012. Table 3.12 profiles the representative high schools.

The PJ panel developed resource specifications for larger high schools with 1,000 students and smaller schools with 400 students.

Table 3.12: School and Student Characteristics—High School

Sample School	High School 1: (1,000 Students— Grades 9–12)	High School 2: (400 Students— Grades 9–12)
Total Enrollment	1000	400
Enrollment Per Grade	250	100
Students Receiving Free and Reduced- Price School Meals—At Risk (60%)	600	240
English Language Learners (9%)	90	36
Gifted/Talented Students (5%)	50	20
Special Education Students (17%)		
Special Education Students—Level 1	62	25
Special Education Students—Level 2	55	22
Special Education Students—Level 3	20	8
Special Education Students—Level 4	35	14

Source: District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education, “FY13 LEA and School Level Enrollment Audit Reports,” <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/fy13-Lea-and-school-level-enrollment-audit-reports>.

Instructional Personnel

The high school PJ panel focused on resource requirements that would enable students to meet current and proposed high school academic standards, earn a high school diploma in four years, and prepare for postsecondary education and training. The emphasis is on helping 9th-grade students make successful transitions from middle school to high school; helping 9th- and 10th-grade students develop course plans that will enable them to meet all graduation requirements; and helping 11th- and 12th-grade students prepare for college or other postsecondary career training. For each age group, panelists emphasized the need to coordinate targeted responses to the characteristics and circumstances that affect students’ academic performance at this stage. Accordingly, the panel specified an average class size of 25:1 to enable all students to meet DC performance standards in grades 9 through 12, with subject-area teachers in eight core subjects.⁵ Panelists recommended that teacher staffing be at a level to enable schools to operate on a block system with four academic blocks per day. Teachers are assumed to teach in three of the four blocks, reserving the fourth for planning and preparation time. Panelists also specified two full-time roving substitute teachers for larger high schools and one full-time roving substitute teacher for smaller high schools.

For instructional and student support staff, the emphasis is on helping 9th- and 10th-grade students make successful transitions from middle school to high school and helping 11th- and 12th-grade students prepare for college or other postsecondary career training.

⁵ Core subjects are defined as art, English, health and physical education, mathematics (algebra I and II, geometry, and an upper-level math), music, science (biology, two lab sciences, and one other science), social studies (world history I and II, DC history, US government, and US history) and world languages.

Student Support Personnel

The PJ panelists identified student support services as essential to promoting health and safety in DC high schools. Similar to the elementary and middle school PJ panels, the high school PJ panel emphasized the need for health and mental health professionals, counselors, social workers, and family liaisons to address inevitable incidents of illness, injury, trauma, or family stress, even among students without identified learning needs. They highlighted the need for a nurse in every school to help address students' regular health needs (e.g., diabetic testing, medication administration, and treatment for athletic injuries).

As is the case for elementary schools and middle schools, DDOT provides crossing guards at DCPS and public charter high schools during morning arrival and afternoon dismissal hours, based on neighborhood conditions, including street traffic around the school. The MPD provides school resource officers, as needed, to prevent juvenile delinquency. As noted for middle schools, MPD assigns SROs to geographic clusters of DCPS and public charter schools based on neighborhood and school conditions, and they may serve more than one school. In addition, schools have private unarmed security guards who provide day-to-day protection and monitor access to school buildings. DCPS has 253 security guards for schools at all levels. Some middle schools and high schools have up to 11 assigned security guards. These guards are hired under a \$17.2 million contract that is paid for through an interagency transfer from DCPS to MPD. Public charter schools hire security officers independently.

Administrative Personnel

To meet the leadership and administrative needs of large high schools, the PJ panel felt that one full-time principal; two assistant principals; two deans of students; a full-time business manager, office manager, and registrar; and four full-time clerical/data entry staff are needed to meet the significantly greater tracking and administrative requirements for high school students. For smaller high schools, the panel specified the need for a full-time principal; a half-time assistant principal, business manager, office manager, and registrar; and two clerical/data entry staff. These levels of administrative staffing are intended to ensure high performance and sound management, especially in schools that take on more direct responsibility for budgeting and resource allocation.

Staffing for Students with Identified Learning Needs

The middle/high school identified learning needs PJ panel called attention to the importance of education advocates for at-risk students, many of whom move in and out of schools during the school year. These student support personnel can be social workers, counselors, or family liaisons with deep knowledge of DC education requirements and administrative systems and experience in helping students negotiate bureaucratic hurdles and requirements. This is especially necessary for transient students and students who are returning to school after dropping out or spending time in a juvenile detention facility. Student support personnel must be knowledgeable and caring advocates who can ensure proper class placement, academic continuity, and credit transfers as well as help students deal with the school bureaucracy.

Panelists also noted that these vulnerable students need assistance to ensure their individual learning needs are identified and properly addressed. Additionally, they need assistance to ensure

they do not fall between the cracks or become ineligible for graduation because they have not taken all the required courses or fail to meet other administrative requirements. Moreover, the pathway to postsecondary education and training is far less certain for at-risk students without intensive support to ensure that they have the required number of course credits, that their transcripts are complete, that they have met college testing requirements, and that they have completed and submitted college and other applications on time.

The middle/high school identified learning needs PJ panel and the Levels 1–4 special education PJ panel felt that the resources specified for general education students without any identified learning needs provide a well-resourced base for DC high schools. The panels also identified additional resources to serve students with identified learning needs that require specialized staff, programs, and equipment. Additional resources for English language learners primarily included additional teachers.

For students identified as at risk and for students who are repeating core courses, the panels specified additional classroom teachers for remedial classes. They also included student support staff (e.g., counselors, psychologists, social workers, and family liaisons), based on student needs and staffing preferences within individual schools. In addition, they specified additional security staff in schools with a large at-risk student population. Approximately 18 percent of specified high school staff is dedicated to addressing the needs of at-risk students; more than 4 percent is dedicated to addressing the needs of ELL students.

For students with special education designations and IEPs, the panelists recommended more intensive support and services by specially trained school staff, including additional special education teachers and instructional aides, an adaptive physical education teacher, and additional student support staff. They also called for specialized therapists, transition specialists, a special education coordinator, and a facilitator/coach to support teachers and ensure effective coordination between specialized programs and regular classroom instruction. More than 17 percent of the specified high school staff is dedicated to addressing the needs of Levels 1–4 special education students.

Although the high school identified learning needs PJ panel also considered the needs of gifted and talented students, they did not provide detailed resource specifications for new programs and learning opportunities. However, the regular high school PJ panel specified that students should have access to Advanced Placement classes and International Baccalaureate programs through their neighborhood schools or through magnet schools that draw students from across the city.

Students should have access to Advanced Placement classes and International Baccalaureate programs through their neighborhood schools or through magnet schools that draw students from across the city.

Additional staffing resources vary depending on the category of need among high school students. Based on the PJ panels' specifications, approximately 39 percent of all high school staff is dedicated to serving students with identified learning needs.

Staffing Summary

For high schools with 1,000 students, the panel called for 148.3 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members. For high schools with 400 students, the panel called for 67 FTE staff members. The PJ panel specifications varied from the evidence base. In particular, the PJ panels called for more student support personnel than is reflected in the research literature, mostly because so many DC students are at risk. To a large extent, this variation also reflects differences in student and teacher schedules; some schools have several class periods per day while some have an individual teacher in each classroom. Accordingly, the study recommendation reflects the number of teachers in a school of each size that would be required to satisfy the specified 25:1 ratio on a block schedule (see Table 3.13).

As with elementary schools and middle schools, the clear implication is that it is more expensive to operate small high schools because the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio are lower than for larger schools. As shown in Table 3.13, the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio for larger high schools are 10.1:1 and 6.7:1, respectively. The comparative ratios for small high schools are 9.8:1 and 6.0:1, respectively.

Table 3.13: Recommended Personnel Specifications—High School

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
High School 1: 1,000 Students						
Teachers	53.3	12.4	4.7	0.5	13.2	84.1
Intervention Teachers		6.0				6.0
Adaptive Physical Education Teachers					1.0	1.0
Librarians/Media Specialists	1.0					1.0
Technology Specialists	1.0					1.0
Instructional Aides			0.6		4.4	5.0
Media Aides	1.0					1.0
Substitutes	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher	
Subtotal: Instructional Staff	56.3	18.4	5.3	0.5	18.6	99.1
Student Support Staff		6.0	0.9			6.9
- Counselors	5.0					5.0
- Nurses	1.0					1.0
- Psychologists					1.4	1.4
- Social Worker/Behavior Therapists	2.0				1.4	3.4
- Speech, Occupational, and Physical Therapists	2.0				2.2	4.2
Subtotal: Student Support Staff	10.0	6.0	0.9		5.0	21.9
Principals	1.0					1.0
Assistant Administrators	2.0					2.0
Deans	2.0					2.0
Special Education Coordinators					1.0	1.0
English Language Learners Coordinators			0.2			0.2
Department Chairs	2.0					2.0
Instructional Facilitators					1.1	1.1
Office Managers	1.0					1.0
Business Managers	1.0					1.0
Data Managers	1.0					1.0
Registrar/Attendance Personnel	1.0					1.0
Clerical/Data Entry Personnel	4.0					4.0
In-School Suspension Personnel	2.0					2.0
Subtotal: Administrative Staff	17.0		0.2		2.1	19.3

Table 3.13: Recommended Personnel Specifications—High School, continued

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
Information Technology Managers	1.0					1.0
Security Personnel	6.0	2.0				8.0
Subtotal: Other Staff	7.0	2.0				9.0
Total Staff	89.3	26.4	6.4	0.5	25.7	148.3
Students Per Instructional Staff						10.1:1
Students Per Total Staff						6.7:1
High School 2: 400 Students						
Teachers	21.3	5.0	2.0	0.2	5.3	33.8
Intervention Teachers		2.4				2.4
Adaptive Physical Education Teachers					0.5	0.5
Librarians/Media Specialists	1.0					1.0
Technology Specialists	1.0					1.0
Instructional Aides			0.2		1.8	2.0
Substitutes	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	10 days/teacher	
Subtotal: Instructional Staff	23.3	7.4	2.2	0.2	7.6	40.7
Student Support Staff		2.4	0.4			2.8
- Counselors	2.0					2.0
- Nurses	1.0					1.0
- Psychologists					0.6	0.6
- Social Workers/Behavior Therapists	0.3				0.6	0.9
- Speech, Occupational, and Physical Therapists					0.9	0.9
- Transition Specialists					2.0	2.0
Subtotal: Student Support Staff	3.3	2.4	0.4		4.1	10.2
Principals	1.0					1.0
Assistant Administrators	1.0					1.0
Deans	1.0					1.0
Special Education Coordinators					0.5	0.5

Table 3.13: Recommended Personnel Specifications—High School, continued

	Base Personnel	At-Risk Personnel	English Language Learners Personnel	Gifted/Talented Personnel	Special Education Personnel	Total Personnel
English Language Learners Coordinators			0.1			0.1
Department Chairs	2.0					2.0
Instructional Facilitators					0.4	0.4
Office Managers	0.5					0.5
Business Managers	0.5					0.5
Data Managers	0.5					0.5
Registrar/Attendance Personnel	0.5					0.5
Clerical/Data Entry Personnel	2.0					2.0
In-School Suspension Personnel	1.0					1.0
Subtotal: Administrative Staff	10.0		0.1		0.9	11.0
Information Technology Managers	1.0					1.0
Security Personnel	3.0	1.0				4.0
Subtotal: Other Staff	4.0	1.0				5.0
Total Staff	41.8	9.8	2.6	0.2	12.6	67.0
Students Per Instructional Staff						9.8:1
Students Per Total Staff						6.0:1

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Other Educational Resources

In addition to personnel resources that are needed to provide instructional programs, student support services, and management/administrative support, the high school PJ panel, the middle/high school identified learning needs PJ panel, and the Levels 1–4 special education PJ panel specified other resources that are required to provide quality instructional programs and services. These nonpersonnel resources include professional development, student activity fees, textbooks, library resources, and supplies. The specifications adopted as the study recommendation for costing purposes are displayed in Table 3.14.

Table 3.14: Recommended Nonpersonnel Resources—High School

	High School 1: 1,000 Students	High School 2: 400 Students
Additional Resources		
Professional Development	13 days/per teacher \$100/student	13 days/per teacher \$100/student
Supplies and Materials	\$225/student	\$225/student
Textbooks	\$125/student	\$125/student
Equipment	\$50/student	\$50/student
Technology Licensing	\$30/student	\$30/student
Student Activities	\$500/student	\$500/student

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Technology Hardware

The high school PJ panel highlighted technology hardware as a high priority for DC high schools. Broadening access and updating technology available to students and staff are critical to a sound high school learning environment. This observation acknowledges that students need to develop strong computer skills to be successful in the 21st century and that technology plays an increasingly prominent role in classroom learning. As shown in Table 3.15, panelists called for a computer for every professional staff member and one laptop computer for every high school student to ensure opportunities for digital learning and adequate preparation for PARCC testing. Additionally, panelists specified one classroom computer, a printer, an LCD projector, a SMART Board, and a document camera for each classroom. They also identified the need for a well-equipped media center in every high school with computers and digital cameras for use by an entire class at any given time. Panelists also specified that every large and small high school should have a well-equipped fixed computer lab with 44 computers, 2 printer/scanners, and 2 SMART Boards. Recognizing the security issues associated with providing each student with a computer, panelists called for secure facilities in school buildings to safeguard laptops at night and on weekends and enable students to check them out on a daily basis during school hours.

Table 3.15: Recommended Technology Hardware—High School

	High School 1 1,000 Students	High School 2 400 Students
Administrative Computers		
Computers	1 per staff member	1 per staff member
Printers (ink)	1 per staff member	1 per staff member
Copiers	5	3
Servers	2	1
Faculty Laptops	1 per staff member	1 per staff member
Classroom		
Computers	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Printers	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
LCD Projectors	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
SMART Boards	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Document Cameras	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Computer Lab(s)—Fixed		
Computers	44	44
Printers/Scanners	1 per lab	1 per lab
SMART Boards	1 per lab	1 per lab
Computer Lab(s)—Mobile		
Laptops	1 per student	1 per student
Media Center		
Computers	27	27
Digital Video Cameras	5	5
Digital Cameras	22	22
Printers (laser)	2	2
Switches and Routers	Sufficient to support identified technology	Sufficient to support identified technology

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations. Currently, no evidence base from education research exists on adequate technology for students.

Additional Programs

The high school PJ panel, the middle/high school identified learning needs PJ panel, and the Levels 1–4 special education PJ panel specified the need for other specialized school-based programs that entail additional costs. Extended-day programs and extended-year programs offer specialized tutoring, homework help, and enrichment during the school year and help prevent learning loss over the summer. They also include summer bridge programs to ease the transition from middle school to high school for entering 9th graders and transfer students. The additional costs related to these programs are presented in Tables 3.16 and 3.17. They include personnel and other direct costs.

Table 3.16: Recommended Additional Programs—High School 1 (1,000 Students)

High School 1: 1,000 Students					
Program Name	Before- or After-School Program	Summer School	After-School Tutoring/ Homework Club/Advanced Placement Preparation	Summer Bridge	Summer Enrichment
Number of Pupils Served	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students			75
Types of Students Served	At risk	At risk	All	Entering 9th graders/transfers	All
Grade Levels	9–12	9–12	9–12	Entering 9th graders	9–12
Program Specifics	2 hours	6 to 8 weeks, full day	2 hours 3 days per week	2 weeks	4 weeks, 3 hours 4 days per week
Personnel					
Teachers	30:1	30:1	16 (1 per core, per grade)	10	20:1
Program Name	Before- or After-School Program	Summer School	After-School Tutoring/ Homework Club/Advanced Placement Preparation	Summer Bridge	Summer Enrichment
Coordinators	1.0				
Security Personnel		2.0			
Other Costs					
Instructional Supplies, Materials, and Equipment				\$100/student	

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations.

Table 3.17: Recommended Additional Programs—High School 2 (400 Students)

High School 2: 400 Students					
Program Name	Before- or After-School Program	Summer School	After-school Tutoring/ Homework Club/Advanced Placement Preparation	Summer Bridge	Summer Enrichment
Number of Pupils Served	100% of at-risk students	100% of at-risk students			30
Types of Students Served	At risk	At risk	All	Entering 9th graders/ transfers	All
Grade Levels	9–12	9–12	9–12	Entering 9th graders	9–12
Program Specifics	2 hours	6 to 8 weeks, full day	2 hours 3 days per week	2 weeks	4 weeks, 3 hours 4 days per week
Personnel					
Teachers	30:1	30:1	8 (1 per core, per 2 grades)	5	20:1
Social Workers		1.0			
Coordinators	0.5				
Security Personnel		1.0			
Other Costs					
Instructional Supplies, Materials, and Equipment				\$100/student	

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations.

Adult Education and Alternative Schools

Students at risk of academic failure because they are over-age, under-credited, and behind-grade frequently have more than one identified learning need. Many of these students have not succeeded in regular high schools. Some have dropped out and later returned to school. Others have spent time in juvenile detention facilities or mental health facilities and are transitioning back to public schools. DCPS and the public charter sector offer several alternative schools and alternative programs within regular high schools for these students. These options are intended to help even the most challenged students complete a high school education and earn a diploma or an equivalency certificate. The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) officially identifies whether DCPS and public charter schools receive alternative school status and receive the appropriate alternative schools funding via the UPSFF. At the time of this study, the PJ panels used OSSE's working definition to describe alternative schools.⁶ At the time of

⁶ OSSE's proposed eligibility criteria for alternative education services at the time of the PJ panels, which differ from what is now in statute, are as follows: 1. Student is eligible for a public school education; AND 2. Student is not academically proficient AND fits one of the following descriptions: 3. Student is under court supervision as a child adjudicated as neglected or abused, or as a person in need of supervision; 4. Student has been incarcerated in an adult correctional facility; 5. Student is committed to the department of youth rehabilitation services as delinquent; 6. Student has received multiple short-term suspensions from a District public school or charter school, as defined by OSSE; 7. Student is on long-term suspension from a District public school or charter school; 8. Student has been

publication, OSSE was reconvening an LEA working group to review and finalize the alternative schools definition.

DCPS and the public charter sector also offer adult education programs that combine foundational literacy and skills courses and workforce development with comprehensive support services for those who are older than age 18 and have work and family responsibilities and are trying to complete their high school education. These programs are intended to help adult students obtain their high school diploma or equivalents; pass the citizenship exam and become US citizens; gain the English language skills necessary to function effectively in a predominantly English-speaking society and help their children with homework; pursue postsecondary education; and enter into careers and climb career ladders.

Based on discussions within the adult education and alternative schools PJ panel, the study team worked with panelists to build representative schools of 500 full-time equivalent students for adult education schools and 300 students for alternative schools. It did so with the understanding that many of these students do not attend full time and require flexible scheduling to pursue coursework.

An average demographic profile for adult education and alternative schools does not exist. Although all students served in these settings are at risk, the proportions of ELL and special education students vary significantly. Some schools (e.g., the Carlos Rosario Public Charter School) serve a predominantly Spanish-speaking student population, while others (e.g., the Maya Angelou Public Charter School) have almost no students for whom English is not a first language. Similarly, though the DCPS Incarcerated Youth Program has 50 percent of students with IEPs, the DCPS Roosevelt High School S.T.A.Y. [School To Aid Youth] program has only 1 percent of students with special education diagnoses and IEPs. Consequently, defining a single demographic profile for these programs and schools is difficult, but the students all have multiple learning needs and life circumstances that require special attention and support to make them successful students. Table 3.18 gives the student demographics for the representative adult education and alternative schools.

expelled from a District public school, District charter school, or another jurisdiction, after the expiration of any required expulsion period; 9. Student who is otherwise eligible seeks admission to a District public school or charter school after withdrawing for a period of one or more terms, during which the student received no public or private instruction; 10. Student is receiving treatment for drug abuse; 11. Student has a history of violence, as defined by OSSE; 12. Student is chronically truant from a District public school or charter school, as defined by OSSE; 13. Student is under-credited; 14. Student is pregnant or parenting; or 15. Student meets other criteria for at-risk status, as defined by OSSE.

Table 3.18: Student Demographics—Adult Education and Alternative Schools

	Enrollment	Percentage of Special Education Students	Percentage of English Language Learners	Percentage of Low-Income Students
Adult Education				
Charter Schools				
Carlos Rosario Public Charter School	2,900	0%	92%	90%
Latin American Youth Center—YouthBuild Public Charter School	110	1%	64%	100%
Education Strengthens Families (Briya) Public Charter School	352		88%	95%
Next Step—El Proximo Paso Public Charter School	158	10%	62%	95%
DCPS				
Ballou S.T.A.Y. [School To Aid Youth] High School	601	7%	0%	99%
Roosevelt S.T.A.Y. High School*	652	7%	0%**	99%
Spingarn S.T.A.Y. High School	244	9%	0%	34%
Average Percentage		5.8%	35%	87.4%
Alternative Education				
Charter School				
Latin American Youth Center—YouthBuild Public Charter School	110	1%	64%	100%
Maya Angelou Public Charter School	296	50%	1%	86%
DCPS				
CHOICE [Choosing Higher Options for Individually Centered Education] Academy	10	60%	0%	99%
Incarcerated Youth Program	49	51%	0%	N/A
Youth Services Center	89	33%	1%	N/A
Luke C. Moore Academy	366	6%	0%	99%
Average Percentage		33.5%	11%	96%

Note:*Roosevelt S.T.A.Y. reported 90 students, or 14 percent, “pending” for English language learner status. Pending means they have not been tested or the testing is out of date.

Source: District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education, “FY13 LEA and School Level Enrollment Audit Reports,” <http://osse.dc.gov/publication/fy13-Lea-and-school-level-enrollment-audit-reports>.

The adult education and alternative schools PJ panel focused on resource specifications that enable students to meet current and proposed high school academic standards; earn a high school diploma or equivalency certificate; and have the habits, attitudes, and language skills to pursue postsecondary education or get a job and advance on a career ladder. Panelists specified resource needs recognizing that all students in these programs and schools have multiple learning needs, and most, if not all, are over-age, under-credited, and behind-grade. Likewise, programs within these schools are tailored to address these students’ learning needs.

The PJ panel focused on resource requirements that enable students to meet current and proposed high school academic standards; earn a high school diploma

or equivalency certificate; and have the habits, attitudes, and language skills to pursue postsecondary education or get a job and advance on a career ladder.

Alternative Education

Alternative education students have learning needs that require comprehensive education models with extended-day and year-round learning opportunities. Many of these students are returning to school after dropping out and/or spending time in juvenile detention facilities, substance abuse treatment facilities, or mental health treatment facilities. These schools are aimed primarily at credit recovery or GED attainment, with a focus on boosting achievement in core subjects, so optimal learning environments include features oriented to help students address issues that affect their ability to be successful students, as shown in Table 3.19.

Table 3.19: Adult Education and Alternative School Needs

	Alternative Education	Adult Education
Small class size and group instruction	X	X
15:1 teacher-to-student ratio	X	X
Specialized curricula and proficiency assessment for students with varied and below-grade proficiency	X	X
Blended learning methods (classroom and online learning and testing)	X	X
Extended-day and year-long learning opportunities	X	X
Flexible scheduling and shorter school days	X	X
School staffing that incorporates vocational skills, job and career support, and life skills training (e.g., financial literacy)	X	X
Enrollment administrators to track needs of transient and non-English-fluent or -literate population	X	X
Comprehensive student support services	X	X
Intensive psychological and behavioral therapy	X	X

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations.

Adult Education

Because of their life circumstances, many adult education students may not be full-time students and may need specialized supports and services to pursue educational success. The staffing specifications are shown for FTE adult students; therefore, figures would need to be proportionately reduced depending on whether an adult student attends 50 percent time, 75 percent time, etc. The panelists emphasized that the most effective educational models offer these students highly resourced environments that address their multiple learning needs and family, living, and work circumstances. Student support services need to include transportation,

counseling, child care assistance, health and mental health care, and help in accessing other social services and supports (e.g., Medicaid, subsidized housing, immigration services, child support payments, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families).

Professionals running adult education programs also emphasized that some of their students are English language learners and would benefit from ELL resources. However, federal funding used for ELL is restricted to students below age 22. Professionals on the PJ panels emphasized that these ELL resources should be extended to students older than age 22. Funding for ELL resources for older students is not included in Table 3.20. City leaders will have to decide whether to fund these services using local resources.

Instructional Staffing and Student Support Personnel

As shown in Table 3.20, both adult education and alternative schools require additional staff and highly trained professionals to help students succeed, including classroom teachers, learning specialists and interventionists, instructional facilitators, instructional aides, and student support staff. The PJ panel generally specified staffing levels that were higher than the evidence base.

Administrative Personnel

To meet the leadership and administrative needs of adult education and alternative schools, the PJ panel felt that one full-time principal/director, one assistant principal (two for adult education schools), one student dean, one registrar, one attendance monitor, one data analyst, and one clerical staff member (three for adult education centers) are needed to ensure the smooth and effective operations of these schools.

Staffing Summary

For alternative schools with 300 students, the panel called for 66.7 FTE staff members. For adult education centers with 500 students, the panel called for 80.1 FTE staff members. The clear implication is that schools that serve these high-need students and provide intensive comprehensive support are much more expensive to operate than are schools with mostly general education students. As shown in Table 3.20, the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio for alternative schools are 7.0:1 and 4.5:1, respectively. The comparative ratios for adult education schools are 11.7:1 and 6.2:1, respectively.

Table 3.20: Recommended Staffing Specifications—Adult Education and Alternative Schools

	Alternative Education Program: 300 Students	Adult Education Program: 500 Full-Time- Equivalent Adults
Teachers	26.7	22.2
Specialists/ Interventionists	4	2
Librarians/Media Specialists	1	1
Technology Specialists	1.0	1.0
Instructional Aides	10.0	16.7
Substitutes	10 days/ teacher	10 days/ teacher
Subtotal: Instructional Staff	42.7	42.9
Student Support Staff*	10.0	16.7
Job Placement/Readiness/Tracking Staff	2.0	2.0
Subtotal: Student Support Staff	12.0	18.7
Principals/Directors	1.0	1.0
Assistant Principals/Assistant Administrators	1.0	2.0
Deans	1.0	1.0
Data Analysts	1.0	1.0
Business Managers	1.0	1.0
Instructional Facilitators (Coaches)	2.0	2.5
Clerical Staff	1.0	3.0
Registrars/Data Entry Personnel	1.0	3.0
Attendance Personnel	1.0	1.0
Subtotal: Administrative Staff	10.0	15.5
Security Personnel	1.0	2.0
Information Technology Specialists	1.0	1.0
Subtotal: Other Staff	2.0	3.0
Total Staff	66.7	80.1
Students Per Instructional Staff	7.0:1	11.7:1
Students Per Total Staff	4.5:1	6.2:1

Note: * Student support staff includes nurses, counselors, psychologists, social workers, and family liaisons.

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

The costs of specified resources for alternative schools are about 94 percent higher than the base for large elementary schools. The comparable costs of specified resources for adult education centers are about 35 percent higher than the base costs for large elementary schools. Because students in these schools are, by definition, at risk of academic failure, the resources to support their success are built into the school-level resource specifications. Additionally, because many of these students are over-age and federal funding for students with identified learning needs is only available for students up to age 22, a larger share of the costs of educating them must be covered with DC funding.

Other Educational Resources

In addition to personnel resources that are needed to provide instructional programs, student support services, and management/administrative support, the adult education and alternative schools PJ panel specified other resources necessary to provide quality instructional programs and services. These nonpersonnel resources included professional development, student activity fees, textbooks, library resources, and supplies. These specifications were adopted as the study recommendation for costing purposes and are displayed in Table 3.21.

Table 3.21: Recommended Nonpersonnel Resources—Adult Education and Alternative Schools

Other Costs	Alternative Education Program: 300 Students	Adult Education Program: 500 Full-Time-Equivalent Adults
Professional Development	15 days/teacher \$100/student	15 days/teacher \$100/student
Supplies and Materials	\$225/student	\$200/student
Textbooks	\$125/student	
Equipment	\$50/student	
Technology Licensing	\$30/student	
Student Activities	\$300/student	
Other	\$400/student	\$400 for every 500 students

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Technology Hardware

An important element of educational programming for adult education and alternative schools students is virtual education. The PJ panel envisioned a hybrid program that would balance time in the classroom with work completed online. Panelists also recognized the importance of helping these students acquire proficient computer skills to overcome a possible digital skills gap compared with general education students. Accordingly, as shown in Table 3.22, panelists called for a computer for every professional staff member; one computer, an LCD projector, a SMART Board, and a digital camera for every classroom; and a well-quipped media center and fixed computer lab in every school.

Table 3.22: Recommended Technology Hardware—Adult Education and Alternative Schools

	Alternative Education Program	Adult Education Program
Administrative Computers		
Computers	1 per staff member	1 per staff member
Printers	3	1 per administrator
Copiers	3	4
Servers	3	3
Faculty Laptops	1 per staff member	1 per staff member
Classroom		
Computers		300
Printers		5
	Alternative Education Program	Adult Education Program
LCD Projectors	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
SMART Boards	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Document Cameras	1 per classroom	1 per classroom
Computer Lab(s)—Fixed	2	
Computers	30	
SMART Boards	1	
Media Center		
Computers	5	
Digital Video Cameras	5	
Digital Cameras	30	25
Printers	1	2
Student Digital Devices	1 per student (\$500 device)	
Switches and Routers	Sufficient to support identified technology	Sufficient to support identified technology

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations. Currently, no evidence base from education research exists on adequate technology for students.

Costs of Education in Schools of Different Size

As noted throughout the presentation of findings from the PJ panels' specifications of education resource needs for schools at each level—as adjusted by the system-level PJ panels, focus groups, individual interviews, stakeholders, and the Advisory Group—it is more costly to educate DC students in small schools than in larger ones. Smaller schools are more staff intensive, and they cannot take advantage of some economies of scale that reduce the per-student costs of instructional programs, student support services, administrative support, and other educational resources for larger schools. As noted earlier in this chapter:

- At the elementary school level, the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio for larger schools with 420 students are 8.8:1 and 6.2:1, respectively. The comparative ratios for small schools with 210 students are 8.3:1 and 5.6:1, respectively.
- At the middle school level, the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio for larger schools with 600 students are 9.7:1 and 6.8:1, respectively. The comparative ratios for small schools with 300 students are 9.6:1 and 6.3:1, respectively.

- At the high school level, the instructional staff-to-student ratio and the total staff-to-student ratio for larger schools of 1,000 students are 10.1:1 and 6.7:1, respectively. The comparative ratios for small schools of 400 students are 9.8:1 and 6.0:1, respectively

As shown in Table 3.23, based on the PJ panel specifications, it is between 8 percent and 10 percent more costly to educate students in small schools than in larger ones.

**Table 3.23: School-Level Base Costs for DCPS and Public Charter Schools of Different Sizes
Projected/Budgeted for School Year 2013–2014**

	Small Elementary School Base	Large Elementary School Base	Small Middle School Base	Large Middle School Base	Small High School Base	Large High School Base
School-Level Base Costs	\$10,402	\$9,405	\$9,539	\$8,450	\$10,382	\$9,110

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations.

Summary

The school-level PJ panels—using the education research evidence base as a point of departure—developed detailed resource specifications for instructional programs, student support, administration, technology hardware, additional programs, and other educational resources at each school level. The identified learning needs panels and the Levels 1–4 special education panel supplemented the work of the school-level panels by adding staffing and other resources required to address the specific needs of English language learners, at-risk students, and special education students. Of particular note:

- DCPS and public charter school educators agreed on the school-level resources needed to provide all DC students with a pre-K3 through grade 12 education that will enable them to meet current academic performance standards and, when they are implemented, the Common Core State Standards.
- Each panel specified significant additional instructional resources for at-risk students, who were initially identified as being eligible for free and reduced-price school meals. Although currently no additional weight exists in the UPSFF, the panelists agreed these students require intensive supports and services because of learning needs that exceed those of general education students.

As noted earlier in this chapter, developing resource specifications for Levels 1–4 special education students proved difficult. In part, this reflects different professional perspectives on the levels and balance of additional instructional programming, student support, and therapeutic services these students need to be successful learners. In some cases, changes in estimates of required staffing were made.

- All of the school-level PJ panels highlighted the importance of significant investments in technology hardware, software, and wireless capacity. For students to be successful in a digital age, they need to develop strong computer skills. Technology plays an

increasingly greater role in the classroom, in the workplace, and in all domains of daily life. In this regard, the high school PJ panel noted that schools will need such capacity to have all students complete the new PARCC exams on computers. Additionally, the adult education and alternative schools PJ panel called for the development of hybrid learning programs that enable students to complete coursework and testing virtually as well as in the classroom.

- The elementary school and middle/high school identified learning needs panels highlighted the importance of offering appropriate educational opportunities to gifted and talented students at each level as well as to those with other learning needs. Although the panelists did not offer detailed resource specifications for this category of students, they urged greater attention and investment in developing appropriate programs and learning opportunities for exceptionally able students and ensuring that adequate resources are available to fully implement them.

4. SYSTEM-LEVEL FINDINGS

The professional judgment (PJ) panels—informed by the evidence base—sought to identify the quantity and types of system-level resources required to provide an adequate education to all District of Columbia (DC) students. This information was supplemented by detailed analyses of budget and expenditure data for District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS), the Public Charter School Board (PCSB), and other DC government agencies. Taken together with the school-level findings presented in Chapter 3, these findings are an important foundation for conclusions on the cost of education adequacy in the District, which are presented in Chapter 5, as well as recommendations for restructuring and resetting the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) base and weights for students with identified learning needs, which are presented in Chapter 6.

Differences between DCPS and public charter schools affect system-level costs for the two sectors.

To examine system-level costs for DCPS and public charter schools, the study team appointed system-level PJ panels to review the work of the school-level panels and the identified learning needs panels. These panels developed specifications to guide the costing out of resources needed to effectively manage and administer instructional programs, student support services, and other educational resources for the DCPS sector and for the public charter school sector. The UPSFF covers costs for system-level management and administration for all local educational agencies (LEAs), and the intent of the law is that funds be allocated equitably. Yet, because DCPS and public charter school LEAs are structured and managed so differently, the study team organized findings on system-level resource specifications and their costs separately for each sector.

The system-level cost analysis also examined costs related to facilities maintenance and operations (M&O); these costs also are covered by the UPSFF, so they are expected to be allocated equitably to DCPS and public charter schools. Findings on facilities costs were developed based on deliberations by the facilities PJ panel and extensive analysis of the per-student and per-square-foot M&O costs for DCPS and public charter schools.

Capital spending on the acquisition and lease of school buildings and grounds is the third major area of system-level education spending. This includes expenditures for constructing new facilities, renovating old facilities, and periodically upgrading facilities to ensure schools are safe and in compliance with DC codes. Capital costs are paid for outside the UPSFF. Because DC law does not require equal funding for capital expenditures for school facilities, the study team did not undertake an extensive analysis of capital spending or recommend a uniform per-student or per-square-foot cost for school facilities at each level. However, based on the premises that all students in the District of Columbia should have access to high-quality school facilities, preferably within their neighborhood, and that facilities are an important aspect of education adequacy, the study team gathered data from DCPS, PCSB, and the Department of General Services to assess the adequacy of capital investments in the two sectors. Because the data are not reported uniformly and because the contexts in which decisions on DCPS and

public charter school capital investments are made are so different, it was not possible to make a meaningful comparison and draw conclusions on the adequacy of capital expenditures.

The system-level analysis also examined differences between how costs that are intended to be covered through the UPSFF are currently funded by DCPS and public charter school LEAs. Again, significant differences between the two sectors exist. Even though DC law prohibits the funding of costs outside the UPSFF that are also covered by the UPSFF, some costs for school-level student support services are funded by other DC government agencies (e.g., school nurses and social workers, school crossing guards, and school resource officers). Compared with public charter schools, public schools receive significantly greater benefit from these services, in total and on a per-student basis. Additionally, the DGS contributes a significant share of M&O costs for DCPS schools, and DCPS receives management and administrative services from some other DC agencies that public charter schools fund from their UPSFF allocation.

As shown in the analysis, the significant structural differences between DCPS and public charter school LEAs affect system-level costs in the two sectors. Importantly, however, the study team did not undertake this review to audit expenditures by DCPS and public charter schools or to prescribe how either sector should allocate resources for LEA central office functions or facilities M&O. Instead, like the school-level cost analysis, the goal was to fairly estimate the costs of resources needed by single-campus and multicampus LEAs to effectively and efficiently operate high-performing schools. In the best-case scenario, both DCPS and public charter schools would have adequate funding and capital resources to reasonably address their central office responsibilities.

The goal of the analysis was not to audit DCPS and charter expenditures. It was to fairly estimate the costs of system-level resources needed to effectively and efficiently operate high-performing schools in both sectors. In the best-case scenario, both DCPS and public charter schools would have adequate funding and capital resources to reasonably address their central office responsibilities.

The system-level resource specifications developed by the PJ panels also were reviewed by the Advisory Group. In addition, the results were reviewed by focus groups and through individual interviews with other stakeholders. In cases where the Advisory Group raised questions, the study team tried to gather additional relevant data and refine the cost estimates. In almost all cases, the final study recommendations reflect the judgment of the study team based on the work of the PJ panels with additional input from the Advisory Group.

Comparison of DCPS and Public Charter Schools

Because DCPS and public charter school LEAs are so different, the study team began by carefully comparing structural characteristics that could affect costs. DCPS is an agency of

District government. The chancellor of DCPS reports directly to the mayor. The mayor is vested with specific authority over DCPS (e.g., closing schools or reducing expenditures) that he does not have with respect to public charter schools. Passage of the Public Education Reform Act of 2007 marked the beginning of mayoral control of DCPS and the end of board of education policy and budgetary oversight for the public schools. As a result, DCPS operates as a centralized LEA with responsibility for managing its almost 100 schools with oversight by the DC City Council.

In contrast, public charter schools are nonprofit corporations that operate as charter independent agencies of DC government overseen by PCSB, an independent agency whose board members are appointed by the Mayor. Most charter schools are independent LEAs. Some operate on two to five campuses under the umbrella of a single LEA. Additionally, some public charter schools identify DCPS as their LEA for special education purposes. PCSB is responsible for authorizing and closing public charter schools, but it has no direct charter school management responsibilities and limited oversight power. The City Council, PCSB's budget authorizer, affects charter schools through the UPSFF base, weights, and facilities allowance, but it has no oversight or other authority over how public charter schools spend funds.

Both sectors are subject to government laws and rules and oversight of education by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), but there are some significant differences between them. Table 4.1 compares DCPS and public charter school characteristics that have cost implications. Following are among the significant differences that affect system-level costs:

- *School-based budgeting.* Each LEA is responsible for creating its own school-specific staffing plans. Public charter school principals typically have wide discretion in staffing their schools and assigning classroom teachers, aides, and other specialists. For DCPS, classroom staffing patterns are prescribed at the central office level. Elementary school principals cannot change the prescribed allocation of instructional personnel at their school. At the middle school and high school levels, DCPS principals have greater flexibility to make decisions about staffing, class size, and teacher ratios. If they want to use instructional staffing resources differently from the budgeted allocation, middle school and high school principals can petition their instructional superintendent. Approved petitions are forwarded to the chancellor for final approval. Changes to the allocations after the initial release must satisfy one of two criteria to be considered: the change request must be budget-neutral or constitute minor corrections to address a budget error (e.g., an accounting problem). Petitions that fall outside the scope of the petition process are not allowable.¹
- *Neighborhood schools and system of right.* DCPS operates neighborhood schools to accommodate students living in communities across the city. It also is a system of right and, therefore, has a legal obligation to enroll all students who live in a traditional DC public school's catchment area who want to enroll at any time throughout the school year. In contrast, though public charter schools must accept any student who is a DC resident, they can set enrollment ceilings and are not obligated to accept students beyond their stated capacity or to accept students throughout the school year. If a charter school has more applicants than spaces available, it is required to admit students through a random selection process. Because of DCPS's mandate to operate neighborhood schools

¹ District of Columbia Public Schools, "Budget Development Guide: School Year 2013–2014," www.dcps.dc.gov.

within a system of right, it has to maintain buildings across the city, even if some are underutilized. This requirement has significant implications for instructional as well as M&O funding. In addition, DCPS receives students during the course of the year from other LEAs and from outside the District. Under the current budgeting process, funding to LEAs does not change if they gain or lose students during the school year; therefore, DCPS does not receive any additional funding for any additional students it enrolls.

- Variation in LEA size. DCPS and public charter school LEAs vary dramatically in size. As the traditional public school system, enrollment in DCPS is 20 times larger than enrollment in the highest enrolled public charter school LEA in the city (i.e., Friendship Charter Academy with 2,500 students at several campuses). Traditional DC public schools range from relatively small neighborhood schools that enroll 100 to 250 students to large comprehensive schools that draw as many as 1,700 students from many neighborhoods. Public charter schools tend to be smaller and more similar in size, ranging from 100 to 500 students.² Small schools are relatively more expensive to operate than larger schools at each level, because some costs are fixed and do not decline with smaller enrollments. Similarly, small LEAs are relatively more expensive than larger ones because of fixed costs and their inability to take advantage of economies of scale in management, purchasing, and other administrative functions.
- Teacher certification. DCPS requires teacher certification, except for entering Teach for America teachers and those in similar programs who are certified based on their program affiliation. Public charter schools do not require teacher certification. As a result, DCPS has a more limited personnel pool from which to hire, and personnel costs generally are lower for charter schools than for DCPS. However, both sectors are subject to the No Child Left Behind requirement of reporting their rate of highly qualified teachers—defined as those with a bachelor’s degree, teaching or intern credential, and demonstrated competence in core subject matter competence.
- Labor costs. DCPS is required to pay union wages for school personnel (principals, teachers, aides, student support staff, and custodians). Public charter schools are not subject to union wage scales and collective bargaining on compensation and working conditions, though charter school educators have the right to organize. The board of directors for each public charter school has the authority to establish compensation and other terms of employment for school staff. DCPS has less flexibility in how it compensates its personnel and, generally, has higher labor costs.
- Enrollment projections versus actuals for school funding. DCPS and public charter schools are paid according to different methodologies. DCPS’s budget is based on student enrollment projections. It receives an advance on July 1st and is paid for the remainder of its authorized budget at the beginning of the fiscal year in early October. In previous years, DCPS’s enrollment projections were higher than its audited October 5 enrollment count, though such discrepancies have lessened in recent years. Public charter

² “DC Public School Profiles, 2012–2013,” www.dcps.dc.gov; and multi-year PCSB enrollment data, 1999 through 2012, cited in District of Columbia Public Education Finance Reform Commission, *Equity and Recommendations Report* (Washington, DC, February 17, 2012).

schools also set their budgets based on enrollment projections, but they are ultimately paid based on their actual October 5 audited enrollment count. Each public charter LEA receives quarterly payments each year from the DC government no later than July 15, October 15, January 15, and April 15. The first payment for an academic year, occurring no later than July 15, is based on the public charter school's projected student enrollment. The second and third payments for an academic year, occurring no later than October 15 and January 15, respectively, are based on finalized student data submitted by public charter schools from their student information systems. The fourth and final payment for an academic year, occurring no later than April 15, is based on the finalized figures from the enrollment audit. These school funding approaches have multiple cost implications. DCPS may be overfunded if its projections are too high. Alternatively, as a school system of right, DCPS may enroll additional students during the school year who are not funded. Charter schools, which generally lose enrollment during the course of the school year, are allowed to keep funding for students who disenroll after the October 5 enrollment audit.

- *Special education enrollment for school funding.* For both DCPS and public charter schools, special education funding is based solely on the October 5 enrollment audit, even though DCPS and public charter schools must accommodate students with special education needs after that date. It often takes longer than the official enrollment count for students to receive their individualized education plans (IEPs). Both DCPS and public charter schools may be underfunded for providing special education services when students are identified after the funding deadline.
- *School facilities.* Traditional DC public schools operate in buildings owned by the DC government, which they occupy rent-free and for which DCPS incurs costs associated with legacy assets. Costs for new construction, renovation, and upgrades are funded from the city's capital budget. Public charter schools must secure and fund their own facilities and are provided a \$3,000 per-student facilities allowance. They have first right of offer on vacated DCPS buildings that are released from the DCPS stock. Historically, however, the process has been time consuming to pursue, and charter school advocates have complained that DCPS has not released enough buildings from its inventory. (Recently, the DGS and the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education have worked to quickly and transparently release former traditional DC public school buildings for use by high-quality charter schools.) The cost implication for DCPS is it has excess space but no financial incentive to release vacant buildings or to collocate with other schools or community organizations in order to operate more efficiently. The cost implications for public charter schools are they often operate in facilities that are inadequate for educational purposes or lack amenities that many traditional DC public schools have (e.g., fields, gyms, and auditoriums).
- *Capital investments in school facilities.* The DC government spends more than public charter schools for capital investments in new and renovated school buildings and grounds because of design and construction preferences and DC law governing union contracts for building projects. Starting in 2008, the city began an aggressive building, renovation, and upgrade program to compensate for many years of neglect in maintaining DCPS facilities. Public charter schools receive a \$3,000 per-student facilities allowance

annually to cover capital investments. These funds are allocated regardless of individual charter schools' capital needs. They can borrow against these real property assets and qualify for tax-exempt revenue bond financing. Although the facilities allowance is intended for capital investment and financing, the use of these funds is not restricted to capital investment purposes and the funds can be carried over between fiscal years. In contrast, DCPS's capital budget must be used exclusively for capital improvements in the fiscal year in which funds are allocated. Many public charter schools have not benefited from capital investments in new and upgraded school buildings and grounds as have many traditional DC public schools. However, DCPS does not have full control of its capital budget nor can it spend capital dollars on operating costs or accumulate the funds across fiscal years.

- *DC government rules and regulations.* Public charter schools are not subject to DC government procurement, human resources, and other rules and regulations that DCPS must follow. The cost implication is public charter schools have greater flexibility in administrative functions, including procurement, and can realize lower costs for services. If charter leaders determine it is cheaper to contract out services, they have greater flexibility to do so.
- *Carry-over funding.* Unlike DCPS, public charter schools can carry over local operating and facilities allowance funding from one fiscal year to the next. All allocated DCPS funds must be used within the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. The cost implication is charter schools can create reserves for future needs while DCPS cannot do so.

Table 4.1: Differences Between District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools

	DCPS	Public Charter Schools
Legal structure	DC agency	Nonprofit corporation; charter independent agency
Authority and accountability	Chancellor to mayor and council and schools to chancellor; plenary authority	Schools to their boards of trustees and to Public Charter School Board; autonomous within charter law and charter terms
Accountability standards	State accountability to the US Department of Education overseen by OSSE; DC academic standards and tests; otherwise per chancellor	State accountability to the US Department of Education overseen by OSSE; DC academic standards and tests, charter terms; Public Charter School Board oversight and subject to closure for poor academic performance
Admissions	Must take all, but may operate selective schools	Must take all if room available; lottery if more applicants than space
Areas where required to enroll students	Neighborhood zones, except selective schools	Citywide only; geographic limits not allowed
Date when required to enroll students	At all times	Up until October 5

Table 4.1: Differences Between District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools, continued

	DCPS	Public Charter Schools
Contracting constraints	DC government rules	Notice in <i>DC Register</i> , approval by Public Charter School Board
Fiscal reporting requirements	DC CFO and federal grants requirements	Annual audit and federal grants requirements
Revenue flow	Spring appropriation, accessible October 1 plus July advance	Quarterly payments, starting July 1
Local fund carryover	Not permitted	Permitted
Unionization	Teachers, principals, and noninstructional workers unionized	School-by-school potential but no employee groups unionized so far
Teacher certification	Required, but teachers entering Teach For America and similar programs are certifiable	Not required, but subject to No Child Left Behind highly qualified teachers requirement
Size of Local Educational Agency	1 local educational agency, serving about 45,500 students in approximately 126 schools in 2012–2013	57 local educational agencies, serving almost 35,000 students on more than 100 campuses in 2012
Facilities	Schools occupy city-owned and -controlled property that carry no rent; certain administrative offices and facilities are leased	Charter-controlled property, owned or leased, funded by separate per-student facilities allowance

Source: Adapted from materials prepared for the District of Columbia Public Education Finance Reform Commission, February 2012.

District of Columbia Public Schools

DCPS is a single LEA. In school year (SY) 2012–2013 it was responsible for 122 elementary, middle, high, adult, alternative, and special education schools citywide. Most of these were neighborhood schools; six are specialized high schools, and the rest are early childhood, special education, adult, and alternative education centers.³ In SY 2013–2014, DCPS is operating 111 schools.

DCPS is a single LEA with responsibility for serving more than 100 schools citywide in school year 2013–2014.

Most other large urban school systems internally manage and cover the costs of all student support and administrative costs. However, despite legal requirements that services funded apart from the UPSFF should not also be funded by the UPSFF, DCPS receives substantial resources from other city agencies, including the Departments of Health (DOH), Behavioral Health (DBH) (formerly referred to as the Department of Mental Health), Transportation (DDOT) and General Services (DGS), as well as the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). The costs of school

³ District of Columbia Public Schools, “School Year 2012–2013 Audited Enrollment Report,” www.dcps.dc.gov.

nurses, social workers, school crossing guards and school resource officers (police officers), as well as school operations and maintenance costs are covered by these other agencies. DCPS also receives benefits from the Offices of the Attorney General (OAG) Contracting and Procurement, and the Chief Technology Officer which provide legal services, contracting services, and information technology systems and services, respectively. Some of these benefits and services are funded by interagency transfers from DCPS to cover school-related line items in other agency budgets (e.g., OCTO). Others are funded resources and services covered in the budgets of these agencies for the benefit of DCPS (e.g., DGS, MPD, DOH, DBH, DDOT, OAG, OCP, and OCTO). (Appendix K describes the functions covered by each DCPS organizational division and those handled by other city agencies.)

The DCPS system-level PJ panel determined that the DCPS SY 2013–2014 budget presents the most appropriate specification of LEA-level resource needs.⁴ Accordingly, the study team’s approach to developing an estimate of system-level costs for DCPS is based on an analysis of this budget document and the budgets of, and interviews with, other city agencies that benefit DCPS outside the UPSFF.⁵ (The cost of DCPS leases and occupancy fixed costs is not included.) As shown in Table 4.2, total base per-student system-level costs within the DCPS budget are projected to total approximately \$86.5 million—1,878 per student—in SY 2013–2014. An additional \$4.36 million—\$95 per student—is projected to come from the separate budgets of other city agencies, for a total of \$1,973 per student. All DC government funding for activities to benefit DCPS shown in the table is in addition to funds provided through the UPSFF. Additional benefits are provided by some agencies and are paid for by DCPS. (The cost of services provided by the DGS is not included in Table 4.2, because it is applied to the maintenance and operations base costs rather than to the instructional costs.)

This total does not include the full budgets for most DCPS central office divisions. Funds that flow through to schools for expenses covered at the school level have been subtracted to prevent double-counting. As an example, funding for athletic programs and textbooks is in the budget of the Office of the Chief Operating Officer rather than in the budgets of individual schools. See Appendix L for a full accounting of DCPS central office divisions and how they were factored into the base and identified needs weights.

⁴ District of Columbia Public Schools, budget submitted to Office of the Chief Financial Officer, April 2013, www.dcps.dc.gov.

⁵ District of Columbia Public Schools, “Facts and Figures: A Look into the FY 14 DCPS Budget,” www.dcps.dc.gov.

Table 4.2: District of Columbia Public Schools System-Level Costs (Instructional)

Agency or Office	DCPS System-Level Costs	
	Total	Per Student
DCPS Resources (to be included in the base cost)		
Office of Family and Public Engagement	\$1,965,025	\$43
Office of the Chief Financial Officer—In Budget	\$3,279,655	\$71
Office of Data and Accountability	\$4,766,130	\$103
Office of the General Counsel—In Budget	\$5,700,000	\$124
Office of Youth Engagement ¹	\$0	\$0
Office of Strategy ²	\$0	\$0
Office of the Chief of Schools	\$3,369,752	\$73
Office of Teaching and Learning	\$11,367,097	\$247
Office of the Chief of Staff	\$5,182,895	\$113
Office of Human Capital	\$15,187,838	\$330
Office of Academic Programming and Support	\$6,848,293	\$149
Office of Special Education ³	\$725,913	\$16
Office of the Chief Operating Officer ⁴	\$21,301,898	\$462
Food Service Administrative Costs ⁵	\$6,817,892	\$148
Subtotal	\$86,512,388	\$1,878
Office of the Attorney General	\$2,442,000	\$53
Office of Contracting and Procurement	\$2,280	\$0
Office of the Chief Technology Officer	\$1,914,110	\$42
Subtotal	\$4,358,390	\$95
DCPS System Base Cost⁶	\$90,870,777	\$1,973

Notes: 1 All services in this office support at-risk students and, therefore, are not included in the computation of base costs.

2 All services in this office support special education students and, therefore, are not included in the computation of base costs.

3 All services in this office, except the child find service, support special education students and, therefore, are not included in the computation of base costs.

4 The cost of DCPS rentals (leases) and occupancy fixed costs are not included. Food service costs are accounted for as a separate line item.

5 Food service costs are based on a comparison of the expenditure with available revenue sources, including the US Department of Agriculture's free and reduced-price school meals program and collected fees from paying students; amounts shown are net of all revenues, local funding, and federal funding; DCPS staff provided updated figures.

6 Department of general services costs are not included in this table because these costs are applied to maintenance and operations instead of the instructional base.

Sources: District of Columbia Public Schools, "Facts and Figures: A Look into the FY 14 DCPS Budget," www.dcps.dc.gov; and interviews with DCPS and DC agency personnel.

Public Charter Schools

In contrast to a single DCPS local educational agency, the public charter sector's 60 LEAs are operating schools on more than 100 campuses in school year 2013–2014.⁶ Many of these LEAs are single-school jurisdictions for independent charter schools; others are charter management organizations (CMOs) that operate affiliated networks of two to five charter schools on different campuses. Public charter schools in the District of Columbia are authorized by the Public Charter School Board.

OSSE transfers funding available under the UPSFF, the charter school facilities allowance, and supplemental funding available from other agencies to authorized charter schools. PCSB tracks and monitors charter school performance across several dimensions (e.g., student achievement, progress toward academic improvement goals, and management effectiveness and efficiency) and rates schools on a three-tier scale. It also reviews new charter authorization applications and determines whether schools should be reauthorized or closed.

However, OSSE does not have centralized administrative and regulatory authority for the public charter school sector. It acts as the regulatory authority to ensure all LEAs meet the necessary requirements and are accounted for under the US Department of Education's Elementary and Secondary Education Act waiver. Accordingly, the charter school system-level PJ panel developed resource specifications for charter school LEAs. These specifications reflect the panelists' judgment on the resource needs of LEAs that are single-campus schools and those that are affiliated clusters of schools operated by CMOs.

The public charter school sector has 60 LEAs,
which are operating schools on more than
100 campuses in school year 2013–2014.

Public charter school LEAs do not currently receive as much funding from other DC agencies as DCPS—in total or on a per-student basis—but do receive benefits from other agencies for some of the same services. (See Appendix M for a list of these services.) Despite legal prohibitions against funding, again, costs that are intended to be funded through the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula, DOH, DBH, DDOT, and MPD provide school nurses, social workers, school crossing guards, and school resource officers. Additionally, PCSB receives an annual appropriation from the city council to cover approximately 50 percent of its operating costs, with the remainder coming from a .5 percent fee that is attached to the budgets of all public charter schools.⁷

Most charter schools that operate as independent LEAs employ an executive director to manage the business operations of the school and a principal to manage the school's academic programming and operations. Charter management organizations that serve as LEAs for clusters of affiliated charter schools (e.g., DC Prep) typically have one executive director who manages the operations of all schools in the cluster; principals in each affiliated school manage their own

⁶ District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, fact sheet, www.dcpsb.org.

⁷ A legislative proposal pending before the city council would increase this fee to 1.0 percent of all charter school budgets.

educational programs and services. These affiliated schools may look to the CMO for guidance or to coordinate with other schools in the cluster, if they have an overarching educational philosophy and mission or if they feed students from one school to another. Except in very large national CMOs (e.g., KIPP) with multiple regional or citywide networks, however, generally there is no standardized hierarchy of system-level staff with assigned oversight and management roles and responsibilities across schools.

Depending on the size of a charter school LEA, it may handle its wide array of management and administrative functions internally or contract them out. Among the administrative functions that smaller LEAs frequently purchase from outside vendors are:

- Financial management services, including budgeting, accounts receivable and payable, accounting, financial controls, reporting, and audit preparation;
- Payroll services, including issuing payroll checks, deducting federal and DC income tax withholding, and withholding for life and health insurance and other employee-subsidized fringe benefits;
- Grant management services, including proposal preparation and submission, recordkeeping, interim and final reporting, and gift acknowledgement;
- Human resources services, including recruiting, application screening, initial interviewing, Equal Employment Opportunity recordkeeping, hiring, personnel recordkeeping, benefits management, and separation management; and
- Information technology services, including network management, maintenance, and support; website management; e-mail service; and database management.

Charter LEAs also frequently contract out:

- Some educational support services, such as student diagnostic assessment; and
- Services related to buildings and grounds maintenance (e.g., custodial and landscape services).

As shown in Table 4.3, the professional judgment panel specified certain system-level resources for public charter schools at each school level. The weighted average of these charter system-level costs is \$1,897 per student. The central office-level costs for DCPS are slightly higher than public charters schools' system-level costs on a per-student basis.

Table 4.3: Charter School System-Level Fiscal and Administrative Staff, Functions, and Other Services¹

	Elementary School 420 Students		Middle School 300 Students		High School 400 Students	
	Personnel	Vendor/Other Costs	Personnel	Vendor/Other Costs	Personnel	Vendor/Other Costs
Executive Director	1.0		1.0		1.0	
Chief Financial Officer/Chief Operating Officer	0.3		0.3		0.3	
Business Manager	1.0		0.5		1.0	
Grants/Fundraising/Marketing/ Enrollment	1.5	\$10,000	1.25	\$10,000	1.5	\$10,000
Human Resources/Payroll/Recruitment/ Retirement	0.5	\$10,000	0.5	\$10,000	0.5	\$10,000
Accounting/Finance/Audit		\$75,000		\$65,000		\$75,000
Assessment		\$25,000		\$20,000		\$25,000
Connectivity		\$12,000		\$12,000		\$12,000
Phones		\$10,000		\$10,000		\$10,000
Board		\$5,000		\$5,000		\$5,000
Information Technology		\$50,000		\$50,000		\$50,000
Security		\$3,000		\$3,000		\$3,000
Insurance		\$40,000		\$35,000		\$45,000
Legal		\$25,000		\$25,000		\$25,000
Miscellaneous		\$50,000		\$50,000		\$50,000
Public Charter School Board Administrative Fee ²		0.50%		0.50%		0.50%
Total Per-Student Costs		\$1,748		\$2,182		\$1,805
Public Charter School Board Appropriation		\$31		\$31		\$31
Total Charter System-Level Per-Student Costs		\$1,779		\$2,213		\$1,836

Notes:

1 School enrollment sizes were selected by charter school system professional judgment panelists as representative of typical DC public charter schools. Figures for personnel reflect those employed directly by the charter school or charter school local educational agency. Figures for vendor and other costs reflect costs of contracted personnel and services.

2 Pending legislation would raise the administrative fee for the Public Charter School Board to 1 percent.

Source: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations.

Facilities

As the DC Public Education Finance Reform Commission noted in its 2012 report, no issue related to education funding in the District of Columbia is more complicated and contentious than the costs of constructing, renovating, maintaining, and operating school buildings and grounds.⁸ According to the authors of the 2013 Public Education Master Facilities Plan for the District of Columbia, the lack of coordination related to facilities perpetuates conflict between DCPS and public charter schools and leads the DC government to spend money inefficiently on capital improvements in school buildings and grounds. Charter school facility needs are not coordinated with DCPS facility plans and sometimes conflict.⁹

No issue related to DC education funding is more complicated and contentious than the costs of constructing, renovating, maintaining, and operating school buildings and grounds.

Currently, DCPS enrollment is uneven across the city. Although traditional public schools experienced a slight increase in enrollment between 2010 and 2012, since 1995, DCPS has lost approximately 2,000 students per year to public charter schools.¹⁰ As a result, many DCPS school facilities have significantly more space than is needed in aging buildings. The space not only is too large, but also is not configured to address contemporary education models. Old buildings have too many classrooms and corridors and not enough space organized for collaborating in small groups. Similarly, schools designed with open education plans provide a lot of very large spaces that are not differentiated and are not configured for specialized purposes and for collaborating in small groups. DCPS has a closures and consolidation plan that closed 23 schools in 2008 and another 15 programs in 14 schools in 2013.¹¹ In addition, an additional seven programs closed between 2009 and 2012.

Overall, DCPS schools are 75 percent utilized, but significant variation exists. While some high-performing schools are nearly occupied, others operate at less than 40 percent occupancy.¹² Additionally, several schools in the DCPS inventory have been vacant and shuttered since they were closed in 2008, without any long-term plan for future use or an interim plan for the reuse of these facilities.¹³ Consequently, the significant cost of maintaining unoccupied and underutilized space currently is covered by DGS within its contribution of approximately \$45 million to DCPS M&O costs and is attributable to DCPS.

⁸ District of Columbia Public Education Finance Reform Commission, *Equity and Recommendations Report* (Washington, DC, February 17, 2012), 25.

⁹ See page 12 of the “2013 Public Education Master Facilities Plan for the District of Columbia,” www.dcps.dc.gov.

¹⁰ See <http://dme.dc.gov/DC/DME/Publication%20Files/IFFFinalReport.pdf>.

¹¹ See <http://newsroom.dc.gov/show.aspx/agency/dme/section/2/release/12592>; and <http://dcps.dc.gov/DCPS/Files/downloads/COMMUNITY/CR/Consolidation%20Plan.pdf>.

¹² For more detail on school building occupancy, see pages 44 and 45 of the “2013 Public Education Master Facilities Plan for the District of Columbia,” www.dcps.dc.gov.

¹³ Master Facilities Plan, 12.

At the same time, the network of charter schools is growing rapidly and haphazardly.¹⁴ Public charter schools open wherever they can find space that is affordable and sufficient for their needs, and many are housed in facilities that are substandard. Yet charter school facility needs are not coordinated with DCPS facility plans and, at times, have conflicted. By law, charter schools are supposed to have the first right of offer for surplus school buildings. In practice, however, the process of leasing and purchasing DC-owned property has been time consuming and difficult for many public charter schools. A 2011 US Government Accountability Office report highlighted the lack of transparency in the process by which the DC government disposes of surplus property and the need to develop clearer and more effective policies, regulations, and protocols for public announcements of a request for offers (RFO) as well as follow-up procedures for unsuccessful bidders.¹⁵

To remedy these issues, DME and DGS are working to help public charter schools lease and occupy vacant school buildings. They have jointly developed and implemented a streamlined and transparent process to afford charter schools and other education programs and organizations access to surplus space in vacant DCPS buildings. Using an RFO process, space is being made available in 12 buildings for long-term (20-year) leases and in 5 additional buildings for short-term (10-year leases). Applicants for leases in both categories are required to demonstrate the financial capacity to renovate, operate, and maintain the facilities. As of June 2013, of the 12 buildings that were available for long-term lease, 4 have been awarded to charters, 1 is pending an award, and 2 are in solicitation.

Overall, public charter schools were 85 percent occupied as of 2012. However, an examination of enrollment patterns showed that several schools classified as Tier 1 by PCSB were 100 percent occupied and had waiting lists of up to 1,000 students.¹⁶

High-Quality Educational Environment

To address the complex issues related to facilities financing, the study team, comprised of staff from The Finance Project (TFP) and Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA), appointed a facilities PJ panel composed of DCPS and public charter school educators, financial managers, and DCPS and DGS space management officials. The panel's deliberations were based on the assumptions that all DC students should have access to high-quality school facilities, preferably within their neighborhood, and that facilities are important to education adequacy. Both DCPS and public charter schools should have sufficient facilities to provide all students with access to high-quality learning environments, a premise that echoes the vision of the 2013 Public Education Master Facilities Plan.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ District of Columbia Public Education Finance Reform Commission, 25; and US Government Accountability Office, *District of Columbia Charter Schools: Criteria for Awarding School Buildings to Charter Schools Needs Additional Transparency* (Washington, DC, March 2011).

¹⁶ Master Facilities Plan, 42 and 44–45.

All students in the District of Columbia should have access to high-quality school facilities, preferably within their neighborhood. School facilities are an important component of education adequacy.

The 2013 facilities plan outlines an approach for assessing the quality and condition of school facilities that accounts for the amount and differentiation of space required for high-quality learning environments. These requirements fall into several general categories:

- Core academic/special areas;
- Visual arts and music;
- Media center;
- Physical education;
- Administration;
- Student dining and food services;
- Maintenance and custodial services;
- Mechanical, electrical, toilets, and custodial closets; and
- Health suite (required for high schools).

According to the DCPS design guidelines,¹⁷ total per-student space requirements are as follows:

- Elementary schools: 150 square feet per student
- Middle schools: 170 square feet per student
- High schools: 192 square feet per student

Facilities Costs

To assess the costs of providing adequate space for students at all school levels across the city, the study team distinguished costs related to maintenance and operations from those related to capital investment. Facilities M&O costs include:

- Custodial services;
- Building maintenance and noncapital repairs (e.g., painting; repairing, or replacing a faucet);
- Grounds maintenance and noncapital repairs (e.g., repairing a fence or piece of playground equipment);
- Utilities;
- Property taxes (for public charter schools only); and
- Property insurance (for public charter schools only).

Maintenance and Operations Costs. As shown in Table 4.4, the total annual M&O costs for DCPS are projected to be approximately \$96.6 million, or \$2,097 per student, across all DCPS schools. By national standards, and compared with public charter school M&O expenses, DCPS costs are high. In part, this difference may reflect the age and poor condition of a large portion of the DC school building stock. In part, it may also reflect the amount of vacant and underutilized space in DC school buildings that must be maintained, including the cost of buildings that are not

¹⁷ “District of Columbia Public Schools Design Guidelines: 2009,” as amended in 2012, www.dcpsb.org.

in use. These costs are attributable to DCPS and are factored into the per-student cost for facilities M&O. Although utilities and most custodial services costs for DCPS schools are covered in the DCPS budget, a significant portion of custodial services and most buildings and grounds maintenance and noncapital repairs are paid by DGS on behalf of DCPS; approximately \$45.5 million is budgeted in SY 2013–2014.

Public charter school M&O costs also include property taxes and property insurance that are not applicable for DCPS. A significant portion of custodial services costs are included in lease agreements and in contracts for other vendor services, so accurately isolating them is impossible. As a result, custodial services costs are underestimated in the study team calculations of public charter school M&O costs. As shown in Table 4.4, the estimated facilities maintenance and operations costs for public charter schools that are leased and owned are projected to be at least \$759 per student, keeping in mind that custodial services costs are not available.

Table 4.4: Total Maintenance and Operations Costs for District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools (Fiscal 2013 and Fiscal 2014 Budgeted Amounts)

Maintenance and Operations	DCPS		Charter School Leased and Owned Buildings	
Cost Category	Total Cost	Cost Per Student ¹	Total Cost	Cost Per Student ²
Custodial	\$22,705,916	\$493	Unavailable ³	Unavailable
Facility Maintenance and Operations ³	\$45,503,000	\$988	\$12,620,844	\$263
Utilities	\$28,385,637 ⁴	\$616	\$7,542,441	\$440
Real Estate Taxes (if applicable)			\$553,784	\$19
Property Insurance			\$1,053,241	\$37
Total Maintenance and Operations	\$96,594,553	\$2,097	\$21,770,310	\$759

Notes:

1 Figure is based on a projected DCPS enrollment for school year 2013–2014 of 46,059.

2 Figure is based on a public charter school enrollment for school year 2012–2013 of 28,667 for schools with data.

3 Charter total maintenance and operations costs are underestimated, because custodial costs cannot accurately be determined.

4 Figure reflects costs for custodial and utilities in the DCPS fiscal 2014 budget; utilities cost represents total for gas, water, and electricity for DCPS portfolio, excluding the main office.

Sources: Department of General Services fiscal 2014 budget for Facilities—Public Education; and public charter facilities data from the local educational agency’s annual report to the Public Charter School Board for 2012–2013.

Capital Investment Costs. DCPS is in the midst of an ambitious school modernization program that has substantially upgraded several older buildings and grounds. After many years of limited investment in new construction, renovations, and capital repairs, many DC government-owned buildings are in substandard condition and can negatively affect student safety and comfort and limit educational programming. Consequently, in 2009, the District began a two-decade-long series of investments in constructing new schools and school additions, reconstructing and renovating old schools, and bringing all occupied buildings up to current health and safety standards based on a master plan. Design and construction standards were set at a high level for

these projects, and quality is considered to include both the capability to support top-tier programming and the architectural character of the facilities and landscape.

Since 2008, the District has spent nearly \$1.5 billion and completed work at 64 schools, encompassing 7.3 million square feet.¹⁸ During this period, annual investments in capital projects have been substantially higher than they were in previous years and than they are expected to be in the future. As shown in Table 4.5, on a per-student basis, costs are expected to be approximately \$4,961 per student over a 22-year period from 1998 through 2019.

Table 4.5 Capital Improvement Spending for District of Columbia Public Schools (1998–2019)

Fiscal Year	Actual Capital Spending (1998–2013)	Budgeted Capital Spending (2014–2019)
1998	\$196,221,294	
1999	\$24,024,127	
2000	\$35,749,884	
2001	\$122,768,344	
2002	\$150,060,937	
2003	\$234,720,219	
2004	\$114,682,235	
2005	\$114,641,781	
2006	\$97,752,179	
2007	\$146,532,713	
2008	\$489,880,523	
2009	\$312,919,158	
2010	\$312,753,448	
2011	\$315,098,286	
2012	\$277,395,246	
2013	\$233,033,809	
2014		\$441,595,000
2015		\$370,184,000
2016		\$291,818,000
2017		\$175,065,000
2018		\$226,283,000
2019		\$288,677,000
Total Cost for 22 Years		\$4,971,856,183
Average Cost Per Year		\$225,993,463
Cost Per Student		\$4,961

¹⁸ Master Facilities Plan, 12.

Sources: Office of the Chief Financial Officer, “CFOInfo,” <http://cfoinfo.dc.gov/cognos8/finance.htm> (accessed July 2013); Office of the Chief Financial Officer, “FY 2014 to FY 2019 Capital Improvements Plan,” <http://cfo.dc.gov/publication/fy-2014-fy-2019-capital-improvements-plan>, March 2013.

Facility investment costs for public charter schools are much more difficult to discern, because no standard approach to investment or accepted method of accounting for costs exists. Some buildings are leased, including leases of DCPS stock at below-market rates. Others are gifts from committed donors and sponsors. Still others are commercial properties that were purchased on the open market and converted to school space. Some charter school operators have taken full advantage of federal tax credit provisions for investing in historic buildings and developing neighborhoods. Others have not been as sophisticated and farsighted. Moreover, because no single accepted chart of accounts exists for presenting facility investment costs, the study team could not develop a reliable facility cost estimate for public charter schools. Available PCSB data, however, suggest that the \$3,000 per-student annual facilities allowance for charter schools provides an adequate benchmark for annual facility costs of many public charter schools, regardless of whether they lease their buildings and pay rent to a landlord or whether they own their buildings and are paying off a mortgage or making bond payments (see Table 4.6).

**Table 4.6: Public Charter School Facility Costs: Leased and Owned Buildings
(Actual Spending, Associated and Indirect Costs -- School Year 2012–2013)**

Cost Category	Leased and Owned Buildings	
	Total Cost	Cost Per Student
Capital expenses (major repairs), not financed	\$9,650,070	\$337
Lender Required Reserves	\$8,001,179	\$279
Direct lease payments	\$27,363,333	\$955
Additional lease payments (CAM charges, etc.)	\$1,382,144	\$48
Amortization of leasehold improvements & FFE	\$6,914,948	\$241
Debt service for LHI & FFE:		
Interest	\$3,055,073	\$107
Principal	\$848,583	\$30
Other Finance Costs being amortized	\$171,575	\$6
Depreciation of building/improvements/FFE	\$11,231,992	\$392
Debt service for mortgage financing:		
Interest	\$14,262,771	\$498
Principal	\$3,687,748	\$129
Other Finance Costs being amortized	\$2,033,913	\$71
Total Facility Costs -	\$88,603,329	\$3,091*

Note: * Figure is based on an enrollment number (28,667) that reflects the number of schools for which financial data were available.

Source: Public Charter School Board, “Charter School Budgets,” <http://www.dcpsb.org/School-Finance/2012-2013-Charter-School-Budgets.aspx> (accessed July 2013).

The study team examined some of the available data related to capital and facility investments for DCPS and similar costs for public charter schools and uncovered certain differences. Importantly, however, current law does not require equal funding for capital investments, or costs, in both school sectors. There are historical reasons for these differences that cannot be addressed solely by changes in the UPSFF. Also, as noted earlier, complete data on charter school facility expenditures could not be obtained. Accordingly, the study team determined that resolving capital and facility investment discrepancies and ensuring all schools have equal access to high-quality buildings, though very important, should not be addressed by the DC Education Adequacy Study.

Funding Within and Outside the UPSFF

The UPSFF is intended to fund all the traditional school system programs and functions for which DCPS and public charter schools are responsible—instructional, noninstructional, and administrative. Funds available through the UPSFF are determined on a per-student basis and are allocated to the LEA where students are enrolled. Currently, UPSFF funding can support instructional programs and resources, student support services, administrative functions, and facilities maintenance and operations costs. Yet it would be misleading to assume that funds provided through the UPSFF are the only resources available for DC students.

As highlighted in Chapter 3 and earlier in this chapter, additional funding has been available to DCPS and public charter schools in recent years, though significantly more has been allocated to DCPS. Mary Levy, a local school budget expert, estimated that between school year 2008 and school year 2012, DCPS received an additional \$72 million to \$127 million annually in extra nonuniform local operating funds.¹⁹ This includes the following:

- Funding for UPSFF functions provided to DCPS via *extra appropriations* and coverage of overspending is estimated to be between \$12 million and \$72 million annually. Beginning in fiscal 2012, both DCPS and public charter schools received funding through a supplemental appropriation; however, until 2012, supplemental appropriations were only available to DCPS and, in many years, were appropriated to cover cost overruns.
- *Subsidies and free in-kind services, particularly facilities maintenance and legal costs* provided to DCPS for UPSFF functions by other city agencies are estimated to total between \$40 million and \$60 million annually. Although some of these services are available to public charter schools, they are not provided equally (e.g., school nurses, social workers, school resource officers, and school crossing guards). Public charter schools receive less benefit, in total and on a per-student basis.
- *Nonuniform student counts* in the UPSFF itself, notably the use of projected rather than actual enrollment to determine DCPS appropriations, are estimated to result in \$4 million to \$45 million more in annual funding for DCPS than for public charter schools that are paid based on their actual enrollment.

¹⁹ Mary Levy, *Public Education Finance Reform in the District of Columbia: Uniformity, Equity and Facilities* (Washington, DC: Friends of Choice in Urban Charter Schools [FOCUS] and the DC Association of Chartered Public Schools, 2012).

- Both DCPS and charters receive *federal categorical funding* on an equal basis to serve low-income and disadvantaged students and those with special education needs. These funds flow through OSSE and are distributed to LEAs based on the number of enrolled students who meet program eligibility criteria.
- Both DCPS and charter schools receive *private funding* from individual donors, parents, and community partner organizations.
- Some public charter schools that lease DCPS school buildings receive *rent abatements or pay below-market rents* to the DC treasurer.
- Public charter schools receive an annual *facilities allowance*, currently set at \$3,000 per student. The allowance was established to help cover the costs of leasing, acquisition, and capital improvements to facilities, though school leaders have flexibility in how they allocate these funds, including covering costs that are within the UPSFF.

Table 4.7 lists the cost categories that are covered within and outside the UPSFF by other DC agencies or through the facilities allowance for public charter schools.

**Table 4.7: Expenses Currently Within and Outside the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula
(District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools)***

Cost Categories	Within UPSFF	Outside UPSFF		
		Costs Covered via Other DC Agency Budgets		Facilities Allowance for Public Charters Only ¹
		For DCPS	For Charters	
Teachers Salaries and Benefits	X			
School Administrators Salaries and Benefits	X			
DCPS Teacher Pensions ²		X		
Student Counselors Salaries and Benefits	X			
School Nurses Salaries and Benefits		Department of Health		
Social Workers Salaries and Benefits		Department of Behavioral Health		
Special Education Social Workers Salaries and Benefits	X			
School Crossing Guards		Department of Transportation		
School Resource Officers		Metropolitan Police Department ³		
Educational Supplies and Materials	X			
Educational Furnishings and Equipment	X	Department of General Services		X
Information Technology Services and Equipment	X	Office of the Chief Technology Officer ⁴		X
Food Services	X			
Before- and After-School Programs	X			
Summer School Programs	X			
Early Childhood Programs	X			
Risk Management, Legal Services, and Settlements	X	Office of the Attorney General		
Public Charter School Board Appropriation			Public Charter School Board	
Security Guards	X			
General Maintenance—Buildings and Grounds	X	Department of General Services		

Cost Categories	Within UPSFF	Outside UPSFF		
		Costs Covered via Other DC Agency Budgets		Facilities Allowance for Public Charters Only ¹
		For DCPS	For Charters	
Custodial Services	X	Department of General Services		
Utilities	X			
Capital Repairs		Department of General Services		X
New Building, Renovation, and Modernization		Department of General Services		X
Rent and Lease Payments /Rent Abatements	X		Treasurer	X
Loans and Mortgage Payments				X
Payments to Bondholders		Treasurer		X
Property Taxes and Insurance				X
Debt Reserve Funds				X

Notes:

* Services provided through the Office of the Attorney General and the Department of General Services are available only to DCPS.

1 The facilities allowance for public charter schools is not restricted to the uses detailed in this table, which reflects the intended use of these funds. Charter schools may use facilities allowance funds for other cost categories.

2 When contributions from current teachers do not meet DCPS pension obligations, the shortfall is covered by added contributions of local funds. On an annual basis, this amount has reached up to \$15 million.

3 The school resource officer (SRO) program is a community policing program partnership between DCPS and the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). MPD will only assign SROs to schools with security staff.

4 DCPS receives information technology (IT) services through the Office of the Chief Technology Officer (OCTO), which it pays for through a memorandum of understanding. In addition, DCPS benefits from IT systems that OCTO has in place for the entire DC government.

Source: Interviews with DC agency personnel.

Unless the total amount of funding from all these sources is taken into account, it is difficult to get a clear picture of how much is actually spent on educating DC students and how it affects the adequacy of educational programs and services. However, as will be explained in greater detail in Chapter 5, for purposes of calculating the costs of an adequate base level of funding and appropriate weights for DC students with identified learning needs, the study team focused exclusively on the DC government share of funds provided through the UPSFF and other DC agency funding, not on federal categorical funding, supplemental appropriations, grants, and private donations. This is because:

- *Federal categorical funding* for students with identified learning needs is provided to DCPS and public charter schools equally to help offset the costs of providing an adequate education to these students. Therefore, the study team accounted for these funds in developing weights for specific categories of special needs students.

- Annual budgeting cannot anticipate *private contributions and supplemental appropriations*. Therefore, planning to meet the cost of education adequacy should not be based on these sources of nonrecurring funds, and the study team did not include them in its education adequacy calculations.
- The UPSFF is used to calculate the amount of local funding required for DCPS and public charter schools.

For purposes of calculating the costs of an adequate base level of funding and appropriate weights for DC students, the study team focused exclusively on the DC government share of funds provided through the UPSFF and other DC agency funding.

A comparison of the value of contributed services available to DCPS and public charter schools through other DC agencies is presented in Table 4.8. This table shows that DCPS is projected to receive much more support from these sources in SY 2013–2014.

**Table 4.8: Benefits Provided by DC Offices and Agencies to DCPS and Public Charter Schools
(Projected Total Value and Per-Student Share in Fiscal 2013 and Fiscal 2014)***

DC Government Agency or Office	Cost of Benefits Provided to DCPS	Cost of Benefits Provided to Public Charter Schools	Total
Department of Health	\$12,750,000 (\$277)	\$4,250,000 (\$114)	\$17,000,000
Department of Health and Behavioral Health	\$3,420,594 (\$74)	\$1,026,177 (\$27)	\$4,446,771
Office of the Attorney General	\$2,442,000 (\$53)		\$2,442,000
Office of Contracting and Procurement	\$2,280 (\$0.05)		\$2,280
Office of the Chief Technology Officer	\$1,914,110 (\$42)		\$1,914,110
Department of General Services	\$45,503,000 (\$988)		\$45,503,000
Public Charter School Board Appropriation		\$1,161,000 (\$31)	\$1,161,000
Total	\$66,031,984	\$5,276,177	\$71,308,161
Per-Student Share of Cost**	\$1,434	\$141	\$854

Notes:

*Additional resources to remain outside the UPSFF include school resource officers (SROs) allocated cross-sector, totaling \$8,186,239 in fiscal 2013; this includes 26 SROs allocated to DCPS, totaling \$2,149,921; 15 SROs allocated to public charter schools, totaling \$1,240,339; and 58 roving officers and officials assigned cross-sector, totaling \$4,795,979. It also includes Department of Transportation crossing guards allocated cross-sector, totaling \$3,050,000 in fiscal 2013.

**Figures are calculated based on 2013–2014 projected enrollment numbers.

Sources: Data provided by Office of Contracting and Procurement based on annual costs; data provided by Department of Health and Department of Behavioral Health based on FY13 costs; data for Public Charter School Board, Office of the Attorney General, Office of the Chief Technology Officer, Department of General Services, and Public Charter School Board based on FY14 budget.

There are several explanations for these differences, though they cannot illuminate all the discrepancy in funding between the two sectors.

- *Many of the services (and associated funding) provided by DC government agencies are based on needs of the neighborhood where a school is located, rather than on per-student allocations.* This is appropriate in the case of school crossing guards and school resource officers, who work on a roving basis and serve more than one DCPS and/or public charter school. The DDOT determines the amount of assigned time for each school based on neighborhood traffic conditions and schedules crossing guards so they can serve multiple schools in a particular neighborhood with staggered arrival and dismissal times. The MPD determines the amount of assigned time for school resource officers in each school,

based on conditions within the schools (e.g., gang presence, neighborhood violence, and number of students reentering school after spending time in a juvenile detention facility).

- *Other services cannot be accessed unless adequate space is made available in school buildings.* This includes health and mental health care. School nurses, for example, are equally available to all schools to address routine student health needs during the school day (e.g., administering medication and conducting routine diabetes testing) and deal with illness and injury when they occur. However, schools that do not have adequate space for a school health suite or clinic that can accommodate nurses and patients may not be assigned nurses. If charter schools do not have spaces for student health functions, they generally do not have nurses on campus, even though nurses are available through the DOH.
- Another source of discrepancy in services and funding between the sectors, though it is comparatively small, is that *DCPS receives significant support for many system-level functions that are typically managed and paid for within the central offices of major urban school systems.* This includes legal services from the OAG, procurement support from the OCP, and technology systems from OCTO. The largest portion of these additional benefits is for facilities maintenance and operations provided by the department of general services. These services and benefits are not available to public charter schools, so they manage these functions internally or contract them out to commercial vendors using UPSFF funds to cover the costs.
- Finally, *the Public Charter School Board receives an annual appropriation to cover approximately half of its budget,* with the remainder of funding coming from charter schools that are charged a 0.5 percent fee based on their annual budget. A legislative proposal pending before the city council would increase this fee to 1.0 percent of all charter school budgets. PCSB is responsible for chartering and providing oversight to the charter LEAs.

Two major factors seem to drive cost differences between DCPS and public charter schools: labor costs and facilities maintenance and operation costs.

Cost Differences Between DCPS and Public Charter Schools

Two major factors seem to drive cost differences between DCPS and public charter schools:

- Labor costs; and
- Facilities maintenance and operation costs.

Differences in Labor Costs

Labor costs are a major source of cost differences between the two sectors; DCPS labor costs are higher than those of public charter schools. In general, average charter salaries (plus fringe benefits) are only 73 percent to 79 percent of average budgeted DCPS salaries (plus fringe benefits). This reflects the fact that the DCPS workforce is largely unionized and, therefore,

DCPS must negotiate salaries, benefits, and working conditions through a collective bargaining process. The workforce of public charter schools is not unionized, though their employees have the right to organize. Their governing boards have the authority to establish compensation for all school staff and specify working conditions and expectations independently. Differences in labor costs also result from the fact that many public charter school staff members are younger than staff in comparable DCPS positions. With less seniority, they have lower salaries. A comparison of three key school personnel categories at different salary levels illustrates the point (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Differences in Labor Costs for Key Personnel Between District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools

Representative Staff Categories	DCPS Budgeted Cost ¹	DCPS Actual Cost ²	Charter Average Cost ³
Principal	\$153,925	\$137,432	\$122,595
Assistant Principal	\$123,432	\$101,133	\$103,951
Teacher	\$90,523	\$88,990	\$71,858

Notes:

1 Figures represent DCPS teacher salary, plus benefits, used for school-level budgeting purposes for school year 2013–2014.

2 Figures are based on PeopleSoft staffing reports, 2013. They include salaries plus an additional 15 percent for benefits.

3 Figures are based on 2012–2013 average salary figure data from the DC Public Charter School Board.

Source: “SY 2013–2014 Budget Planning Guide for District of Columbia Public Schools,” www.dcps.dc.gov.

The DCPS average salary level with benefits compares favorably with those of other school districts in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, which range from \$83,804 to \$108,510. When compared with 10 suburban districts, the fiscal 2013 average DC teacher salary with benefits is in the middle, with five districts higher (Alexandria City, Arlington County, Montgomery County, Fairfax County, and Falls Church City) and five districts lower than DC (Prince William County, Prince George’s County, Manassas City, Manassas Park City, and Loudon County).²⁰

For LEA and school budgeting purposes, DCPS salaries for staff in each position are based on the average salary (plus fringe benefits) for that position. As an example, though teacher salaries can range from \$59,270 to \$122,521, all teachers are budgeted at the average level of \$90,523. Actual salary expenditures, as shown on the Schedule A report, are somewhat less, though still significantly higher than actual charter school salaries (plus fringe benefits). Schools do not receive the difference between budgeted and actual salaries (plus fringe benefits) to reallocate to other staff or for other purposes. These funds remain in the DCPS central office budget.

²⁰Washington Area Boards of Education, *The FY 2013 WABE Guide* (Fairfax County, VA: Fairfax County Public Schools, 2013). Note that DCPS does not participate in the Washington Area Boards of Education.

The DCPS average teacher salary level with benefits compares favorably with those of other school districts in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, and it is higher than the average public charter school teacher salary level with benefits.

Additionally, DCPS education service staff members are eligible to participate in the DC Teacher's Retirement System and to receive IMPACT [performance assessment] bonuses and support. Contributions to the Teacher's Retirement System, which is separate from the DCPS budget, are expected to be \$31.6 million for fiscal 2014.²¹ School-based IMPACT bonuses, which are included in the DCPS budget, are budgeted at \$3.2 million.²² Another \$12 million is budgeted for the early retirement option, buyout option, and extra year option under the mutual consent provisions.²³ The bonus program was initially implemented with philanthropic support, but those grants have ended. Starting in fiscal 2013, DCPS is funding bonuses through the UPSFF. Although public charter school staff cannot participate in these programs, charter school LEAs can create a retirement system and performance pay system using UPSFF funding.

Differences in Facilities Maintenance and Operations Costs

Compared with DCPS, public charter schools are much more efficient regarding facility M&O. Public charter school facilities generally are more crowded and have fewer amenities than DCPS school facilities. Many charter schools operate in commercial spaces (e.g., warehouses and storefronts) that have been converted to schools and, therefore, do not have athletic fields, auditoriums, cafeterias with working kitchens, and other spaces specified as needed for an adequate education facility.

Approximately \$45 million, or 40 percent, of DCPS system M&O costs are covered by the department of general services outside the UPSFF. In comparison, none of public charter school facilities costs are paid directly by DGS or other city agencies and offices. However, some public charter schools lease space from DGS at below-market rates and receive rent abatement, if they invest more than \$1 million in capital improvements in unoccupied or underutilized DCPS buildings.

Implications for Per-Student Costs

Total projected per-student costs are higher for DCPS than for public charter schools, as shown in Table 4.10. This is largely attributable to the higher costs per student for facilities M&O, though it should be noted again that the public charter M&O costs are undercounted because the study team could not accurately account for custodial costs. Because the study team separated facilities M&O from other LEA-level costs related to management and administration of instructional programs, student support services, and other educational resources, the subtotal compares instruction-related costs and the total adds in the additional costs for facilities M&O.

²¹ Information is based on a congressional budget submission from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

²² Information is based on a DCPS budget submission to the CityCouncil.

²³ Ibid.

**Table 4.10: Total Base-Level, Per-Student Costs in
District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
(Projected/Budgeted for School Year 2013–2014)**

Cost Category	DCPS	Public Charter Schools*
School-Level costs	\$9,405	\$9,405
System-Level costs	\$1,973	\$1,897
Subtotal	\$11,378	\$11,302
Cost Category	DCPS	Public Charter Schools*
Maintenance and Operations Costs	\$2,097	\$759*
Total	\$13,475	\$12,061

Note:* Total maintenance and operations costs for public charter schools are underestimated, because custodial costs cannot be determined.

Sources: The recommendations are derived from the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations; interviews with personnel from DC government agencies and the executive of the mayor in June 2013; "DCPS 2013–2014 Spending Plan," www.dcps.dc.gov (accessed April 2013); and "DCPS Operations and Maintenance: DCEAS Facilities Cost Analysis FY 2014," www.dcps.dc.gov (accessed July 2013).

Summary

The system-level professional judgment panels—using the education research evidence base as a point of departure—developed detailed resource specifications for LEA costs for DCPS and for public charter schools. Of particular note:

- Because the two sectors are structured and operate so differently, the study team appointed two panels, one for DCPS and one for public charter schools, to identify and specify resource requirements for efficient and effective central office management and administration.
- System-level costs related to central office management and administration of instructional programs, student support services, and other educational resources are slightly higher on a per-student basis for DCPS.
- System-level costs for facilities M&O are significantly higher for DCPS. In part, this difference reflects the costs of vacant and underutilized space that are included in the DCPS estimate. It also reflects an underestimation of costs for public charter school custodial services, which could not be determined.
- Neither DCPS nor public charter schools fund all of their instructional programs and student support services through the UPSFF. Although DC law prohibits also funding costs outside the UPSFF that are covered by the formula, both sectors receive some services—and the economic benefit—from other DC government agencies. To the extent school-related services are funded outside the UPSFF, they are supposed to be funded

equally. However, DCPS receives significantly greater benefit than public charter schools, in total and on a per-student basis.

- DCPS also receives significant support from other agencies and executive offices for central office functions that typically are managed internally by most large urban school systems. Charter schools cover the costs of these functions with their UPSFF funding.
- The primary drivers of current cost differences between DCPS and public charter schools are labor costs and facilities maintenance and operations costs. DCPS costs are significantly higher than public charter schools in both areas.

5. Cost of Education Adequacy in the District of Columbia

The study team’s estimation of the cost of providing an adequate education to all District of Columbia (DC) students, prekindergarten through grade 12, including adult learners, is based on findings from the professional judgment (PJ) panels. The estimation was informed by the evidence base, the successful schools study, and extensive analysis of District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter schools budget and expenditure data. In this way, the study team developed conclusions on the cost of education adequacy in the District and recommendations for restructuring and resetting the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) base and weights for students with identified learning needs.

Throughout the analysis, the combination of methodological approaches and extensive review by local stakeholders and the Advisory Group provided a wealth of information that informed questions related to specific cost factors. When assessing the data generated through each of the approaches, the study team considered several criteria, including:

- How strongly the identified data or costs were associated with achieving *DC’s student academic performance expectations*;
- The degree to which the data or costs took into consideration *efficiency* and the lowest possible cost of resource delivery; and
- The *transparency and reliability* of the data generated.

The final cost calculations reflect resource needs based on DC students and their demographic characteristics. Although differences in schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) were taken into account in generating the specifications for costing out, the recommended funding levels do not vary based on school or LEA characteristics. DC law requires that:

- “[S]ervices provided by District of Columbia government agencies to public schools shall be provided on an equal basis to the District of Columbia Public Schools and public charter schools;” and
- “[A]ny services that are funded apart from the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula shall not also be funded by the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula.”¹

In accordance with DC law requiring uniformity in funding, the UPSFF base and weights for students with identified needs are the same for all DC students, regardless of whether they attend DCPS or public charter schools. This includes costs for all the resources that students need to be successful, including those currently provided outside the UPSFF.

To achieve greater equity, uniformity, and adequacy in education funding, the study team conducted separate analyses of the costs of:

¹ DC Official Code § 38-2913.

- Instructional programming, student support services, administration, and other educational resources; and
- Facilities maintenance and operations.

Currently, the UPSFF includes funding for facilities maintenance and operations (M&O) (e.g., general upkeep and noncapital repairs to buildings and grounds, custodial services, utilities, property taxes, and property insurance). However, to understand the impact of these costs on a per-student basis and how they can be most equitably addressed through the UPSFF, the study team analyzed them independently from costs related to instructional programming, student support, and administration.

As discussed in Chapter 4, though the study team also examined information on capital investments by DCPS and public charter schools, it was not possible to develop a meaningful comparison, because the available budget and expenditure data are not comparable. Public charter school LEAs receive a \$3,000 per-student annual facilities allowance to fund capital investments, but they are not required to spend these funds only on capital projects. Absent data that enable a reliable estimate of annual public charter school spending on facilities acquisition, purchase, construction, renovation, and upgrading, the study team could not develop sound, evidence-based recommendations for restructuring or resetting this allowance.

Base-Level Cost for Instructional Needs

The UPSFF is intended to fund all costs related to instruction, student support, and administration; other educational costs (e.g., professional development, student fees, books, and supplies); and technology hardware and software. Based on the entirety of the analysis by the study team—comprised of staff from The Finance Project (TFP) and Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA)—calculations show that the base-level per-student cost of educational programming, support services, administration, and other education resources is \$11,344, as shown in Table 5.1. The UPSFF base reflects the cost of serving elementary students (kindergarten through grade 5). Additional costs for students at other grade levels and for students with identified learning needs are incorporated into the weights. The UPSFF base reflects the cost of serving students without any identified learning needs that require additional special instructional programs, support services, and other resources. As discussed in Chapter 3, the school-level base reflects the estimated cost for large elementary schools (420 students); *the system cost reflects the weighted average of DCPS and public charter school LEA-level costs*. In sum, these estimates reflect the instructional portion of the UPSFF base-level, per-student cost before any adjustments for federal funding that is received by the District of Columbia to offset a portion of the cost.

Table 5.1: Instructional Portion of Uniform Per Student Funding Formula Base Cost Before Federal Funding Revenue Adjustment

Cost Elements	Per-Student Instructional UPSFF Formula Base Before Federal Revenue Adjustment
School-Level Base Cost	\$9,405
Average System Cost	\$1,939
Total Formula Base Cost	\$11,344

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

As highlighted in the findings presented in Chapter 4, labor costs are one of the most significant differences between DCPS and public charter school cost structures that affect per-student cost estimates. The DCPS average salary and fringe benefit scale is higher for all positions than is the average salary and fringe benefit scale for public charter schools. In calculating the school-level base cost, *the study team used the DCPS average salary scale*. This holds DCPS at its current labor cost level for school year (SY) 2013–2014, with cost-of-living adjustments of 2 percent projected to begin in SY 2014–2015. In professional judgment panel deliberations, the study team received feedback from charter school representatives that they had challenges in meeting the salary levels set by DCPS. Using the DCPS average salary scale in calculating school-level base costs for both sectors also affords additional room for public charter schools to increase salaries and offer performance incentives. This will enhance their ability to offer compensation that is competitive in the local market for highly qualified teachers, if they choose to do so.

Weights for Students at Different Grade Levels and with Identified Learning Needs

For general education students at other grade levels and for students with identified learning needs, the study team calculated the difference in costs from the base level for elementary students in order to determine appropriate weights to account for the costs of serving students at these grade levels. This includes additional costs related to serving:

- Three-year-olds in prekindergarten (pre-K3) and four-year-olds in prekindergarten (pre-K4);
- Students in middle school (grades 6 through 8);
- Students in high school (grades 9 through 12);
- Students in alternative schools; and
- Students attending adult education programs.

It also includes differences related to serving students with identified learning needs, including:

- English language learners;

- Students at risk of academic failure; and
- Special education students, Levels 1–4².

These weights are expressed as a proportional addition to the base-level funding for each relevant grade level and category of identified learning needs. For students with multiple learning needs, the weights are cumulative, except for alternative and adult education students, because, by definition, all of these students are at risk, and the additional estimated costs of serving them is incorporated into the designated weights.

Adjustment for Federal Funding

The total costs of serving general education students and students with identified learning needs is partially offset by federal funding, including federal categorical funding that flows from several federal entitlement programs and other formula grant programs that benefit students with identified learning needs. Therefore, once the initial UPSFF base-level cost and weights were established, the study team analyzed sustained and predictable federal and other nonlocal funds that are available to the District of Columbia to partially offset these costs. It then reduced the recommended base-level funding amount and weights, accordingly.

Table 5.2 breaks down available federal and other program funding that has been factored into the calculations of the adjusted base-level funding and weights.

Table 5.2: Available Federal and Nonlocal Program Funding to Partially Offset Education Costs

Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Funding Source		General Education	At Risk	English Language Learner	Special Education	Alternative Education	Pre-kindergarten
84.010A	College and Career Ready Students		\$41,812,230				
84.013A	State Agency Program—Neglected and Delinquent Children and Youth Education					\$216,054	
84.041	Impact Aid Basic Support Payments	\$1,645,583					
84.365A	English Learner Education (English Language Acquisition)			\$849,710			
84.196A	Homeless Children and Youth Education		\$184,482				
84.027A	Special Education—Grants to States				\$15,528,284		
84.173A	Special Education—Preschool Grants				\$217,081		
84.048A	Career and Technical Education State Grants	\$4,004,175					

² Special education students are categorized into four levels of need, according to the number of hours per week they require specialized services.)

Table 5.2: Available Federal and Nonlocal Program Funding to Partially Offset Education Costs, continued

Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Funding Source		General Education	At Risk	English Language Learner	Special Education	Alternative Education	Pre-kindergarten
84.370A	DC School Choice Incentive Program	\$38,360,000					
84.041	Head Start						\$10,333,000
Federal	Consolidated Head Start						\$5,061,817
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	Summer Education, Arts and Sports—After School		\$6,500,000				
Federal	Department of Health and Human Services—New Heights		\$400,000				
Federal	Department of Health and Human Services—New Heights New Heights 2		\$1,437,985				
Federal	Medicaid				\$5,000,000		
Federal	Medicaid Claiming Reimbursement				\$312,000		
Local	Youth Services Center					\$1,959,000	
	E-Rate Education Fund	\$7,806,341					
84.282A	Title V Part B Charter School Program	\$3,903,000					
	Community School Grants		\$1,000,000				
Federal Funding Total		\$55,719,099	\$51,334,697	\$849,710	\$21,057,365	\$2,175,054	\$15,394,817

Source: “Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance,” <https://www.cfda.gov>.

The net UPSFF base-level funding and weights deduct the amount of categorical funding that flows from federal agencies through the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) to DCPS and public charter schools from the total cost estimate for serving general education students and students in each identified learning needs category. Accordingly, after the adjustments for sustained and predictable federal funding and other nonlocal sources, the net base cost level for the UPSFF is estimated to be \$10,557 per student. This portion represents the instructional portion of the UPSFF and does not include funding needed for maintenance and operations. Table 5.3 shows the net base-level instructional funding and weights after adjustments for federal funding were made. The first two columns of the table present the total instructional resources needed for students to be able to meet all the requirements and performance objectives in the District based on the study. The third and fourth columns present the net instructional amounts once federal funds are deducted.

Table 5.3: Recommended Instructional Uniform Per Student Funding Formula Base Funding Level and Weights*

Category	Proposed Instructional UPSFF Weight Before Federal Revenue Adjustments	Proposed Instructional UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations Before Federal Revenue Adjustments	Proposed Instructional UPSFF Weight After Federal Revenue Adjustments	Proposed Instructional UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Federal Revenue Adjustments
Base-Level Funding		\$11,344		\$10,557
General Education				
Preschool	1.18	\$13,386	1.15	\$12,141
Prekindergarten	1.18	\$13,386	1.15	\$12,141
Kindergarten	1.00	\$11,344	1.00	\$10,557
Grades 1–3	1.00	\$11,344	1.00	\$10,557
Grades 4–5	1.00	\$11,344	1.00	\$10,557
Grades 6–8	1.01	\$11,457	1.01	\$10,663
Grades 9–12	1.09	\$12,365	1.10	\$11,613
Alternative ¹	1.95	\$22,121	1.73	\$18,264
Special Education Schools	1.09	\$12,352	1.17	\$12,352
Adult Education ²	1.00	\$11,344	1.00	\$10,557
Identified Learning Needs Add-On Weightings				
Special Education Level 1	0.89	\$10,096	0.88	\$9,290
Special Education Level 2	1.10	\$12,478	1.08	\$11,402
Special Education Level 3	1.80	\$20,419	1.77	\$18,686
Special Education Level 4	3.19	\$36,187	3.13	\$33,043
Special Education Capacity Fund	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners	0.58	\$6,580	0.61	\$6,440
At Risk	0.52	\$5,899	0.37	\$3,906

Table 5.3: Recommended Instructional Uniform Per Student Funding Formula Base Funding Level and Weights, continued*

Category	Proposed Instructional UPSFF Weight Before Federal Revenue Adjustments	Proposed Instructional UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations Before Federal Revenue Adjustments	Proposed UPSFF Weight After Federal Revenue Adjustments	Proposed UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Federal Revenue Adjustments
Base-Level Funding		\$11,344		\$10,557
Special Education Compliance				
Blackman-Jones Compliance	0.06	\$651	0.06	\$651
Attorneys' Fee Supplement	0.07	\$838	0.08	\$838
Summer School³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extended School Year Level 1	0.053	\$596	0.056	\$596
Extended School Year Level 2	0.190	\$2,150	0.204	\$2,150
Extended School Year Level 3	0.410	\$4,653	0.441	\$4,653
Extended School Year Level 4	0.408	\$4,625	0.438	\$4,625
Residential Add-On Weights				
Residential Weight	1.39	\$15,820	1.50	\$15,820
Special Education Residential				
Level 1	0.31	\$3,480	0.33	\$3,480
Level 2	1.12	\$12,656	1.20	\$12,656
Level 3	2.41	\$27,369	2.59	\$27,369
Level 4	2.40	\$27,211	2.58	\$27,211
English Language Learner Residential	0.56	\$6,328	0.60	\$6,328

Notes:

* The figures in this table do not include facilities maintenance and operations funding.

1 The proposed weight assumes alternative school students would not receive an at-risk weight.

2 The proposed weight assumes adult education students would not receive an at-risk weight. The adult weight was also prorated to take into account that an adult full-time equivalent (FTE) student requires fewer hours and weeks in school than a full-time general education student.

3 Summer school is not assigned a specific weight in the proposed UPSFF because it is included in the at-risk and English language learner weights.

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

For students with multiple needs, the weights are cumulative for all categories of identified learning needs, except for alternative and adult education students. Therefore, as an example, for a high school student who is identified as an English language learner (ELL) and at risk, the general education base-level funding weight is 1.10 and the added weights are .61 plus .37, bringing the cumulative total to 1.97. The total instructional portion of the UPSFF allocation for this student is $\$11,613 + \$6,440 + \$3,906 = \$21,959$.

Costs for Facilities Maintenance and Operations

The study team analyzed facilities maintenance and operations costs separately from instructional costs for purposes of proposing a new UPSFF base. The study team collected available M&O cost data for DCPS and public charter schools. As noted in Chapter 4, charter school M&O costs also include property taxes and property insurance that are not charged to DCPS. However, not all categories of M&O are reported uniformly for charter schools. Also as discussed in Chapter 4, the study team's analysis shows that facilities M&O costs are a significant driver of the cost difference between DCPS and public charter schools, with DCPS costs being higher than those for public charter schools.

Some of the difference may be due to the fact that LEAs in the District do not use a uniform accounting protocol for categorizing M&O costs, which makes it difficult to isolate relevant expenditures and compare levels of spending across LEAs. For example, as highlighted in the system-level findings, custodial services are likely underestimated in public charter school calculations because, in many cases, they cannot be isolated from lease costs or other vendor contracts. Similarly, M&O costs are likely higher for DCPS because they include expenses for vacant and underutilized space in schools.

To some extent, the difference may also reflect the fact that DCPS uses union labor for engineers, technicians, custodians, and other maintenance personnel and is subject to collective bargaining on compensation and work rules. In contrast, public charter schools have the flexibility to negotiate contracts with outside vendors based on lower wage rates.

To develop a uniform basis for calculating space costs for DCPS and public charter schools, the study team developed a per-square-foot M&O cost rate. To derive an equitable per-student M&O cost at each school level, the study team applied the per-square-foot rate to the number of square feet of space recommended for students at each grade level in the DCPS design guidelines. It then used student enrollment data to determine the amount of funding that should be allocated to DCPS and public charter schools.

The study team identified the number of square feet of school facility space per student that is needed to support an adequate education.³ These recommended space requirements, which differ depending on school level, are based on design guidelines adopted by DCPS. Total per-student space requirements are as follows:

- Elementary schools: 150 square feet per student
- Middle schools: 170 square feet per student
- High schools: 192 square feet per student
- Adult and alternative education centers: 170 square feet per student
- Special education schools: 192 square feet per student.⁴

³ The education space specifications do not include a recommended amount of square feet for special education programs or for alternative or adult education programs. After consulting with education experts, the study team determined that the middle school specification was sufficient for alternative and adult education programs because these programs do not require the larger space requirements of a full high school education. Stakeholders recommended that the high school specification be applied to special education schools.

Because it was not possible to calculate an accurate actual M&O cost for public charter schools, the study team used the DCPS average cost per weighted square foot for an average elementary, middle, and high school to determine the relevant facilities M&O costs that should be factored into the UPSFF. The cost was weighted by the total square feet for each school-level building.

M&O costs were derived using Department of General Services (DGS) and DCPS actual and budgeted costs by school for:

- DGS scheduled and preventive maintenance [DC Partners for the Revitalization of Education Projects (DC PEP) and consolidated maintenance contract costs, a combination of actual and budgeted costs];
- Budgeted DGS specialized cleaning costs and trash removal as well as budgeted DCPS school custodian costs;
- Budgeted DGS corrective maintenance and repair costs for elevators; electrical; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; plumbing; structural/roofs; life safety/fire; and general external and internal space;
- Budgeted DGS grounds costs, which include costs for landscaping, garage/parking, and snow removal;
- Budgeted DGS costs for field personnel in the above categories; and
- A combination of actual and estimated DCPS energy costs for electricity, water, and gas.

The study team developed an average M&O cost for three grade levels: elementary school, middle school, and high school. (The study team applied the middle school or the high school rate to other types of programs that were not specifically called out in the DCPS design guidelines, such as alternative, adult education, and stand-alone special education schools.) The average costs are as follows:

- \$1,071 for each elementary school student;
- \$1,209 for each middle school student;
- \$1,342 for each high school student;
- \$1,209 for each alternative and adult education student; and
- \$1,342 for each student attending a stand-alone special education school.

Calculating M&O costs in this way, based on actual costs applied to recommended space criteria, enables funding to flow through the formula on a per-student basis in a transparent way. This process will also enable DC leaders to more regularly update estimated facilities M&O costs to reflect actual needs. To accurately reset the M&O payment levels over time, LEAs will need to collect and report M&O costs in a uniform manner that allows for analysis of actual costs. Table 5.4 shows the UPSFF base and weights with M&O costs incorporated into the base.

**Table 5.4: Current and Recommended Uniform Per Student Funding Formula Base-Level Funding and Weights
(Maintenance and Operations Costs Included in Base)**

Category	Current UPSFF Weight	Current UPSFF Per-Pupil allocation	Proposed UPSFF Weight After Revenue Adjustments	Proposed Instructional UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Revenue Adjustments	Facility M&O UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations	Proposed UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Revenue Adjustments with M&O
Base-Level Funding		\$9,306		\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
General Education						
Preschool	1.34	\$12,470	1.15	\$12,141	\$1,071	\$13,212
Prekindergarten	1.30	\$12,098	1.15	\$12,141	\$1,071	\$13,212
Kindergarten	1.30	\$12,098	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 1–3	1.00	\$9,306	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 4–5	1.00	\$9,306	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 6–8	1.03	\$9,585	1.01	\$10,663	\$1,209	\$11,872
Grades 9–12	1.16	\$10,795	1.10	\$11,613	\$1,342	\$12,955
Alternative ¹	1.17	\$10,888	1.73	\$18,264	\$1,209	\$19,473
Special Education Schools	1.17	\$10,888	1.17	\$12,352	\$1,342	\$13,694
Adult Education ²	0.75	\$6,980	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,209	\$11,766
Identified Learning Needs Add-On Weightings						
Special Education Level 1	0.58	\$5,397	0.88	\$9,290		
Special Education Level 2	0.81	\$7,538	1.08	\$11,402		
Special Education Level 3	1.58	\$14,703	1.77	\$18,686		
Special Education Level 4	3.10	\$28,849	3.13	\$33,043		
Special Education Capacity Fund	0.40	\$3,722	N/A	N/A		
English Language Learners	0.45	\$4,188	0.61	\$6,440		
At Risk	N/A	N/A	0.37	\$3,906		

Table 5.4: Current and Recommended Uniform Per Student Funding Formula Base-Level Funding and Weights, continued

Category	Current UPSFF Weight	Current UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocation	Proposed UPSFF Weight After Revenue Adjustments	Proposed UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Revenue Adjustments
Foundation		\$9,306		\$10,557
Special Education Compliance				
Blackman-Jones Compliance	0.07	\$651	0.06	\$651
Attorneys' Fee Supplement	0.09	\$838	0.08	\$838
Summer School³	0.17	\$15,820	N/A	N/A
Extended School Year Level 1	0.064	\$596	0.056	\$596
Extended School Year Level 2	0.231	\$2,150	0.204	\$2,150
Extended School Year Level 3	0.500	\$4,653	0.441	\$4,653
Extended School Year Level 4	0.497	\$4,625	0.438	\$4,625
Residential Add-On Weightings				
Residential Weight	1.70	\$15,820	1.50	\$15,820
Special Education Residential				
Level 1	0.374	\$3,480	0.330	\$3,480
Level 2	1.360	\$12,656	1.199	\$12,656
Level 3	2.941	\$27,369	2.592	\$27,369
Level 4	2.924	\$27,211	2.578	\$27,211
English Language Learner Residential	0.68	\$6,328	0.60	\$6,328

Notes:

1 The proposed weight assumes alternative school students would not receive an at-risk weight.

2 The proposed weight assumes adult education students would not receive an at-risk weight. The adult weight also assumes that adult education students attend school for less time than a full-time equivalent (FTE) general education student.

3 Summer school is not assigned a specific weight in the proposed UPSFF because it is included in the at-risk weight and English language learner weights.

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Comparison of the Current and Recommended Structure for the UPSFF

Based on the PJ panel deliberations and the analysis of DCPS and public charter school cost data, the study team highlighted the need for several modifications to the structure of the current UPSFF base-level funding formula and weights:

- To increase equity between DCPS and public charter schools, *all education funding for DCPS and public charter schools should flow through the UPSFF and be provided on an equal basis, except for funding for student safety*. Because student safety funds are allocated based on neighborhood conditions and factors, such as traffic patterns, gang presence, and the prevalence of school violence, rather than the number of students attending a school, they should continue to flow through DDOT (school crossing guards)

and MPD (school resource officers). DCPS and public charter schools should be required to use funding provided through the UPSFF to pay for any other services and administrative support they receive from other DC government agencies through an interagency transfer, or they should purchase these services in the commercial market.

- To increase transparency and aid in routinely updating the base-level funding and weights within the UPSFF formula, the estimated costs of the two major components that are the basis for setting payment levels—instructional operating costs and facilities M&O costs—should be priced separately. The amount of per-student funding should be the sum of these two components.
- In addition to the current set of UPSFF weights, a weight is needed for students at risk of academic failure. This new weight would be accumulative for all grade levels except alternative and adult education grades, and it would be accumulative for ELL and special education students. The PJ panels specified significant additional instructional and student support resources for students at risk of academic failure because of economic disadvantage and disconnection. The study team suggests that a working definition focus on three criteria:
 - Students who are in foster care;
 - Students who are homeless; and
 - Students who are living in low-income families eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

Several stakeholders have raised concerns that these criteria are too narrow and would significantly undercount the number of students who are truly at risk of academic failure. Others remarked that using eligibility for free-and reduced-price school meals as a proxy for at risk, which was a definition initially considered by the study team, would overfund schools that have a high percentage of low- and moderate-income students who would qualify for subsidized meals but are not truly at risk of academic failure. The study team recognizes the deficiencies in the proposed working definition. Therefore, as it is ultimately a policy decision for the Mayor and the DC City Council to define at-risk status, the study team urges DC education leaders to engage stakeholders further to help refine the definition of at risk, so it is targeted to the District's needs; and align the criteria for determining eligibility with OSSE's early warning system for identifying students at risk of academic failure, when it is completed.

- Because resources to provide extended-year programs for students who are struggling academically are built into the proposed UPSFF weights for these categories of identified learning needs, the summer school weight in the current UPSFF is redundant and is no longer needed. It is covered in funding for extended-year programs to help boost achievement for at-risk students during the school year and help prevent summer learning loss. In its cost calculation, the study team assumed that 100 percent of at-risk students would attend summer school and Level 1 and Level 2 ELL students would also attend summer school.

Current Per-Student Spending Compared with the Estimated Cost of Education Adequacy

To clarify the differences in cost between current DCPS and public charter school expenditures and the recommended new UPSFF base cost, the study team examined:

- The amount of funding that currently flows to LEAs through the UPSFF base and weights;
- The total amount of funding that is contributed to DCPS and public charter schools by other DC government agencies and executive offices and supplemental appropriations; and
- Reported levels of spending by successful DCPS and public charter schools in the District of Columbia.

The results of the successful schools study shown in Table 5.5 present a point of comparison with current levels of spending in DCPS and public charter schools and the projected base-level cost of education adequacy for DC students based on the specifications of the PJ panels. The successful schools base cost reflects the successful schools' expenditures and does not differentiate between sources of funding (i.e., federal, local, or philanthropic). Therefore, the successful schools expenditures are likely financed through additional funding beyond the UPSFF, such as federal program support and privately raised dollars.

**Table 5.5: Successful Schools Per-Student Expenditures
(School Year 2011–2012)***

Successful Schools	Per-Student Instructional Formula Base Cost
	Weighted Average
Charter School Data from Public Charter School Board (13 schools/LEAs)	\$10,885
District of Columbia Public Schools (21 schools)	\$12,783
Weighted Average of Charter School and DCPS	\$12,102

Note: * Weighted averages are based on the audited number of students in each of the successful schools. Weighted average of charter school and DCPS represents the average of available information for all successful schools combined.

Sources: Cost information for charter schools based on audited SY 2011–2012 financial data from the Public Charter School Board. Cost information for DCPS from Office of the Chief Operating Officer in DCPS.

Table 5.5 presents the total amount of instructional base-level funding that currently supports students in DCPS and public charter schools from these sources, plus the additional per-student base amount in the fiscal 2013 supplemental budget for DCPS and public charter schools. Table 5.6 compares the weighted average per-student costs in high-performing schools in SY 2011–2012 with the proposed UPSFF instructional funding prior to federal revenue adjustments. The weighted average in high-performing schools in SY 2011–2012 was \$12,102, which is more than the calculated level of spending based on the current UPSFF; however, the successful schools study admittedly includes additional funding besides local dollars. Yet the weighted average is

6.7 percent more than the estimated cost of adequacy prior to federal revenue adjustments in SY 2013–2014, based on the PJ panel deliberations and the evidence base. The proposed UPSFF instructional funding prior to federal revenue adjustments equals \$11,344.

Table 5.6: Successful Schools Study and the Recommended Uniform Per Student Funding Formula Instructional Per-Student Base-Level Funding Prior to Federal Revenue Adjustment Recommended to Achieve Education Adequacy

Cost Elements	Successful Schools Study	Recommended UPSFF Base Prior to Federal Revenue Adjustment
Instructional Operating Allocation	\$12,102	\$11,344

Source: Calculations by Augenblick, Palaich and Associates.

Clear messages from a comparison of these spending levels for general education students *without* identified learning needs that require additional resources are these:

- Current UPSFF base-level funding has not kept up with the cost of educating students. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that both high-performing DCPS and public charter schools currently spend more per student than they receive through the UPSFF. During the past several years, a portion of these higher costs has been covered by other DC government agencies that provide services for DCPS and public charter schools outside the UPSFF and by mid-year supplemental education appropriations provided by the City Council. Many high-performing DCPS and public charter schools also receive private funding from foundation grants, in-kind contributions from community partner organizations, and annual donations from parents and private donors.
- The recommended UPSFF base-level funding level and the level of spending by high-performing schools are closely correlated. The recommended UPSFF base-level funding for students without identified learning needs is within 6.7 percent of the calculated per-student costs for these students in the city’s high-performing schools, when federal program support is factored in. These two cost estimates were derived using different methodological approaches; that they are within 10 percent of each other underscores the validity of the study team’s general conclusions on the cost of education adequacy in the District of Columbia.

Fiscal Impact of Proposed Changes to the UPSFF

To examine the fiscal impact of proposed changes to the UPSFF, the study team compared projected local spending for SY 2013–2014—and for the next three years—and compared that projected spending with expected local education spending absent changes to the structure and levels of base funding and weights provided in the UPSFF (see Table 5.7). These projections are based on student enrollment projections for DCPS and public charter schools and for students

with identified learning needs and an indexed cost-of-living increase of 2 percent beginning in SY 2014–2015.⁵

During the four-year period from SY 2013–2014 through SY 2016–2017, the net cost difference to provide all students with an adequate education is estimated to be approximately \$1.1 billion. Of that amount, approximately \$433.7 million would be allocated to the new at-risk weight. See Appendix N for detailed projected costs for SY 2014–2015 through SY 2016–2017 using the proposed UPSFF. Appendix O lists the detailed projected costs for SY 2014–2015 through SY 2016–2017 using the current UPSFF.

**Table 5.7: Net Fiscal Impact
(School Year 2013–2014 Through School Year 2016–2017)**

Cost Category	SY 2013–2014	SY 2014–2015	SY 2015–2016	SY 2016–2017	Total
Total Projected Costs with Proposed Changes to UPSFF	\$1,406,127,715	\$1,478,134,740	\$1,548,403,718	\$1,622,637,470	\$6,055,303,643
Total Projected Costs with No Changes to UPSFF	\$1,152,035,738	\$1,209,472,100	\$1,266,986,935	\$1,326,798,521	\$4,955,293,294
Net Cost	\$254,091,977	\$268,662,640	\$281,416,783	\$295,838,949	\$1,100,010,349

Sources: Mary Levy, an independent budget consultant, developed the projections of current expenditures. The study team developed the projections of proposed expenditures with changes to the UPSFF.

As shown in Table 5.8, the total additional cost of proposed educational resources in SY 2013–2014 is approximately \$254.1 million, based on the study team analysis. Of that amount:

- Approximately \$168.7 million is attributable to increased base-level funding for instructional programs, student support services, administration, and other educational resources for general education students.
- Approximately \$101.2 million is projected for the proposed new weight for students at risk of academic failure, including students who are in foster care, who are homeless, and/or who are living in low-income in families eligible for TANF. As discussed earlier, some stakeholders raised concerns that the working definition of at risk is too narrow. Should the definition be broadened, as some stakeholders have suggested, the fiscal impact will be more substantial. (The net increase is approximately \$65.7 million when the current allocation for summer school is factored in.)

⁵The study team estimated that DCPS general education enrollments would increase by 1 percent annually and that charter school general education enrollments would increase by 5 percent annually. Similarly, DCPS English language learner enrollments were projected to increase by 1 percent per year and charter school ELL enrollments by 3 percent per year. Special education enrollments by level of need were projected to remain the same over time.

- Total funding for special education students is projected to increase slightly by approximately \$3.0 million, while funding for English language learners is projected to increase by approximately \$16.7 million.

Table 5.8: Projected Costs for School Year 2013–2014 with Proposed Changes to the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula

Cost Categories	Current UPSFF: SY 2013–2014	Recommended UPSFF: SY 2013–2014
Operating Costs		
General Education (instructional and maintenance and operations)	\$854,908,536	\$ 1,023,612,861
Special Education	\$198,532,500	\$ 201,486,467
Special Education Compliance Fund	\$17,396,496	\$ 17,396,496
English Language Learners	\$31,032,716	\$ 47,720,400
At Risk	Not a current weight	\$ 101,195,839
Summer School	\$35,449,838	Included in proposed weights
Extended School Year	\$8,162,659	\$ 8,162,659
Total UPSFF Nonresidential	\$1,145,482,745	\$ 1,399,574,722
Total Residential	\$6,552,993	\$ 6,552,993
Total Instructional Operating Allocation	\$1,152,035,738	\$ 1,406,127,715

Sources: Mary Levy, an independent budget consultant, developed the projections of current expenditures. The study team developed the projections of proposed expenditures with changes to the UPSFF.

Analysis of Net Fiscal Impact

As shown in Table 5.9, an estimated \$72.5 million of other local funding is expected to be available to offset approximately 30 percent of the \$254.1 million in projected new education costs in SY 2013–2014 to achieve education adequacy in the District of Columbia. This includes funding from other DC government agencies that provide services—and the related economic benefit—to DCPS and public charter schools outside the UPSFF. (The costs of services by these DC agencies are now included in the proposed UPSFF funding.) Assuming this current spending is applied to offset the projected costs, the remaining balance that would still need to be funded is approximately \$181.6 million in the current school year—an amount equal to just more than 15 percent of total current local education spending for SY 2013–2014.

**Table 5.9: Projected Costs for School Year 2013–2014 with
Proposed Changes to the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula,
Including the Offset of Other Local Funding**

	Current Funding	Proposed Funding	Difference
OPERATING COSTS			
<i>General Education (instructional and maintenance and operations)</i>	\$854,908,536	\$1,023,612,861	\$168,704,325
Special Education	\$198,532,500	\$201,486,467	\$2,953,967
Special Education Compliance Fund	\$17,396,496	\$17,396,496	None
English Language Learner	\$31,032,716	\$47,720,400	\$16,687,684
At Risk		\$101,195,839	\$101,195,839
Summer School	\$35,449,838		\$(35,449,838)
Extended School Year	\$8,162,659	\$8,162,659	None
Total UPSFF Nonresidential	\$1,145,482,745	\$1,399,574,722	\$254,091,977
Total Residential	\$6,552,993	\$6,552,993	None
Subtotal UPSFF Funding	\$1,152,035,738	\$1,406,127,715	\$254,091,977
OTHER LOCAL FUNDS AVAILABLE			
Department of Health	\$17,000,000		
Department of Behavioral Health	\$4,446,771		
Office of the Attorney General	\$2,442,000		
Office of Contracting and Procurement	\$2,280		
Office of the Chief Technology Officer	\$1,914,110		
Public Charter School Board Appropriation	\$1,161,000		
Department of General Services (maintenance and operations)	\$45,503,000		
	Current Funding	Proposed Funding	Difference
Subtotal Other Local Funds	\$72,469,161		
Total Funding SY 2013–2014	\$1,224,504,899	\$1,406,127,715	\$181,622,816

Sources: Mary Levy, an independent budget consultant, developed the projections of current expenditures. The study team developed the projections of proposed expenditures with changes to the UPSFF.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

At each stage of its work, from study design through data collection, analysis, and formulation of findings and recommendations, the study team—comprised of staff from The Finance Project (TFP) and Augenblick, Palaich and Associates (APA)—was guided by the principles outlined in the introduction to this report. Of particular concern in formulating the recommendations was ensuring that suggested changes in the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula (UPSFF) are clearly focused on achieving adequacy, equity, and transparency in education funding in the District of Columbia (DC).

The Mayor and DC Council have increased funding for general education and for special education during the past several years. However, as shown in the successful schools study and the cost estimation based on the professional judgment (PJ) panels, current funding through the UPSFF has not kept up with the cost of educating students in District of Columbia Public schools (DCPS) and public charter schools. This is due to several factors that impact education costs:

- *Characteristics of the student population.* The District has a high proportion of students from low-income, severely disadvantaged, and non-English-speaking families. These students require additional instructional resources and student support services to be successful learners.
- *High labor costs.* The high cost of living in the city and metropolitan area and the predominance of a unionized workforce in DCPS means the District has a relatively high wage scale for educators.
- *Education reform.* The District of Columbia, along with many states across the nation, is taking steps to implement the Common Core State Standards for kindergarten through grade 12, which require significant investments in new and upgraded curricula, instructional programs, assessment, and professional development as well as increased coordination across grade levels and schools.
- *Commitment to equity between sectors.* By law, the District is obligated to provide operating funds through a Uniform Per Student Funding Formula to both DCPS and public charter schools. Meeting this obligation requires additional resources because of past differences in funding between the two sectors.

Despite the current level of education funding, the UPSFF will need to be increased to ensure all schools have the resources they need to enable students to successfully meet DC academic performance standards. The UPSFF should also include additional funding to address the learning needs of students at risk of academic failure.

DC education funding also is inequitable, as shown in the TFP/APA study team's analyses of current spending on DCPS and public charter schools. The School Reform Act requires uniform funding of operating expenses for both DCPS and public charter schools.¹ Both DCPS and public

¹ Note that no such requirement exists for capital expense.

charter schools depend on additional resources provided by other DC government agencies to cover the costs of some school-based programs and services (e.g., school nurses and social workers, school crossing guards, and school resource officers). To the extent additional services are available to DCPS, they must be equally available to public charter schools. However, DCPS receives significantly more funding than public charter schools, in total and on a per-student basis. Additionally, the department of general services (DGS) funds approximately 40 percent of facilities maintenance and operations (M&O) costs for DCPS schools and some of its administrative offices. Other city agencies subsidize or perform central office functions for DCPS.

These funding disparities are contrary to DC law, which mandates that DCPS and public charter schools be funded through the UPSFF for operating expenses, that services provided by DC government agencies be on an equal basis, and that costs covered by the UPSFF should also not be funded by other DC agencies and offices.² The differences also have become a source of significant tension between the two education sectors. Against this backdrop, the study team was keenly focused on ensuring that its recommendations for restructuring and resetting the UPSFF address these issues and create greater equity between DCPS and public charter schools. Moreover, the study team was focused on ensuring all schools are funded at a level that will enable students to meet academic performance standards.

Recommendations based on the findings of the DC Education Adequacy Study are organized under six broad headings:

- Restructuring education funding through the UPSFF to explicitly address facilities M&O costs;
- Resetting the UPSFF base level and weights;
- Maintaining the capital facility allowance for public charter schools pending further analysis;
- Ensuring local funding flows through the UPSFF with specific and limited exceptions;
- Creating greater transparency and accountability in education budgeting, resource allocation, and reporting; and
- Updating the UPSFF regularly.

Restructuring the UPSFF to Address M&O Costs

Currently, the UPSFF includes funding to cover the per-student costs for both instructional operating allocations and facilities M&O allocations, though these costs are not disaggregated. However, to understand the relative impact of these costs, the study team analyzed the two components independently.

To develop a uniform rate for M&O costs for DCPS and public charter schools, as is required by law, the study team developed a per-square-foot M&O cost rate based on the current costs for DCPS schools at each grade level—elementary school, middle school, and high school. No established space standard exists for adult learning centers, alternative schools, and special education schools where students are ungraded, so the study team applied the middle school M&O cost rate for adult education and alternative schools and the high school cost rate for stand-

² DC Official Code §§38-1804.01, 2902, and 2913.

alone special education schools. To derive a uniform per-student M&O cost at each school level, the study team applied the grade-level-specific, per-square-foot cost rate to the number of square feet of space recommended for students at each school level in the DCPS design guidelines.³ It is this grade-level-specific, per-square-foot cost rate that is applied in the UPSFF and used to determine the amount of funding that should be allocated to DCPS and public charter school local educational agencies (LEAs) for each student. This approach provides the foundation for several related recommendations to restructure the UPSFF to explicitly address facilities M&O costs.

- The study team recommends that the two components of the UPSFF per-student payment (i.e., the instructional operating allocation and the facility M&O allocation) should be calculated and presented separately within the formula. The instructional operating allocation is structured as a base funding level and weights that are added to the base to address cost differences for students at different grade levels and with identified learning needs (similar to the current configuration). The M&O allocation is structured as an actual grade-level-specific dollar amount to be added to the amount of the instructional base funding and weights for each student. The table presents the recommended UPSFF, including both the instructional and facility M&O costs.
- The study team recommends that grade-level-specific M&O costs should be structured as an actual per-student dollar amount rather than as a weight. Based on DCPS actual and fiscal 2014 projected M&O costs, the study team recommends the following per-student facilities M&O costs as a component of the UPSFF:
 - \$1,071 for each elementary school student;
 - \$1,209 for each middle school student;
 - \$1,342 for each high school student;
 - \$1,209 for each adult education and alternative student; and
 - \$1,342 for each student attending a stand-alone special education school.
- Calculating the M&O costs in this way, based on actual costs applied to recommended space criteria, enables funding to flow through the formula on a per-student basis in a transparent way. However, given the different cost structures for DCPS and public charter schools, the study team recommends that DC leaders develop a uniform reporting structure for facilities M&O costs in both sectors so, going forward, the M&O payment can be built on cost estimates that include actual costs for DCPS and public charter schools.
- The study team recommends a strong focus on more efficient use of DCPS buildings by releasing surplus buildings for use by charter schools and aggressively pursuing collocation opportunities, even as DCPS continues to work to build its enrollment.

³ According to the “District of Columbia Public Schools Design Guidelines: 2009,” as amended in 2012, the total per-student space requirements are as follows: elementary schools: 150 square feet per student; middle schools: 170 square feet per student; and high schools: 192 square feet per student. The study team assigned adult education and alternative schools and education centers, and special education schools to the middle school rate of 170 square feet per student.

- During a reasonable transition period, DGS should provide M&O funding to make up the difference of DCPS's facilities M&O costs.

Paying facility M&O costs using the recommended per-square-foot-per-student allocation approach through the UPSFF will not cover the full costs of DCPS facilities M&O expenses. This is due, primarily, to the large amount of underutilized space in city-owned school buildings and grounds that must be maintained. Applying the recommended square footage per student to the school year 2012–2013 audited enrollment for DCPS shows that DCPS requires only about 7.4 million square feet, or roughly 70 percent, of the approximately 10.6 million square feet of active school building space in its current portfolio.⁴

Yet DCPS operates as a system of right, which requires that schools be available across the city that can serve every neighborhood at every grade level. In addition, though it is difficult to quantify the monetary value of benefits, DCPS school buildings and grounds represent community assets that serve diverse purposes for community residents beyond educating neighborhood children and youth. DCPS's pools, fields, and athletic spaces provide community recreation resources. Auditoriums, multi-purpose rooms, and classrooms provide community performance and meeting space. Schools also house other community services, such as health care and child care, in school-based facilities, with their M&O costs attributed to DCPS.

Beyond increasing enrollment in DCPS schools, the study team recommends that city leaders aggressively pursue policies to use underutilized space in DC-owned school buildings and grounds more efficiently. Not only will this help defray DCPS's M&O costs in the long term, but it will also benefit the communities surrounding underutilized DCPS schools. As the first and most important step in this direction, DCPS should, where appropriate, collocate with other LEAs, city agencies, or community-based organizations. Although collocation requires substantial management and oversight, the District should aggressively move to lease space in underutilized DCPS buildings to other appropriate entities. It should also support DCPS and prospective tenants in planning for successful collocations.

Resetting Instructional Education Funding Levels Through the UPSFF

The process for developing the proposed instructional base funding level and weights was the result of a rigorous, multimethod analysis that included input and review by multiple local and national experts. The recommended formula is structured to account for the resource needs of general education students and students with identified learning needs at every grade level, from prekindergarten for three-year-olds through grade 12, as well as the needs of adult learners. The UPSFF base-level funding and weights for students at different grade levels and with identified learning needs are the same for all DC students, regardless of whether they attend DCPS or public charter schools. This includes costs for all the resources that students need to be successful in light of the District's performance standards, including those currently provided outside the UPSFF. Accordingly, the study team offers several related recommendations for resetting the UPSFF:

⁴ DCPS has approximately another 1.5 million square feet of space for DCPS future use, swing space, and administrative space.

- The study team recommends that the proposed UPSFF base funding level should reflect a combined cost of \$10,557 per student for instructional purposes and \$1,071 per student for facility M&O, totaling \$11,628 (see table). This is equal to the per-student base cost at the least-costly grade level—kindergarten through grade 5. The instructional and facility M&O portions of the UPSFF are reported separately for purposes of transparency.
- The study team recommends that the instructional portion of the UPSFF should be adjusted in two fundamental ways:
 - The new instructional base funding level and weights should provide adequate resources to address the needs of all students to meet current academic performance standards and, when they are fully implemented, the new Common Core State Standards. This includes instructional programs, student support services, administrative capacity, and other educational resources, as described in Chapters 3 and 4.
 - The total costs of serving students, including those with identified learning needs, should be partially offset by federal categorical funding that flows from federal entitlement programs, formula grant programs, and other categorical programs that benefit students with particular needs and characteristics. As a result, in calculating the new UPSFF base funding level and weights, the study team deducted the projected amount of these federal funds from the estimated costs.
- Weights beyond the base level of funding represent additional percentages of the base for students at other grade levels and for students with identified learning needs that entail costs above the base. In addition to grade-level weights, the study team recommends maintaining the current categories of special education and English language learners. These weights should continue to be cumulative.

The recommended levels of required funding, based on the cost analysis, are higher than current levels for special education Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 students and for English language learners.⁵ These higher levels of funding reflect the needs for increased specialized resources. The total costs of serving students with identified learning needs is partially offset by federal categorical funding that flows from federal entitlement programs, formula block grants, and other categorical programs that benefit students with particular needs and characteristics. In calculating the net new base-level cost and weights, the study team deducted these federal funds from the gross cost figures.

- The study team recommends adding a new weight of 0.37 for students at risk of academic failure. An initial working definition of at risk should focus on three primary criteria:
 - Students who are in foster care,
 - Students who are homeless, and

⁵ Special education students are categorized into four levels of need, according to the number of hours per week they require specialized services.

- Students who are living in low-income families eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

This weight can be combined with weights for other applicable identified learning needs, except for alternative or adult education students, because, by definition, these students are at risk and additional resources have been factored into their relevant weights.

As previously noted, many stakeholders have raised questions about whether these criteria too narrowly limit the definition of educational risk, particularly the use of TANF eligibility, because the program sets income limits at only 100 percent of the federal poverty level and families eventually time out of the program. However, use of the traditional metric for low-income status—eligibility for free and reduced-price school meals—may be overly broad and result in overfunding some schools as the District moves toward community eligibility.

The study team recognizes the deficiencies in the proposed working definition. As it is ultimately a policy decision for the Mayor and DC Council to determine the definition of at risk, the study team recommends that education leaders engage stakeholders further to decide on a definition of at risk that is targeted to the District's needs and that is based on available data sources. Additionally, as work by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education to develop an early warning system for identifying students at risk of academic failure is completed, the at-risk definition should take account of relevant evidence-based indicators that will be tracked (e.g., over-age and behind-grade).

- The study team recommends excluding two current weights and instead accounting for these needs in other weights: the current summer school weight, which is accounted for in the new at-risk weight and in the weight for English language learners in the proposed UPSFF; and the special education capacity fund, because it is accounted for in the special education weights.
- The study team recommends developing a weight for gifted and talented students. The professional judgment panels did not outline comprehensive resource specifications for high-performing students as they did for other students with identified learning needs, though such a weight is frequently a component of a comprehensive weighted student funding formula. Accordingly, the study team recommends that the District explore the feasibility of developing and costing out specifications for additional specialized educational resources and opportunities for gifted and talented students.

Table 6.1: Recommended UPSFF Base Funding Level and Weights

GENERAL EDUCATION AND ADD-ON WEIGHTING, INCLUDING MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS						
Category	Current UPSFF Weight	Current UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocation	Proposed UPSFF Weight After Federal Revenue Adjustments	Proposed UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Federal Revenue Adjustments	Facility M&O UPSFF Per Pupil Allocations	Proposed UPSFF Per Pupil Allocations After Federal Revenue Adjustments with M&O
Foundation		\$9,306		\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
General Education						
Preschool	1.34	\$12,470	1.15	\$12,141	\$1,071	\$13,212
Prekindergarten	1.30	\$12,098	1.15	\$12,141	\$1,071	\$13,212
Kindergarten	1.30	\$12,098	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 1–3	1.00	\$9,306	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 4–5	1.00	\$9,306	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,071	\$11,628
Grades 6–8	1.03	\$9,585	1.01	\$10,663	\$1,209	\$11,872
Grades 9–12	1.16	\$10,795	1.10	\$11,613	\$1,342	\$12,955
Alternative ¹	1.17	\$10,888	1.73	\$18,264	\$1,209	\$19,473
Adult Education ²	0.75	\$6,980	1.00	\$10,557	\$1,209	\$11,766
Special Education Schools	1.17	\$10,888	1.17	\$12,352	\$1,342	\$13,694
Special Needs Add-on Weightings						
Special Education Level 1	0.58	\$5,397	0.88	\$9,290		
Special Education Level 2	0.81	\$7,538	1.08	\$11,402		
Special Education Level 3	1.58	\$14,703	1.77	\$18,686		
Special Education Level 4	3.10	\$28,849	3.13	\$33,043		
Special Education Capacity Fund	0.40	\$3,722	N/A			
English Language Learners	0.45	\$4,188	0.61	\$6,440		
At Risk	N/A	N/A	0.37	\$3,906		

Table 6.1: Recommended UPSFF Base Funding Level and Weights, continued

SUMMER SCHOOL, EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR, AND RESIDENTIAL				
Category	Current UPSFF Weight	Current UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocation	Proposed UPSFF Weight After Revenue Adjustments	Proposed UPSFF Per-Pupil Allocations After Revenue Adjustments
Foundation		\$9,306		\$10,557
Special Education Compliance				
Blackman-Jones Compliance	0.07	\$651	0.06	\$651
Attorneys' Fee Supplement	0.09	\$838	0.08	\$838
Summer School³	0.17	\$15,820	N/A	N/A
Extended School Year Level 1	0.064	\$596	0.056	\$596
Extended School Year Level 2	0.231	\$2,150	0.204	\$2,150
Extended School Year Level 3	0.500	\$4,653	0.441	\$4,653
Extended School Year Level 4	0.497	\$4,625	0.438	\$4,625
Residential Add-Ons				
Residential Weight	1.70	\$15,820	1.50	\$15,820
Special Education Residential				
Level 1	0.374	\$3,480	0.330	\$3,480
Level 2	1.360	\$12,656	1.199	\$12,656
Level 3	2.941	\$27,369	2.592	\$27,369
Level 4	2.924	\$27,211	2.578	\$27,211
English Language Learner Residential	0.68	\$6,328	0.60	\$6,328

Notes:

1 The proposed weight assumes alternative school students would not receive an at-risk weight.

2 The proposed weight assumes adult education students would not receive an at-risk weight. The weight also assumes a general education full-time equivalent (FTE) student. However, many adult education students would be counted at below FTE, so the weight was prorated by 75 percent.

3 Summer school is not assigned a specific weight in the proposed UPSFF because it is included in the at-risk weight and English language learner weights.

Sources: The recommendations are derived from both the professional judgment panel specifications resulting from panelists' deliberations and the evidence base found in Michael E. Goetz, Allen R. Odden, and Lawrence O. Picus, "Using Available Evidence to Estimate the Cost of Educational Adequacy," *Education Finance and Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3 (2008): 374–97.

Maintaining the Capital Facility Allowance for Public Charters Pending Further Analysis

Although the study team examined information on capital investments by DCPS and public charter schools, available financial data were insufficient to fully assess public charter school costs and develop a meaningful comparison to DCPS spending. DCPS funding for new construction, renovation, and upgrading of school buildings and grounds is paid for by DGS and is based on a capital plan that prioritizes school improvement projects. Public charter schools receive an annual facilities allowance of \$3,000 per student to cover the acquisition, lease, and improvement of school facilities. However, capital investment costs for public charter schools are much more difficult to discern, because no standard approach for investment or accepted

method of accounting for costs exists. The lack of a single accepted chart of accounts for presenting expenditures, including those for capital investment, made it impossible for the study team to develop a reliable capital cost estimate for public charter schools. Due to these constraints, the study team recommends that:

- The Mayor and DC Council should maintain the current capital allowance for public charter schools, pending further financial analysis based on uniform data reporting by charter LEAs on their capital expenditures.

Ensuring Local Funding Flows Through the UPSFF with Specific and Limited Exceptions

To comply with current DC law, which requires that costs covered by the UPSFF should not also be funded by other DC agencies and offices, and to achieve greater funding equity between DCPS and public charter schools, the study team worked with the PJ panels to examine the flow of funding within and outside the UPSFF. One goal was to determine which student support services currently funded outside the UPSFF should be covered by funds that flow through the formula. A second goal was to determine whether any benefits should continue to be funded outside the UPSFF by other DC government agencies.

The study team recommends that the UPSFF provide comprehensive funding for all DC students that adequately covers instructional programs, student support services, administrative, and other educational resource needs at the school and system levels as well as funding for facilities M&O costs. To ensure this happens, the study team recommends the following modifications to current arrangements that provide resources to DCPS and public charter schools through other DC government agencies:

- Most resources currently provided by city agencies to both DCPS and/or charter schools should be funded through the UPSFF. They are included in the recommended new base funding level for all students and in weights for students with identified learning needs. These services include:
 - School nurses for DCPS and public charter schools (DOH);
 - School social workers for DCPS and public charter schools (DBH);
 - Public Charter School Board Appropriation for charter schools (PCSB);
 - Technology systems for DCPS (OCTO);
 - Procurement services for DCPS (OCP);
 - Legal Services for DCPS (OAG); and
 - Facilities maintenance and repairs for DCPS (DGS).

In the future, DCPS and public charter school LEAs should be responsible for purchasing these services for their schools using UPSFF funds. If mutually agreeable arrangements already exist for other DC government agencies to supply services, DCPS and/or public charter schools can enter into a memorandum of understanding with each of these agencies to continue the arrangement. LEAs should cover the costs through interagency transfers.

- School safety resources provided to both DCPS and public charter schools should continue to be paid for and allocated by city agencies, outside the UPSFF. These include school resource officers (SROs) supplied by MPD to prevent and respond to juvenile

delinquency and school violence and school crossing guards supplied by the DDOT to reduce pedestrian injuries and fatalities in traffic accidents. Because decisions on the allocation of these resources are based on considerations for student safety, local traffic patterns, neighborhood environments, school culture, and imminent threats of violence that have little to do with a per-student share of costs, they are less amenable to allocation through the UPSFF. Therefore, MPD and DDOT should continue to provide these services and should be accountable for funding them at a level that is adequate to meet the needs of DCPS and public charter schools citywide. In addition, MPD and DDOT should develop clear criteria to determine which LEAs or schools qualify for these services to reduce confusion and inequity between the sectors.

Creating Greater Transparency and Accountability in Education Budgeting, Resource Allocation, and Reporting

This research was not undertaken to audit DCPS or public charter school income and expenditures. Nevertheless, the study team spent considerable time gathering and analyzing financial data and information provided by DCPS, PCSB, individual charter schools, and other DC government agencies and executive offices to inform the cost estimates presented in this report. As the study team learned in the course of its work, education budgeting, resource allocation, and financial reporting are not clear and easily traceable processes in DCPS or public charter schools. The state of financial recordkeeping makes it difficult to determine the total amount spent by cost category or to assess cost drivers and cost variations within and among DCPS and public charter schools. It is also difficult to trace funding from the source to the student and to understand the total amount of education spending in the city and how it is allocated to individual schools and to central office functions. These issues are particularly pronounced for facilities M&O costs and capital investments. Accordingly, the study team recommends that:

- The Public Charter School Board should require all charter schools to adopt a standardized chart of accounts that provides clarity and accountability and enables comparisons among charters and between DCPS and the charter school LEAs. Currently, all charter schools submit annual financial reports to the PCSB; however, these reports are not standardized and account for spending inconsistently.
- The city should establish an online public education funding reporting system that provides annual education budget information (e.g., local and nonlocal sources of funding; allocation of resources to LEAs and from LEAs to individual schools; and individual school-level expenses for instruction, student support services, administration, and other educational resources).

Updating the UPSFF Regularly

This education adequacy study represents the DC government's first effort to undertake a rigorous analysis to develop a data-driven estimate of the costs of providing three-year-olds in prekindergarten, students in kindergarten, students in grades 1 through 12, and adult students in the District with an educational experience that will enable them to meet academic standards. To keep the UPSFF formulas and funding levels up to date, adequate, and equitable, the study team offers three related recommendations:

- The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) should reconvene the technical work group (TWG) to monitor the base and weights of the UPSFF and identify, study, and make recommendations on any issues that impact the effectiveness and efficiency of these mechanisms and any concerns that raise questions about their adequacy, equity, uniformity and transparency. The TWG should be composed of local educators, education finance experts, DCPS and public charter school representatives, and community leaders. It should serve as an advisory group to the Office of the State Superintendent of Education and the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education.
- The DC government should undertake a rigorous assessment of the adequacy of education funding through the UPSFF every five years. As conditions change in the city and as educational practice advances, city leaders should periodically assess the alignment of education funding with the city’s education goals and the adequacy of funding to achieve them. The Mayor and DC Council should consider restructuring and resetting the UPSFF based on changing economic and demographic conditions, evolving educational norms and best practices, and information on educational resource needs and spending. On a more frequent basis, the city should review the facility M&O costs portion of the UPSFF to update the costs based on actual costs for DCPS and public charter schools.
- In the interim years, the UPSFF should be updated based on an indexed cost-of-living adjustment that is relevant to the cost of living in the District of Columbia.

Implementing the Study’s Recommendations

Under any scenario, the path toward funding the study team’s recommendations will require a significant new financial commitment to education. Fully implementing these provisions is likely to be a multiyear process. The city’s leaders will have to wrestle with the real limitations of fiscal feasibility and educational need. As they consider a phase-in approach, they should take into account the parallel priorities of increasing the foundational level of resources to address new standards, targeting the highest-need students, and increasing equity between DCPS and public charter schools.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

Soumya Bhat
Education Finance and Policy Analyst
DC Fiscal Policy Institute
Washington, DC

Joshua Edelman
Senior Program Officer
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Washington, DC

Mark Fermanich
Associate Professor
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR

Michael Griffith
Senior Policy Analyst
Education Commission of the States
Denver, CO

Tabitha Grossman
Director
Hope Street Group
Washington, DC

Tameria Lewis
Social Services Director
E.L. Haynes Public Charter School
Washington, DC

Lucretia Murphy
Former Executive Director
See Forever Foundation
Maya Angelou Public Charter School
Washington, DC

Michael Rebell
Executive Director
Columbia University
New York, NY

Lisa Ruda
Chief of Staff
District of Columbia Public Schools
Washington, DC

Zena Rudo
Project Director
SEDL
Austin, TX

David Sciarra
Executive Director
Education Law Center
Newark, NJ

Michael Siegel
Principal
Public and Environmental Finance
Association
Washington, DC

APPENDIX B: DC EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS FRAMEWORK

Over the course of the day, the professional judgment panel is tasked with identifying the resources needed in District of Columbia public schools and public charter schools to meet specific academic standards and requirements that flow from federal and district legislative and/or policy mandates. This document describes both the input and outputs/outcome requirements for District schools and contains:

- **Requirements for All Students**
 - **Instructional Inputs**—Instructional input requirements generally are rules, services, or programs that must be provided. They include specific mandates, such as curriculum standards that must be taught or the minimum number of days that students must attend school.
 - **Student Achievement Outputs/Outcomes**—Outputs focus on the completion of requirements; outcomes focus on the level of success students must achieve on tests such as the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) assessments.
 - **Additional System-level Requirements**—System-level requirements include those related to district data systems and strategic planning.
- **Additional Provisions and Requirements for Special Needs Students**—Additional provisions and requirements for special needs students are the requirements for special education, at-risk, and English language learner (ELL) students beyond those mandated for all students.

The document has been reviewed and approved by the deputy mayor for education. It incorporates feedback from the office of the state superintendent of education (OSSE), the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS), and the DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB).

Requirements for All Students

Instructional Inputs

Minimum Number of Days of Instruction

Every family with a child who has attained the age of five years on or before September 30 of the current school year shall place the minor in regular attendance at a public, an independent, or a parochial school or in private instruction during the period of each year when the public schools of the District are in session. The obligation of the parent, guardian, or other person having custody extends until the minor reaches the age of 18 years.

Curricular Standards

The District of Columbia Board of Education has adopted the Common Core State Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics for kindergarten through grade 12 (K–12). These standards will begin to be implemented in 2012–2013, and they will be fully implemented by the 2014–2015 school year. Public charter schools must meet or exceed, but are not limited by, these board-adopted standards.

The office of the state superintendent of education has identified standards in the following subjects: arts, early learning, health and physical education, science, social studies, technology, and world language.

Additionally, the Financial Literacy Council shall monitor the planning and implementation of financial literacy education in District public schools.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waiver

In August 2012, the US Department of Education selected the District of Columbia to receive waiver relief from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known more commonly as No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

The waiver allowed OSSE to implement a new state accountability system. Key highlights include:

- ***Multiple Measures to Gauge Achievement:*** Each local educational agency (LEA) and school will be measured on proficiency, growth, graduation rates, and participant rates for DC CAS.
- ***Growth for All Students:*** Growth is expected for all students. The new accountability system incentivizes growth by awarding more points for continued growth toward advanced proficiency.
- ***Flexibility in Use of Title I Funds:*** LEAs and schools will have flexibility in the types of interventions and supports to meet the needs of students, teachers, and schools.
- ***LEA Accountability:*** LEAs that miss the same target(s) for two consecutive years will be required to:
 - Reserve 20 percent of Title I funds;
 - Implement LEA-level interventions and supports that address missed targets;
 - Amend the LEA Title I plan to include interventions and supports; and
 - Report on a biannual basis on meeting implementation milestones.
- ***Classification of Schools:*** Schools will be classified into five categories: “reward,” “rising,” “developing,” “focus,” and “priority.”
- ***OSSE Supports:*** The level of support provided to LEAs and schools will be contingent upon the school classifications and needs of the LEA. Statewide initiatives will be based on DC CAS data trends and needs. Services include:

- Professional development for LEAs, schools, and parents;
- Ongoing guidance and technical assistance;
- Quality monitoring to support effective implementation; and
- Dissemination of data to be used for LEA and school decision-making.¹

Staffing Requirements

Highly-Qualified Teachers

Under NCLB, all K–12 core content teachers, which include regular and special education teachers, must be highly qualified. This requirement applies to the following core content areas: English, reading, or language arts; mathematics; science; foreign languages; social studies; and the arts. To be highly qualified, these teachers must hold a degree, be fully licensed, and demonstrate subject-area competency, which may be through content testing or an endorsement, certification, or degree in the subject-matter field depending on whether the teacher is in elementary or secondary education.

Public School Nurses

A registered nurse shall be assigned to each District of Columbia elementary and secondary public school and public charter school a minimum of 20 hours per week during each semester and during summer school, if a summer school program is operated.

Early Childhood Education

To be eligible for enrollment in prekindergarten (pre-K), a child shall be a resident of the District and be of pre-K age (i.e., become three years of age on or before September 30 of the program year). Priority enrollment shall be first to children who live within the school's attendance zone boundary, then to children whose family income is between 130 percent and 250 percent of the federal poverty guidelines, and then to children whose family income is below 130 percent who are not served by existing programs.

The DCPS chancellor shall track and monitor the preparedness of children three and four years of age to determine the children's readiness for entry and achievement in DCPS and children in kindergarten through grade 3 who are not ready for entry and achievement in grade 4.

Public charter schools are subject to accountability standards set forth in the Early Childhood Performance Management Framework. PCSB is pilot testing this framework during the 2012–2013 school year, with plans to fully implement the framework in school year 2013–2014.

The DC board of education is revising its early education and prekindergarten education standards. Proposed standards are scheduled to be available for public comment February–May 2013.

Postsecondary and Adult Education

District Employment and Learning Center

The center shall establish a program to provide job training and employment assistance in the District of Columbia and shall coordinate with career preparation programs in existence on April 26, 1996, such as vocational education, school-to-work, and career academies in DCPS.

¹ DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, *DC ESEA Flexibility Waiver, Key Highlights of New Accountability System* (Washington, DC, August 2012).

Postsecondary Preparation Plan

Beginning with the graduating class of 2014, the mayor shall ensure that each public high school student applies to at least one postsecondary institution before graduation. The mayor shall issue a report that details the number of students who attend a postsecondary institution, including the number of students who attend each type inclusive of universities, colleges, vocational schools, and other postsecondary institutions.

Beginning with the graduating class of 2014, the mayor shall require that each student attending public high school takes the Scholastic Aptitude Test or the American College Testing program before graduation.

Evening, Weekend, and Summer Adult Technical Career Training Program

Adult evening, weekend, and summer classes shall be conducted at Phelps Architecture, Construction and Engineering High School, the Academy for Construction & Design at Cardozo Senior High School, the Hospitality High School of Washington, DC, or any future adult and technical career public charter school whose charter application is approved by the Public Charter School Board.

The mayor shall apply for grants and additional federal funding that may be available as part of the Workforce Investment Act as well as grants available as part of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act.

Additional System-Level Requirements

Requirements for Data Systems and Use

Educational Data Warehouse System

The office of the state superintendent of education, in coordination with the office of the chief technology officer, shall develop and implement a longitudinal educational data warehouse system to be used by:

- OSSE;
- The University of the District of Columbia;
- Public schools;
- Public charter schools;
- Publicly funded educational programs;
- Policymakers;
- Institutions of higher education; and
- Researchers.

Early Warning System

There is an established pilot early warning and support system that tracks how individual students in grades 4 through 9 in four feeder school groups are performing on certain indicators of high school and college readiness. The system shall identify students at risk and develop initiatives to support high school and college readiness. Initiatives may include:

- College and career awareness;
- Parent outreach and engagement;
- Tutoring and mentoring for struggling learners, including the use of technology-based programs;
- Individualized learning plans; and
- Data coaches.

Race to the Top

The District of Columbia received a Race to the Top grant in 2010. Grant funds in the amount of \$75 million will be used to improve the District's capacity to collect, analyze, and use data. DCPS and 30 charter school LEAs participate in Race to the Top. This more robust data will be used to:

- Improve teacher and leader evaluations;
- Provide teacher professional development that is embedded in the classroom;
- Tailor instruction and focus interventions for students; and
- Set high, but appropriate, expectations for teachers, students, schools, and LEAs.

Strategic Planning for the District

There will be an annual evaluation of DCPS and any affiliated education reform efforts. The annual evaluation shall include an assessment of:

- Business practices;
- Human resources operations and human capital strategies;
- All academic plans; and
- Annual progress made as measured against the benchmarks submitted the previous year, including a detailed description of student achievement.

District of Columbia Reform Plan

The superintendent shall submit an annual reform plan consistent with the financial plan and budget for the District of Columbia. The plan must address how DCPS will become a world-class education system that prepares students for lifetime learning in the 21st century and that is on a par with the best education systems of other cities, states, and nations.

Student Achievement Outputs and Outcomes

Student Performance Requirements on Assessments

The following assessments are used to measure student interim growth and progress toward proficiency:

The **Paced Interim Assessment (PIA)**² is administered five times a year to students in selected schools in grades 2 through 10. The assessment covers targeted standards from each unit and shows what knowledge and skills students have mastered and where instructional time and

² PIA is administered only to DCPS schools.

resources need to be focused. The fifth PIA, administered in June, assesses student mastery of the most essential skills as listed in the DCPS scope and sequence documents.

The **Achievement Network (ANet) Assessment**³ is another type of paced interim assessment, used at approximately one-third of schools in DCPS. It is aligned to the ANet Schedule of Assessed Standards and administered four times a year to students in 41 participating schools in grades 3 through 8. All four assessment cycles are administered prior to the state summative assessment, DC CAS.

The **District of Columbia Comprehensive Assessment System** assesses students in the following subjects and grade levels:

- Reading in grades 2 through 10;
- Mathematics in grades 2 through 8 and in grade 10;
- Composition in grades 4, 7, and 10;
- Science in grades 5 and 8 and biology in high school; and
- Health in grades 5 and 8 and in high school.

DC CAS is a standards-based assessment. Based on assessment results, each student is classified as scoring at one of four performance levels: “advanced,” “proficient,” “basic,” or “below basic.” The performance standards—also known as cut scores—are approved annually by the superintendent. Following are the proficiency targets OSSE has set:

Year	Elementary School		High School	
	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Mathematics</i>
2017	75%	75%	75%	75%

Graduation Requirements

To receive a diploma, students who enroll in 9th grade for the first time in school year 2007–2008 and thereafter must earn 24.0 credits (or Carnegie units) as follows:

Subject	Credits (Carnegie Units)
Art	0.5
Electives	3.5
English	4.0
Health and Physical Education	1.5
Mathematics (including algebra I, geometry, algebra II, and upper-level math)	4.0

³ ANet is administered only to DCPS schools.

Subject	Credits (Carnegie Units)
Music	0.5
Science (including biology, 2 lab sciences, and 1 other science)	4.0
Social Studies (including world history I and II, DC history, US government, and US history)	4.0
World Languages	2.0
Total	24.0 credits

Students must also meet the following requirements:

- At least 2.0 credits of the 24.0 required credits must be earned through courses that appear on the approved “College Level or Career Prep” list (e.g., Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, career technical education courses, and college-level courses); and
- At least 100 hours of community service must be completed.

Proposed Graduation Requirements⁴

Subject	Credits (Carnegie Units)
English	4.0
Mathematics (Including at least 1.0 unit above algebra II or its equivalent and not including any lower than algebra I or its equivalent. Students may earn units for high school mathematics courses taken in middle school if their rigor can be verified.)	4.0
Science (Including biology and 2 other laboratory courses. In the future, courses will be aligned with Next Gen Science Standards.)	4.0
Social Studies (Including world history/global studies, US history/government, DC history/civics, and student choice.)	3.0
World Language (Two years of the same language. Students may earn units for high school language courses taken in middle school/online per video chat, if their rigor can be verified.)	2.0

⁴ The proposed graduation requirements are open for public comment. The DC Board of Education is scheduled to vote on the requirements later in 2013.

Subject	Credits (Carnegie Units)
Visual/Performing Arts	2.0
Electives (Study abroad in an established and verified program can satisfy elective units.)	3.0
Physical and Health Education Physical education 1.5 units. (Units may be earned through physical education class, participation in a team sport, or Junior ROTC.) Health education .5 units. In addition, students must engage in physical activity 50 hours each year for a total of 200 hours.	2.0
College and Career Readiness (At least 2.0 units must be earned through courses that appear on the approved “College or Career Prep” list (e.g., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, career technical education, and/or dual-enrollment college-level courses.)	
Total	24.0 credits

Students must also meet the following requirements:

- Complete a thesis/culminating project during their junior or senior year; and
- Complete 100 hours of community service.

Additional Provisions and Requirements for Special Needs Students

Special Education

Assessment and Placement of a Student with a Disability

The local educational agency shall assess or evaluate a student who may have a disability and who may require special education services within 120 days from the date the student was referred for an evaluation or assessment.

The LEA shall place a student with a disability in an appropriate special education school or program in accordance with DC Education Code and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Special education placements shall be made in the following order or priority, provided the placement is appropriate for the student and made in accordance with IDEA and DC Education Code:

- DCPS schools, or District of Columbia public charter schools, pursuant to an agreement between DCPS and the public charter school;
- Private or residential District of Columbia facilities; and
- Facilities outside the District of Columbia.

Students who have significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed using the DC CAS-ALT:

DC CAS-ALT is a portfolio assessment given to students who have significant cognitive disabilities that prevent them from participating in the general assessment (DC CAS) even with accommodations and/or modifications. It is administered to a smaller number of students in grades 3 through 8 and in grade 10 in reading and mathematics. The portfolio is created throughout the school year with submission during the spring.

Participation of LEA in IEP Development or Review

When a student is receiving education and related services from a nonpublic special education school or program that is approved by OSSE and receives funding from the District of Columbia government, the LEA shall participate in the initial meeting to develop an individualized education plan (IEP). For any subsequent meeting to review or revise the IEP, the failure or inability of an LEA representative to attend the IEP meeting after the meeting has been set shall not prevent the meeting from taking place as planned.

At-Risk Students

Alternative Education Programs

The DC Board of Education shall provide to any student who is expelled from school an alternative education program at the DC Street Academy, at another existing alternative education program, or at any alternative education program that may be established in the future.

APPENDIX C: DATA SOURCES FOR COST ESTIMATION AREAS

Rich and robust data have been collected through the DC Education Adequacy Study. The professional judgment panels, successful schools study, and evidence-based approach have contributed to a comprehensive understanding of the strengths and challenges of the current weighted Uniform Per Student Funding Formula and its implementation in District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and public charter schools. The table presents some of the data collected.

	Professional Judgment Panels	Successful Schools Study	Evidence Base	Other Sources*
<i>Data</i>				
The teacher-student ratio needed to provide an adequate education for students <i>without</i> identified learning needs at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	X		X	
The teacher-student ratio needed to provide an adequate education for at-risk students at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	X		X	
The teacher-student ratio needed to provide an adequate education for students receiving special education services at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	X			X
The teacher-student ratio needed to provide an adequate education for English language learners at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	X		X	X
The level of academic support staff needed to provide an adequate education at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	X		X	

	Professional Judgment Panels	Successful Schools Study	Evidence Base	Other Sources*
The level of student support staff needed to provide an adequate education at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	X		X	X
The level of office and administrative staff needed to provide an adequate education at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	X		X	
The cost per student of providing an adequate level of textbooks, supplies, equipment, and assessments for students.	X		X	X
The cost per student of providing an adequate level of teacher professional development.	X		X	X
The cost per student of providing adequate safety and security services in schools.	X		X	
The cost per student of providing an adequate level of student activities.	X		X	X
The cost per student of providing additional programs to support learning (e.g., extended-day, extended-year, summer, before-school, after-school, and Saturday school programs).	X		X	X
The cost per student of providing adequate technology resources in schools.	X		X	X
The cost of providing central office and administrative services to students.	X		X	X
The cost of general support services at identified successful schools.		X		X
The cost of centralized support systems at identified successful schools.		X		X
The nonsalary costs of student services, student health services, operations, maintenance, technology, and community services at identified successful schools.		X		X

	Professional Judgment Panels	Successful Schools Study	Evidence Base	Other Sources*
The amount of additional revenues from discretionary grants, direct fundraising, philanthropic and corporate support, and direct cash donations at identified successful schools.		X		X
The fair-market price of resources provided to DCPS schools by other DC agencies (e.g., department of health, department of general services, department of behavioral health, office of the attorney general, office of the chief technology officer, metropolitan police department, and department of transportation).		X		X

APPENDIX D: FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS

Kamili Anderson
Ward 4 Representative
DC State Board of Education

S. Joseph Bruno
President
Building Hope

Robert Cane
Executive Director
FOCUS
[Friends of Choice in
Urban Schools]

David Catania
Councilmember and
Chairman
DC City Council Committee on Education

Kedarious Colbert
Intern
21st Century School Fund

Chan Tei Durant
Legislative Counsel
Office of DC Councilmember Marion Barry

Ramona Edelin
Executive Director
DC Association of Chartered Public Schools

Mary Filardo
Executive Director
21st Century School Fund

Elba Garcia
Director
Office of Bilingual Education
DC Public Schools

Christina Henderson
Legislative Director
Office of DC Councilmember David Grosso

Jordan Hutchinson
Senior Counsel
DC City Council Committee on Education
Office of Councilmember David Catania

Adrian Jordan
Budget and Research Analyst
Office of DC Councilmember Kenyan McDuffie

Karl Jentoft
Vice President of Corporate Development
Charter School Development Corporation

Joshua Kern
Owner
The Ten Square Group

Brendan Williams-Kief
Committee Director
DC City Council Committee on Education
Office of Councilmember David Catania

Kevin Lang
Policy Analyst
DC City Council Committee on Education
Office of Councilmember David Catania

Mary Lord
At Large
DC State Board of Education

Skip McCoy
Programmatic Initiatives
Fight For Children
Chair, DC Public Charter School Board

Matt Orlins
Senior Legislative Counsel
Office of Councilmember Mary M. Cheh

Scott Pearson
Executive Director
DC Public Charter School Board

Ariana Quinones
Chief of Staff
Office of the DC Deputy Mayor for Health
and Human Services

Cathy Reilly
Director
Senior High Alliance of Parents,
Principals and Educators

Christina Setlow
Legislative Counsel
Office of DC Councilmember Phil Mendelson

Laura Slover
President, Ward 3 Representative
DC State Board of Education

Maria Tukeva
Principal
Columbia Heights Educational Campus

Erika Wadlington
Deputy Committee Director
DC City Council Committee on Education
Office of Councilmember David Catania

Karen Williams
Ward 7 Representative
DC State Board of Education

Trayon White
Ward 8 Representative
DC State Board of Education

APPENDIX E: INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWEES

Nathaniel Beers
Chief, Special Education
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Marc Bleyer
Capital Program Manager
Office of the DC Deputy Mayor for
Education

Matthew Brown
DC Department of Transportation

Diana Bruce
Director of Health and Wellness
Office of Youth Engagement
DC Public Schools

Sanya Cade
Chief of Staff and Budget Manager
DC Office of Contracting and Procurement

Tarifah Coaxum
Chief Administrative Officer
DC Office of the Attorney General

Justin Constantino
Budget Counsel
DC Mayor's Office of Budget and Finance

Art Fields
Director/Manager
Office of Special Education
Monitoring and Compliance Team
DC Public Schools

Allen Francois
DC Public Schools

Elba Garcia
Director
Office of Bilingual Education
DC Public Schools

Brenton Higgins
Strategy Analyst
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Charles Jackson
Deputy Chief of Operations
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

James Jackson
Facilities Services Officer
Department of General Services

Katherine Jefferson
DC Department of Transportation

Mosmi Kaothari
DC Department of Health

Mary Levy
Independent Analyst

John McGaw
Director of Capital Improvements Program
DC Mayor's Office of Budget and Finance

Marie Morilus-Black
Director, Children and Youth Services
Division
DC Department of Behavioral Health

Rebecca Newman
Director, Business Operations
Office of the Deputy Chancellor
DC Public Schools

Kelley O'Meara
Executive Director, Strategic Change
DC Metropolitan Police Department

Victoria Syphax
Agency Fiscal Officer
DC Office of the Attorney General

Peter Olle
DC Office of the Chief Technology Officer

Deena Thweatt
DC Department of Transportation

Barbara Parks
DC Department of Behavioral Health

Yesim Yilmaz
Director of Fiscal and Legislative Analysis
Office of the Chief Financial Officer
DC Public Schools

John Peterson
DC Public Schools

Saj Popat
Director of Operations for Community
Health Administration
DC Department of Health

Aaron Rhones
DC Department of Transportation

Christopher Rinkus
Manager, Critical Response Team
Office of Chief of Staff
DC Public Schools

Barbara Roberson
DC Department of Health

Chelsea Rock
Director of Technology
Office of the Chief Operating Officer
DC Public Schools

Donald Sink
Director and Manager of Budget Operations
Office of the Chief Financial Officer
DC Public Schools

Olivia Smith
Founder and Principal/Director
Bridges Public Charter School

APPENDIX F: GUIDANCE TO PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT PANELS

Over the next day or two, you will participate in a *professional judgment panel* to collaboratively identify the resources needed so all students and schools—public and public charter—can meet all District of Columbia academic standards. The questions and instructions below will help guide you in this process. It is important to remember that you are not being asked to build your dream school. Rather, you are being asked to use your professional experience, expertise, and judgment to identify the resources needed to meet the specific standards and requirements the District expects students and schools to meet. You should allocate resources as efficiently as possible without sacrificing quality.

Guiding Questions:

School-Level Panels

There will be two school-level panels addressing the resource needs of public schools and public charter schools serving students at different grade levels. The following guiding questions will frame this process:

1. *What resources are needed to provide effective and comprehensive educational programs and services at each level?*
2. *What resources are needed to provide effective instructional and strategic leadership at each level?*
3. *What resources are needed to provide effective support and professional development for teachers and other program staff at each level?*
4. *What materials, textbooks, supplies, technology, and equipment resources are needed at each level?*
5. *What are other critical resource needs not encompassed in the prior categories?*

Instructions:

1. You are a member of a panel that is being asked to design how programs and services will be delivered in a representative school at a specific grade level (elementary school, middle school, or high school) specifically to serve students with special needs (at-risk, English language learners, and special education). You and other panel members will identify the resources that schools in your assigned grade level should have in order to meet current DC academic standards. Facilitators will ask framing questions to guide this process.
2. All panels will be focusing on the resources needed at the school level to meet the requirements set forth for schools and students in the District of Columbia. The schools being built are neither

strictly traditional public schools nor charter schools; instead, they are schools that represent the elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools in the District regardless of type.

3. The “input” requirements and “outcome” objectives that need to be accomplished by the representative school(s) are those required by the District of Columbia; a summary of these requirements is provided as a separate document. These requirements or objectives can be described broadly as education opportunities, programs, and services or as levels of education performance.
4. In designing the representative school(s), we need you to provide some very specific information so we can calculate the cost of the resources that are needed to fulfill the indicated requirements or objectives. The fact that we need this information should not constrain you in any way in designing the program of the representative school(s). Your job is to create programs, curriculums, or services designed to serve students with particular needs in such a way that the indicated requirements or objectives can be fulfilled. Use your experience and expertise to organize personnel, supplies and materials, and technology in an efficient way you feel confident will produce the desired outcomes.
5. For this process, the following statements are true about the representative school(s) and the conditions in which they exist:

Teachers: You should assume you can attract and retain qualified personnel and can employ people on a part-time basis, if needed (based on tenths of a full-time equivalent person).

Facilities: For the purposes of this specific panel, you should assume the representative school has sufficient space and the technology infrastructure to meet the requirements of the program you design. We understand that many schools face facilities constraints, and we are convening a separate facilities panel to address these issues.

Revenues: You should not be concerned about where revenues will come from to pay for the program you design. Do not worry about requirements that may be associated with certain types of funding. You should not think about what revenues might be available in the school in which you now work or about any constraints on those revenues.

Programs: You may create new programs or services that do not presently exist but you believe would address the challenges that arise in schools. You should assume that such programs or services are in place and that no additional time is needed for them to produce the results you expect of them. For example, if you create after-school programs or preschool programs to serve some students, you should assume that such programs will achieve their intended results, possibly reducing the need for other programs or services that might otherwise have been needed.

APPENDIX G: PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT PANEL MEMBERS

School-Level Panel (Elementary School)

Kathy Hollowell-Makle
Teacher
Simon Elementary School

Caroline John
Teacher
Stanton Elementary School

Alexandra Legutko
Teacher
DC Prep Egglewood Campus
Public Charter School

Lynn Main
Principal
Lafayette Elementary School

Linda Moore
Founder and Executive Director
Elsie Whitlow Stokes Community
Freedom
Public Charter School

Charisse Robinson
Teacher
Cleveland Elementary School

School-Level Panel (Middle School)

Elle (Noelle) Carne
Operations Manager
Capital City
Public Charter School

Widelene Desarmes
Assistant Principal
Jefferson Academy
Public Charter School

Mary Weston
Principal
John Burroughs Education Campus

School-Level Panel (High School)

Matt Fiteny
Dean of Academics/ Director of
Instruction
See Forever/ Maya Angelou Young
Adult Learning Center
Public Charter School

David Pinder
Principal
McKinley Technology High School

Megan Reamer
Director of Data and Accountability
Capital City
Public Charter School

Syritha Robinson
Teacher
Friendship Collegiate Academy
Public Charter School

Kerry Sylvia
Teacher
School Without Walls

David Tansey
Teacher
Dunbar Senior High School

Brian Wiltshire
Teacher
Roosevelt Senior High School

Special Education Panel (Elementary School)

Thomas Flanagan
Interim Deputy Chief of Programming
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Erick Greene
Instructional Superintendent
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Douglas Gotel
Clinical Specialist
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Timothy Leonard
Teacher
Shepherd Elementary School

Marni Mintener Barron
Instructional Coach
Hearst Elementary School

Crystal Sylvia
Clinical Social Worker
C. Melvin Sharpe Health School

Dawn Thurman
Clinical Specialist
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Special Education (Middle School and High School)

Katrice Ashton
Clinical Specialist
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Julie Camerata
Executive Director
DC Special Education Cooperative

Amber Church
Special Education Coordinator
Next Step/ El Proximo Pas
Public Charter School

Julie Meyer
Executive Director
Next Step/El Proximo Pas
Public Charter School

Richard Trogisch
Principal
School Without Walls

Rachel Bradley Williams
Clinical Specialist
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Special Needs Panel (Alternative and Adult Education)

Arthur Dade
Executive Director
YouthBuild
Public Charter School

Terry DeCarbo
Instructional Superintendent
DCPS Alternative Schools

Matt Fiteny
Dean of Academics/ Director of
Instruction
See Forver/ Maya Angelou Young Adult
Learning Center
Public Charter School

Allison R. Kokkoros
Chief Academic Officer
Carlos Rosario International
Public Charter School

Candy Hernandez
Chief Operating Officer
Carlos Rosario International
Public Charter School

Azalia Hunt-Speight
Principal
Luke C. Moore Senior High School

Carlos Perkins
Principal
Washington Metropolitan High School

Christine McKay
Education Director/Charter School
Executive Director
Mary's Center for Maternal and Child
Care Inc./Education Strengthens
Families
Public Charter School

Julie Meyer
Executive Director
Next Step/El Proximo Pas
Public Charter School

Irasema Salcido
Founder and Chief Executive Officer
Cesar Chavez
Public Charter School

Nakita West
Teacher/ Department Chair
See Forever/Maya Angelou Young
Adult Learning Center
Public Charter School

Special Education Panel (Levels 1–4)

Sofie Alavi
Teacher/Local Educational Agency
Representative
Brent Elementary School

Keesha Blythe
Director of Student Support Services
Bridges Public Charter School

Julie Camarata
Executive Director
The DC Special Education Cooperative

Brenton Higgins
Strategy Analyst
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Charles Jackson
Deputy Chief of Operations
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Amy Maisterra
Assistant Superintendent, Specialized
Education
DC Office of the State Superintendent of
Education

Faith Leach
Federal Grants Coordinator
DC Office of the State Superintendent of
Education

Allie Thompson
Special Education Coordinator/Local
Educational Agency Representative
DC Public Schools

Molly Whalen
Director of Development and
Communications
Ivymount School

Facilities Panel

Kamili Anderson
Ward 4 Representative
DC State Board of Education

Renard Alexander
Director of Facilities Planning Division
Office of the Chief Operating Officer
DC Public Schools

Martha Cutts
Head of School
Washington Latin
Public Charter School

Clara Hess
Director, Human Capital and Strategic
Initiatives
Public Charter School Board

Geovanna Izurieta
Director of Finance
Washington Latin
Public Charter School

Will Mangrum
Senior Vice President
Brailsford & Dunlavey, Inc./
DC Department of General Services

Christine McKay
Education Director/Charter School
Executive Director
Mary's Center for Maternal and Child
Care Inc./Education Strengthens
Families
Public Charter School

Wendy Scott
Chief Operating Officer
DC Preparatory
Public Charter School

Rikki Taylor
Principal
Takoma Education Campus

System Panel (DCPS)

Jeannie Boehlmer
Chief of Staff to the Chief Academic
Officer
Office of the Chief Academic Officer
DC Public Schools

Anthony DeGuzman
Chief Operating Officer
DC Public Schools

Tom Flanagan
Deputy Chief, Programming
Office of Special Education
DC Public Schools

Anna Gregory
Chief of Staff to the Chief for Human
Capital
Office of Human Capital
DC Public Schools

Dan Gordon
Deputy Chief for Academic Programs
Office of the Chief Academic Officer
DC Public Schools

Lolli Haws
Instructional Superintendent
Cluster 7
DC Public Schools

Mark King
Instructional Superintendent
Cluster 8
DC Public Schools

Nadja Michel-Herf
Manager, Resource Allocation
Office of Data and Strategy
DC Public Schools

Lisa Ruda
Deputy Chancellor for Operations
DC Public Schools

Dan Shea
Instructional Superintendent
Cluster 9
DC Public Schools

Peter Weber
Chief of Strategy
DC Public Schools

System Panel (Charter Schools)

Erika Bryant
Managing Director
Elsie Whitlow Stokes Community
Freedom
Public Charter School

Frank Bonanno
Regional Financial Director
Imagine
Public Charter School

Wesley Harvey
Director of Operations and Financial
Services
Community Academy
Public Charter School

Lin Johnson
Financial Analyst
Public Charter School Board

Alonso Montalvo
Financial Manager
Public Charter School Board

Bradley Olander
Partner
Goldstar

Bryan Patten
Co-Founder and Chief Executive Officer
EdOps

Jeremy Williams
Chief Financial Officer
Public Charter School Board

APPENDIX H: SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS SELECTION CRITERIA

The District of Columbia’s Public Charter School Board measures schools in the following four categories:

- *Student progress over time*: Measures growth over time of student scores on the Reading and Math DC Comprehensive Assessment System (DC CAS) tests, the District’s Elementary and Secondary Education Act tests.
- *Student achievement*: Measured by student scores on Reading and Math DC CAS tests as well as, in high schools, achievement on Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) tests.
- *Gateway Measures*: The Gateway Measure in elementary schools and middle schools is the percent of students scoring “proficient” or “advanced” in grade 3 Reading and Math DC CAS tests. In high school, the Gateway Measure includes the school’s graduation rate, Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) performance in 11th grade, Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) performance in 12th grade, and its college acceptance rate.
- *Leading Indicators*: Elementary school and middle school Leading Indicators are a measure of attendance and re-enrollment rates. High school Leading Indicators are a measure of attendance and re-enrollment rates as well as the number of 9th graders with credits on track to graduate.¹

District of Columbia Public Schools

In partnership with the chief of schools, the office of the deputy mayor for education identified successful DC public schools based on a combination of factors, including:

- Student achievement;
- Leadership; and
- Overall school climate.

¹ District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, “Frequently Asked Questions: Performance Management Framework,” www.dcpubliccharter.com.

APPENDIX I: SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS SAMPLE PROFILE INFORMATION SUMMARY

School	DCPS/Public Charter Schools	Ward	Grade Span	Enrollment	Percentage Qualifying for Subsidized School Meals	Percentage of English Language Learners	Percentage of Special Education Students	Classification ¹	Title 1
Achievement Preparatory Academy PCS	Charter	8	4–8	202	88.0%	0.0%	10.2%	Tier 1	Yes
Anne Beers Elementary School	DCPS	7	Pre-K3–5	386	P2 ²	1.0%	22.0%	Reward	Yes
Benjamin Banneker Academic High School	DCPS	1	9–12	413	61.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Reward	Yes
Brent Elementary School	DCPS	6	Pre-K3–5	347	21.0%	2.0%	12.0%	Rising	No
Capital City PCS—Lower School	Charter	4	Pre-K4–8	243	48.1%	27.0%	13.9%	Tier 1	Yes
Center City PCS—Brightwood	Charter	4	Pre-K4–8	231	95.2%	11.3%	3.0%	Tier 1	Yes
Center City PCS—Petworth	Charter	4	Pre-K4–8	232	78.8%	32.3%	13.3%	Tier 1	Yes
Cezar Chavez PCS for Public Policy—Chavez Prep	Charter	1	6–9	320	65.0%	2.3%	15.0%	Tier 1	Yes
Columbia Heights Education Campus	DCPS	1	6–12	1,203	P2 ²	36.0%	9.0%	Rising	Yes
Community Academy PCS—Butler Global	Charter	2	Pre-K3–5	302	85.4%	27.0%	6.8%	Tier 1	Yes
DC Preparatory PCS—Edgewood Middle	Charter	5	4–8	280	81.5%	0.8%	16.9%	Tier 1	Yes
Deal Middle School	DCPS	3	6–8	1,014	24.0%	4.0%	10.0%	Reward	No
E.L. Haynes—Georgia Avenue	Charter	4	Pre-K3–5	394	58.7%	19.1%	18.0%	Tier 1	Yes
Eaton Elementary School	DCPS	3	Pre-K4–5	457	21.0%	12.0%	7.0%	Reward	No
Howard University Middle School of Math and Science	Charter	1	6–8	307	62.2%	3.0%	4.3%	Tier 1	Yes
Janney Elementary School	DCPS	3	Pre-K4–5	548	4.0%	5.0%	6.0%	Reward	No
Key Elementary School	DCPS	3	Pre-K4–5	386	11.0%	7.0%	7.0%	Reward	No
KIPP DC—AIM Academy PCS	Charter	8	5–8	309	87.4%	0.3%	18.1%	Tier 1	Yes
KIPP DC—College Preparatory PCS	Charter	8	9–11	294	85.4%	0.0%	17.0%	Tier 1	Yes
KIPP DC—KEY Academy PCS	Charter	7	5–8	404	80.2%	0.0%	13.4%	Tier 1	Yes
KIPP DC—WILL Academy PCS	Charter	6	5–8	313	87.2%	0.0%	16.0%	Tier 1	Yes
Lafayette Elementary School	DCPS	4	Pre-K4–5	707	8.0%	3.0%	7.0%	Reward	No

School	DCPS/ Charter School	Ward	Grade Span	Enrollment	Percentage Qualifying for Subsidized School Meals	Percenta ge of English Language Learners	Percentage of Special Education Students	Classification ¹	Title 1
Latin American Montessori Bilingual PCS	Charter	4	Pre-K3–5	263	31.7%	58.0%	13.0%	Tier 1	Yes
McKinley Technology High School	DCPS	5	9–12	670	52.0%	1.0%	2.0%	Reward	Yes
yster-Adams Bilingual Education Campus—Oyster Campus	DCPS	3	Pre-K3–3	335	23.0%	16.0%	10.0%	Reward	No
Oyster-Adams Bilingual Education Campus—Adams Campus	DCPS	3	4–8	321	23.0%	16.0%	12.0%	Reward	No
Plummer Elementary School	DCPS	7	Pre-K3–5	220	99.0%	5.0%	15.0%	Reward	Yes
SEED Public Charter School—High School	Charter	7	6–12	340 ³	75.0%	0.0%	11.6%	Tier 1	Yes
SEED Public Charter School—Middle School	Charter	7	5–8	340 ³	75.0%	0.0%	11.6%	Tier 1	Yes
Shepherd Elementary School	DCPS	4	Pre-K4–5	331	30.0%	8.0%	8.0%	Rising	No
Thomas Elementary School	DCPS	7	Pre-K3–5	235	P2 ²	0.0%	21.0%	Reward	Yes
Thurgood Marshall Academy PCS	Charter	8	9–12	390	76.7%	0.0%	6.9%	Tier 1	Yes
Tubman Elementary School	DCPS	1	Pre-K3–5	489	P2 ²	35.0%	13.0%	Rising	Yes
Two Rivers PCS	Charter	6	Pre-K3–8	451	30.0%	3.3%	18.3%	Tier 1	No
Washington Latin PCS—Middle School	Charter	4	5–8	349	24.1%	2.1%	6.6%	Tier 1	No
Washington Latin PCS—Upper School	Charter	4	9–12	225	44.0%	2.0%	6.0%	Tier 1	No
Washington Yu Ying PCS	Charter	5	Pre-K4–5	439	20.0%	8.0%	9.0%	Tier 1	No

Notes:

¹ Under the accountability system for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, schools are classified in one of five categories that summarize the performance of their students on the DC Comprehensive Assessment System.

² P2 means all students within the school can access free and reduced-price school meals.

³ Enrollment data reflect all children in both schools.

APPENDIX J: SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS BUDGET TEMPLATE

Instructions for Cost and Income Collection Tool

Please include documentation for all information provided.

GENERAL INFORMATION PAGE

All Student Counts should be for the school year for which expenditure data will be provided.

- In cell B6, please enter the grade span for the school.
- In cell B9, please enter the total number of students in grades 1 through 5.
- In cell B10, please enter the total number of students in grades 6 through 8.
- In cell B11, please enter the total number of students in grades 9 through 12.
- In cell B12, please enter the total number of students in adult-only programs.
- In cell B13, please enter the total number of half-time kindergarten students, if any.
- In cell B14, please enter the total number of full-time kindergarten students, if any.
- In cell B15, please enter the total number of preschool students, if any.
- In cell B17, please enter the average years of experience of teachers in the identified school.
- In cell B19, please enter the percent of teachers in the identified school who hold an advanced professional certificate or higher. This includes those with master's degrees.

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY ADMINISTRATION PAGE

We ask that this page be completed by DCPS or the charter management organization that provides services to the school. If you have more than one school and have already provided this information, you may skip this section.

We are looking for the full LEA cost for each area.

- In cell B6, please enter the total amount expended for Salaries and Wages for General Support Services.
- In cell C6, please enter the total amount expended for Benefits for General Support.

- In cell D6, please enter the total amount expended for General Support Services, including the amount spent for Salaries and Wages and Benefits.

Second, we want to look at the expenditures for **Business Support Services**.

- In cell B11, please enter the total amount expended for Salaries and Wages for Business Support Services.
- In cell C11, please enter the total amount expended for Benefits for Business Support.
- In cell D11, please enter the amount expended for Business Support Services, including the amount spent for Salaries and Wages and Benefits.

Next we want to look at the expenditures for **Centralized Support Services**.

- In cell B16, please enter the total amount expended for Salaries and Wages for Centralized Support Services.
- In cell C16, please enter the total amount expended for Benefits for Centralized Support Services, including the amount spent for Salaries and Wages.
- In cell D16, please enter the amount expended for Centralized Support Services, including the amount spent for Salaries and Wages and Benefits.

Finally, we want to look at the costs associated with **Instructional Administration and Supervision**.

- In cells B21, C21, D21, E21, and F21, please enter the total number of people working in each designated area under Instructional Administration and Supervision.
- In cells B22, C22, D22, E22, and F22, please enter the LEA's total expenditure for salaries for each personnel category for Instructional Administration and Supervision. This figure should not include any expenditure for benefits.
- In cells B23, C23, D23, E23, and F23, please enter the LEA's total expenditure for benefits for each personnel category for Instructional Administration and Supervision. This figure comes from Fixed Charges and should not include teacher retirement.
- In cells B24, C24, D24, E24, and F24, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively with limited-English-proficient (LEP) students or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to LEP students.
- In cells B25, C25, D25, E25, and F25, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively with at-risk students or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to at-risk students.

- In cells B26, C26, D26, E26, and F26, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively with special education students or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to special education students.
- In cells B27, C27, D27, E27, and F27, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively on adult-only programs or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time with adult-only programs.
- In cell B30, please enter the total amount spent for Supplies and Materials for Instructional Administration and Supervision.
- In cell C30, please enter the total amount spent for Other Costs for Instructional Administration and Supervision.
- In cell D30, please enter the total amount spent on Equipment for Instructional Administration and Supervision.
- In cell E30, please enter the total amount spent for Contractual Services for Instructional Administration and Supervision.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION PAGE

We will only be looking at the **Office of the Principal/Executive** for this section.

- In cells B7, C7, D7, E7, F7, and G7, please enter the total number of people working in each designated area under Office of the Principal/Executive.
- In cells B8, C8, D8, E8, F8, and G8, please enter please enter the school's total expenditure for salaries for each personnel category for Office of the Principal/Executive. This figure should not include any expenditure for benefits.
- In cells B9, C9, D9, E9, F9, and G9, please enter the school's total expenditure for benefits for each personnel category for Office of the Principal/Executive.
- In cells B10, C10, D10, E10, F10, and G10, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively with limited-English-proficient students (LEP) or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Office of the Principal/Executive. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to LEP students.
- In cells B11, C11, D11, E11, F11, and G11, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively with at-risk students or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Office of the Principal/Executive. For example, if reporting partial

time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to at-risk students.

- In cells B12, C12, D12, E12, F12, and G12, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively with special education students or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to special education students.
- In cells B13, C13, D13, E13, and F13, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively on adult-only programs or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time with adult-only programs.
- In cell B18, please enter the total amount spent for Supplies and Materials for Office of the Principal/Executive.
- In cell C18, please enter the total amount spent for Other Costs for Office of the Principal/Executive.
- In cell D18, please enter the total amount spent for Equipment for Office of the Principal/Executive.
- In cell E18, please enter the total amount spent for Contractual Services for Office of the Principal/Executive.

SCHOOL INSTRUCTION PAGE

We do not want to double-count any funds; please make sure these costs are unique to this section.

We will first look at **Instructional Salaries**. We want to build this cost by personnel type so we can exclude those who work identifiable amounts of time with limited-English-proficient, at-risk, special education, or adult students.

- In cells B5, C5, D5, E5, F5, G5, H5, and I5, please enter the total number of people working in each designated area under Instructional Salaries.
- In cells B6, C6, D6, E6, F6, G6, H6, and I6, please enter the school's total expenditure for salaries for each personnel category for Instructional Salaries. This figure should not include any expenditure for benefits.
- In cells B7, C7, D7, E7, F7, G7, H7, and I7, please enter the school's total expenditure for benefits for each personnel category for Instructional Salaries.
- In cells B8, C8, D8, E8, F8, G8, H8, and I8, please enter the number of people in the school in each designated area that work exclusively with limited-English-proficient (LEP) students or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Salaries. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to LEP students.

- In cells B9, C9, D9, E9, F9, G9, H9, and I9, please enter the number of people in the school in each designated area that work exclusively with at-risk students or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Salaries. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to at-risk students.
- In cells B10, C10, D10, E10, F10, G10, H10, and I10, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively with special education students or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time providing services to special education students.
- In cells B11, C11, D11, E11, F11, G11, H11, and I11, please enter the number of people in each designated area that work exclusively on adult-only programs or administration or the part of time spent exclusively in this area under Instructional Administration and Supervision. For example, if reporting partial time for a person, enter .4 for someone who spends 40 percent of his or her time with adult-only programs.
- In cell B15, please enter the school's total expenditure for stipends to employees working extracurricular activities for Instructional Salaries.
- In cell C15, please enter the school's total expenditure for substitutes for Instructional Salaries.

Next we want to get the costs associated with **Instructional Textbooks and Supplies**.

- In cell B21, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure for Instructional Textbooks and Supplies in cell B23.

Finally, we want to collect all **Other Instructional Costs**.

- In cell B27, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure for Other Instructional Costs in cell B29.

OTHER COSTS PAGE

In this section, we want to capture **all other operating costs** of the Local Educational Agency/Charter Management Organization/School, excluding food service, transportation, and special education.

- In cell B5, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school for Student Personnel Services, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure in cell B7.
- In cell C5, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school for Student Health Services, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure for Category 208 in cell C7.
- In cell D5, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school for Operation of Plant, Category 210, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure in cell D7.
- In cell E5, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school for Maintenance of Plant, Category 211, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure in cell E7.

- In cell F5, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school for Technology, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure in cell F7.
- In cell G5, please enter the amount attributable to the specific school for Community, if identifiable. If not, please enter the LEA's total expenditure in cell G7.

OTHER REVENUES PAGE

In this section, we want to capture any revenues the school receives from outside sources, including for four categories of revenue: federal discretionary grants, parent teacher student organization /school-level direct fundraising, philanthropic and corporate support, or direct donations and other cash support. We are interested in detailed information within each of the four categories if more than one source of revenue is available in the category. Five lines will be provided for each category. Please list the largest revenue source for the category in the first line for each category. If you have more than five sources for a category, please enter the highest four revenue sources first and then the total of the remaining sources in the fifth line.

Federal Discretionary Grants

- In cell B4, please enter the total revenue from the school's highest source of federal discretionary funding, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C4.
- In cell B5, please enter the total revenue from the school's second highest source of federal discretionary funding, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C5.
- In cell B6, please enter the total revenue from the school's third highest source of federal discretionary funding, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C6.
- In cell B7, please enter the total revenue from the school's fourth highest source of federal discretionary funding, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C7.
- In cell B8, please enter the total revenue from the school's fifth highest source of federal discretionary funding, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C8. If the school has more than five sources of funding in this area, please enter the total remaining funds from this source in cell B8 and note that it is the total of multiple sources in cell C8.

Parent Teacher Student Organization/School-Level Direct Fundraising

- In cell B11, please enter the total revenue from the school's highest source of PTSO/school-level direct fundraising revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C11.
- In cell B12, please enter the total revenue from the school's second highest source of PTSO/school-level direct fundraising revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C12.

- In cell B13, please enter the total revenue from the school's third highest source of PTSO/school-level direct fundraising revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C13.
- In cell B14, please enter the total revenue from the school's fourth highest source of PTSO/school-level direct fundraising revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C14.
- In cell B15, please enter the total revenue from the school's fifth highest source of PTSO/school-level direct fundraising revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C15. If the school has more than five sources of funding in this area, please enter the total remaining funds from this source in cell B15 and note that it is the total of multiple sources in cell C15.

Philanthropic and Corporate Support

- In cell B18, please enter the total revenue from the school's highest source of philanthropic and corporate support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C18.
- In cell B19, please enter the total revenue from the school's second highest source of philanthropic and corporate support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C19.
- In cell B20, please enter the total revenue from the school's third highest source of philanthropic and corporate support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C20.
- In cell B21, please enter the total revenue from the school's fourth highest source of philanthropic and corporate support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C21.
- In cell B22, please enter the total revenue from the school's fifth highest source of philanthropic and corporate support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C22. If the school has more than five sources of funding in this area, please enter the total remaining funds from this source in cell B22 and note that it is the total of multiple sources in cell C22.

Direct Cash Donations and Other Cash Support

- In cell B25, please enter the total revenue from the school's highest source of direct cash donations and other cash support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C25.
- In cell B26, please enter the total revenue from the school's second highest source of direct cash donations and other cash support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C26.

- In cell B27, please enter the total revenue from the school's third highest source of direct cash donations and other cash support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C27.
- In cell B28, please enter the total revenue from the school's fourth highest source of direct cash donations and other cash support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C28.
- In cell B29, please enter the total revenue from the school's fifth highest source of direct cash donations and other cash support revenue, if applicable. Please provide a description of this funding source in cell C29. If the school has more than five sources of funding in this area, please enter the total remaining funds from this source in cell B29 and note that it is the total of multiple sources in cell C29.



APPENDIX K: FUNCTIONS AND SERVICES PROVIDED TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Agency or Office	Function/Services
DCPS Central Office	
Office of Family and Public Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family and community engagement Parent resource center Office of communications and public information
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting Budget operations Chief financial officer operations
Office of Data and Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accountability, testing, research, and evaluation Educational assessment and accountability Student data systems
Office of the General Counsel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk management Legal Settlements and judgments
Office of Youth Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health services School social and psychological services Student attendance Student hearings Student support services Transitional services Transportation Youth engagement
Office of Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of federal programs and grants Private school support School transformation
Office of the Chief of Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School performance/restructuring Athletics
Office of Teaching and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum development and implementation Library media School leadership Professional development
Office of the Chief of Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk management Security School operations support Performance management
Office of Human Capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human capital leadership, labor management, and partnerships Teacher personnel Principal personnel Central office personnel Master educators Teacher Incentive Fund

Agency or Office	Function/Services
Office of Academic Programming and Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ After-school programs ▪ Career and technical education ▪ Vocational education ▪ College and career readiness: co-curricular and extra-curricular ▪ Home instruction program ▪ Early childhood education ▪ Head Start ▪ Evening credit recovery ▪ English language learners/bilingual education ▪ Summer school programs
Office of Special Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Special education instruction ▪ Early stages ▪ Extended school year ▪ Inclusive academic programs ▪ Special education capacity-building ▪ Related services ▪ Resolution, monitoring, and compliance ▪ School support (dedicated aides) ▪ Financial management ▪ Information management ▪ Operations
Office of the Chief Operating Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Food service ▪ Instructional technology ▪ Logistics (mail, printing, and duplicating) ▪ Contracting and procurement ▪ Textbook program ▪ Realty
City Agencies	
Department of Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nurses
Department of Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crossing guards
Department of Behavioral Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social workers
Metropolitan Police Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School resource officers
Office of the Attorney General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff time and attorneys
Office of Contracting and Procurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training and support
Office of the Chief Technology Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Citywide messaging ▪ Procurement Automated Support System ▪ PeopleSoft ▪ Data warehouse ▪ Geographic Information System
Department of General Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School construction and renovation ▪ School maintenance and repairs



APPENDIX L: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS SYSTEM COSTS FOR BASE AND IDENTIFIED NEEDS WEIGHTS¹

Agency or Office	DCPS System Costs—Base	DCPS System Costs—At Risk	DCPS System Costs—English Language Learners	DCPS System Costs—Special Education
DCPS Resources	Total	Total	Total	Total
Office of Family and Public Engagement	\$1,965,025	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of the Chief Financial Officer—In Budget	\$3,279,655	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of Data and Accountability	\$4,766,130	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of the General Counsel—In Budget	\$5,700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of Youth Engagement	\$0	\$8,078,332	\$0	\$0
Office of Strategy	\$0	\$4,921,104	\$0	\$0
Office of the Chief of Schools	\$3,369,752	\$1,358,818	\$0	\$0
Office of Teaching and Learning	\$11,367,097	\$1,373,870	\$0	\$0
Office of the Chief of Staff	\$5,182,895	\$1,145,583	\$0	\$0
Office of Human Capital	\$15,187,838	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of Academic Programming and Support	\$6,848,293	\$0	\$1,120,170	\$0
Office of Special Education ²	\$725,913	\$0	\$0	\$39,811,751
Office of the Chief Operating Officer	\$21,301,898	\$0	\$0	\$0
Food Service Administrative Costs	\$6,817,892	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal	\$86,512,388	\$16,877,707	\$1,120,170	\$39,811,751
Resources from Outside Agencies (to be included in the base cost)	Total			
Office of the Attorney General	\$2,442,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of Procurement	\$2,280	\$0	\$0	\$0
Office of the Chief Technology Officer	\$1,914,110	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal	\$4,358,390	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Judgment Panel-Specified System Base Cost	\$90,870,777	\$16,877,707	\$1,120,170	\$39,811,751

Notes:

1 All system cost figures are system-level resources above those identified at the school level, so they may be lower than total budget amounts for these offices.

2 Extended-school year costs were maintained separately from special education system-level costs.

Sources: District of Columbia Public Schools, "Facts and Figures: A Look into the FY 14 DCPS Budget," www.dcps.dc.gov; Office of the Chief Financial Officer, "Budget: Fiscal Year 2013," www.cfo.dc.gov (accessed May 2013); and interviews with DC government agency staff.

APPENDIX M: FUNCTIONS AND SERVICES PROVIDED TO PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS

Agency or Office	Function and Services
Public Charter School Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application review process ▪ Oversight and support ▪ Active engagement of stakeholders ▪ Evaluation of schools ▪ School accountability
Department of health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nurses
Department of transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crossing guards
Department of behavioral health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social workers
Metropolitan police department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School resource officers

Appendix N: Projected Costs for School Year 2013–2017 with Proposed Changes to the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula

Projected Costs for SY 2013–2014 with Proposed Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter School Student Count	Charter School Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$11,628
Operating Costs					
General education	46,059	\$562,554,467	37,410	\$461,058,394	\$1,023,612,861
Special education	7,300	\$125,370,494	4,762	\$76,115,973	\$201,486,467
Special Education Compliance Fund	6,921	\$10,305,369	4,762	\$7,091,127	\$17,396,496
English language learners	4,605	\$29,656,200	2,805	\$18,064,200	\$47,720,400
Extended school year	1,117	\$3,882,624	1,535	\$4,280,035	\$8,162,659
At risk	16,443	\$64,226,604	9,465	\$36,969,235	\$101,195,839
Total UPSFF Nonresidential		\$795,995,758		\$603,578,964	\$1,399,574,722
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,552,993	\$6,552,993
Total UPSFF Instructional Operating Allocation		\$795,995,758		\$610,131,957	\$1,406,127,715

Projected Costs for SY 2014–2015 with Proposed Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter School Student Count	Charter School Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$11,860
Operating Costs					
General education	46,650	\$581,385,030	39,268	\$497,426,442	\$1,078,811,471
Special education	7,373	\$129,155,708	4,999	\$81,498,324	\$210,654,032
Special Education Compliance Fund	6,990	\$10,610,820	4,999	\$7,588,482	\$18,199,302
English language learners	4,651	\$30,552,419	2,889	\$18,977,841	\$49,530,260
Extended school year	1,117	\$3,960,403	1,535	\$4,365,442	\$8,325,845
At risk	16,654	\$66,349,166	9,935	\$39,580,751	\$105,929,917
Total UPSFF Nonresidential				\$649,437,281	\$1,471,450,827
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,683,913	\$6,683,913
Total UPSFF Instructional Operating Allocation		\$822,013,546		\$656,121,194	\$1,478,134,740

Projected Costs for SY 2015–2016 with Proposed Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter School Student Count	Charter School Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$12,098
Operating Costs					
General education	47,115	\$598,941,962	41,220	\$532,580,741	\$1,131,522,703
Special education	7,447	\$133,047,981	5,250	\$87,300,552	\$220,348,533
Special Education Compliance Fund	7,060	\$10,935,940	5,250	\$8,132,250	\$19,068,190
English language learners	4,698	\$31,476,600	2,976	\$19,939,200	\$51,415,800
Extended school year	1,117	\$4,039,591	1,535	\$4,453,045	\$8,492,636
At risk	16,820	\$68,356,704	10,429	\$42,381,829	\$110,738,533
Total UPSFF Nonresidential		\$846,798,778		\$694,787,617	\$1,541,586,395
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,817,323	\$6,817,323
Total UPSFF Instructional Operating Allocation		\$846,798,778		\$701,604,940	\$1,548,403,718

Projected Costs for SY 2016–2017 with Proposed Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter Student Count	Charter Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$12,340
Operating Costs					
General education	47,594	\$617,110,142	43,268	\$570,181,141	\$1,187,291,283
Special education	7,521	\$137,074,943	5,513	\$93,503,495	\$230,578,438
Special Education Compliance Fund	7,130	\$11,265,400	5,513	\$8,710,540	\$19,975,940
English language learners	4,745	\$32,427,330	3,065	\$20,946,888	\$53,374,218
Extended school year	1,117	\$4,120,021	1,535	\$4,541,547	\$8,661,568
At risk	16,991	\$70,427,935	10,947	\$45,374,108	\$115,802,043
Total UPSFF Nonresidential		\$872,425,772		\$743,257,719	\$1,615,683,491
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,953,979	\$6,953,979
Total UPSFF Instructional Operating Allocation		\$872,425,772		\$750,211,698	\$1,622,637,470

Appendix O: Projected Costs for School Year 2013–2017 with No Changes to the Uniform Per Student Funding Formula

Projected Costs for SY 2013–2014 with No Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter School Student Count	Charter School Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$9,306
Operating Costs					
General education	46,060	\$473,172,358	37,410	\$381,736,178	\$854,908,536
Special education	7,300	\$123,520,694	4,762	\$75,011,806	\$198,532,500
Special Education Compliance Fund	6,921	\$10,305,369	4,762	\$7,091,127	\$17,396,496
English language learners	4,605	\$19,285,740	2,805	\$11,746,976	\$31,032,716
Summer school	10,867	\$17,191,594	11,541	\$18,258,244	\$35,449,838
Extended school year	1,117	\$3,882,624	1,535	\$4,280,035	\$8,162,659
Total UPSFF Nonresidential		\$647,358,379		\$498,124,366	\$1,145,482,745
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,552,993	\$6,552,993
Total UPSFF Funding		\$647,358,379		\$504,677,359	\$1,152,035,738

Projected Costs for SY 2014–2015 with No Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter School Student Count	Charter School Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$9,492
Operating Costs					
General education	46,650	\$490,195,496	39,268	\$408,940,502	\$899,135,998
Special education	7,373	\$127,254,541	4,999	\$80,310,046	\$207,564,587
Special Education Compliance Fund	6,990	\$10,610,820	4,999	\$7,588,482	\$18,199,302
English language learners	4,651	\$19,864,421	2,899	\$12,381,629	\$32,246,050
Summer school	11,006	\$17,763,854	12,114	\$19,552,551	\$37,316,405
Extended school year	1,117	\$3,960,403	1,535	\$4,365,442	\$8,325,845
Total UPSFF Nonresidential		\$669,649,535		\$533,138,652	\$1,202,788,187
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,683,913	\$6,683,913
Total UPSFF Funding		\$669,649,535		\$539,822,565	\$1,209,472,100

Projected Costs for SY 2015–2016 with No Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter School Student Count	Charter School Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$9,682
Operating Costs					
General education	47,115	\$504,986,734	41,220	\$437,835,996	\$942,822,730
Special education	7,447	\$131,092,705	5,250	\$86,029,898	\$217,122,603
Special Education Compliance Fund	7,060	\$10,935,940	5,250	\$8,132,250	\$19,068,190
English language learners	4,698	\$20,469,186	2,976	\$12,966,432	\$33,435,618
Summer school	11,116	\$18,296,784	12,716	\$20,931,051	\$39,227,835
Extended school year	1,117	\$4,039,591	1,535	\$4,453,045	\$8,492,636
Total UPSFF Nonresidential		\$689,820,940		\$570,348,673	\$1,260,169,612
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,817,323	\$6,817,323
Total UPSFF Operating Allocation		\$689,820,940		\$577,165,996	\$1,266,986,935

Projected Costs for SY 2016–2017 with No Changes to the UPSFF					
	DCPS Student Count	DCPS Funding	Charter Student Count	Charter Funding	Total Funding
Base Cost					\$9,876
Operating Costs					
General education	47,594	\$520,329,574	43,268	\$468,775,334	\$989,104,908
Special education	7,521	\$135,052,859	5,513	\$92,137,141	\$227,190,000
Special Education Compliance Fund	7,130	\$11,265,400	5,513	\$8,710,540	\$19,975,940
English language learners	4,745	\$21,086,780	3,065	\$13,621,301	\$34,708,081
Summer school	11,229	\$18,853,355	12,716	\$21,350,690	\$40,204,044
Extended school year	1,117	\$4,120,021	1,535	\$4,541,547	\$8,661,568
Total UPSFF Nonresidential		\$710,707,989		\$609,136,553	\$1,319,844,542
Total Residential		\$0		\$6,953,979	\$6,953,979
Total UPSFF Operating Allocation		\$710,707,989		\$616,090,532	\$1,326,798,521