Capital Improvement Plan Prioritization (FY19-FY22)
March 24, 2016

To evaluate schools in in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for FY19 and beyond, a data driven approach was used to rank and prioritize schools. There are 18 schools in the current DCPS portfolio that have not received a significant capital investment (modernization) and were not in the CIP plans for FY16 through FY18 in the FY16-21 CIP. Data was gathered for these 18 schools in four key focus areas and weights were applied based on the overall importance of the category. The categories and weights used in the analysis can be found in Table 1.

The prioritized list of schools can be found in Table 2. The schools were inserted in the Capital Improvement Plan based on this prioritization, but the sequencing may have been impacted by the following factors:

> **Swing space availability:** if two schools are anticipated use the same swing space location (temporary location during construction), it may impact where they fall in the sequencing.
> **District priorities:** Middle schools were prioritized in the CIP to align with the District's vision to improve middle school options for families.
> **Anticipated cost of the project**: The project budgets need to balance within the constraints of annual fiscal year allotment.

The goal of this approach is to provide a fair and transparent methodology for the prioritization and sequencing of projects in the Capital Improvement Plan.

Table 1: Data Weights

Group	Group Weight	Subcategory	Subcategory Weight
Equity	40%	% of Schools in Ward that have been modernized.	15.0%
		% At Risk Students	15.0%
		% Spec. Ed Students	7.5%
		% ELL Students	2.5%
Student Demand	30%	Enrollment	10.0%
		Building Utilization	20.0%
Neighborhood Population	20%	# of Kids in Neighborhood Cluster	10.0%
		Estimated Relevant Age Pop. Growth	10.0%
Building Condition/ Educational Effectiveness of Building	10%	FCI = Cost of fixing systems/cost of new construction	5.0%
		Sq. Ft. per student, open plan, and building history	5.0%

To score each of the categories shown in Table 1, the school-level data for each of the categories was gathered and a score between 1 and 10 was given to the school for each of the categories. To avoid creating arbitrary cut-off points in the data, the raw score was determined by breaking the data down into 10 percentile groups based on normal distribution and standard deviation. This methodology was used to statistically create break points in the data for each of the categories.

The percentile tells you where the school lands compared to the other schools in the dataset.

DCPS evaluated ranking the schools from 1 to 18 in each of the categories and assigning a point value of 1 to 18 based on rank. This approach was not used because in some instances it unfairly rewarded or penalized schools when there was little variation in the data. For example, if School A has the 8th ranked utilization rate at 80% and School B has the 12th ranked utilization rate at 79.5%, School B would have 4 points less than School A even though their utilization rate is very similar.

The scores for each of the categories can be found in Appendix A. After the percentile score was determined for each of the categories, the subcategory weights found in Table 1 were applied to get the weighted score. The sum of the weighted scores was used to rank the schools. The prioritization based on the weighted total can be found in Table 2.

The schools were inserted in the Capital Improvement Plan based on the prioritization in Table 2, but as noted above, the sequencing may change based on swing space availability, District priorities and anticipated cost of the project. Table 2 shows the raw ranking, identified swing space location, and the anticipated start year for project planning.

Table 2: School Prioritization

Schools	Weighted Totals	Rank	Ward	Potential Swing Site	Planning Year
CW Harris	7.38	1	7	On Site	FY18
Raymond	6.80	2	4	Garnett Patterson	FY22
Smothers	6.15	3	7	Davis	FY22
Dorothy Height	6.00	4	4	Sharpe	FY22
West[1]	5.78	5	4	Sharpe	FY19
Aiton	5.60	6	7	Davis	FY21/22
Garfield	5.58	7	8	Malcolm X	FY22
Banneker[2]	5.55	8	1	Garnett Patterson	FY18/19
School Without Walls @Francis Stevens	5.55	9	2	Garnett Patterson	FY22
Adams	5.48	10	1	Meyer	Not in CIP
School Within a School @Goding	5.43	11	6	Eliot-Hine	FY22
Logan/Capitol Hill Montessori	5.30	12	6	Meyer	Not in CIP
Eaton[3]	5.05	13	3	Meyer	FY22
Elliot-Hine[2]	5.03	14	6	Eliot-Hine	Ongoing/FY18
Jefferson[2]	4.95	15	6	Jefferson	Ongoing/FY19
Washington Metro	4.43	16	1	Garnett Patterson	Not in CIP
Malcolm X @ Green	4.40	17	8	Malcolm X	Not in CIP
Browne	3.85	18	5	Browne	Not in CIP

1: West was prioritized in the CIP ahead of Dorothy Height because it has been in the DCPS portfolio longer and it is an open plan school.
2: District Initiative: Middle and High Schools were prioritized in the CIP to align with the District's vision to improve Middle and High School options for families.
3: Eaton was prioritized because of the overcrowding at the school.

Appendix A: Percentile Scores and Raw Data by School and Subcategory (Percentile Points (Raw Value))

School Name	Equity (40%)				Student Demand (30%		Community (20%)		Building Condition (10%)	
	% of Schools Modernized in Ward	% of At Risk Students	% ELL Students	% Special Education Students.	SY15-16 Enrollment Total	SY15-16 Building Utilization	# of Students in Geographic Cluster	Projected Population Growth in Cluster	Building FCI	Building Ed Effectiveness (Ratio of SF per Student to ideal SF per Student)
Adams	7 (64%)	1 (12%)	10 (52%)	3 (10%)	5 (314)	8 (87%)	2 (1337)	9 (94%)	5 (9.5%)	7 (121%)
Aiton	9 (60%)	9 (81%)	3 (0%)	7 (17%)	3 (260)	3 (58%)	5 (2724)	4 (19%)	4 (8.1%)	6 (149%)
Banneker	7 (64%)	2 (25%)	7 (22%)	1 (2%)	9 (454)	5 (69%)	10 (6430)	4 (27%)	9 (14%)	4 (207%)
Browne	2 (77%)	8 (68%)	5 (9%)	7 (18%)	6 (333)	1 (39%)	4 (2622)	2 (-1%)	4 (8.5%)	2 (412%)[1]
CW Harris	9 (60%)	9 (78%)	3 (.3%)	10 (27%)	4 (293)	8 (86%)	7 (4062)	3 (9%)	10 (17%)	7 (122%)
Dorothy Height	5 (68%)	4 (40%)	10 (56%)	2 (8%)	10 (492)	6 (77%)	10 (6501)	4 (3%)	4 (9%)	9 (80%)
Eaton	1 (90%)	1 (5%)	6 (18%)	2 (8%)	10 (478)	10 (124%)	2 (1331)	7 (56%)	2 (6.1%)	9 (68%)
Elliot-Hine	7 (63%)	7 (62%)	3 (2%)	10 (25%)	2 (209)	1 (29%)	7 (3756)	7 (60%)	5 (9.6%)	1 (440%)
Garfield	4 (69%)	9 (82%)	3 (.6%)	4 (13%)	5 (317)	8 (85%)	3 (1924)	3 (8.2%)	4 (8%)	7 (119%)
Jefferson	7 (63%)	7 (64%)	3 (3%)	9 (23%)	3 (273)	2 (47%)	2 (1286)	8 (67%)	5 (9.2%)	3 (236%)
Logan/Capitol Hill Montessori	7 (63%)	1 (8%)	3 (3%)	1 (5%)	5 (330)	7 (83%)	7 (3756)	7 (57%)	4 (9%)	9 (90%)[1]
Malcolm X @ Green	4 (69%)	9 (84%)	3 (0%)	5 (15%)	2 (238)	2 (47%)	6 (3354)	3 (6.8%)	6 (10.5%)	4 (208%)
Raymond	5 (68%)	6 (53%)	10 (63%)	4 (13%)	10 (572)	8 (88%)	10 (6501)	4 (29%)	3 (7.6%)	9 (81%)
School Within a School @Goding	7 (63%)	1 (6%)	3 (.3%)	8 (19%)	4 (289)	6 (74%)	7 (3756)	7 (55%)	4 (9%)	7 (137%)
School Without Walls @Francis Stevens	1 (81%)	2 (26%)	5 (11%)	5 (14%)	9 (441)	10 (105%)	1 (334)	10 (194%)	4 (8%)	8 (136%)[1]
Smothers	9 (60%)	8 (73%)	4 (4%)	6 (16%)	3 (274)	7 (81%)	3 (1532)	4 (20%)	5 (9.5%)	8 (104%)
Washington Metro	7 (64%)	9 (82%)	3 (3%)	8 (19%)	1 (150)	1 (37%)	2 (885)	3 (6%)	6 (10.9%)	5 (176%)
West	5 (68%)	4 (41%)	7 (21%)	4 (12%)	4 (303)	8 (90%)	10 (6501)	4 (29%)	1 (4.6%)	10 (145%)[2]

1: 1 Point was added because the original design of the building does not match current programming (e.g. ES in a building designed as a MS).
2: Increased point total because open space school design.