

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

1.0 VISION

***The Standard:** The MFP should provide a clear, inspiring vision for the District's public facilities that will be broadly acceptable to its citizens. The plan must build confidence in DCPS' ability to overhaul its inventory of facilities efficiently and thoroughly. This must be an inclusive plan that can be embraced by the entire city, providing a serviceable template for the next decade.*

The **VISION** in the Master Facilities Plan is worthy of the District of Columbia and its children, families and neighborhoods. Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Does the MFP present a vision for the system that will be generally accepted by DC citizens?
- Does the vision support a system of public schools where the expectation is high participation of parents and families throughout the city?
- Is the vision inclusive of the city as a whole?
- Is the vision inspired?
- Does this vision build confidence in leadership?
- With the understanding that the plan is to be updated every 3 years, is this a plan that can provide a blueprint for the next decade?
- Will this plan encourage the return of families back to DCPS in the long run?
- Will implementing the plan increase DCPS enrollment in the short term?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

2.0 HIGH QUALITY PUBLIC EDUCATION

***The Standard:** Foremost, the MFP must provide the best support for educational improvement. It must accurately reflect reforms that are detailed in the Master Education Plan and lay the foundation for a high quality system of public schools in the District of Columbia.*

The Master Facility Plan advances and supports **HIGH QUALITY PUBLIC EDUCATION**, not just school buildings. Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Does it accurately reflect the Master Education Plan?
- Does the plan give priority to programs with special space requirements, such as career and technical education; vocational training; early childhood education; special education for children with intensive physical and developmental needs?
- Does the plan include vision and plans for outdoor recreation and play space as well as environmental education?
- Does it support innovation?
- Does it align to specific special education programs and capabilities in DCPS to support special education students in District facilities rather than private placement outside the District?
- Does it create a compelling educational environment for teachers?
- Does it support new standards and curriculum?
- Is the need for support spaces for nurses, counselors, social workers and psychologists included in space requirements?
- Is the space provided adequate to support existing gyms, auditoriums, and old and historic structures?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

3.0 VIBRANT AND SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS

***The Standard:** Improved school facilities in neighborhoods can become a major factor in attracting and keeping families in the District of Columbia. They contribute to improving the quality of life for all residents, particularly if the facility is part of community based improvement initiatives. It must be clear that by implementing the MFP, the District can strengthen neighborhoods for students, staff, and residents by increasing public access and connections with public school facilities and grounds. High quality design and construction of public school facilities must be supported by the MFP.*

The Master Facilities Plan will make a major contribution to securing **VIBRANT AND SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS**. Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Does the plan envision schools that contribute to the overall attractiveness of the neighborhood?
- Does the plan contribute to a greener and more environmentally responsible city?
- Does the plan allow sufficiently for community use of schools?
- Does the plan support schools in every neighborhood so that elementary and middle school students can walk to school?
- Does the MFP allow for DCPS schools that are large enough to be fiscally viable but small enough to compete with specialty DCPS and charter schools?
- Does the MFP provide for schools that are small enough to be safe and self-policing?
- Does this plan incorporate the improvement of civic spaces in schools, such as fixed seat auditoriums, stadiums, gymnasiums, swimming pools, libraries, multi-purpose rooms?
- Is the plan conducive to increased reliance on public transportation for staff and students?
- Does the plan envision schools as emergency shelters?
- Does the plan modernize our old and historic schools?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

4.0 FAIR AND EQUITABLE

***The Standard:** The plan should represent fair and equitable priorities for distribution of limited school modernization funds and DCPS management attention. The priorities for projects should be driven by need and be mindful of the importance of public school construction investment in all communities. The criteria for setting project priorities should be explicitly stated and developed with public input.*

The MFP represents a **FAIR AND EQUITABLE** distribution of funding and attention, first treating those schools and neighborhoods with the greatest need.

Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Is the plan equitable, treating schools and neighborhoods fairly with valuable public school investment throughout the District?
- Does the plan distribute resources to schools fast enough to get them all up to reasonable standards with the next several years (carpet, paint, lighting, bathrooms, etc.)?
- Are all schools scheduled for modernization within the next 10-15 years?
- Are criteria for priorities reasonable?
- Are criteria consistently applied?
- Does the plan provide for improved maintenance and repair simultaneously with modernizations?
- Does the plan encourage co-location, leasing, and other accommodations for charter schools?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

5.0 COMPLETE AND COMPREHENSIVE

***The Standard:** The MFP has to be complete and comprehensive, planning for all neighborhoods and for all public schools, including public charter schools. Consideration of all relevant factors must be demonstrated, including full comprehension of the impact of public charter school enrollment patterns on traditional DCPS schools as well as charter school needs for co-location and stand-alone school facilities. In addition, the plan should reflect community demographic change, initiatives and programs underway that will affect population, neighborhoods and communities.*

The MFP is a **COMPLETE AND COMPREHENSIVE** plan for all District of Columbia public schools. Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Is there a short term and long term plan for each school?
- Is there a schedule for the short term and long term improvements needed for each school?
- Is there a budget estimate for the short term and the long term improvements planned for each school?
- Do enrollment estimates incorporate explicit and research based assumptions about future residential change and enrollment change?
- Are the schoolyards, playgrounds, athletic fields, recreational assets and green space at each school an integral part of the planning for each school?
- Is staff and community parking considered as part of planning for each school?
- Is access to public transportation valued in preserving school sites?
- Is sufficient swing space provided in each planning area?
- Is there enough consideration for future growth?
- Are the needs of special education students sufficiently considered?
- Does the plan offer a realistic, studied proposal for DCPS administrative needs?
- Is sufficient space provided for DCPS central administration?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

6.0 COORDINATED

***The Standard:** There should be evidence of planning in coordination with District agencies including libraries, parks and recreation, public transportation, health services, housing, and public safety. The MFP should reflect increased accommodation for community use of schools during non-school hours. It should take into account the impact of charter school enrollments.*

The Master Facility Plan is **COORDINATED** with plans and initiatives of other District agencies, as well as with initiatives within its own system.

Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Does the plan envisage and allow for coordinated planning, design and construction among District agencies
 - libraries?
 - parks and recreation?
 - public transportation?
 - health services?
 - public safety?
- Are priorities for school improvements aligned to educational priorities?
- Does the plan simplify feeder school patterns so that neighborhood students can remain together from elementary school, to middle school and through a comprehensive, neighborhood high school?
- Does the MFP sufficiently consider increased charter school enrollment and its impact on DCPS planning?
- Does planning reflect the six new regional area administrative groupings?
- Is the plan in keeping with environmental standards for schools, such as LEEDS?
- Does the MFP advance District green initiatives for increased tree cover and permeable surfaces that retain storm water?
- Is the MFP coordinated with initiatives for energy conservation?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

7.0 ACCURATE AND COMPLETE DATA

***The Standard:** Reports from local schools, parents, teachers, principals and students should indicate that assumptions are valid and data is accurate. Spot checks of data must show that it is current and complete. Information should be presented in a clear, transparent and comprehensible format.*

The MFP data are known to be **ACCURATE AND COMPLETE** and the information is clear and easy to understand. Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Are enrollment projections based on valid assumptions that are explicitly stated?
- Are project estimates realistic and cost assumptions valid and explicitly stated?
- Is inflation factored into cost estimates?
- Do condition and adequacy assessments reflect the experience of the school users?
- Have condition, adequacy, and capacity assessments been checked by local school principals, parents, teachers, custodians and building engineers?
- Is information clear, transparent and presented in a comprehensible format?
- Is the data clearly tied into the criteria for making decisions on school consolidations and building improvements?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

8.0 MANAGEABLE AND FEASIBLE

***The Standard:** The MFP must reflect the urgent need for improved facilities, but the plan must be feasible and manageable by DCPS.*

The MFP describes a plan that is **MANAGEABLE** by DCPS and **FEASIBLE** with the time, cost and scope objectives as proposed in the plan.

Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Is there a project schedule for implementation of each project that accurately reflects the real world opportunities and constraints?
- Are cost estimates realistic and will they enable all schools, at a minimum, to be brought into good repair with full modernization the ultimate objective?
- Is there justification for the scope of work that is linked to building or educational studies?
- How many projects will be at what stage of development for each year of the MFP?
- What is the anticipated cost for each year of the modernization program—including inflation?
- What is the anticipated cost for capital projects that need to be completed while schools are waiting their turn for modernization or replacement?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

9.0 PUBLICLY OPEN, INQUIRY BASED PROCESS

The Standard: Planning for the future of the city and its many neighborhoods needs intense involvement of residents, experts, public and private interests and, most importantly, local school staff, teachers, parents and students—the people who use the public schools daily. The visioning, assessment, and planning should engage a broad community of stakeholders in an open, inquiry based process in order to develop a plan that the public owns and supports.

The MFP process was **PUBLICLY OPEN** and **INQUIRY BASED**.

Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Did DCPS involve residents in developing the proposed plans for their school buildings?
- Were local school staff, teachers, parents and/or students engaged in developing the proposed plans for their schools?
- Was there integration and communication between area experts and the public in setting criteria or conducting assessments of school buildings or of public or local school needs for facility improvements?
- Is a process for revision of the proposed plans in place?
- Did DCPS involve sufficient members of residents in developing the MFP?
- Were public charter school parents, staff, and operators included in the planning for the District's public school facilities?

Comments:

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Rate the statements below on a scale of 0-4, with four the highest rating and 0 the lowest. Use the questions bulleted below to help make your rating.

10.0 THE FUTURE OF OUR SCHOOLS

***The Standard:** The plans for each public school should be clearly stated, with what will happen, when and at what cost. The plans should be explicitly justified and give parents, students, staff and neighbors cause to evaluate their support or concerns for the future of the schools in their community and that their children attend.*

The MFP outlines and justifies a **FUTURE** for my neighborhood and/or my child's **SCHOOL** that I support.

Circle appropriate rating: 0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4

- Do you support the recommendations for your school that are made in the MFP: *major building improvements; modernization or replacement; swing space location; closing or receiving schools; co-location; community school or other demonstration program; feeder school patterns; boundary changes?*
- Is the priority for modernization for your school consistent with your understanding of the conditions in your school?
- Are there appropriate improvements planned for your school while waiting for modernization?
- Do the plans for closing, consolidating or receiving students minimize the disruption of the educational environment for teachers and students and their families and offer them a better environment immediately?

Comments: