



Board of Education Report

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

File #: Rep-396-16/17, Version: 1

FINAL APPROVED

APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT ACTIONS

April 18, 2017

Professional Services Division

ADOPTED BY CONSENT VOTE

Action Proposed:

Staff proposes that the Board of Education (Board) **ratify** the contract actions taken by the Procurement Services Division within delegated authority as listed in Attachment "A" including the approval of award of Professional Service Contracts not exceeding \$250,000: New Contracts and Amendments; Low Value - Decentralized Purchase Orders; Goods and General Services Contracts: Purchase Orders; Low Value - Decentralized Purchase Orders; District Card Transactions; Rental of Facilities; Travel/Conference Attendance; General Stores Distribution Center; and Book/Instructional Material Purchase Orders; and **approve** Professional Service Contracts (exceeding \$250,000): New Contracts and Amendments; Income Contracts; Good and General Services Contracts (exceeding \$250,000): New Contracts as listed in Attachment "B".

Background:

Procurement Services staff prepares monthly reports for contract actions necessary for the execution of the projects approved by the Board for the educational and operational requirements of the District in accordance with Board delegated authority to the Superintendent.

Expected Outcomes:

Approval of these items will allow the goods and services provided by these contracts furnishing the equipment, supplies, or services to the Los Angeles Unified School District that support Board policies and goals.

Board Options and Consequences:

The Board can approve all actions presented, or postpone selected actions pending receipt of additional information. Non-ratification of actions awarded under delegated authority in Attachment "A" will result in immediate unavailability of products or discontinuance of services, or both. While non-ratification may be legally defensible, it would likely result in costly litigation over discontinued payments or if the District attempts to reclaim payments made to a vendor. District costs will likely increase as fewer vendors compete for future procurements. Postponement of actions presented for approval in Attachment "B" will delay contract award or delivery dates.

Policy Implications:

This action does not change District policy and conforms to *California Education Code section 17604* that permits the Board of Education to delegate authority for Procurement Services (Board Report #311-15/16), which the Board exercised on May 10, 2016.

Budget Impact:

The contract actions presented are within the budget authority previously approved by the Board. Ratification of contracts awarded under delegation of authority and within their Board approved budget listed

in Attachment "A" includes:

- Award of Professional Service Contracts not exceeding \$250,000: New Contracts and Amendments; Low Value - Decentralized Purchase Orders; and
- Goods and General Services Contracts not exceeding \$250,000: Procurement Transactions - Purchase Orders; Low Value - Decentralized Purchase Orders; Rental of Facilities; Travel/Conference Attendance; District Card Transactions; General Stores Distribution Center; and Book/Instructional Material Purchase Orders

Request for Approval of Procurement Contracts not under delegated authority listed in Attachment "B" includes:

- Professional Services Contracts (exceeding \$250,000): New Contracts and Amendments; Income Contracts; and
- Goods and General Services Contracts (exceeding \$250,000): New Contracts

Issues and Analysis:

There are no policy implications on these agreements. The Business and Government Services Team, Office of the General Counsel, has reviewed and approved the agreements as to form.

Attachments:

Attachment "A" - Ratification of Contracts Awarded Under Delegated Authority

Attachment "B" - Request for Approval of Contracts Not Under Delegated Authority

Informatives:

Informative - Warehouse - February 2017

Informative - California College Guidance Initiative; Hobsons; Next Tier Education; Parchment; XAP Corporation; The Princeton Review - Contract Nos. 4400005595-5599, 4400004391-2

Informative - City of Los Angeles - Contract No. 4400005611

Informative - City of Los Angeles - Contract No. 4400005610

Informative - City of Los Angeles - Contract No. 4400005585

Informative - High Rise Goodies Restaurants Groups, Inc., dba Trimana - Contract No. 4400005590

Informative - Amplify Education, Inc. - Contract No. 4400002912-2

Informative - Data Recognition Corporation - Contract No. 4400004565-4

Informative - Quality Commercial Cleaning, Inc., dba Spectrum Facility Maintenance- Contract No. 4400005536

Informative - Welligent; Mythics, Inc. - Contract No. 4500293632, 4500293633

Informative - Buddy's All Stars, Inc. - Contract No. 4400005602

FINAL

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:


MICHELLE KING
Superintendent


THELMA MELÉNDEZ DE SANTA ANA
Chief Executive Officer
Office of Educational Services


APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

REVIEWED BY:


APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:


DAVID HOLMQUIST
General Counsel


GEORGE SILVA
Chief Procurement Officer
Procurement Services Division

☒ Approved as to form.

REVIEWED BY:


CHERYL SIMPSON
Director, Budget Services and Financial Planning

☐ Approved as to budget impact statement.

ATTACHMENT A

APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS: RATIFICATION OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY**A. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS ALREADY AWARDED****NEW CONTRACTS NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000**

FINAL

\$302,654

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

APPROVED

Sentient Research	4400005561	Named-in-grant provider contract for research and evaluation of the development and delivery of sex health education emphasizing prevention of HIV and other STD infections, increasing adolescent access to key sex health services, and establishing safe and supportive environments for students and staff. Contractor will collaborate with the District and community-based organizations to deliver evidence-based interventions to increase access to sex health services and establish safe and supportive environments for students and staff.	Promoting Adolescent Health Through School-Based HIV/STD Prevention and School Based Surveillance Grant (100%)	\$104,000
-------------------	------------	--	--	-----------

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Contract Term: 02/21/17 through 07/31/18
includes one (1) one-year renewal option

Aggregate Two-Year Contract Value:
\$104,000

Requester: *Eduardo Solórzano, Director
Health Education Programs*

The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health	4400005560	Named-in-grant provider contract to provide resources, services, and staff for an evidence-based intervention program in 20 priority LAUSD schools to reduce HIV and other STD infections among adolescents and provide support in the development and facilitation of research and evaluation of the evidence-based intervention.	Promoting Adolescent Health Through School-Based HIV/STD Prevention and School Based Surveillance Grant (100%)	\$198,654
---	------------	--	--	-----------

Contract Term: 02/21/17 through 07/31/18
includes one (1) one-year renewal option

Aggregate Two-Year Contract Value:
\$198,654

Requester: *Eduardo Solórzano, Director
Health Education Programs*

ATTACHMENT A

APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS: RATIFICATION OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY**A. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS ALREADY AWARDED****INCOME CONTRACTS NOT EXCEEDING \$500,000****\$0**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

None

APPROVED**FINAL****CONTRACT AMENDMENTS NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000****\$60,132**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

Cornerstone OnDemand, Inc.	4400002943-8	Amendment to increase capacity of formally competed contract to provide an enhancement to the functionality of My Professional Learning Network (MyPLN) system. My PLN is designed to support diverse type of content including face to face sessions, virtual sessions, multimedia curricula, videos and materials. The enhancement will automate training recommendations for Principal's Portal users and will align My PLN to the functionality currently available in the Learning Zone.	Educator Effectiveness Grant (100%)	\$6,932*
-------------------------------	--------------	---	--	----------

**ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT****APR 18 2017****Contract Term:** 02/03/13 through 6/30/18

Original Contract Value:	\$829,750
Amendment No. 1:	\$101,715
Amendment No. 2:	\$0
Amendment No. 3:	\$168,053
Amendment No. 4:	\$424,935
Amendment No. 5:	\$0
Amendment No. 6:	\$27,428
Amendment No. 7:	\$481,750
*Amendment No. 8:	\$6,932
(Executed Date: 02/13/17)	
Aggregate Contract Value:	\$2,040,563

Requester: *Ileana Davalos, Director
Professional Learning and Leadership
Development
Human Services Division*

*Current Ratification

ATTACHMENT A

APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS: RATIFICATION OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY**A. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS ALREADY AWARDED****CONTRACT AMENDMENTS NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000 (CONT.)**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Think TRG	4400004635-3	Amendment to extend and increase capacity of informally competed contract to provide development services to design and program enhancement for the telephone billing system for advanced reports and audit features that will improve user functionality. Current Contract Term: 04/10/15 through 06/30/17 New End Date by This Amendment: 12/31/17 Original Contract Value: \$77,000 Amendment No. 1: \$0 Amendment No. 2: \$0 *Amendment No. 3: \$53,200 (Executed Date: 02/23/17) Aggregate Contract Value: \$130,200 Requester: <i>Shahryar Khazei</i> <i>Chief Information Officer</i> <i>Information Technology Division</i>	General Funds (100%)	\$53,200*

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

FINAL

*Current ratification

ATTACHMENT A

APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS: RATIFICATION OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY**B. AFTER THE FACT CONTRACTS NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000 ALREADY AWARDED****\$0**

The contract actions represented below are unauthorized commitments initiated by the sponsoring school or division without a formal contract in place. This action requires the Board to ratify the contract after the fact to allow the vendor to be paid. The District did request and has received the benefit of the services. **Informative memorandum included.**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

APPROVED**FINAL**

None

**ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT****APR 18 2017****C. GOODS AND GENERAL SERVICES CONTRACTS ALREADY AWARDED****NEW CONTRACTS NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000****\$0**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

None

CONTRACT AMENDMENTS NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000**\$0**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

None

ATTACHMENT A

APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS: RATIFICATION OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY**D. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACT ASSIGNMENTS****\$0**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

None

APPROVED

FINAL

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

E. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS ALREADY AWARDED**\$0**

The contract action(s) represented below is (are) part of the Instructional Technology Initiative (ITI) and ITD-SEP previously adopted by the Board on _____, under Board Report No. _____.

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

None

F. GOODS AND GENERAL SERVICES CONTRACTS ALREADY AWARDED**\$0**

The contract action(s) represented below is (are) part of the Instructional Technology Initiative (ITI) Plan and ITD-SEP previously adopted by the Board on _____, under Board Report No. _____. The total amount is only an estimate since the expenditures made against contracts are based upon purchases and/or approved invoices.

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>NOT TO- EXCEED AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------

None

ATTACHMENT A

APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS: RATIFICATION OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY**G. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000**

FINAL February 2017– \$1,389,464
YTD - \$11,008,539

The contract actions represented below are those actions put in place within each sponsoring school's or division's approved budget. These delegated procurement methods represent streamline ordering tools that assist schools and offices in meeting immediate mission-essential needs for professional services.

**ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT**
APR 18 2017

	<u>February*</u> <u>Qty of POs</u>	<u>YTD</u> <u>Qty of POs</u>	<u>February*</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>YTD</u> <u>Total</u>
Low Value – Decentralized Purchase Orders - February 2017	168	1,562	\$1,389,464 (\$8,271)	\$11,008,539

H. GOODS AND GENERAL SERVICES NOT EXCEEDING \$250,000

February 2017 - \$21,163,751
YTD - \$154,946,318

The contract actions represented below are those actions put in place within each sponsoring school's or division's approved budget. These delegated procurement methods represent streamline ordering tools that assist schools and offices in meeting immediate mission-essential needs for goods or general services.

	<u>February *</u> <u>Qty of POs/</u> <u>Transactions</u>	<u>YTD</u> <u>Qty of POs/</u> <u>Transactions</u>	<u>February*</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>YTD</u> <u>Total</u>
Low Value – Decentralized Purchase Orders – February 2017	4,673	35,019	\$10,556,076 (\$2,259)	\$78,990,328
Purchase Orders - February 2017	29	178	\$1,122,803 (\$38,717)	\$17,126,987
DISTRICT CARD TRANSACTIONS (i.e., P-Card, Fuel Card, Toshiba Card, etc.) February 2017	9,749	66,073	\$3,150,007 (\$323)	\$22,778,552
Rental Facilities – February 2017	6	31	\$22,731 (\$3,788)	\$240,311
Travel/Conference Attendance – February 2017	1,227	4,850	\$682,758 (\$556)	\$2,934,861
GENERAL STORES DISTRIBUTION CENTER – February 2017	355	2,467	\$3,489,673 (\$9,830)	\$13,829,155
BOOK/INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL PURCHASE ORDERS (BPO) – February 2017	490	3,499	\$2,139,703 (\$4,367)	\$19,046,124

*Detailed information is provided on the Procurement Services website.

ATTACHMENT B

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

A. APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS

NEW CONTRACTS EXCEEDING \$250,000

\$5,000,000

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
California College Guidance Initiative; Hobsons; Next Tier Education; Parchment; XAP Corporation; The Princeton Review**	4400005595 4400005596 4400005597 4400005598 4400005599 4400004391-2 (RFP 2000001309)	Authorization to increase capacity and execute five (5) formally competed contracts to be added to the existing bench of contracts* and augment the scope of work of one (1) existing contract**, via a "refresh" to provide college access and readiness support services to schools, local districts and offices. The authority to increase or decrease individual amounts for all contracts will be limited to the aggregate amount of \$7,000,000. Contract Term: 05/01/17 through 11/30/20 Initial Contract Value: \$2,000,000 ***Additional Authorized Value: \$5,000,000 Aggregate Contract Value For Twenty- Seven (27) Contracts: \$7,000,000 Requester: <i>Carol Alexander, Director</i> <i>A-G Intervention and Support</i> <i>Division of Instruction</i>	School Improvement Grant (SIG) (30%) Various per Requesting School or Office (70%)	\$5,000,000***

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

*Good Sports, Ltd., dba arc; Boys & Girls Club of Carson; Boys & Girls Club of LA Harbor; CollegeSpring; EduCare; Educational Achievement Services; Families in Schools; Iridescent; Los Angeles Educational Partnership; Partnership for Los Angeles Schools; Project GRAD; Study Smart Tutors; WIN Learning; Youth Policy Institute; College Summit; Social Justice Learning Institute; The College Bridge; The Princeton Review; Fulfillment Foundation; AVID; UCLA Center X; The College Board. (Contract Term: 12/09/15 through 11/30/20)

ATTACHMENT B

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

A. APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS

NEW INCOME CONTRACTS EXCEEDING \$500,000

< \$2,933,021 >

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

City of Los Angeles	4400005611	Revenue contract for the District to serve as a partner for 16 YouthSource Centers providing on-site support to Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act case managers in identifying potential participants, out-of-school youth and targeting potential participants to youth services and connecting students to YouthSource Centers and/or LAUSD services when available.	Revenue	<\$1,083,021>
---------------------	------------	---	---------	---------------

Contract Term: 07/01/16 through 06/30/17**Contract Value:** <\$1,083,021>Requester: *Erika Torres, Executive Director
Student Health and Human Services*

City of Los Angeles	4400005610	Revenue contract for the District to provide Pupil Services Attendance Counselors to 13 FamilySource Centers to: Conduct psychosocial and educational assessments; link students and families to educational, social, and other services; provide case management related to academic outcomes; serve as mental health consultants; and provide training workshops.	Revenue	<\$1,000,000>
---------------------	------------	---	---------	---------------

Contract Term: 07/01/16 through 06/30/17**Contract Value:** <\$1,000,000>Requester: *Erika Torres, Executive Director
Student Health and Human Services*

ATTACHMENT B

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

A. APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS

NEW INCOME CONTRACTS EXCEEDING \$500,000 (CONT.)

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

City of Los Angeles	4400005585	Revenue contract to provide Performance Partnership Pilot (P3) Pupil Services Attendance Counselor to serve as liaison on behalf of the Los Angeles Unified School District working on P3 related projects to support the implementation of the LA P3 model and provide training, information and guidance to P3 Partners on LAUSD's disconnected youth (special population) program to focus on the coordination and delivery of services to homeless, runaway, probation, dropout and foster youth.	Revenue	<\$250,000>
---------------------	------------	---	---------	-------------

Contract Term: 09/01/16 through 09/30/18

Contract Value: <\$250,000>

Requester: *Erika Torres, Executive Director
Student Health and Human Services*

High Rise Goodies Restaurants Group, Inc., dba Trimana	4400005590 (RFP 2000001282)	Formally competed revenue contract to provide food and beverage services to the District's headquarters. Revenue generated from contract assists in offsetting the operating expenses for the building.	Revenue	<\$600,000>
--	--------------------------------	---	---------	-------------

Contract Term: 07/01/17 through 06/30/22

Contract Value: <\$600,000>

Requester: *Yekaterina Boyajian, Director
Non-Academic Facilities Planning
District Operations*

ATTACHMENT B

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

A. APPROVAL OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS

CONTRACT AMENDMENTS EXCEEDING \$250,000

FINAL

\$9,275,000

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------

APPROVED

Amplify Education, Inc.	4400002912-2	Amendment to extend term and increase capacity of formally competed contract to provide foundational reading skills assessments, e.g. Dynamic Indicators or Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIEBELS).	General Funds (100%)	\$9,275,000
----------------------------	--------------	--	----------------------------	-------------

Current Contract Term: 07/10/14 through 06/30/17

New End Date by this Amendment: 06/30/19

Initial Contract Value: \$14,186,706

Amendment No. 1: \$0

*Amendment No. 2: \$9,275,000

Aggregate Contract Value: \$23,339,584

Requester: *Derrick Chau*
Senior Executive Director
Division of Instruction

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Data Recognition Corporation	4400004565-4	Amendment to extend term of formally competed contract to provide language development assessments for English Learners and Standard English Learners for Grades K-12.	General Funds (100%)	\$0*
---------------------------------	--------------	--	----------------------------	------

Current Contract Term: 07/10/14 through 06/30/17

New End Date by this Amendment: 06/30/19

Initial Contract Value: \$4,350,000

Amendment No. 1: \$0

Amendment No. 2: \$0

Amendment No. 3: \$0

*Amendment No. 4: \$0

Aggregate Contract Value: \$4,350,000

Requester: *Derrick Chau*
Senior Executive Director
Division of Instruction

ATTACHMENT B

**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER
DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

FINAL

B. APPROVAL OF GOODS AND GENERAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

Authority to award contracts for furnishing equipment, supplies and general services. The total amount is only an estimate since the expenditures made against contracts are based upon purchases and/or approved invoices.

NEW CONTRACTS EXCEEDING \$250,000**\$5,633,424**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Quality Commercial Cleaning, Inc., dba Spectrum Facility Maintenance	4400005536 (IFB 2000001161)	Formally competed capacity contract to provide flooring and pavement cleaning services. Contract Term: 05/01/17 through 04/30/22 includes two (2) one-year renewal options Contract Value: \$1,000,000	General Funds (90%) Bond Funds (10%)	\$1,000,000

Requester: *Roger Finstad, Director
Maintenance & Operations
Facilities Services Division*

**ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT**

APR 18 2017

ATTACHMENT B

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER
DELEGATED AUTHORITY**FINAL****B. APPROVAL OF GOODS AND GENERAL SERVICES CONTRACTS**

Authority to award contracts for furnishing equipment, supplies and general services. The total amount is only an estimate since the expenditures made against contracts are based upon purchases and/or approved invoices.

NEW CONTRACTS EXCEEDING \$250,000 (CONT.)

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Welligent	4500293632	Sole-source agreement to acquire software support, used by the Division of Special Education and Student Health and Human Services, to manage Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and student health records.	General Funds (100%)	\$425,452

APPROVED**ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT****APR 18 2017****Contract Term:** 07/01/17 through 06/30/18**Contract Value:** \$425,452

Requester: *Shahryar Khazei*
Chief Information Officer
Information Technology Division

Mythics, Inc.	4500293633 (IFB 20000001331)	Formally competed contract for the purchase of software support and maintenance for existing Oracle database, Advanced Data Compression, Golden Gate and for Oracle Business Intelligence Foundation Suite software.	General Funds (100%)	\$2,047,972
---------------	---------------------------------	--	-------------------------	-------------

Contract Term: 07/01/17 through 06/30/18**Contract Value:** \$2,047,972

Requester: *Shahryar Khazei*
Chief Information Officer
Information Technology Division

ATTACHMENT B

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

B. APPROVAL OF GOODS AND GENERAL SERVICES CONTRACTS

FINAL

Authority to award contracts for furnishing equipment, supplies and general services. The total amount is only an estimate since the expenditures made against contracts are based upon purchases and/or approved invoices.

NEW CONTRACTS EXCEEDING \$250,000 (CONT.)

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFICATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
Buddy's All Stars, Inc.	4400005602 (IFB 2000001133)	Formally competed capacity contract to provide new football helmets, shoulder pads, and miscellaneous items for all secondary schools' Associated Student Body (ASB) organizations throughout the District.	Various per Requesting School (100%)	\$2,160,000
Contract Term: 05/01/17 through 04/30/22 includes two (2) one-year option renewals			ADOPTED BOARD REPORT	
Contract Value: \$2,160,000			APR 18 2017	
Requester: Earl Perkins Associate Superintendent District Operations				

CONTRACT AMENDMENTS EXCEEDING \$250,000

S0

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFICATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	---------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	---------------

None

ATTACHMENT B

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS NOT UNDER
DELEGATED AUTHORITY

FINAL**B. APPROVAL OF GOODS AND GENERAL SERVICES CONTRACTS**

Authorize the utilization of piggyback contracts in effect. The proposed action complies with the Public Contract Code Sections 10299 and 20118, which allows school districts to utilize other governmental agencies' established contracts and does not change District policy.

UTILIZATION OF PIGGYBACK CONTRACTS IN EFFECT EXCEEDING \$250,000**\$0**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

None

APPROVED**ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT****APR 18 2017****INCOME CONTRACTS****\$0**

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>IDENTIFI- CATION NO.</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SOURCE OF FUNDS</u>	<u>NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT</u>
-------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

None

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Procurement Services Division

INFORMATIVE

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent

DATE: March 6, 2017

FROM: George Silva, Chief Procurement Officer
Procurement Services Division

**SUBJECT: GENERAL STORES DISTRIBUTION CENTER SPEND FOR
REPLENISHMENT OF STOCK INVENTORY OF SUPPLIES,
EQUIPMENT AND FURNITURE**

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

During the Board of Education's May 10, 2016 meeting, pre-authorization was granted to the Procurement Services Division (PSD) to enter into various new contracts, extend existing contracts, and award various purchase orders to make regular and routine procurements of products used by schools and offices and stocked in the General Stores Distribution Section. As part of the pre-authorization, it was agreed that PSD would report on the total procurement activity on a monthly (per board report) basis. In an effort to streamline and enhance the reporting process, the chart below lists the major commodity categories and total purchase order issuance for the month of February.

GENERAL STORES DISTRIBUTION

MAJOR COMMODITY CATEGORIES	PURCHASE ORDER ISSUANCE FEBRUARY 1 TO FEBRUARY 28 2017	ACCUMULATIVE FISCAL YEAR TOTAL
Athletic Equipment	\$40,123.20	\$283,229.54
Audio Visual	\$12,459.96	\$128,770.67
Custodial/Maint. & Operations	\$770,158.25	\$4,355,232.38
Educational Supplies/Tools	\$317,405.49	\$698,126.10
Forms & Publications	\$76,063.81	\$181,679.95
Furniture	\$343,584.58	\$1,601,810.98
Music	\$13,920.65	\$77,305.45

APR 18 2017

Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent

-2-

APPROVED

March 6, 2017

MAJOR COMMODITY CATEGORIES	PURCHASE ORDER ISSUANCE FEBRUARY 1 TO FEBRUARY 28 2017	ACCUMULATIVE FISCAL YEAR TOTAL
Office Essentials	\$1,082,662.92	\$3,761,515.78
Paper	\$304,820.41	\$838,629.36
Science/Home Economics/First Aid	\$59,006.40	\$602,953.29
Visual Arts	\$469,467.38	\$1,299,901.38
TOTALS	\$3,489,673.05	\$13,829,154.88

If you have questions or require additional information, please contact me at (213) 241-1751.

c: David Holmquist
Thelma Melendez
Frances Gipson
Nicole Elam-Ellis
Jefferson Crain
Marc Monforte

Board of Education Report
No. 396-16/17
For 04/18/17 Board Meeting

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Division of Instruction

INFORMATIVE

DATE: April 18, 2017

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent of Schools

FROM: Derrick Chau
Senior Executive Director, P-12 Instruction

Carol Alexander
Director of A-G Intervention and Support

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

APPROVED

**SUBJECT: MULTIPLE CONTRACTS WITH PROVIDERS OF COLLEGE ACCESS
PLANNING AND REPORTING SERVICES
CONTRACT NO.: 4400004391, 4400005595 – 4400005599
CONTRACT AMOUNT: \$5,000,000
RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD**

The District's emphasis on achieving 100% graduation rate for high school students and ensuring college and career readiness continue to drive the need for established vendors that have substantial experience providing college access services to help overcome internal and external barriers to college enrollment and enhance students' capacity to successfully transition to college and persist in earning a degree.

At present, the District has bench contracts with various college readiness providers. In August 2015, the District issued Request for Proposals (RFP) to establish the initial bench. The initial bench provided schools and offices with options for SAT / ACT / AP test preparation, financial guidance, parent communication, college tours and life skills. Currently, multiple schools and offices including Advanced Learning Options, Linked Learning, and Parent and Community Services are using the services of the vendors bench. The increase of \$5 million in the aggregate contract amount will support continuation of these activities as well as those of A-G Intervention and Support.

In particular, the District requires access to a range of college access tools and options to support all students, with particular outreach to the historically underserved groups of first generation, low income and English learners who aspire to earn a college degree. The District requires a system to monitor student planning, applications and success in post-secondary institutions, as well as professional development resources for counselors, staff, parents and students on topics to include college planning, application and transition.

The goals of these vendor contracts are to focus on capacity building and systems thinking, create an infrastructure for communication, tools, and resources, and to establish data benchmarks and assemble a system to assist with the collection and monitoring of students' college applications

APR 18 2017

and acceptances. The intent is to provide schools with the option of selecting from a range of pre-approved vendors placed on a bench contract that will support the college access services providing schools with cost savings and options to fulfill local needs.

Why is this necessary?

To meet the goals of supporting all students to be college and career ready, the District will promote academic preparation and planning for college in accessible formats geared to all stakeholders. In addition, schools will provide ongoing professional development both online and in person to build the capacity of school counselors, staff, and families. They will create a structure for communication, tools and resources, and assemble a structure to assist with the collection and monitoring of student college applications and acceptances. Becoming prepared for college and providing support for students and families greatly eases the internal and external barriers to support our first generation and underrepresented students in applying, transitioning, and persisting in college. With the appropriate targeted quality professional development and resources, schools will be able to provide support to students and families to build capacity and acquire the knowledge needed when applying to college.

Why do we need to do this now?

There is recognized need for timely approval and establishment of a bench contract, which will enable schools and offices to immediately target and begin providing a variety of college access services needed to support postsecondary readiness. Indicators in the new State Accountability System describe factors that should be present for a student to be deemed college and career ready. These include standardized test scores (such as scoring "Standard Met" or above in the SBA grade 11 for math and ELA), access to and success in Advanced Placement courses, completion of A-G courses with a grade of C or better, CTE course pathway completion, and dual/concurrent enrollment. Other indices relate to English learner reclassification rates, attendance, and discipline reports. The provision of college access services will augment these school-based factors that are identified as indicating college readiness in the State Accountability System. By providing all stakeholders with information about the complex stages in identifying, planning, applying and enrolling in college, and for financial aid timelines and support, the District's supports will be equitable and thorough.

What would happen if this were not approved?

Without the scale and preferential pricing of Districtwide bench contracted vendors, individual local districts and schools will find the process of researching and targeting contracted services more complex to navigate. If the RFP is not approved there will also be a significant impact on school budgets, as schools will still have to obtain the required professional developments, resources and materials in order to support all students, particularly targeted subgroups. Having bench contracts in place and with adequate capacity will streamline the process of identifying and obtaining needed resources.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

These contracts will be for a single 3-year term to coincide with the remaining term of the existing Professional Development contracts. In addition, one agreement with an existing college access contractor is amended to accommodate expanded services. There is a \$5 million increase to the overall spending ceiling already approved for this contract bench. All services, materials and prices will be detailed in the existing catalogue of providers so that the range of choices is readily apparent to principals and administrators. On agreement with a vendor, a school or office will issue a shopping cart requisition that will generate a purchase order to the vendor. On-going

evaluations of these vendor's services will result in shared information that will enable access to the highest-rated service providers.

If you have any questions, or require additional information, please contact Carol Alexander, director of elementary instruction, carol.alexander@lausd.net, (213) 241-5607.

c: David Holmquist
Alma Peña-Sanchez
Thelma Meléndez de Santa Ana
Alison Yoshimoto-Towery
Nicole Elam
Jefferson Crain
Gary Garcia
Jesus Angulo

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Student Health and Human Services

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent of Schools

DATE: March 20, 2017

FROM: Erika F. Torres
Executive Director, Student Health and Human Services

SUBJECT: CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CONTRACT NO.: 4400005611
CONTRACT AMOUNT: <\$1,083,021>
RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD REVENUE CONTRACT TO CITY OF
LOS ANGELES

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

APPROVED

In an effort to address the dropout rate, the City of Los Angeles Economic and Workforce Development Department and the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), Division of Student Health and Human Services collaborated to develop a comprehensive dropout recovery model. Since 2012, the City Partnership Program has supported our highest need communities with the highest dropout rate in an effort to re-engage our youth back into an educational setting. As part of the collaboration, Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) Counselors have been co-located within City of Los Angeles YouthSource Centers and community based organization in order to serve our students collaboratively.

Why is this necessary?

This revenue contract funds the salaries of 7 LAUSD PSA Counselors and one Coordinator assigned to the co-located YouthSource Centers. This revenue contract is required so that LAUSD PSA Counselors can continue to serve our students and communities through the 16 YouthSource Centers and provide on-site support and educational services to students 16-24 years old. LAUSD PSA Counselors focus on supporting students that have the highest risk of dropping out of school and re-engaging youth that have dropped out of school back into an educational setting. This program has proven effective, an example is demonstrated by the impact in 2015-16 school year:

- More than 30,000 youth ages 16-24 have utilized the YouthSource Centers;
- 23,742 youth received an educational and psychosocial assessment from a PSA Counselor;
- 2,668 high school dropouts were re-enrolled in school.

PSA Counselors co-located at YouthSource Centers also serve as an integral component of the Truancy Diversion Program where students that have been found violating the Daytime Curfew Law are referred to receive services.

Why do we need to do this now?

This partnership model with the City of Los Angeles has been recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and the National League of Cities as a national model for re-engaging youth. This contract provides a critical revenue source that enables the District PSA Counselors to continue

to provide services within the YouthSource Centers to students that experience difficulty in achieving their academic potential due to social/emotional, home and community barriers.

What would happen if this were not approved?

If this contract were not approved by the board, PSA Counselors would not be able to continue to provide services to our highest needs students and communities within the City of Los Angeles YouthSource Centers.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

The duties of PSA Counselors will include:

- Outreach to schools, community agencies and identify students through potential dropout lists to link them to services at the YouthSource Center.
- Conduct psychosocial and educational assessments for all students that walk in to the YouthSource Center.
- Re-engage students that have dropped out of high school by linkage to appropriate school placement and advocacy for school enrollment.
- Provide services and link students, who violate daytime curfew law, referred through Los Angeles School Police Department Truancy Diversion Referral to YouthSource Programs and services.
- Serve as liaisons between YouthSource Centers and LAUSD area schools.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at erika.torres@lausd.net or at (213) 241-3840.

c: David Holmquist
Thelma Melendez
Frances Gipson
Nicole Elam-Ellis
Jefferson Crain
George Silva
SHHS Directors

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Student Health and Human Services

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent of Schools

DATE: March 20, 2017

FROM: Erika F. Torres
Executive Director, Student Health and Human Services

SUBJECT: CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CONTRACT NO.: 4400005610
CONTRACT AMOUNT: <\$1,000,000>
RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD REVENUE CONTRACT TO CITY OF
LOS ANGELES

The FamilySource Partnership Program is a collaborative effort between the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and the City of Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department (HCID) which began in 2014. The partnership program serves students, primarily between the ages 5-17 and families throughout LAUSD and within the City of Los Angeles. Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) Counselors are co-located at 13 FamilySource Centers throughout the City of Los Angeles to address barriers to academic success and provide academic consultation. The FamilySource Partnership Program aims to increase attendance, improve academic achievement and support the goal of graduation for all students.

Why is this necessary?

This revenue contract funds 50% of the salaries of 13 LAUSD PSA Counselors, one lead PSA Counselor and a Coordinator assigned to the co-located FamilySource Centers. This revenue contract is required so that LAUSD PSA Counselors can continue to serve our students and communities through the 13 FamilySource Centers by connecting them to appropriate support resources in FamilySource Centers, LAUSD services and other community agencies. LAUSD PSA Counselors who are co-located at FamilySource Centers (FSC) focus on engaging parents and students with resources to decreasing barriers to academic achievement. PSA Counselors conduct comprehensive academic assessments and serve students and families through outreach, advocacy and connecting families to programs and services. PSA Counselors also provide parent and student engagement workshops and classes at the FamilySource Centers and at local community schools. PSA Counselors at the FSCs also serve as the main provider for the Los Angeles Police Department (LASPD) Diversion Referral, an alternative to citations for students who commit minor infractions.

Why do we need to do this now?

This contracts provides a critical revenue source that enables the District PSA Counselors to continue to provide services within the City of Los Angeles FamilySource Centers to students and families and work collaboratively with them to strengthen families and enhance communities to support student academic achievement.

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

What would happen if this were not approved?

If this contract were not approved by the board, PSA Counselors would not be able to continue to provide services to our highest needs students and communities within the City of Los Angeles FamilySource Centers.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

The duties of PSA Counselors will include:

- Conduct psychosocial and educational assessments
- Link students and families to educational, social, and other services, as needed
- Provide case management related to academic outcomes for parents and families, as needed
- Serve as mental health consultants to FamilySource Center staff and provide expertise in threat assessment and crisis and suicide intervention
- Provide training workshops on the relationship on student academic success and good attendance to parents and to secondary students
- Serve as liaisons between the FamilySource Centers and LAUSD area schools
- Facilitate the process of releasing confidential information from schools to help document the academic achievement of youth participants
- Provide LAUSD progress reports to FamilySource Center staff
- Facilitate and conduct 10 FamilySource Center parent workshops
- Facilitate and conduct 10 FamilySource Center youth/student workshops
- Facilitate and conduct 4 crisis (including child abuse awareness and suicide prevention) to all 16 FamilySource Center program staff citywide

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at erika.torres@lausd.net or at (213) 241-3840.

c: David Holmquist
Thelma Melendez
Frances Gipson
Nicole Elam-Ellis
Jefferson Crain
George Silva
SHHS Directors

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Student Health and Human Services

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent of Schools

DATE: March 20, 2017

FROM: Erika F. Torres
Executive Director, Student Health and Human Services

**SUBJECT: CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CONTRACT NO.: 4400005585
CONTRACT AMOUNT: <\$250,000>
RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD REVENUE CONTRACT TO CITY OF
LOS ANGELES**

In 2014, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), Division of Student Health and Human Services, in collaboration with the City and County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Community College District, State Employment Development Department and other public and private agencies applied for a federal Performance Partnership Pilot grant with the U.S. Department of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. The Los Angeles Performance Partnership Pilot (LAP3) was one of nine pilots selected nationwide. The LAP3 offers a unique opportunity for all involved stakeholders to test innovative new strategies to improve outcomes for low-income disconnected youth ages 14 to 24, including youth in foster care, experiencing homelessness, young parents, involved in the juvenile justice system, unemployed, or who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out of school.

Why is this necessary?

The Los Angeles Performance Partnership Program (LAP3) is a comprehensive service delivery system that coordinates and integrates the multiple layers of services being provided to disconnected youth ages 16-24, high school dropouts, active in the probation system, foster care, experiencing homelessness, or out-of-school or out-of-work. LAP3 will align and coordinate with all named partners to serve at-risk youth populations. This will enable improved case management, treatment and outcome. It will address the intractable twin problems of low high school graduation and high youth unemployment rates experienced by disconnected youth through an integral local strategic plan and by enhancing its current systems based approach for youth workforce and career development.

Why do we need to do this now?

This contract will provide funding for the salary of a Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) Counselor, for two years, to serve as the LAP3 liaison, on behalf of the LAUSD, and work on LAP3 related projects to support the implementation of the LAP3 model. The PSA Counselor will provide training, information and guidance to P3 partners on LAUSD's disconnected youth and special student populations and programs. The PSA Counselor will focus on coordination and delivery of services for students experiencing homelessness, runaways, involved in the juvenile justice system and in foster care.

Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent

- 2 -

APR 18 2017

March 20, 2017

APPROVED

What would happen if this were not approved?

If this contract were not approved by the board, the LAP3 PSA Counselor would not be able to serve as the LAP3 Liaison for the LAUSD and the District would be in violation of the grant requirements.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

LAUSD Pupil Services will serve as a partner in the development and implementation of the Los Angeles Performance Partnership Program. LAUSD Pupil Services will participate in all operations, policy, data and advisory meetings during them implementation phase.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at erika.torres@lausd.net or at (213) 241-3840.

c: David Holmquist
Thelma Melendez
Frances Gipson
Nicole Elam-Ellis
Jefferson Crain
George Silva
SHHS Directors

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Division of District Operations

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

INFORMATIVE

DATE: March 10, 2017

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent

APPROVED

FROM: Yekaterina Boyajian
Director, Non-Academic Facilities Planning

**SUBJECT: HIGH RISE GOODIES RESTAURANT GROUP, INC. dba TRIMANA
REVENUE CONTRACT NO.: 4400005590
REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO FIVE YEAR
REVENUE CONTRACT FOR FOOD AND BEVERAGE SERVICES AT
LAUSD ADMINISTRATIVE HEADQUARTERS**

Introduction

The current five year revenue contract with Trimana for food and beverage services in the A Level of LAUSD Administrative Headquarters expires June 30, 2017. This new contract was advertised and competitively bid by the District's Procurement Services Division via Request for Proposal (RFP).

Why is this necessary?

Food and beverage services have been provided here at Headquarters since the District's purchase of the building. The service was also provided at the previous headquarters. Having quick and convenient access to food services in the building helps with staff efficiencies. The revenue generated from the operation provides a significant offset to operating expenses for the building. The District's Food Services Division has declined to take over the Beaudry Cafeteria, citing its focus on the student meal program.

Why do we need to do this now?

Award of this contract prior to July 1, 2017 will insure continued food and beverage services for the staff and visitors to Headquarters.

What would happen if this were not approved?

A no vote would mean the existing contract would end on June 30, 2017 and no food and beverage services would be provided onsite at Headquarters. Staff and visitors would have to travel outside of the building with additional time allocated for travel.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

The new contract will provide the higher of a monthly minimum versus a percentage of gross sales. Trimana remains responsible for all cleaning, maintenance and repair of equipment within the cafeteria premises and is required to maintain an A rating from the health department.

Revenue from this contract will continue to offset a portion of the operating expenses for LAUSD Administrative Headquarters. Trimana has offered to provide a Work-Based Learning Partnership for students and will be further expanding its menu items. Menu pricing on average is to remain at or below 95% of similar items from other similar cafeteria retailers within a 5 minute walk of the building.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at Yekaterina.Boyajian@lausd.net or at (213) 241-4520.

c: David Holmquist
Earl Perkins
Thelma Melendez
Frances Gipson
Nicole Elam-Ellis
Jefferson Crain
George Silva

APPROVED

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Division of Instruction

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

INFORMATIVE

DATE: April 3, 2017

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent

FROM: Katie McGrath
Administrator, Elementary Instruction

APPROVED

**SUBJECT: AMPLIFY EDUCATION, INC. CONTRACT 4400002912 TERM
AMENDMENT**

The District seeks to extend the contract term of the Amplify Education, Inc. contract 4400002912. The contract has a three-year term and has been active since July 1, 2014. This term amendment would extend the contract by two years to June 30, 2019. The contracted services support our goal of *Proficiency for All*, specifically the *percentage of 2nd grade students meeting early literacy benchmarks 81% by 2018-2019*.

Why is this necessary?

We aim to ensure that all students are reading, writing, speaking, and listening accurately with comprehension by the end of 2nd grade. This contract provides assessments with metrics for measuring student progress toward mastery of basic early literacy skills. The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment, a component of the Amplify Education, Inc. contract services, provides data on student progress along the continuum of literacy skills: *phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension*. See early literacy indicators in Attachment A.

With this assessment tool, teachers, students, and school administrators are able to engage in a learning cycle informed by data to design instruction, lessons, and interventions that meet the specific needs of students. Teachers are able to monitor progress at and out of grade level, to target specific skills with instruction closely linked to individual student need. Included with the assessments are tools for designing instruction, such as the “Now What Tools.” There are home-school connection features that generate suggestions and resources for parents to reinforce literacy at home with their children. There are also multiple assessments and tools in the platform in both English and Spanish. See section “Statement of Work” for itemized list on page 3 of this document.

Why do we need to do this now?

In addition to the educational benefits, there are accountability measures for the District that are linked to the assessment data:

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Related Accountability Systems

Accountability System	Measure Used
Reclassification of English Learners	DIBELS Kindergarten-5 th Grade benchmark composite score and benchmark in all sub-indicators
Local Control Accountability Plan	DIBELS 2 nd Grade End-of-Year Percentage Benchmark
California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP)	Smarter Balanced Assessments 3 rd -5 th Grades English Language Arts Meet or Exceed Standard
New State and Federal Accountability System <i>Priority 2 Implementation of State Academic Standards</i>	DIBELS Kindergarten-2 nd Grade

What would happen if this were not approved?

The current District English learner reclassification criteria requires a language assessment which is California English Language Development Test (CELDT); a basic skills assessment which is DIBELS; and English language arts grades which are given by teachers. The District reclassification criteria meets state mandated reclassification criteria guidelines. If this contract amendment were not approved, we would no longer meet reclassification criteria and would not be able to reclassify students until an alternative for the basic skills test were acquired. In order to meet reclassification criteria, the District would need to acquire a basic skills exam that meets the specifications cited in section 313[f](4) of the California education code.

- (f) The reclassification procedures developed by the department shall utilize multiple criteria in determining whether to reclassify a pupil as proficient in English, including, but not limited to, all of the following:*
- (1) Assessment of language proficiency using an objective assessment instrument, including, but not limited to, the English language development test that is developed or acquired pursuant to Section 60810.*
 - (2) Teacher evaluation, including, but not limited to, a review of the pupil's curriculum mastery.*
 - (3) Parental opinion and consultation.*
 - (4) Comparison of the performance of the pupil in basic skills against an empirically established range of performance in basic skills based upon the performance of English proficient pupils of the same age, that demonstrates whether the pupil is sufficiently proficient in English to participate effectively in a curriculum designed for pupils of the same age whose native language is English.*

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

This contract amendment will extend it for a single 2-year term. All services,

APR 18 2017

materials, and prices are detailed in a Statement of Work so that the range of services is readily apparent:

APPROVED

Statement of Work

The scope of work includes the following assessments and related services:

- 274,000 *mCLASS: Reading3D* (English) and *Now What? Tools* annual student licenses
- *mCLASS:IDEL* (Spanish DIBELS) licenses

License to administer the following assessments during 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school years:

- Placement Assessment for Grade 6 Mathematics
- Summative Assessment for Algebra
- Program Management
- Account manager will support overall project and program management
- Professional Services
- Amplify will provide in-person training and access to online modules

In-Person Training

Amplify will provide 1-day on-site and 1/2 day in person on-site sessions (quantity to be determined by Amplify and LAUSD based on the development of a professional development plan) to include but not limited to “train the trainer,” teacher and administrator training, and onsite visits. Session attendants will be determined by LAUSD with a maximum of 25 participants per session and will be scheduled for groups of schools in collaboration with LAUSD.

Online Modules

Amplify will provide access to online, asynchronous program modules, including:

- Online modules covering assessment products
- Online modules covering data use
- Online tutorials for new users
- Online tutorial for TRC targeting those who would participate in a train-the-trainer program
- Any teacher or administrator in LAUSD can access the modules

Reporting on English Learner Development Levels

Amplify will import student English language development (ELD) levels as a numeric code along with other roster data, using the usual roster processes beginning in July 2017. This data is available in *mCLASS: Reading 3D* through the use of aggregate reports at the district and Local District level by ELD level. Amplify *mCLASS: Reading 3D* has the ability to filter by ELD levels with our aggregate reporting system with the comparing populations, comparing measures, and completion reports (by grade, by school, by Local District, by district, or any combination of standard and LAUSD custom demographics).

4
APPROVED

April 3, 2017

71

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Placement Assessment for Grade 6 Mathematics and Summative Assessment for Algebra

- LAUSD will have license to administer these mathematics assessments during the 2018-2019 school year to any number of students enrolled in LAUSD and enrolled in any grade.
- Updates or changes to the assessments are optional at an additional cost.
- These assessments will be provided to the single LAUSD contact in PDF format, and LAUSD will be responsible for distribution to faculty and staff. LAUSD will take reasonable precautions to ensure the assessments are only made available to LAUSD faculty.
- In addition, *Fluence Learning* will make a best effort to load the assessments into the LAUSD platform (TBD) for use within that system, and, on request of LAUSD, *Fluence Learning* will make the assessments available through its partner platforms.

For additional information contact Katie McGrath, administrator, elementary instruction, (213) 241-5333, Katie.McGrath@lausd.net.

Attachment: A) DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score

c: Frances Gipson
David Holmquist
Thelma Melendez
Nicole Ellis-Elam
Jefferson Crain
Derrick Chau
George Silva

DIBELS® Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / December 1, 2010

Benchmark Goals

DIBELS *benchmark goals* are empirically derived, criterion-referenced target scores that represent adequate reading progress. A benchmark goal indicates a level of skill where the student is likely to achieve the next DIBELS benchmark goal or reading outcome. Benchmark goals for DIBELS are based on research that examines the predictive validity of a score on a measure at a particular point in time, compared to later DIBELS measures and external outcome assessments. If a student achieves a benchmark goal, then the odds are in favor of that student achieving later reading outcomes if he/she receives research-based instruction from a core classroom curriculum.

Benchmark Goal Research

The DIBELS Next benchmark goals, cut points for risk, and Composite Score were developed based upon data collected in a study conducted during the 2009–2010 school year. The goals represent a series of conditional probabilities of meeting later important reading outcomes. The external criterion was the Group Reading and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE; Williams, 2001). The 40th percentile on the GRADE assessment was used as an indicator that the student was making adequate progress in acquisition of important early reading and/or reading skills. Data for the study were collected in thirteen elementary and middle schools in five states. Data collection included administering the DIBELS Next measures to participating students in grades K–6 in addition to the GRADE. Participants in the study were 3816 students across grades K–6 from general education classrooms who were receiving English language reading instruction, including students with disabilities and students who were English language learners provided they had the response capabilities to participate. The study included both students who were struggling in reading and those who were typically achieving. A subset of the total sample participated in the GRADE assessment ($n = 1306$ across grades K–6). Additional information about the study will be included in the *DIBELS Next Technical Manual*, which will be available in January, 2011.

Cut Points for Risk

The *cut points for risk* indicate a level of skill below which the student is unlikely to achieve subsequent reading goals without receiving additional, targeted instructional support. Students with scores below the cut point for risk are identified as likely to need intensive support. Intensive support refers to interventions that incorporate something more or something different from the core curriculum or supplemental support. Intensive support might entail:




- delivering instruction in a smaller group,
- providing more instructional time or more practice,
- presenting smaller skill steps in the instructional hierarchy,
- providing more explicit modeling and instruction, and/or
- providing greater scaffolding and practice

Because students needing intensive support are likely to have individual and sometimes unique needs, we recommend that their progress be monitored frequently and their intervention modified dynamically to ensure adequate progress.

Between a benchmark goal and a cut point for risk is a range of scores where the student's future performance is harder to predict. To ensure that the greatest number of students achieve later reading success, it is best for students with scores in this range to receive carefully targeted additional support in the skill areas where they are having difficulty, to be monitored regularly to ensure that they are making adequate progress, and to receive increased or modified support if necessary to achieve subsequent reading goals. This type of instructional support is referred to as strategic support.

Table 1 provides the target or design odds of achieving later reading outcomes and labels for likely need for support for each of the score levels. Benchmark goals and cut points for risk are provided for the DIBELS Composite Score as well as for individual DIBELS measures.

Table 1. Odds of Achieving Subsequent Early Literacy Goals, *DIBELS* Next Benchmark Goal Levels, and Likely Need for Support

Odds of achieving subsequent early literacy goals	Visual Representation	Score Level	Likely need for support to achieve subsequent early literacy goals
80% to 90%		At or Above Benchmark <i>scores at or above the benchmark goal</i>	Likely to Need Core Support
40% to 60%		Below Benchmark <i>scores below the benchmark goal and at or above the cut point for risk</i>	Likely to Need Strategic Support
10% to 20%		Well Below Benchmark <i>scores below the cut point for risk</i>	Likely to Need Intensive Support

DIBELS Composite Score

The DIBELS Composite Score is a combination of multiple DIBELS scores and provides the best overall estimate of the student's early literacy skills and/or reading proficiency. Most data management services will calculate the DIBELS Composite Score for you. To calculate the DIBELS Composite Score yourself, see the *DIBELS Next Composite Score Worksheets*. In DIBELS 6th Edition, the Instructional Recommendations provided the best overall estimate of the student's early literacy skills and/or reading proficiency. The DIBELS Next Composite Score and the benchmark goals and cut points for risk based on the composite score replace the Instructional Recommendations on DIBELS 6th Edition.

Benchmark goals and cut points for risk for the DIBELS Composite Score are based on the same logic and procedures as the individual DIBELS measures; however, since the DIBELS Composite Score provides the best overall estimate of a student's skills, the DIBELS Composite Score should generally be interpreted first. If a student is at or above the benchmark goal on the DIBELS Composite Score, the odds are in the student's favor of reaching later important reading outcomes. Some students who score at or above the DIBELS Composite Score benchmark goal may still need additional support in one of the basic early literacy skills, as indicated by a below benchmark score on an individual DIBELS Next measure (FSF, PSF, NWF, DORF, or Daze), especially for students whose composite score is close to the benchmark goal.

Because the scores used to calculate the DIBELS Composite Score vary by grade and time of year, it is important to note that the composite score generally cannot be used to directly measure growth over time or to compare results across grades or times of year. However, because the logic and procedures used to establish benchmark goals are consistent across grades and times of year, the percent of students at or above benchmark can be compared, even though the mean scores are not comparable.

Frequently Asked Questions About DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals

1. Why doesn't Letter Naming Fluency have benchmark goals?

Answer:

Letter Naming Fluency (LNF) is an *indicator of risk*, rather than an instructional target. While the ability to recognize and name letters in preschool and at the beginning of kindergarten is a strong predictor of later reading achievement (e.g., Badian, 1995; Walsh, Price, and Gillingham, 1988), studies have failed to show that teaching letter names to students enhances their reading ability (e.g., Ehri, 1983) and, in fact, have demonstrated that successful learning of letter-sound

correspondences that leads to reading acquisition can occur without knowledge of letter names (Bruck, Genesee, & Caravolas, 1997; Mann & Wimmer, 2002). Because learning letter names is not a powerful instructional target, benchmark goals are not provided for LNF. LNF is a strong predictor of later reading, however, so it is included as a part of the DIBELS Composite Score in kindergarten and early first grade.

2. Why are the sixth grade benchmark goals lower than the fifth grade goals?

Answer:

The difficulty level of the passages used for DORF and Daze changes by grade, so composite scores and benchmark goals can't be directly compared across grades. The difficulty level of the passages increases by grade in a roughly linear fashion. However, student performance increases in a curve, with the most growth occurring in the earlier grades, and slower growth in the upper grades. Between fifth and sixth grade, the difficulty level of the materials increases at a faster rate than student performance, so benchmark goals are lower in sixth grade than in fifth.

References

- Badian, N.A. (1995). Predicting reading ability over the long term: The changing role of letter naming, phonological awareness and orthographic processing. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 45, 79-96.
- Bruck, M., Genesee, F., & Caravolas, M. (1997). A cross-linguistic study of early literacy acquisition. In B. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia: Implications for early intervention* (pp. 145-162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ehri, L.C. (1983). A critique of five studies related to letter-name knowledge and learning to read. In L. Gentile, M. Kamil, & J. Blanchard (Eds.), *Reading research revisited* (pp. 143-153). Columbus, OH: C.E. Merrill.
- Mann, V.A., & Wimmer, H. (2002). Phoneme awareness and pathways into literacy: A comparison of German and American children. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15, 653-682.
- Walsh, D.J., Price, G.G., & Gillingham, M.G. (1988). The critical but transitory importance of letter naming. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 108-122.
- Williams, K.T. (2001). *Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE)*. New York: Pearson.

DIBELS® Next: Summary of Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Composite Score																					
26	122	119	113	130	155	141	190	238	220	285	330	290	330	391	357	372	415	344	358	380	
13	85	89	97	100	111	109	145	180	180	235	280	245	290	330	258	310	340	280	285	324	
First Sound Fluency (FSF)																					
10	30																				
5	20																				
Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)																					
No benchmark set for LNF																					
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)																					
20	40	40																			
10	25	25																			
Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF)																					
17	28	27	43	58	54																
8	15	18	33	47	35																
Whole Words Read						1	8	13	13												
						0	3	6	6												
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF)																					
Words Correct						23	47	52	72	87	70	86	100	90	103	115	111	120	107	109	120
						16	32	37	55	65	55	68	80	70	79	95	96	101	90	92	95
Accuracy						78%	90%	90%	96%	97%	95%	96%	97%	96%	93%	94%	95%	98%	97%	97%	98%
						68%	82%	81%	91%	93%	89%	92%	94%	93%	94%	95%	95%	96%	94%	94%	96%
Retell						15	16	21	27	18	20	26	30	27	30	33	33	36	27	29	32
						0	8	13	18	10	18	18	20	14	20	24	22	25	16	18	24
Retell Quality of Response						2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3
						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	
Date						8	11	19	15	24	18	20	24	15	17	24	18	20	19	21	
						5	7	14	10	12	13	12	20	10	12	20	18	14	14	15	
Kindergarten			First Grade			Second Grade			Third Grade			Fourth Grade			Fifth Grade			Sixth Grade			
Beg	Mid	End	Beg	Mid	End	Beg	Mid	End	Beg	Mid	End	Beg	Mid	End	Beg	Mid	End	Beg	Mid	End	

DIBELS Composite Score: A combination of multiple DIBELS scores, which provides the best overall estimate of the student's reading proficiency. For information on how to calculate the composite score, see the *DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score* document available from <http://dibels.org/>.

BENCHMARK GOAL (large number in top of each box): Students scoring at or above the benchmark goal have the odds in their favor (approximately 80%–90%) of achieving later important reading outcomes. These scores are identified as *At or Above Benchmark* and the students are likely to need *Core Support*.

CUT POINT FOR RISK (small number in each box): Students scoring below the cut point for risk are unlikely (approximately 10%–20%) to achieve subsequent goals without receiving additional, targeted instructional support. These scores are identified as *Well Below Benchmark* and the students are likely to need *Intensive Support*.

Scores below the benchmark goal and at or above the cut point for risk are identified as *Below Benchmark*. In this range, a student's future performance is harder to predict, and these students are likely to need *Strategic Support*.

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

This is a summary of the DIBELS Next benchmark goals. For a full description, see the *DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score* document available from <http://dibels.org/>.
DIBELS is a registered trademark of Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. This page is adapted from a chart developed by Cache County School District.

Kindergarten Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

Measure	Score Level	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	26 +	122 +	119 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	13 - 25	85 - 121	89 - 118
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 12	0 - 84	0 - 88
FSF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	10 +	30 +	
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	5 - 9	20 - 29	
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 4	0 - 19	
PSF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support		20 +	40 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		10 - 19	25 - 39
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0 - 9	0 - 24
NWF-CLS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support		17 +	28 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		8 - 16	15 - 27
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0 - 7	0 - 14

The benchmark goal is the number provided in the At or Above Benchmark row. The cut point for risk is the first number provided in the Below Benchmark row.

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

First Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

Measure	Score Level	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	113 +	130 +	155 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	97 - 112	100 - 129	111 - 154
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 96	0 - 99	0 - 110
PSF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	40 +		
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	25 - 39		
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 24		
NWF-CLS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	27 +	43 +	58 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	18 - 26	33 - 42	47 - 57
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 17	0 - 32	0 - 46
NWF-WWR	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	1 +	8 +	13 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	0	3 - 7	6 - 12
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0 - 2	0 - 5
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support		23 +	47 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		16 - 22	32 - 46
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0 - 15	0 - 31
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support		78% +	90% +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		68% - 77%	82% - 89%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0% - 67%	0% - 81%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support			15 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support			0 - 14
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			

The benchmark goal is the number provided in the At or Above Benchmark row. The cut point for risk is the first number provided in the Below Benchmark row.

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Second Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

Measure	Score Level	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	141 +	190 +	238 +
Composite	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	109 - 140	145 - 189	180 - 237
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 108	0 - 144	0 - 179
NWF-CLS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	54 +		
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	35 - 53		
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 34		
NWF-WWR	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	13 +		
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	6 - 12		
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 5		
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	52 +	72 +	87 +
Words	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	37 - 51	55 - 71	65 - 86
Correct	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 36	0 - 54	0 - 64
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	90% +	96% +	97% +
Accuracy	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	81% - 89%	91% - 95%	93% - 96%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 80%	0% - 90%	0% - 92%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	16 +	21 +	27 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	8 - 15	13 - 20	18 - 26
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 7	0 - 12	0 - 17
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support		2 +	2 +
Quality of	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		1	1
Response	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			

The benchmark goal is the number provided in the At or Above Benchmark row. The cut point for risk is the first number provided in the Below Benchmark row.

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Third Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

Measure	Score Level	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	220 +	285 +	330 +
Composite	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	180 - 219	235 - 284	280 - 329
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 179	0 - 234	0 - 279
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	70 +	86 +	100 +
Words	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	55 - 69	68 - 85	80 - 99
Correct	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 54	0 - 67	0 - 79
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	95% +	96% +	97% +
Accuracy	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	89% - 94%	92% - 95%	94% - 96%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 88%	0% - 91%	0% - 93%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	20 +	26 +	30 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	10 - 19	18 - 25	20 - 29
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 9	0 - 17	0 - 19
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	2 +	2 +	3 +
Quality of	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	1	1	2
Response	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			1
Daze	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	8 +	11 +	19 +
Adjusted	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	5 - 7	7 - 10	14 - 18
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 4	0 - 6	0 - 13

The benchmark goal is the number provided in the At or Above Benchmark row. The cut point for risk is the first number provided in the Below Benchmark row.

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Fourth Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

Measure	Score Level	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	290 +	330 +	391 +
Composite	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	245 - 289	290 - 329	330 - 390
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 244	0 - 289	0 - 329
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	90 +	103 +	115 +
Words	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	70 - 89	79 - 102	95 - 114
Correct	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 69	0 - 78	0 - 94
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	96% +	97% +	98% +
Accuracy	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	93% - 95%	94% - 96%	95% - 97%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 92%	0% - 93%	0% - 94%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	27 +	30 +	33 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	14 - 26	20 - 29	24 - 32
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 13	0 - 19	0 - 23
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	2 +	2 +	3 +
Quality of	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	1	1	2
Response	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			1
Daze	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	15 +	17 +	24 +
Adjusted	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	10 - 14	12 - 16	20 - 23
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 9	0 - 11	0 - 19

The benchmark goal is the number provided in the At or Above Benchmark row. The cut point for risk is the first number provided in the Below Benchmark row.

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Fifth Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

Measure	Score Level	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	357 +	372 +	415 +
Composite	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	258 - 356	310 - 371	340 - 414
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 257	0 - 309	0 - 339
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	111 +	120 +	130 +
Words	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	96 - 110	101 - 119	105 - 129
Correct	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 95	0 - 100	0 - 104
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	98% +	98% +	99% +
Accuracy	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	95% - 97%	96% - 97%	97% - 98%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 94%	0% - 95%	0% - 96%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	33 +	36 +	36 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	22 - 32	25 - 35	25 - 35
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 21	0 - 24	0 - 24
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	2 +	3 +	3 +
Quality of	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	1	2	2
Response	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		1	1
Daze	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	18 +	20 +	24 +
Adjusted	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	12 - 17	13 - 19	18 - 23
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 11	0 - 12	0 - 17

The benchmark goal is the number provided in the At or Above Benchmark row. The cut point for risk is the first number provided in the Below Benchmark row.

APPROVED
ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Sixth Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

Measure	Score Level	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	344 +	358 +	380 +
Composite	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	280 - 343	285 - 357	324 - 379
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 279	0 - 284	0 - 323
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	107 +	109 +	120 +
Words	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	90 - 106	92 - 108	95 - 119
Correct	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 89	0 - 91	0 - 94
DORF	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	97% +	97% +	98% +
Accuracy	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	94% - 96%	94% - 96%	96% - 97%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 93%	0% - 93%	0% - 95%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	27 +	29 +	32 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	16 - 26	18 - 28	24 - 31
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 15	0 - 17	0 - 23
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	2 +	2 +	3 +
Quality of	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	1	1	2
Response	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			1
Daze	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support	18 +	19 +	21 +
Adjusted	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	14 - 17	14 - 18	15 - 20
Score	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 13	0 - 13	0 - 14

The benchmark goal is the number provided in the At or Above Benchmark row. The cut point for risk is the first number provided in the Below Benchmark row.

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Kindergarten Odds of Meeting Selected Later Important Reading Outcomes from Benchmark Goal Research

Measure	Score Level	Odds of being on track on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Beginning of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on GRADE based on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score
DIBELS	At or Above Benchmark	84%	83%	74%
Composite	Below Benchmark	50%	38%	50%
Score	Well Below Benchmark	22%	35%	36%
<hr/>				
FSF	At or Above Benchmark	81%	76%	
	Below Benchmark	43%	43%	
	Well Below Benchmark	33%	29%	
<hr/>				
PSF	At or Above Benchmark		75%	70%
	Below Benchmark		54%	56%
	Well Below Benchmark		38%	50%
<hr/>				
NWF-CLS	At or Above Benchmark		82%	74%
	Below Benchmark		46%	63%
	Well Below Benchmark		30%	20%

Note. This table shows the odds of being on track for the DIBELS Composite Score at the middle and end of the year and the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's DIBELS Composite Score at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2012

First Grade Odds of Meeting Selected Later Important Reading Outcomes from Benchmark Goal Research

Measure	Score Level	Odds of being on track on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Beginning of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on GRADE based on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	84%	90%	90%
	Below Benchmark	35%	34%	48%
	Well Below Benchmark	26%	12%	10%
PSF	At or Above Benchmark	75%		
	Below Benchmark	56%		
	Well Below Benchmark	39%		
NWF-CLS	At or Above Benchmark	83%	85%	83%
	Below Benchmark	40%	42%	50%
	Well Below Benchmark	20%	26%	35%
NWF-WWR	At or Above Benchmark	81%	85%	83%
	Below Benchmark	36%	42%	59%
	Well Below Benchmark		21%	32%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark		88%	90%
	Below Benchmark		34%	42%
	Well Below Benchmark		7%	10%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark		87%	89%
	Below Benchmark		39%	36%
	Well Below Benchmark		20%	13%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark		APR 18 2017	87%
	Below Benchmark			62%
	Well Below Benchmark			

Note. This table shows the odds of being on track for the DIBELS Composite Score at the middle and end of the year and the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's DIBELS Composite Score at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

APPROVED

Second Grade Odds of Meeting Selected Later Important Reading Outcomes from Benchmark Goal Research

Measure	Score Level	Odds of being on track on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Beginning of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on GRADE based on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	92%	92%	89%
	Below Benchmark	41%	37%	45%
	Well Below Benchmark	10%	9%	14%
NWF-CLS	At or Above Benchmark	90%		
	Below Benchmark	52%		
	Well Below Benchmark	24%		
NWF-WWR	At or Above Benchmark	89%		
	Below Benchmark	52%		
	Well Below Benchmark	42%		
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	95%	95%	89%
	Below Benchmark	48%	46%	43%
	Well Below Benchmark	12%	10%	14%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	89%	92%	88%
	Below Benchmark	48%	45%	39%
	Well Below Benchmark	9%	12%	26%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	86%	88%	86%
	Below Benchmark	59%	48%	56%
	Well Below Benchmark	23%	17%	19%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark		86%	81%
Quality of Response	Below Benchmark		46%	41%
	Well Below Benchmark			

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Note. This table shows the odds of being on track for the DIBELS Composite Score at the middle and end of the year and the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's DIBELS Composite Score at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

APPROVED

Third Grade Odds of Meeting Selected Later Important Reading Outcomes from Benchmark Goal Research

Measure	Score Level	Odds of being on track on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Beginning of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on GRADE based on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	93%	91%	90%
	Below Benchmark	47%	43%	48%
	Well Below Benchmark	4%	8%	7%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	93%	90%	89%
	Below Benchmark	37%	42%	50%
	Well Below Benchmark	8%	11%	18%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	89%	86%	87%
	Below Benchmark	54%	44%	38%
	Well Below Benchmark	5%	7%	19%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	85%	84%	86%
	Below Benchmark	54%	58%	48%
	Well Below Benchmark	21%	26%	20%
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	88%	82%	87%
	Below Benchmark	50%	40%	60%
	Well Below Benchmark			15%
Daze Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	90%	89%	90%
	Below Benchmark	41%	50%	48%
	Well Below Benchmark	14%	19%	14%

Note. This table shows the odds of being on track for the DIBELS Composite Score at the middle and end of the year and the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's DIBELS Composite Score at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

APPROVED

Fourth Grade Odds of Meeting Selected Later Important Reading Outcomes from Benchmark Goal Research

Measure	Score Level	Odds of being on track on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Beginning of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on GRADE based on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	92%	90%	84%
	Below Benchmark	38%	41%	58%
	Well Below Benchmark	6%	10%	3%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	91%	88%	85%
	Below Benchmark	52%	46%	59%
	Well Below Benchmark	5%	2%	3%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	87%	81%	75%
	Below Benchmark	52%	45%	54%
	Well Below Benchmark	11%	16%	6%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	84%	87%	83%
	Below Benchmark	48%	53%	53%
	Well Below Benchmark	20%	13%	12%
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	80%	79%	87%
	Below Benchmark	39%	33%	52%
	Well Below Benchmark			19%
Daze Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	87%	88%	80%
	Below Benchmark	50%	54%	65%
	Well Below Benchmark	12%	20%	14%

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Note. This table shows the odds of being on track for the DIBELS Composite Score at the middle and end of the year and the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's DIBELS Composite Score at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

APPROVED

Fifth Grade Odds of Meeting Selected Later Important Reading Outcomes from Benchmark Goal Research

Measure	Score Level	Odds of being on track on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Beginning of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on GRADE based on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	90%	88%	87%
	Below Benchmark	25%	32%	45%
	Well Below Benchmark	4%	3%	7%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	89%	87%	83%
	Below Benchmark	41%	32%	57%
	Well Below Benchmark	6%	5%	11%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	83%	77%	82%
	Below Benchmark	47%	36%	55%
	Well Below Benchmark	6%	13%	16%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	76%	78%	86%
	Below Benchmark	57%	43%	39%
	Well Below Benchmark	26%	25%	20%
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	71%	77%	83%
	Below Benchmark	34%	47%	38%
	Well Below Benchmark		23%	11%
Daze Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	82%	88%	82%
	Below Benchmark	47%	49%	61%
	Well Below Benchmark	6%	6%	20%

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

APPROVED

Note. This table shows the odds of being on track for the DIBELS Composite Score at the middle and end of the year and the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's DIBELS Composite Score at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

Sixth Grade Odds of Meeting Selected Later Important Reading Outcomes from Benchmark Goal Research

Measure	Score Level	Odds of being on track on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Beginning of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score based on the Middle of Year DIBELS Composite Score	Odds of being on track on GRADE based on the End of Year DIBELS Composite Score
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	94%	94%	93%
	Below Benchmark	34%	37%	45%
	Well Below Benchmark	10%	9%	13%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	92%	92%	90%
	Below Benchmark	43%	41%	64%
	Well Below Benchmark	8%	19%	25%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	88%	89%	90%
	Below Benchmark	49%	54%	69%
	Well Below Benchmark	21%	14%	30%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	86%	88%	90%
	Below Benchmark	58%	50%	60%
	Well Below Benchmark	16%	20%	25%
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	84%	83%	92%
	Below Benchmark	48%	39%	68%
	Well Below Benchmark			25%
Daze Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	90%	89%	90%
	Below Benchmark	54%	51%	57%
	Well Below Benchmark	14%	15%	20%

Note. This table shows the odds of being on track for the DIBELS Composite Score at the middle and end of the year and the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's DIBELS Composite Score at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

APPROVED

K Kindergarten DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning of Year Benchmark

FSF Score = _____ [1]

LNF Score = _____ [2]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–2) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

FSF Score = _____ [1]

LNF Score = _____ [2]

PSF Score = _____ [3]

NWF CLS Score = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

LNF Score = _____ [1]

PSF Score = _____ [2]

NWF CLS Score = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

APPROVED

1 First Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet 91

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Beginning of Year Benchmark

LNF Score = _____ [1]

PSF Score = _____ [2]

NWF CLS Score = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 49%	0
50% – 52%	2
53% – 55%	8
56% – 58%	14
59% – 61%	20
62% – 64%	26
65% – 67%	32
68% – 70%	38
71% – 73%	44
74% – 76%	50
77% – 79%	56
80% – 82%	62
83% – 85%	68
86% – 88%	74
89% – 91%	80
92% – 94%	86
95% – 97%	92
98% – 100%	98

Middle of Year Benchmark

NWF CLS Score = _____ [1]

NWF WWR Score = _____ [2]

DORF Words Correct = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %

$100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 64%	0
65% – 66%	3
67% – 68%	9
69% – 70%	15
71% – 72%	21
73% – 74%	27
75% – 76%	33
77% – 78%	39
79% – 80%	45
81% – 82%	51
83% – 84%	57
85% – 86%	63
87% – 88%	69
89% – 90%	75
91% – 92%	81
93% – 94%	87
95% – 96%	93
97% – 98%	99
99% – 100%	105

End of Year Benchmark

NWF WWR Score _____ x 2 = _____ [1]

DORF Words Correct = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %

$100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

2 Second Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet⁹²

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

APPROVED

ADOPTED
TOWARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Beginning of Year Benchmark

Beginning of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 64%	0
65% – 66%	3
67% – 68%	9
69% – 70%	15
71% – 72%	21
73% – 74%	27
75% – 76%	33
77% – 78%	39
79% – 80%	45
81% – 82%	51
83% – 84%	57
85% – 86%	63
87% – 88%	69
89% – 90%	75
91% – 92%	81
93% – 94%	87
95% – 96%	93
97% – 98%	99
99% – 100%	105

NWF WWR Score _____ x 2 = _____ [1]

DORF Words Correct = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

3 Third Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet 93

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

APPROVED

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

ACCEPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

4 Fourth Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet ⁹⁴

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____ Class: _____

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

5 Fifth Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet 95

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____ Class: _____

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

6 Sixth Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet 96

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____ Class: _____

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Division of Instruction

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent of Schools

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

INFORMATIVE

DATE: March 29, 2017

FROM: Angela Hewlett-Bloch *AHB*
Administrator, Access, Equity, and Acceleration

Kandice McLurkin *KM*
Administrative Coordinator, Standard English Learners/AEMP

APPROVED

SUBJECT: *AWARDED CONTRACTOR NAME:* Data Recognition Corporation
CONTRACT NO.: 44000004565
CONTRACT AMOUNT: \$0
**RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD, REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION,
AMENDMENT, ETC.**

Why is this necessary?

The District's Local Control Accountability Plan, EL Master Plan, Strengthening Support for Standard English Learners Resolution, and the voluntary agreement with the Office of Civil Rights requires the monitoring of language proficiency for African-American and other Standard English Language Learner populations.

Why do we need to do this now?

As outlined in the Strengthening Support for Standard English Learners Resolution (Res-097-13/14) (Noticed May 20, 2014) students face barriers to learning when their language varies from the Academic Standard English used in classroom discourse and textbooks, and thus may not always access equitable opportunities to learn. We are charged with implementing an appropriate assessment of the academic language needs of Standard English Learners to ensure that all students are provided with equitable opportunities to access the California State Standards. Language Assessment Scales (LAS) Links provides diagnostic information about the strengths and weaknesses of each student and student group, hence informing educators with a more accurate picture of students' language and literacy needs.

What would happen if this were not approved?

This assessment provides teachers and administrators with tools to assist in the monitoring of language proficiency for Standard English Learners. If this contract is not approved, LAUSD will not have an assessment for the purpose of monitoring the language proficiency of Standard English Learners.

APPROVED

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

The academic language development assessments for Standard English Learners will be provided by Data Recognition Corporation (DRC). The amended contract terms will be extended from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2019. Data Recognition Corporation will provide an integrated assessment system that includes the online versions of the language proficiency test, Language Scales Assessment. The assessment will measure listening, speaking, reading and writing language skills as well as provide diagnostic scores in the following language context strands: Social, Instructional, Intercultural; Language Arts/Social Studies/History/Mathematics/ Science and Technical subjects. This assessment will be used to monitor academic language development and will assist teachers in designing targeted language proficiency instruction in an academic context. Language scores will provide information on the progress of academic English proficiency.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Angela Hewlett-Bloch, angela.hewlett@lausd.net or Kandice McLurkin, kandice.mclurkin@lausd.net at (213) 241-3340.

c: David Holmquist
Thelma Melendez de Santa Ana
Nicole Elam-Ellis
George Silva
Dr. Frances Gipson

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Facilities Services Division

INFORMATIVE

DATE: February 22, 2017

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent of Schools

FROM: Roger Finstad, Director
Maintenance and Operations

**SUBJECT: GUM REMOVAL AND PAVEMENT CLEANING SERVICES,
IFB NO. 2000001161
QUALITY COMMERCIAL CLEANING, INC., DBA SPECTRUM FACILITY
MAINTENANCE, CONTRACT NO.: 4400005536
CONTRACT AMOUNT: \$1,000,000.00 TOTAL VALUE OVER THREE YEARS
WITH TWO TWELVE MONTH EXTENSION OPTIONS
RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD**

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT
APR 18 2017

Maintenance and Operations is requesting the Board of Education's approval to award Contract No. 4400005536 for the purchase of Gum Removal and Pavement Cleaning Services at various locations within the District.

Why is this necessary?

This contract is needed to provide the lowest overall competitive cost for Gum Removal and Pavement Cleaning Services.

Why do we need to do this now?

There is a continuous need for Gum Removal and Pavement Cleaning Services within the District. The award of this contract will allow Maintenance & Operations to perform the needed service District-wide.

What would happen if this were not approved?

If this request is not approved, the District will expend additional resources to procure services for Gum Removal and Pavement Cleaning. The District does not have adequate staff to provide for Gum Removal and Pavement Cleaning Services on a regular basis.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

The terms of the contract will be for 36 months, with two twelve month extension options. Funding will be provided on an as needed basis utilizing an estimated 90% General Funds and 10% Bond.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at roger.finstad@lausd.net or at (213) 241-0304.

c: David Holmquist
Thelma Meléndez de Santa Ana
Jefferson Crain

Alma Pena-Sanchez
Nicole Elam-Ellis
Hugh Tucker

Quinton Dean
Mark Hovatter
George Silva

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Information Technology Division

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

INFORMATIVE

DATE: April 18, 2017

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent of Schools

FROM: Shahryar Khazei, Chief Information Officer

**SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF AGREEMENTS TO RENEW ANNUAL SUPPORT AND
MAINTENANCE OF THE DISTRICT'S ENTERPRISE-LEVEL
SOFTWARE**

CONTRACTOR	CONTRACT NO.
WELLIGENT	4500293632
MYTHICS, INC	4500293633

The Information Technology Division (ITD) is requesting Board approval to renew critical enterprise-level software support and maintenance agreements for the continued operation of the District's computing environment for fiscal year 2017-18.

Why is this necessary?

Software support and maintenance agreements ensure the District maximizes the efficiency and utilization of software applications through version upgrades, bug fixes, patches, and technical support.

Why do we need to do this now?

The District's software support and maintenance agreements are renewed on an annual basis. The vendors included in these agreements provide critical support to major District software applications.

What would happen if this were not approved?

Without approval, the District would lose access to the version upgrades, bug fixes, and patches that keep the District's major software applications running at optimal condition. Additionally, the District would lose access to technical support from highly skilled and certified technicians that help the District diagnose issues and resolve problems quickly.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

Each software support agreement is scheduled to be renewed for a one-year term. The source of funding for each proposed agreement is 100% General Fund. Additional information, including description, procurement type and term, is summarized in the attached table.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at 213-241-4096.

c: David Holmquist	Thelma Meléndez	Frances Gipson	Nicole Elam-Ellis
Jefferson Crain	George Silva		

Table - Summary of Enterprise-Level Agreements Submitted for Renewal

Vendor	Renewal Amount	Products Included in Software Support Agreements	Procurement Type
Welligent	\$425,452	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ongoing support for the system used by the Division of Special Education and Student Health and Human Services to manage individualized education plans (IEPs) and student health records.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sole Source - Software support agreement for the listed product is proprietary to Welligent and not available through any authorized reseller.
Mythics, Inc	\$2,047,972	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oracle databases provide the foundation for all major District business applications, including SAP, MiSiS, MyData, and Welligent.• Oracle Business Intelligence Foundation Suite is the toolset used to develop the District's strategic dashboards and reports.• Advanced Data Compression – reduces the size of large databases to increase storage capacity and optimize application performance.• Golden Gate – provides real time data replication across multiple systems for reporting purposes without reducing performance on production systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Formally Competed – Software support agreement is available through authorized resellers.

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE
Los Angeles Unified School District
Division of District Operations

Board of Education Report
No. 396-16/17
For April 18, 2017, Board Meeting

REVISED INFORMATIVE

DATE: April 17, 2017

TO: Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent

FROM: Earl R. Perkins
Associate Superintendent

Deborah D. Brandt
Director

APPROVED

ADOPTED
BOARD REPORT

APR 18 2017

SUBJECT: BUDDY'S ALL STARS CONTRACT NO. 4400005602 – (IFB 2000001133) NEW FOOTBALL HELMETS, SHOULDER PADS, AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

The Interscholastic Athletic Department is requesting the Board of Education's approval to award Contract No. 4400005602 – New Football Helmets, Shoulder Pads, and Other Miscellaneous Items.

Why is this necessary?

Currently, the District's high school football teams use a variety of vendors to purchase helmets, shoulder pads, and other gear for student-athletes' use. This contract is needed to provide the lowest overall competitive cost for helmets, shoulder pads, and other items for our 67 high schools that field football teams. This contract will also help the District to monitor all football equipment purchased at school sites.

The selected vendor provides the Xenith EPIC and X2E football helmets. The National Football League Health and Safety Report found the helmets are among the safest ones available. Numerous college football programs also gave them their highest rating. The Xenith's have a compression liner that acts as a suspension system, allowing the helmet and shell to move independently, reducing rotational forces. These models also include a shock absorber technology that uses compression to offset impact. Players like these helmets for two main reasons: vents on each side provides maximum airflow and keeps the head cool. In addition, the helmets, designed for student-athletes at the high school, collegiate and professional levels, are light and comfortable to wear. The National Operating Committee's Standards for Athletic Equipment (NOCSAE) chose these head protectors, among a small number that met all national safety certifications.

Safety is also a top criterion for other football gear. The Douglas shoulder pads (SPQBK, SPMRD@ and SP252) are considered one of the top shoulder pads available in the average price range. The quarterback and wide receiver pads (SPQBK) are streamlined, lightweight, and flexible allowing for better arm movement. The lineman pads (SPMRD2) are considered one of the top-rated models for protection, and are used by numerous college and professional athletes. The running back and defensive back (SP252) pads have the most built-in protection available for the core.

Equipping student-athletes in brands, like Douglas and Xenith, would be a tremendous asset to our football players.

Why do we need to do this now?

First, student safety is a top priority for the District's athletes. Moreover, there is greater public awareness of head concussions and other injuries. The state is also adding more requirements for school districts to report athletic injuries. For these reasons, purchasing equipment through a single vendor creates several advantages like producing greater cost savings for schools; tracking purchases for improving financial and quality controls; and equipping players with gear that is better suited for preventing injuries.

APR 18 2017 2

Members, Board of Education
Michelle King, Superintendent

Board of Education Report
No. 396-16/17
For April 18, 2017, Board Meeting

APPROVED

What would happen if the contract were rejected?

If the contract were not approved, schools would pay higher equipment costs. This may force many schools to defer buying new equipment, and sticking with older gear. Using uncertified or damaged equipment is harmful to our student-athletes, making it imperative to use equipment that meets all safety standards. In addition, purchasing equipment from different vendors could lead to less quality control and inconsistent service, exposing the District to greater risk and liability.

What are the terms of the proposed agreement?

The contract covers 60 months. Each school can buy items through their general fund or Associated Student Body account (ASB), using a purchase order. The annual total expense for the 67 Los Angeles Unified School District high schools offering football is \$2,160,000.00.

If you have any questions, please contact Trenton Cornelius, Coordinator, at trenton.cornelius@lausd.net or at (213) 241-5847.

c: Alma Peña-Sanchez
David Holmquist
Thelma Méndez de Santa Ana
Frances Gipson
Nicole Elam-Ellis
Jefferson Crain
Cheryl Simpson
Deborah Brandy
Trenton Cornelius