

DPB Response to Written Questions for RFP # SER-2014-01

1. In reviewing background documentation related to this project, we noted that the DPB website shows that Petersburg City Schools indicated 98.9 percent implementation of recommendations, while the update study by MGT noted 39 out of 48 recommendations with fiscal impacts implemented. These numbers do not reconcile. What was the source and date of the 98.9 percent?

All school divisions that participate in an efficiency review through this program are required to report to the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) on the implementation status of each recommendation and any budget savings realized. We collect this data 6 months, 12 months, and a final report 2 years after the review is completed. The data reported on our website reflects the most recent implementation status provided by the division to the DPB. For Petersburg, the data reflects their final report, which was reported to the DPB on January 5, 2009.

2. The RFP notes that there were 91 recommendations made in the initial study and that 48 had fiscal impact. The 2007 MGT report notes only 90 recommendations and 38 that had fiscal impact. Can you provide details on what changed in regard to the recommendations and their fiscal impacts?

The 2007 Petersburg School Efficiency Review report resulted in 91 recommendations, 48 of which had fiscal impacts. The executive summary of this report stated that there were 90 recommendations because recommendation 7-13 was missing from the summary tables. The 2007 report noted 38 recommendations with fiscal impacts when there were actually 39 because recommendation 7-13 was not counted. In 2008, the private firm that conducted the initial review provided a follow up review of the recommendations with a fiscal impact and found that was actually a total of 48 with fiscal implications – nine recommendations that were not originally identified as having a fiscal impact.

3. For this update, are you requesting a review of implementation of only the 48 recommendations with initial fiscal impacts, or all 91 recommendations? We believe it possible that some of the original recommendations without fiscal impact recommendations could have in fact resulted in some fiscal impact, such as the one on page 3-14 of the 2007 report, which notes that some costs could be reduced if monthly payroll processing is feasible, but no estimate of fiscal impact is included.

For this update, we are requesting a review of all 91 recommendations.

4. Although DPB has contracted for numerous School Efficiency Reviews in past years, this appears to be the first time it has contracted for an update study. Why was Petersburg City Schools selected for a contracted update?

Petersburg City Schools was selected for a contracted review pursuant to Item 271 of Chapter 806, Acts of Assembly of 2013 that requires the DPB to conduct a follow-up review of the implementation status of the recommendations from the 2007 Petersburg School Efficiency Review. Reports produced and information gathered through this RFP may be used in DPB's report to the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by December 1, 2013.

5. Will the firm which conducted the comprehensive efficiency review of the school division in 2007 be given preference for this review?

No

6. On page 4 of the RFP, it states that the same firm (which did the original review) conducted a follow-up review in 2008. What was the amount of money the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget paid for this follow-up study?

The Department of Planning and Budget paid \$19,975 for the follow-up study in 2008-2009.

7. Why is this follow-up review being conducted? Is it due to concerns about the school division's curriculum, finances, or other operations?

Petersburg City Schools was selected for a contracted review pursuant to Item 271 of Chapter 806, Acts of Assembly of 2013 that requires the DPB to conduct a follow-up review of the implementation status of the recommendations from the 2007 Petersburg School Efficiency Review. Reports produced and information gathered through this RFP may be used in DPB's report to the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees by December 1, 2013.

8. Will the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget be issuing any additional RFPs this year?

This question does not pertain to RFP # SER-2014-01.