

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register* and the Office of Employee Appeals' website. Parties should promptly notify the Office Manager of any formal errors so that this Office can correct them before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

**THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**BEFORE**

**THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS**

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
EMPLOYEE <sup>1</sup> ,	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0062-25
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: January 6, 2026
	)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,	)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency	)	Senior Administrative Judge
	)	
Employee, <i>Pro se</i>		
Angel Cox, Esq., Agency Representative		

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On August 1, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA”) contesting the D.C. Public Schools’ (“Agency” or “DCPS”) decision to terminate him from his position as a Manager, Strategy and Logistics at Burrville Elementary School.<sup>2</sup> OEA issued a Request for Agency Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal on August 1, 2025. Thereafter, on September 3, 2025, Agency filed its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal.

This matter was assigned to the undersigned on September 3, 2025. Thereafter, I issued an Order on September 10, 2025, scheduling a Status/Prehearing Conference for October 15, 2025. Both parties attended the scheduled conference. During the conference, the undersigned directed Agency to submit documentation scheduling the May 16, 2025, IMPACT conference between Employee and the school principal. Agency submitted its response on October 29, 2025.

---

<sup>1</sup> Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.

<sup>2</sup> Both parties initially asserted that Employee was terminated for receiving an ‘Ineffective’ IMPACT Rating during the 2024-2025 School Year. However, Agency cited in its Motion to Dismiss dated December 11, 2025, that Employee was separated effective June 27, 2025, pursuant to a Reduction-in-Force (RIF) which was prior to the August 1, 2025, IMPACT termination effective date. Employee’s SF-50 as provided in Agency’s Exhibit 3, highlights that Employee was separated effective June 27, 2025. Agency’s Director Strategic Staffing, in the Office of Employee Services, Ms. Charelle Jeffries affirmed this in her Affidavit attached to Agency’s Addendum to Motion to Dismiss. Ms. Jeffries also affirmed that “Absent the RIF separation, Employee would have been terminated from DCPS effective August 1, 2025. However, given the Employee’s RIF separation, the [IMPACT Termination] Notice further detailed that his employment was scheduled to end prior to the issuance of the Notice, and that the IMPACT separation Notice did not change Employee’s status with DCPS.”

On November 20, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order scheduling a Prehearing Conference for December 11, 2025, with Prehearing statements due by December 2, 2025. While Agency filed its Prehearing Statement, Employee did not submit a Prehearing Statement. Both parties were present for the December 11, 2025, Prehearing Conference. Agency filed its Motion to Dismiss Employee's Petition for Appeal on that same day, citing that Employee was separated effective June 27, 2025, and his Petition for Appeal was filed more than thirty (30) days from the effective date of his separation. Agency's Motion to Dismiss was discussed during the Prehearing Conference and Employee inquired about the steps to voluntarily dismiss his Petition for Appeal. Agency was ordered during the Prehearing Conference to submit a supplemental affidavit to its Motion to Dismiss. Subsequently, on December 15, 2025, Employee emailed the undersigned inquiring about "what steps I need to take to close the case." In an email dated December 15, 2025, the undersigned informed Employee that if he chose to have this matter dismissed, he had to do so in writing and file that via postal mail service or in-person delivery to OEA. Employee was also informed that upon receipt of Employee's request to dismiss, an initial decision would be issued dismissing the pending Petition for Appeal.

On December 23, 2025, Employee filed a letter with this Office "to formally request a "Motion to Dismiss" OEA Matter No. 1601-0062-25, the case against The District of Columbia Public Schools concerning the Petition to Appeal on my IMPACT scores. As of today, December 22, 2025, I kindly request for a Motion to Dismiss for the foregoing reasons that District of Columbia Public Schools provided to all parties."<sup>3</sup> On December 29, 2025, Agency filed its Addendum to Motion to Dismiss, which included the affidavit requested by the undersigned during the December 11, 2025, Prehearing Conference. The record is now closed.

### JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office, pursuant to *D.C. Official Code, § 1-606.03 (2001)*, has not been established.

### ISSUE

Whether Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

### FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In the instant matter, since Employee has voluntarily withdrawn his appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

### ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Agency's Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED** and the Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Monica N. Dohnji

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.

Senior Administrative Judge

---

<sup>3</sup> See. Employee's December 23, 2025, submission.