DEEL LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, January 9, 2018

MINUTES


Others Present: Dwane Chappelle (DEEL), Sid Sidorowicz (DEEL), Veronica Gallardo (DEEL), Monica Liang-Aguirre (DEEL), Dana Harrison (DEEL), Jolenta Coleman (DEEL), Long Phan (DEEL), Marissa Rousselle (DEEL), Kathryn Aisenberg (DEEL), Austin Miller, Clarence Dancer, Jr. (DEEL), Frances Robinson (DEEL), Sara Rigel (Public Health – Seattle & King County), Erin MacDougall (Public Health – Seattle & King County), Brian Goodnight (Council Central Staff), Vy Nguyen (Office of Councilmember González), Eden Mack (Seattle Public Schools)

Dwane Chappelle called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.

Levy Renewal Update – Sid Sidorowicz, Deputy Director, DEEL

Sid Sidorowicz reported that DEEL has briefed the Mayor on current plans for renewals of the Families and Education and the Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) Levies. Discussions have included how the state’s McCleary K-12 school-funding ruling impacts the Seattle School District, and DEEL has worked with independent consultants on this same question. The state legislation, he said, looked at equity among districts, not how it affects equity among children.

DEEL is also looking at what’s going on with local levies in general, and how we align with other levies. There is no indication yet whether the new levy will be put on the ballot in August or November, however the Mayor has directed DEEL to wrap up our work on the new levy package in March. DEEL has input from two years of education summits, from Seattle Preschool Program evaluations, as well as from current outreach efforts to gather feedback.

Questions:

- When will the council actually place the measure on the ballot?
  - Councilmember Lorena Gonzalez shared that this usually occurs within three weeks of when council signs the measure.
• Are there recommendations as to which month is better for the ballot?
  o Sid responded that this is a question for those who make political decisions.

**Levy Outreach – Austin Miller, DEEL Communications and Outreach Strategic Advisor**

DEEL’s levy outreach has included, to-date, over 20 meetings with 300 individuals. The general structure of these meetings has been to ask attendees, “What are the five things you absolutely want to see in the levy,” then compare them with the top goals from the past levy. Outreach meetings in 2017 targeted community-based organizations; in January, DEEL will be concentrating on engaging parents, families and youth. After these initial outreach efforts are completed, DEEL will go back out to the community to let people know what will or will not be included in the levy.

**Questions:**

• Can we contact early learning teachers specifically—not administrators?
  o Yes, we can.

• Is there an approach to engage families of students?
  o We have invited all of the SPP parents to the meetings, and we’ve partnered with parent-teacher-student associations, the Seattle Department of Neighborhoods, and others.

• Have you engaged with homeless populations?
  o Not sure that we have engaged them specifically, but this has been a topic of discussion at meetings.

• Have engagements been conducted on a geographic basis?
  o Our plan has been to hold one meeting in each council district.

• How will community feedback be incorporated with what DEEL considers effective strategies?
  o This will be part of the next phase with the Mayor.

• What are some of the most effective strategies?
  o We’ve invested in some evaluations of the school health care centers, and we are doing three investigations in-house right now. One of them concerns middle school innovation investments and what are the longitudinal results versus year-to-year. school changes. The harder thing to examine is which are the most effective interventions. High school and elementary investigations are still pending.

  o A totally independent multi-part, third-party evaluation on preschool is being conducted by the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) and the University of Washington. Two years of research has been conducted on this; we will be presenting it to the LOC in a couple of months.
• Are there any new strategies we haven’t identified that we might utilize?
  o It will depend on the mayor’s priorities. Two new areas we are looking at are post-secondary work and homelessness. We’ve never had direct resources for homelessness in the levy.

General Discussion:
• The McCleary decision means Seattle taxpayers will be paying more for schools.
• Seattle Public Schools’ next levy is currently scheduled for February 2019. They are expected to put forth an operations levy and a buildings levy to meet their capacity challenges and the cuts they will receive from the state legislature. It was suggested that the schools may decide to schedule their levies earlier to avoid potential voter “levy fatigue.”

Presentation on the Seattle Promise – DEEL staff member Clarence (CJ) Dancer
Mayor Durkan signed an Executive Order announcing the Seattle Promise on Day 2 of her term. It dovetails with the existing 13th Year program at South College, which has plans to expand to three more schools. The Mayor’s order includes a 14th year, or 90 credits total for current 13th year students at South College. The Mayor’s order also includes provisions to create an interdepartmental team to develop a plan so all Seattle students could access the Promise program. The goal is to have a planning structure for the Mayor to approve on March 8.

The South Seattle College Foundation has been raising money for tuition for the 13th Year, and some additional funds are provided through the city’s General Fund. In 2018, it will receive money from the Sweetened Beverage Tax.

Questions:
• How much is the Seattle Promise likely to cost?
  o This is unknown at this point. If the program is opened to more students, not just smaller targeted groups, costs will change, and the Mayor doesn’t want the City to fund the full program. Chancellor Shouan Pan said that current estimated costs are about $5 million/year; however, the amount to sustain this effort would be considerably more.

• How many are enrolled in the program now?
  o Last year, the 13th Year served 650 seniors and 120 students on campus. All the students have to apply for financial aid before they can access 13th Year funds.

• What capacity problems will colleges face if the number of students going to them increases?
  o To date, Seattle Colleges have indicated an ability to manage an increase in students.

• What happens to credits students receive in high school?
  o Not known at this time.
• Are students eligible only if you are scheduled to graduate?
  o In the current model, as long as you are a senior, you can participate. There is an application process, but if you fill it out, you’re in.

• Currently students from certain high schools must attend certain colleges (Garfield High School students go to Central College; Ingraham students attend North College). What about student choice and portability?
  o We hope to make all three colleges available to all students, within next 3-4 years. Dr. Pan believes it will not take this long.

• How does the 14th Year address closing the achievement gap?
  o Data shows these programs are having an impact.

• How are students progressing in college after their 14th Year?
  o Many students are transferring from community colleges to four-year colleges. Statistics show more students who transfer from Seattle colleges graduate in four years than students who go straight from high school to four-year schools.

• Will the Seattle Promise allow kids who go to charter schools to participate? What about private schools? Higher income kids will cost the program more than lower income kids.
  o We are using the 13th year model because this model has been operating for 10 years. As we move into schools that don’t have high rates of free-and-reduced lunch, or students who aren’t eligible for Pell Grants, etc. we will need to look at our projections and cost model. Costs will be ongoing conversation, including colleges’ administrative costs.

• Are there other post-secondary programs that are effective?
  o Programs that don’t have wraparound services didn’t see changes in attendance. Trio is another program; it includes tutoring, and some living costs. The University of Washington has some wraparound services we are looking at. Other barriers are high student-to-advisor rations at colleges, as well as living expenses and child care.

• What is the alignment with SPS? Was this identified as a priority in the Education Summits?
  o The Education Advisory Committee identified straightening post-secondary access. DEEL received some money from the General Fund for wraparound services, and we’ve designated some funds for tuition in the plan for the Sweetened Beverage Tax. The weakest point we have in the Levy to date is students’ 12th year; we haven’t had services funded for students past the 9th grade.
2018 Proposed Agenda – Sid Sidorowicz

S. Sidorowicz presented a proposed calendar for 2018 LOC meetings, but mentioned that due to school schedules, we will switch the proposed dates for the middle and high school site visits. He also recommended that members keep the “no meeting” dates open on their calendars, so meetings can be held on those days if necessary. He also pointed out that once City Council approves the levy measure for the ballot, DEEL and the LOC will, for ethics reasons, “go silent” on the levy; however, G.Wong noted, LOC members can lobby on their personal time.

Questions/Comments:

- Would like DEEL to keep the LOC informed about times when information will be presented to the Mayor, etc.
- The LOC meeting dates conflict with the Seattle School Board meetings. Can this change?
- Will there be opportunities for committee members to learn more about what will be included in the levy?

Meeting Adjourned