DEEL Levy Oversight Committee

AGENDA
Tuesday, December 13, 2016
4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Seattle Municipal Tower, 17th floor, Room 1756
700 5th Avenue

Welcome and Introductions Dwane Chappelle
Review and Approve 11/8/16 Minutes Dwane Chappelle
Review Agenda Dwane Chappelle
K12 Annual Report Isabel Muñoz-Colón
Thank You and Adjourn Dwane Chappelle, All

Attachments
Draft minutes from 11/8/16 meeting
Annual Report PowerPoint

Next Meeting
No meeting in January 2017
February 14, 2017 Elementary School Site Visit
MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandi Everlove, Council President Bruce Harrell, Greg Wong, Saadia Hamid, Hueling Chan, Erin Okuno, Larry Nyland, Kevin Washington, Rick Burke, and Allison Wood

OTHERS PRESENT: Dwane Chappelle (DEEL), Monica Liang-Aguirre (DEEL), Cameron Clark (DEEL), Erica Johnson (DEEL), Marie Rompon (DEEL), Jasmine Alo (DEEL), Sonja Griffin (DEEL), Sharon Knight (DEEL), Kathryn Aisenberg (DEEL), Leilani Dela Cruz (DEEL), Sara Rigel (PHSKC), and Cashel Toner (SPS)

Dwane Chappelle greeted everyone and called the meeting to order. D. Chappelle then showed a slide and spoke briefly about John Lewis and asked everyone to reflect on the first time they voted.

Larry Nyland mentioned they held a successful State of the District presentation on November 7, 2016 and he discussed how the Seattle Public School (SPS) District is doing well if it’s compared with neighboring districts; however SPS is still doing poorly when you look at the opportunity gap.

The minutes from the September 13 LOC meeting were approved.

Monica Liang-Aguirre presented the DEEL Early Learning Annual Report. Kevin Washington asked if the Parent Child Home program is connected to the United Way program. M. Liang-Aguirre said it is a continuation and Sonja Griffin added this program was approved with the 2004 Levy.

Erin Okuno asked if Native American was included in the presented data. M. Liang-Aguirre stated DEEL did not have that data and E. Okuno said it would still be good to list it with the data.

Greg Wong asked what the goal was on the balance of participants who pay SPP tuition. M. Liang Aguirre said DEEL budgeted tuition revenue of $422,000 and we collected $190,000. The two reasons DEEL collected less was that we had more students qualifying for free tuition and secondly the students who did qualify for paying tuition paid at a lower rate than anticipated. G. Wong asked a follow-up question about mixed-income models and if there is a set portion or blend that is known to be successful. E. Johnson answered that there are research-based studies amount mixed-income classrooms. Leilani Dela Cruz stated the mixed classrooms need to include students who qualify for other means...
tested programs, like Head Star or ECEAP and students who do not. The research that was conducted looked at students who qualified for free lunch and those that did not. There is no set number of the students needed to be in either group or what percent this should be at.

Saadia Hamad asked what “other language” includes and if this occurred because it was a small group or not identified. Kathryn Aisenberg answered because of suppression issues (too few students). M. Liang-Aguirre asked if there may be more information in the full report and E. Johnson said it can be included in the full report.

Bruce Harrell commented that seeing examples is very helpful.

Sandi Everlove asked if DEEL could collect the full tuition amount from the paying families. M. Liang-Aguirre clarified that families were qualifying for a lower amount of tuition than DEEL expected – not only were there fewer families who paid, but they qualified to pay less than DEEL anticipated. DEEL did have a very high collection rate and there were only 2 delinquent accounts.

E. Johnson than presented on a few slides.

E. Okuno asked what “mature” means for a program. E. Johnson answered that it means they have been up and running for at least 5 years.

Rick Burke asked where the CLASS Instructional Support goal came from. Sonja Griffin answered that our goals came from having high expectations and wanting to close the opportunity gap. If we want to see our children doing better then we need to hold higher practice goals for teachers. We decided to choose the higher level goals. R. Burke asked if there were any specific numbers that the mature preschools had. E. Johnson answered no, that they are more an average range.

S. Everlove asked if a 4.5 is a fair and realistic goal for CLASS since Boston was at 4.3. S. Griffin answered that we want to stand firm and have high expectations for what we think our children deserve. The 4.5 was based on the research and the teachers who were scoring 4.5 and the 6s were getting the results we want to see. S. Everlove asked a second question if this is the CLASS tool out of Virginia. S. Griffin answered yes.

B. Harrell asked if the three areas of assessment are equally important. E. Johnson stated there is no set guideline from the people who created CLASS. D. Chappelle stated they’re all important.

Allison Wood asked in the three dimensions around structural support if DEEL noticed any trends. E. Johnson answered that she’ll look more into that and can include it in the full report.

G. Wong asked if the teachers and coaches get to see these results and how they’re getting incorporated into improvements in the classroom. E. Johnson answered they are given the results in the spring, but DEEL will be moving the timeline up. This year the
DEEL coaches are doing classroom assessments in the fall and the University of Washington is using My Teaching Partner to help assist teachers improve along the way.

S. Hamid asked if the teachers get the information ahead of time and if they know what they’re rated on. S. Griffin answered yes, they all have the CLASS manual so they know the areas and have all the information on what they’re being rated on. DEEL also provides numerous trainings throughout the year so that they really understand the material.

K. Washington asked if there are performance averages for mature programs that we can compare to. S. Griffin answered that not everyone uses the same measures. E. Johnson added that she’ll look it up and add it to the full report.

K. Washington stated he was surprised that the results are so consistent. E. Johnson stated they are and that the results are statistically correlated with the pre-test in the fall.

R. Burke asked if the bar is an average on the students. E. Johnson answered yes, that it’s all descriptive. R. Burke asked how much variation or standard deviation would you get and within the groups. E. Johnson stated that’s an excellent point and that DEEL has that data and can include it in the final report.

S. Everlove asked if we can see who’s scoring well and if we can go visit those classrooms. E. Johnson stated it’s a good idea.

E. Okuno stated the slides are showing there is an achievement gap showing up in preschool. E. Johnson, as well as others in the room, agreed.

K. Washington asked as the program expands does coaching remain reasonably consistent? M. Liang-Aguirre answered it’s something DEEL is thinking about and planning how to scale up the coaching through the years.

K. Washington asked if the information captured in CHIPS can be passed along to SPS. K. Aisenberg answered DEEL is currently working on a contract for data sharing with SPS for that purpose.

The presentation went two minutes over. M. Liang-Aguirre stated she’d be happy to answer additional questions and D. Chappelle excused the members.

S. Hamid asked if the professional development for the Bachelors Program will extend to Teachers Aids as well. M. Liang-Aguirre answered she believes so and would find out.

R. Burke asked if DEEL could pull out more achievement gap data. M. Liang- Aguirre answered that DEEL could and would include it in the full report.
Families and Education Levy Annual Report Agenda

• Levy Investment Overview
• Levy Implementation Highlights and Summary of Results
  – Elementary
  – Middle
  – High
  – Summer
• Closing

UPCOMING LOC AGENDA ITEMS IN 2017

- **February** – Elementary School Site Visit
- **March** – Early Learning Enrollment
- **April** – Mid-Year Report
- **May** – My Brother’s Keeper
- **June** – TBD
- **July** – Summer site visit
Annual At-A-Glance Report

WHAT IS THE FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY?
The Families and Education Levy is a property tax measure approved by Seattle voters in 2011. It nets $235 million over seven years, with funding awarded from school year 2012-13 through 2018-19. Administered by the City’s Office for Education and Early Learning, the Levy is distinct from but collaborating with the Seattle School District - the Levy is accountable to a community Levy Oversight Committee and the Seattle City Council. It was built on previous levies approved by voters in 1986, 1993, and 2006.

WHAT DOES IT DO?
The Levy’s goals are to help students:
- Close the opportunity gap to succeed
- Achieve academically, reducing the achievement gap for our diverse students, students of color, and English Language Learners
- Prepare students for college and career

WHERE IS IT USED?
LEVY MONEY HELPS BY SUPPORTING:
- Schools with larger numbers of academically struggling students
- Culturally and linguistically diverse communities
- Unmet arts and humanities-based organizations and families
- College and career readiness
- Physical and Mental Health Access for students
- Early Learning & Kindergarten readiness for low-income students

WHERE TO LEARN MORE
www.seattle.gov/education/familiesandlevy.html

STAY ENGAGED:
- SUBSCRIBE TO OUR NEWSLETTER:
  Education@seattle.gov
- FOLLOW OUR BLOG
  www.educationseattle.org
- FOLLOW US ON TWITTER
  @SeattleEDGov

City of Seattle, Department of Education and Early Learning
Seattle Municipal Tower
1000 3rd Avenue, Suite 1100
206-684-4392

VOICES FROM THE CLASSROOM

CHELSEA
Chelsea’s first contact for Salem High School is a Kindergarten nurse named Medical, and the nurse explains how a “sneaky relationship” with the school staff made her a “life savior” to the SHRM coalition, who then approached her to become their Salem school liaison and Chelsea in return to ensure all the SHRM mental health resources. Chelsea’s own experience and advice left her feeling based on her experience and advice left her feeling based on her experience.

WHERE IT IS FONDED

SHOWCASE OF SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED AND HIGHLIGHTS FROM LAST YEAR

LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES
- Overview of Levy goals
- Summary of programs funded
- Showcase of specific activities supported and highlights from last year
- Impact Stories
Families and Education Levy Goals

Goals

- Children will be ready for school
- All students will achieve academically and the achievement gap will be reduced
- All students will graduate from school

Process for Achieving Levy Goals

Continuous Improvement Cycle

- DEEL sets contract Indicator and Outcome targets
  - Unique annual targets set for each provider/school (“Grantee”) based on historical data
- DEEL provides data and ongoing analysis support to grantees
- Grantees make course corrections to improve implementation efforts
- Students achieve improved outcomes as determined by contract measures and achievement trends
2011 FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY PROGRAM INVESTMENTS

Fourth Year of Implementation


Award Majority of Investments
(New Elementary, Summer Learning, and Pilot Community-Based Family Support Awards)

Analyze Implementation Efforts and Make Course Corrections

Review Student Outcomes

Note: Totals exclude administrative costs.
2015-16 FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY ANNUAL BUDGET

Student Health $6.4M 20%
High School Academic Achievement $2.8M 9%
Middle School Academic Achievement $6.4M 20%
Elementary Academic Achievement $7.6M 24%
Early Learning and School Readiness $8.7M 27%

TOTAL = $31.9M

Note: School- and Community-Based Family Support funds are represented within Elementary. Summer Learning funds are represented in the Elementary, Middle, and High School areas. Budgeted funds include administrative costs and will therefore differ from total amounts awarded on slide 3.
Majority of the Levy Investments are concentrated in southeast and southwest Seattle.

Multiple Levy investments at many sites.
HOW WE MEASURE PERFORMANCE

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Attendance
- Growth on state English language proficiency exam
- Growth from prior year in math or English language arts
- Meeting standard on math and English language arts state assessments
- Promotion to 10th grade
- Passing and performance in core courses

TARGETS AND TARGET SETTING

- **Stretch targets are set** for each site based on historical performance
- **Sites may show improvement** but may not necessarily reach 90% of stretch target in a given year
- **Challenges** in reaching stretch targets:
  - Turnover in staff
  - Changing demographics
  - Increase in number of homeless students
  - Changing metrics
SHOWING GROWTH, THOUGH SHORT OF STRETCH TARGET

Examples:

• Semester 1 attendance rates in Elementary Innovation Schools
SHOWING GROWTH, THOUGH SHORT OF STRETCH TARGET

Examples:

- Semester 1 rates in High School Innovation schools for 9th graders passing core courses
Proficiency rates for African American students in SPS middle schools rank highest among the middle schools in WA State.

However proficiency rates for African American students are still low compared to other student groups.
SUBGROUP PERFORMANCE COMPARED TO PEERS

Grade 4 Math

Comparing proficiency rates and growth percentiles for African American students in SPS elementary schools.

*Note: Size of circle reflects number of students, N must be >10 to appear
ELEMENTARY INVESTMENTS
TOTAL LEVY INVESTMENT: $7.96 million

INVESTMENT SITES/PROGRAMS:
- 16 Elementary Innovation Schools
- 8 Elementary Health Services Sites
- 19 PreK-5 Summer Learning Sites
- 3 Community-Based Family Support Programs
- 6 School-Based Family Support Program Sites

ES INVESTMENT GROWTH OVER TIME:
- Began 2012-13SY with four ES sites
- Added four sites each subsequent year for a total of sixteen in 2015-16SY
• Total Levy Investment: $7.96 million

• Investment Sites/Programs:
  – 16 Elementary Innovation Schools
  – 8 Elementary Health Services Sites
  – 19 PreK-5 Summer Learning Sites
  – 3 Community-Based Family Support Programs
  – 6 School-Based Family Support Program Sites

• ES Investment Growth over time:
  – Began 2012-13SY with four ES sites
  – Added four sites each subsequent year for a total of sixteen in 2015-16SY
## Elementary Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Community Based Family Support</th>
<th>School-Based Family Support Program</th>
<th>Health Services</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>$5.5M</td>
<td>$446K</td>
<td>$870K</td>
<td>$439K</td>
<td>$708K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>Community-Based Organizations</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Health Providers</td>
<td>Schools &amp; Community-Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Strategies        | • PreK-3 Alignment  
• Expanded Learning Opportunities  
• Extended learning  
• Social, Emotional, Family Support | • Case Management  
• School and family connection  
• School Transitions  
• Referrals to medical and mental health services | • Case Management  
• School and Family Connection  
• School Transitions  
• Referrals to medical and mental health services | • School-based medical and mental health services | • Academic instruction  
• School Readiness Support  
• Enrichment activities |
Family Partnerships
Unique campaigns designed to increase attendance and authentically partner with families to extend school learning to home and increase teachers’ understanding of how to integrate students’ Funds of Knowledge into their instructional practice.

- Highlight: Wing Luke Elementary School

Kindergarten Readiness Programs
- Programs implemented at 7 schools
  - Highlight: Super K Readiness Program @ Highland Park Elementary School

Engaging Families and Encouraging Multiculturalism
CBFS grantee Chinese Information and Services Center (CISC) engages families in their Parent Workshop Series, collaborates with SPS and others to extend family learning through Family Connectors University, and encourages perception of multilingualism as an asset through Home Language Campaign

Health Services and Supports
Reinforce implementation of SPS’s MTSS-B model, by providing Tier 2 services through SBHCs and promoting effective implementation of all tiers at the building level.
## ELEMENTARY PERFORMANCE

### Elementary Innovation, CBFS, FSP, Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Targets Met 90% or ↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>24 of 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Readiness</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Growth: Reading</td>
<td>4 of 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Growth: Math</td>
<td>4 of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic: Reading</td>
<td>4 of 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic: Math</td>
<td>7 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48 of 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater success in reaching 1st Semester targets than 2nd Semester targets:

- S1 = 67% of targets met at 90% ↑ (14 of 21)
- S2 = 45% of targets met at 90% ↑ (10 of 22)

Overall drop in MAP performance across the district led to lower growth in primary grades:

- 4 of 7 intermediate grade reading and math growth targets met at 90% ↑

Significant improvement from prior year performance:

- Over 30% increase in Academic Math targets met at 90% ↑
ELEMENARY CONTINUED SUPPORT

1. Professional development opportunities offered to teachers and school leaders
   - Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) for job-alike positions across schools
   - Tools of the Trade locally hosted mini-conference
   - Partnerships with the University of Washington and others to provide job-embedded learning opportunities

2. Ongoing technical support to identify and implement evidence based curriculum aligned to the standards

3. Strategic partnerships and ongoing technical support to implement and improve the quality of kindergarten readiness summer programs

4. Encourage the development and implementation of progress monitoring systems including the expanded use of formative assessments, data collection tools, and protocols to guide data-informed decision making
MIDDLE SCHOOL INVESTMENTS
• Total Levy Investment: $6.9 million

• Investment Sites/Programs:
  – 4 Innovation Middle Schools
    • Aki Kurose Middle School
    • Denny Middle School
    • Mercer Middle School
    • Washington Middle School
  – 13 Linkage Middle Schools
  – 5 Middle School Health Services Sites
  – 8 Summer Learning Sites
## MIDDLE SCHOOL FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Linkage</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment</strong></td>
<td>$3.1M</td>
<td>$1.4M</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider</strong></td>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>Health Providers</td>
<td>Schools &amp; Community-Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Strategies** | • Extended in-school learning time  
• Social/emotional/behavioral support  
• College and career planning  
• Family involvement  
• Out-of-school time programs | • Extended in-school learning time  
• Social/emotional/behavioral support  
• College and career planning  
• Family involvement  
• Out-of-school time programs | • On-site medical and mental health services  
• Initiatives to improve school climate  
• Care coordination with CBOs  
• Health education and promotion | • Academic instruction  
• Enrichment activities |
MIDDLE SCHOOL HIGHLIGHTS

Reading Strategies Show Gains
In response to prior year data, schools reevaluated and refined their targeted reading strategies which was a contributing factor to all four Innovation Schools surpassing their reading target on the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA).

– Highlights: Non-Reader Hot List at Denny MS
    Literacy Home Visits at Mercer MS

Developing a Growth Mindset Towards Learning Math
Levy investments focused on building math confidence in students through the integration of growth mindset concepts and math instruction.

–Highlight: EMP at Hamilton and Madison MS

Engaging and Motivating Middle School Students
Teams from 11 middle schools & K-8s attended multiple sessions with Kevin Haggerty from UW to learn 15 Teacher Practices to Promote Student Motivation and Engagement.

– Highlight: Aki Kurose Middle School

Health Services and Supports
Middle school sites participated in a Public Health initiative to promote HPV vaccine initiation and series completion through school-based campaigns and streamlined consent processes.
### Innovation, Linkage, and Health Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Targets Met 90% or ↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>12 of 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Core Courses</td>
<td>15 of 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Growth: Reading</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Growth: Math</td>
<td>10 of 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic: Reading</td>
<td>6 of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic: Math</td>
<td>12 of 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57 of 81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First semester attendance rates were stronger than second semester
- **S1**: 61% of targets met at 90% ↑
- **S2**: 23% of targets met at 90% ↑

SBHC is an effective strategy to combat attendance
- SBHC met 95% of performance target

Significant improvements from prior year in both math and reading
- All four Innovation Schools **surpassed** reading targets; on average, achieving 129% of reading contract target
- Nearly 40% increase in academic math targets met at 90% ↑
1. Multiple strategies underway to support middle school attendance.
   - Attendance Matters Workshops focused on practical attendance strategies
   - Collaborate with SPS Attendance Manager to provide targeted attendance support to schools
   - Align attendance efforts between schools and SBHC.

2. Partnership with the UW Center for Educational Leadership (CEL) to strengthen the impact of schools’ professional development efforts.

3. Continue math instruction support through an ongoing partnership with the UW and SPS to facilitate a math coach PLC for the four Innovation Schools and continue the 6th grade Empowerment Math Project (EMP) across multiple schools.

4. Provide professional development and support for schools to analyze and enhance their College and Career Readiness plans.
HIGH SCHOOL OVERVIEW

• Total Levy Investment: $5.5 million

• Investment Sites/Programs:
  
  – 5 Innovation High Schools
    (Cleveland, Franklin, Ingraham, Interagency Academy, West Seattle)

  – 12 School-Based Health Centers

  – 7 Summer Learning Sites
## HIGH SCHOOL FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment</strong></td>
<td>$2.2 million</td>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
<td>$0.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider</strong></td>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>Health Providers</td>
<td>Schools &amp; Community-Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Focus on the 9th grade only:</td>
<td>• On-site medical and mental health services</td>
<td>Academics/enrichment focused on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 8th to 9th grade Summer Bridge</td>
<td>• Initiatives to improve school climate</td>
<td>• Middle school to high school transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case management for College Bound Scholars</td>
<td>• Care coordination with CBOs</td>
<td>• College/career readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extended in-school learning time</td>
<td>• Health education and promotion</td>
<td>• Credit recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social/emotional/behavioral support</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Service hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• College and career planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>• English language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HIGH SCHOOL HIGHLIGHTS

College Bound Scholars Case Management
Levy-funded high schools received additional resources to provide individualized support to 9th grade College Bound Scholarship students experiencing significant academic and social/emotional barriers.

– Highlight: Ingraham HS, Interagency Academy

Student Led Conferences
9th grade students led conferences with their parents and school staff focused on their personal and academic goals. Students were empowered by their role in planning and leading the conference, and parents were more likely to attend.

– Highlight: Franklin HS, Cleveland HS

Data access for mental health providers
SBHC mental health providers received Institutional Partner status from the district. This improved provider access to academic data allows real-time monitoring of student progress toward academic goals.

GOT 9 at West Seattle HS
Struggling students participate in the GOT 9 (“Get On Track”) program with same teachers, a small learning environment, and extra tutoring/academic supports. This year, teachers working together on interdisciplinary curriculum and standards.

– Highlight: West Seattle HS
New ‘Gap Closing’ Measures: Schools have been successful in achieving targets, but large opportunity gaps persist by race. This year, we are implementing more rigorous performance measures to help close these gaps over time.

Health achieved targets: Success with passing core courses, attendance (3 of 4).

Case Management: Last year, piloted a more rigorous Passing Core Courses metric of “C or Better” for case managed students (College Bound Scholars).

EOC Math: The state no longer requires the End of Course (EOC) Math exam for graduation. As a result, the district did not administer the assessment in 2015-16.
Last year’s RSJI analysis (presented to LOC) revealed large opportunity gaps by race.

Beginning this year, we are implementing more rigorous performance measures for 9th grade students at all of our comprehensive high school investments.

High Schools will be expected in close opportunity gaps over time in: attendance, earning credits & on-time promotion, and passing core courses with “C or better.”

*From SPS District Scorecard*

- **Opportunity Gap Students:** African-American, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Pacific Islander
- **Non-Opportunity Gap Students:** White, Asian-American

(Note: Does not include students who identify as Multi-racial or Other.)
1. **Professional development opportunities** offered to teachers and school leaders:
   - Standards-based grading and assessment practices
   - Literacy strategies
   - Mental health supports

2. **Professional learning communities (PLCs)** for Levy coordinators and CBS case managers to share best practices and strategies.

3. **Ongoing technical support** for school-based reporting, data visualization, and budget reconciliation.

4. **Public Health** used student data as part of integrated treatment planning, ran school-based campaigns for HPV vaccine, and improved performance reporting processes.
SUMMER LEARNING INVESTMENTS
SUMMER LEARNING OVERVIEW

- Total Levy Investment: $2.3 million
- Investment Sites/Programs: 38 sites
  - 14 Kindergarten Readiness sites
  - 5 Elementary sites
  - 12 Middle School sites
  - 7 High School sites
- Students Served: 2,000+ students
- Expected Growth: 3 more RFI funding cycles may add 1,000+ more students by end of Levy
## Summer Learning Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kindergarten Readiness</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment</strong></td>
<td>$0.4M</td>
<td>$0.4M</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider</strong></td>
<td>Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)</td>
<td>Schools &amp; CBOs</td>
<td>Schools &amp; CBOs</td>
<td>Schools &amp; CBOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Academics/enrichment focused on:</td>
<td>Academics/enrichment focused on:</td>
<td>Academics/enrichment focused on:</td>
<td>Academics/enrichment focused on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kindergarten readiness (WA Kids)</td>
<td>• Reading/writing</td>
<td>• Reading/writing</td>
<td>• Middle school to high school transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PreK to elementary transition</td>
<td>• Math or math with science</td>
<td>• Math or math with science</td>
<td>• College/career readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• English language acquisition</td>
<td>• Elementary to middle school transition</td>
<td>• Credit recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM)</td>
<td>• Middle school to high school transition</td>
<td>• Service hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social emotional learning</td>
<td>• College/career readiness</td>
<td>• English language acquisition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMER LEARNING HIGHLIGHTS

District Collaboration

Worked with SPS staff on several summer initiatives:

• Co-funding of three sites to serve more elementary students.
• Made websites more user-friendly for parents, cross-marketed each other’s summer opportunities.
• Celebrated ‘National Summer Learning Day’ at Middle School site with Mayor, Deputy Superintendent, and School Board President.

Continued Focus on Program Quality

Contracted with School’s Out Washington to help improve the quality of Levy-funded summer programs, with the belief that high-quality programs improve academic outcomes.

• 25 of 38 sites participated in the Summer Program Quality Assessment (PQA) supplemented with training, coaching, and technical assistance.
### Performance Measure Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Targets Met 90% or ↑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>19 of 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>5 of 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Readiness</td>
<td>8 of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Credits</td>
<td>4 of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Assessments</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Developed Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>11 of 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>5 of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>59 of 107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fully enrolled, but struggled with attendance:** Programs are fully enrolled, but struggle to meet 90% attendance rate primarily due to summer family vacations.

**Lack of district assessment:** Since the district discontinued use of Spring to Fall MAP, no formal way to measure gains from summer programs.

**Quality of program-developed assessments:** Heavier reliance on program-developed assessments means variation in terms of quality and rigor across programs.
SUMMER LEARNING CONTINUED SUPPORTS

1. **$600K in RFI Levy funds to invest in new or existing summer programs:** Focus on programs serving Black students or areas of district not currently served.

2. **Additional Mayoral support for summer learning:** New City budget adds 200 more summer slots to serve students with culturally-specific programming.

3. **Expand program quality work:** Increase number of Levy sites (to 30+) participating in Program Quality Assessment and related supports.

4. **National Summer Learning Conference:** 15 Levy summer program providers attended the national summer conference in Seattle.
QUESTIONS