

Request for Qualifications
Elementary Social, Emotional, Behavioral and Family Support

COVER SHEET

Organization Information:

Organization name: CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

Organization address: P.O. Box 15190, 3300 NE 65th Street, Seattle, WA 98115

Describe your legal status and, if applicable, state of incorporation (for example, Washington State non-profit corporation, Washington State partnership, sole proprietorship):

Washington State non-profit corporation

Application Components and Checklist (submit in this order)

- Cover Sheet
- Key People
- Previous Experience
- Tracking to Success
- Women and Minority Inclusion; Non-discrimination

Contact Information:

Contact person: Cathy Garland
(please print clearly)

Title: King County Community Director

Mailing address: P.O. Box 15190, 3300 NE 65th Street, Seattle, WA 98115

Day/Work phone: 206-718-3119 Email address: cathyg@chs-wa.org

Signature: Cathy Garland

Date: 2/14/12

Additional information is provided in Attachment 3.

CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON
RFQ- FEL Elementary Social, Emotional, Behavioral and Family Support

KEY PEOPLE

1. Key Staff Qualifications

This project will be staffed by well-trained and qualified staff with experience providing parent education and working with families and children, including Joy Scott, Children's Home Society of Washington's current Family Advocate serving the North Seattle area. Ms. Scott has extensive experience working with families in crisis, including staffing a domestic violence shelter and hot line, working with youth involved in the juvenile justice system, and counseling families in a transitional housing program. Ms. Scott currently works one-on-one and in group settings with families needing support of various kinds – emergency assistance to prevent utility shutoffs or homelessness, employment support to improve their incomes, coaching to advocate better for their children, training and access on using computers to better their employment prospects and learn more about school expectations and their child's academic performance. Ms. Scott has an MSW and has worked at the Family Center for the past three years.

New staff hired for this initiative will meet the minimum requirements for CHSW's Parent Educator position, which include: B.A. degree in social work, education or a related human services field; at least two years' experience working with low-income families; knowledge and experience with adult education principles and interventions; strong skills communicating with and motivating families; knowledge of family development and support principles and conflict resolution skills; ability to work effectively with diverse populations; ability to build relationships with schools and community organizations; and, qualified to attain a Washington State Agency-Affiliated Counselor credential. Preference will be given to bilingual/bicultural candidates. All new staff members hired will receive training on all four curricula proposed, as well as cultural competency, family support principles, and other topics to prepare them for the work proposed.

2. Project Leadership

Ann Fuller will serve as the Program Manager overseeing all social, emotional, behavioral and family support services provided to target schools. Ms. Fuller has served as the Director of the North Seattle Family Center for the past 15 years. This program was originally funded by Families and Education Levy funding in 1991 and has been providing educational and family support services continuously ever since. (The program is now funded through the Department of Neighborhoods.) Ms. Fuller has a B.A. degree, 22 years of experience providing and managing social service programs, including five years in the adult and youth literacy field. For the past three years, Ms. Fuller has also overseen a second family center, located in Auburn, as well as other family support services operated by CHSW in King County. She has developed strong relationships with Seattle Human Services Department staff, as well as a wide range of community partners, including: North Seattle Community College, Seattle Housing Authority, and Seattle-King County Public Health. Ms. Fuller has also demonstrated excellent management skills in supervising a diverse staff of nine professionals, recruiting and supervising community volunteers, overseeing a program budget in excess of \$400,000,

and ensuring that the extensive data collection and reporting systems required by the city are maintained and that educational and family support services offered by CHSW meet their target goals.

Cathy Garland serves as the Community Director for King County, providing leadership for program operations and community relationships and supervising the Program Manager. In her career, she has led several projects that have focused on improving academic outcomes for children and youth, including eight years leading school-based Youth Service Teams in Oregon and Idaho for youth in the juvenile justice system, and six years as Executive Director of the Marion County (OR) Commission for Children and Families administering the Student Retention Initiative for at-risk children and youth. Ms. Garland also served for six years as a Community Manager for United Way of King County, overseeing South King County contracts focused on academic improvement outcomes. She has worked for CHSW for the past 10 years as Community Director in King County and Core Service Director of Early Learning. Ms. Garland is a graduate of Willamette University and the University of Oregon's Pacific Leadership Institute.

Bridget McLeman serves as CHSW's Core Service Director of Family Support: In this role, Ms. McLeman oversees the planning, quality and best practices of the agency's family support services statewide and will provide consultation for this project. She has more than 25 years' experience working with children, youth and families in both educational and family support settings. Ms. McLeman holds a Ph.D. in Educational Policy and an M.A. in the Social Foundations of Education. She also serves as CHSW's Community Director in Clark County and has worked closely with several school districts in southwest Washington to implement Compassionate Schools, Strengthening Families and other projects improving academic performance for at-risk children/youth.

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

1. Populations Served

Founded in 1896, Children's Home Society of Washington has a long history of serving ethnically diverse and low-income families and children across the state. Last year, we served nearly 10,000 parents/guardians and children in King County. The majority of these participants were people of color, including 15% African/African American, 24% Latino, 2% Native American/American Indian, and 12% bi- or multi-racial. In particular, the North Seattle Family Center serves families from a wide range of cultural or national backgrounds. Nearly one in four (24%) of families speak a language other than English at home and 17% identify limited English as an issue for at least one member of the family.

It is expected that CHSW, in partnership with individual elementary schools, will serve children at-risk of academic problems, as defined by the Seattle Office of Education criteria for this RFQ, and their family members. These families are likely to be low-income and minority, and many of the parents will have poor educational achievement and/or past difficulty in school themselves. Children who are referred to this program may reflect the general population of that school but will likely include a higher percentage of children with multiple risk factors, including: learning disabilities, mental health problems, minority status, low-income household, single parent household, and/or parents with poor educational achievement.

2. Experience with Services and Results

Children's Home Society has extensive experience providing educational and family support services proven to support children's educational achievement. These services are often provided within the context of broad family support programs focused on improving parenting skills and knowledge, including parent education classes, family counseling, and family resource centers. Other programs are targeted more at children and youth, providing strategic and evidence-based interventions proven to improve school behavior, attendance and performance. The following serve to illustrate just some of the CHSW programs that have achieved positive educational results.

Readiness to Learn – Part of a large statewide initiative, CHSW operates *Readiness to Learn* programs in several locations, offering a wide range of services to educationally at-risk children and their families, as needed, including: developmental and educational assessments, case management, parent education, and concrete supports like food and housing assistance. The most recent RTL Outcomes Report reflects the following results: **22% improvement in Grade Level Expectations (GLEs)** as reported by teachers; **reductions in absenteeism/truancy**, particularly when services included assistance accessing health services (9%); **reductions in suspensions** (graduated by intensity); **improved school behavior** (graduated from 2% to 6% based on intensity) measured by teacher rating of pro-social behavior; and **improved social-emotional development** (2% to 6% reduction in “distress” and 3% to 10% increase in “emotional sensitivity”).

Cobb Center for Youth and Fostering to Permanence – These programs provide comprehensive residential and treatment services to children and youth who were removed from their homes due to abuse, neglect and/or severe emotional or behavioral programs. Services include round-the-clock supervision, group and family therapy, behavior modification, developmental and other assessments, and close work with each child's school to support educational goals. In addition to a variety of mental health and family capacity measures, these programs also collect data on several educational outcomes: 94% (Cobb) and 48% (FtP) of youth **improved their grade point averages** (as measured by quarter grades pre/post); 62% of youth in FtP **improved their school attendance** (as measured by school records); and 88% of Cobb Center youth **improved their attendance and classroom behavior** (as measured by Children's Functional Assessment Rating Scale-CFARS scores).

BOOST Educational Mentoring – This demonstration project operated from 2008 through 2010, providing educationally at-risk children in grades 4-8 with mentors to assist them with school work and life skill development. The program was a close partnership between CHSW and local school districts, which referred children and provided space and time during the school day and after school for child-mentor meetings and larger group activities. The program reported the following results among participants: 53% **improved grades**; 74% **improved attendance**; 94% **decreased disciplinary actions**; 88% **increased participation in school activities**; and 93% **improved attitudes** about school and learning.

3. References

Wendy Holman, Seattle Human Services, 206-233-7090, Wendy.Holman@seattle.gov

Isidro Rodriguez, United Way of King County, 206-461-5021, irodriguez@uwkc.org
Maria Ursua, Seattle Housing Authority, 206-615-3594, mursua@seattlehousing.org

4. Student Challenges

Students served through this initiative are likely to have the following challenges: lack of parent involvement/support, unstable or inappropriate housing, lack of access to family services or basic needs, limited technology access and poor foundational academic skills and/or learning disabilities. CHSW works with parents in a variety of ways to improve their ability to support their child's education. Parent training helps parents understand the education system and expectations, create a homework-friendly space for their children to do school work, provide more educationally-enriching activities in the home and utilize data portals and other school information sources. Case management services often help parents access more stable housing and employment, emergency assistance and homelessness prevention (rent and utility funds, food baskets, etc.), and community services such as family counseling, developmental assessments, health and dental care, and chemical dependence assessment and treatment. In addition to parent education, Family Resource Centers offer afterschool homework clubs, computer labs, one-on-one tutoring, mentoring and group activities that encourage academic and leadership skill development among children and youth.

TRACKING TO SUCCESS

1. Data Points Tracked by CHSW

For the above highlighted programs (*RTL, Cobb Center, Fostering to Permanence and BOOST Educational Mentoring*) CHSW has tracked the following raw educational data directly from schools/districts: school attendance; school behavior/disciplinary referrals; and quarterly grades for English/reading, math, social studies and science. For more intense residential programs, additional data were collected from each child's teacher(s) on a daily basis, including skill areas needing improvement (MAP), behavior issues and/or social skills needing improvement (but not necessarily referred for discipline), and daily homework assignments.

In addition, the agency regularly administers the CFARS in many of our programs. This pre/post tool is completed by the worker, in collaboration with the child and/or the parent, and measures perceived improvements in school participation, engagement and behavior. Comparison scores from the pre/post tool are used to supplement school data to provide a complete picture of the impact of the intervention on educational performance and related program goals.

2. Using Data to Improve Services

CHSW has a strong Performance Quality Improvement (PQI) process, which includes regular review of data by program managers and staff, quarterly peer record reviews, and an extensive accreditation process that includes review of program procedures, data collection and outcome reporting every three years. In addition to this overall program review, Family Support workers and other staff work closely with consumers and partner organization staff to develop, assess, and track service goals for each individual receiving services. A comprehensive consumer database assists in this process by maintaining electronic consumer records, which can be easily aggregated, in addition to the hard-

copy files kept by some programs. Service plans are continually adjusted to address any new needs identified through continual data review and are completely updated, as needed, every 90 days. A regular function of the weekly or bi-weekly supervision of all direct service staff is to assist them with this data review process and develop additional or intermediate goals to support the service plan for each consumer. Staff training is sometimes provided, as are professional consultations, to ensure that staff have the knowledge and resources required to address emerging consumer needs with the most effective and focused interventions possible.

3. Use of Daily/Weekly Data

Daily and weekly school notes and progress reports are used in CHSW's RTL, Cobb Center and Fostering to Permanence programs, as well as the agency's early learning programs (Head Start and Early Head Start). Particularly in the residential and early learning programs, these reports are used to tailor treatment for each child on a daily basis. Teacher-identified priorities influence afterschool activities, and staff work closely with each child's teacher to ensure that all needed support services (tutoring, academic or other assessments, etc.) are delivered.

4. Sample Data Report

Attached please find a complete data report, including raw data sheet, for CHSW's BOOST Educational Mentoring Program, submitted in June 2010. In addition to this complete report, we have also provided a summary of educational performance data reported to United Way of King County for the Cobb Center for Youth and Fostering to Permanence programs, both located in King County. These programs address multiple goals and indicators, including academic performance, among children in residential care. Finally, we have included the most recent City of Seattle Family Center Outcome Report, which includes data on **correlated parenting outcomes**, including increases in parent-child activities that promote school success.

WOMEN AND MINORITY INCLUSION

Non-Discrimination in Hiring and Subcontracting

Children's Home Society of Washington is a community-based not-for-profit organization governed by a Board of Trustees which includes female and minority members. We do not anticipate subcontracting any activities funded through the Seattle Families and Education Levy to other organizations. We do expect to hire additional staff, depending on the scope of any school partnerships which may be initiated through this effort. The agency has a strict policy of non-discrimination in hiring and promoting staff and a long history of recruiting staff members who are reflective of the community served. The agency also has a strong commitment to cultural competence, including providing leadership for the King County Disproportionality Coalition and offering services in participants' first language whenever possible. Current staff and volunteers at the North Seattle Family Center, which will serve as the home base for FEL efforts, offer services in a variety of languages, including Spanish, Arabic, Swahili, Somali, Vietnamese, Tagalog, French and Amharic (in addition to English). CHSW utilizes social media and various job posting sites as well as advertisements in local ethnic media to recruit appropriate staff to serve at-risk children and families from those communities.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report Cover Sheet (ED 524B)**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

Check only one box per Program Office instructions.

[] Annual Performance Report [X] Final Performance Report

General Information

1. PR/Award #: Q184B080003 2. Grantee NCES ID#: N/A
(Block 5 of the Grant Award Notification - 11 characters.) (See instructions. Up to 12 characters.)
- 3 Project Title: Rural Mentoring Coalition Project
(Enter the same title as on the approved application.)
4. Grantee Name *(Block 1 of the Grant Award Notification.):* Children's Home Society of Washington
5. Grantee Address *(See instructions.)*
6. Project Director *(See instructions.)* Name: Mike Fitzpatrick Title: Family Support Program Manager
 Ph #: (206) 695 - 3200 Ext: () Fax #: (206) 695 - 3201
 Email Address: mikef@chs-wa.org

Reporting Period Information (See instructions.)

7. Reporting Period: From: 07 / 01 / 2009 To: 06 / 30 / 2010 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Budget Expenditures (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions. Also see Section B.)

8. Budget Expenditures

	Federal Grant Funds	Non-Federal Funds <i>(Match/Cost Share)</i>
a. Previous Budget Period	180,199	0
b. Current Budget Period	180,167	0
c. Entire Project Period <i>(For Final Performance Reports only)</i>	360,366	0

Indirect Cost Information (To be completed by your Business Office. See instructions.)

9. Indirect Costs

- a. Are you claiming indirect costs under this grant? Yes No
- b. If yes, do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal Government? Yes No
- c. If yes, provide the following information:
 Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 07 / 01 / 2008 To: 06 / 30 / 2010 (mm/dd/yyyy)
 Approving Federal agency: ED Other *(Please specify):* Department of Health and Human Services
 Type of Rate *(For Final Performance Reports Only):* Provisional Final Other *(Please specify):* Predetermined
- d. For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:
 Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement?
 Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?

Human Subjects (Annual Institutional Review Board (IRB) Certification) (See instructions.)

10. Is the annual certification of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval attached? Yes No N/A

Performance Measures Status and Certification (See instructions.)

11. Performance Measures Status

- a. Are complete data on performance measures for the current budget period included in the Project Status Chart? Yes No
- b. If no, when will the data be available and submitted to the Department? / / (mm/dd/yyyy)

12. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data in this performance report are true and correct and the report fully discloses all known weaknesses concerning the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data.

Randy Perin
Name of Authorized Representative:

Title: Vice President of Operations

Signature:

Date: 6 / 30 / 2010



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

(See Instructions)

The Rural Mentoring Coalition Project completed its second and final year in 2009 – 2010. The project developed and implemented an initiative matching trained volunteer mentors with at-risk elementary and middle school students in two communities in rural Washington – Wenatchee and Walla Walla. Early in implementation, the project was renamed “Boost” to convey the help it was providing students and make it easier to publicize. A total of **91 students** were served in the two years Boost operated, well in excess of the 80 students proposed in the original grant application. (This included 46 students in Walla Walla and 45 students in Wenatchee.) Boost also provided an opportunity for Children’s Home Society of Washington to strengthen relationships with the six school district partners in the coalition: Wenatchee, Eastmont, Entiat, Orondo, Walla Walla and College Place. The school districts all serve high percentages of economically disadvantaged and Hispanic students, many of whom are recent immigrants and English Language Learners. A unique aspect of Boost was its focus on Hispanic students and its success recruiting bilingual and/or bicultural mentors to work with these children, often in their native Spanish. A total of 98 mentors were matched with students during the two years of Boost operation.

The project had a significant impact on the lives of these at-risk students. More than half of the students improved their grades as a result of the services and support provided by their mentor. Other performance measures showed even more positive results – 94% of students had fewer disciplinary referrals, 94% had improved social (relationship) skills, 93% had improved attitudes (positive feelings) about school, and 88% had improved motivation (participation in school activities.) Of the 91 students served over the two years, 63 students (69%) experienced mentoring matches that sustained nine months or longer, including 18 that lasted the entire service period of 19 months.

The project was operated with a centralized Program Manager overseeing all activities and budget expenditures and local Site Coordinators facilitating daily activities in each community. Following are the Year 2 accomplishments in each community.

Wenatchee Accomplishments

Wenatchee’s Boost mentoring program grew in leaps and bounds the second year. Mentor recruitment picked up and the Mentor Coordinator received weekly calls from people interested in volunteering. The same recruiting strategies were used this year as the first year, including posting banners, fliers and posters around town. In addition, Boost aired local TV spots and secured a long-running add in the local paper in Year 2. Visits were made to local clubs, some of which included: Kiwanis, Soroptimist, family PAC team, and Junior Legal. Boost staff and volunteers also participated in local fairs and events including Wenatchee’s Healthy Families Day, Pig Out in the Park for the DSV, Homebuilders Fair and the High School career fair.

Early in Year 2, Boost staff met with school principals and or counselors at each partner elementary and middle schools to explore ways to better serve students and the school. These meetings generated abundant interest in the program which resulted in many student referrals and the start of some after and during school groups. However, this resulted in having more student referrals than volunteers. To solve this volunteer shortage, Boost started school groups in some schools facilitated by staff and one or two volunteers to begin serving students immediately; as more appropriate mentors were recruited and trained, Boost then made one-on-one matches for most of the students in the groups.

Wenatchee Boost had great success securing participation and assistance from the community. An Advisory Board was established that met quarterly to leverage resources and help with marketing and recruitment. Advisory Board members included:

Gaby Fernandez	Wenatchee City Council and Orchard MS Gear-Up Program
Margie Jones	Former Program Coordinator, BBBS Program
Joyce Wright	Mission View Elementary, Primary Intervention Program
Judy Trefethen	Wenatchee Kiwanis Club member and volunteer mentor
Rita Salama	Advisory Board Member, Wenatchee CHSW
Ernie Hobbs	Wenatchee Kiwanis Club member and volunteer mentor
Marta Zaldivar	Family Advocate, Wenatchee High School
Anne Crain	Boost volunteer mentor
Doug Head	CHSW Regional Director
Jaime Robison	Boost Mentor Coordinator
Kris Collier	CHSW Program Supervisor

Due to the early termination of the U.S. Department of Education’s Mentoring program, Boost worked on a transition plan starting in February to ensure that students received the ongoing support they needed. Students who had met their goals were discharged. Students with mentors who were willing to continue the match on their own were discharged as well. These cases are now considered “unofficial” matches but mentors are offered ongoing support, as needed, through other CHSW program staff. Students in school groups were transitioned to CHSW’s Readiness to Learn program and continued to receive services through that program, and mentoring group, through the end of the school year. In response to the termination of the Boost program, the Readiness to Learn program has also increased its provision of mentoring services to continue building on Boost’s success recruiting community mentors and serving at-risk 4th through 8th grade students.

Walla Walla Accomplishments

In Year 2, BOOST worked with a total of 7 elementary and middle schools in the Walla Walla and College Place School Districts. A total of 44 students were enrolled this year – of those, 8 transferred to another state or advanced to high school at the end of the year. A total of 59 mentors were recruited, trained and matched with students over the two years of the project, 36 of whom participated in Year 2. A total of eight training sessions were offered, covering topics from how to engage students to understanding the rules and regulations of the program.

There were wonderful academic results, like the 4th grade girl that couldn’t accomplish the academic requirements for 4th grade and was on the list to be retained. Boost provided a mentor for the student and, in three months, she not only fulfilled the 4th grade requirements but also passed the WASL (state standardized achievement test.) This was all thanks to a dedicated mentor and the student’s hard work.

The program also had its share of challenges. Working with volunteers required the program to work around their schedules and be flexible about expectations. The program relied heavily on college students from the three local colleges as a major source of volunteers. This required some flexibility as well, depending on the college schedule and trying to retain mentors once the college academic year was complete. Another challenge was timely processing of potential volunteer’s fingerprints for the clearance in the schools. A system was finally established, but it was time consuming and created delays in the match process.

A transition plan was established for students in Walla Walla when notification of early termination was received from the US Department of Education. In most cases, students are continuing to receive some academic support through other CHSW programs, including the after school program at the Farm Labor Homes and the Northside Homework Club. CHSW will continue to provide space for mentors and mentees (working on an “unofficial” basis) to meet once a week in the tutoring rooms operated by these programs. Students and mentors meeting at the Farm Labor Homes will continue to have some supervision by the Coordinator of that program.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q184B080003

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

1. Improved school performance.

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
1.a. The percentage of mentored students who demonstrate improvement in core academic subjects as measured by grade point average after 12 months.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			17 / 24	71%		41 / 77	53%

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
1.b. The average number of unexcused absences from school per mentored student. (The average number of unexcused absences per student was 1.0 this year, but it is also useful to consider the ratio of students who had fewer unexcused absences this year than last, which was 29 of 39 students, or 74%, this year. This is an improvement over last year's ratio of 58%.)	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		1.042	/		1.0	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Performance Measure 1.a. is assessed based on grade data provided by partner school districts in March 2010. CHSW has created a "grade key" to convert different grading systems into one numeric "grade point average" for each subject. Data was collected on the previous year's grades to use as a comparison point. The "Target Data" is last year's reported results. Analysis of grade data has been complicated by two factors: English-language learners may actually experience a reduction in grades if they converted from a Spanish-language class into an English-language class during the year; and, most students were referred to the program because they were struggling with their grades and did not master the previous year's content, so they are naturally having extreme difficulty catching up with the content and achieving improved grades this year.

Performance Measure 1.b. is assessed based on attendance data provided by partner school districts in March 2010. Data was collected on the previous year's attendance to use as a comparison point. The "Target Data" is last year's reported results. "Actual Data" is based on attendance from September 09 through February 2010. In order to be counted as a student with a "improved attendance", that student either had no or fewer unexcused absences to date this school year (September 09 through February 2010) compared to last year.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q184B080003

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

2. Improved school behavior and social skills.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
2.a. The percentage of student/mentor matches that are sustained for a period of nine months.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			0 / 24		0%		63 / 91

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
2.b. Decrease in number of disciplinary referrals after 6 months in program.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			15 / 21		71%		58 / 62

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Performance Measure 2.a. is assessed based on program records for match initiation and closure maintained by the Site Coordinators. Since the project was still in it's first year last year, the "Target Data" for this performance measure is "0". The "Actual Data" reports the entire duration of the match, regardless of which year the match was made.

Performance Measure 2.b. is assessed based on discipline data provided by partner school districts in March 2010. In order to be counted as a student with a "decrease in disciplinary referrals", that student either had no or fewer referrals to date this school year (September 09 through February 2010) compared to last year.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q184B080003

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

2. Improved school behavior and social skills. (continued)

2.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.c. Improve relationship skills with adults and peers within 1 year of match.	Project		15 / 21	71%		58 / 62	94%

(Intentionally left blank)	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Performance Measure 2.c. is assessed utilizing surveys administered to teachers, mentors and students that contain a series of items related to social skills. The "Target Data" column reflects reported results in Year 1. The surveys are conducted once a year and ask for a retrospective analysis of social skills. The "Actual Data" reported combines student, teacher and mentor survey data for each student to come up with a percentage who have "improved relationship skills".



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q184B080003

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

3. Improved attitude and motivation for school.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
3.a. Increase positive feelings about school and learning.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			17 / 23	74%		61 / 66	93%

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
3.b. Increase participation in school-related activities.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			16 / 22	73%		57 / 65	88%

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Performance Measures 3.a. and 3.b. are assessed utilizing mentor, teacher, and student surveys that contain a series of items related to "attitude/positive feelings" and "motivation/participation". The "Target Data" columns reflect last year's reported results. The surveys were conducted once a year and ask for a retrospective analysis of student "attitude" and "motivation". The "Actual Data" combines student, teacher and mentor survey data for each student to compute the percentage who have achieved each performance measure for "improved attitude" and/or "improved motivation".



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q184B080003

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

4. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

4. Mentors feel success in making a difference in the life of a child.

4.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
4.a. The percentage of student/mentor matches that are sustained for a period of nine months.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			0 / 24		0%		63 / 91

4.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
4.b. Increase knowledge of mentee needs and resources.	Project	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
			19 / 23		83%		35 / 37

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Performance Measure 4.a. (the same as measure 2.a) is assessed based on program records for match initiation and closure maintained by the Site Coordinators. Since the project was still in it's first year last year, the "Target Data" for this performance measure is "0". The "Actual Data" reports the entire duration of the match, regardless of which year the match was initiated.

Performance Measure 4.b. is assessed utilizing a survey administered to mentors that contains three items related to increased knowledge and feelings of accomplishment. The "Target Data" is the reported results last year and the "Actual Data" is the reported results this year. The mentor survey was conducted once a year and asked for a retrospective analysis of knowlege gained and feelings of "making a difference in the life of a child."



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): __Q184B080003__

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

All funds were drawn down from the G5 System to pay for the budget expenditure amounts reported in items 8a. – 8c of the ED 524B Cover Sheet by the end of this budget period, which was also the end of the grant period.

There were no modifications of project activities and no significant changes to our approved budget. The only minor change in our budget during this budget period was our new approved indirect cost rate of 21.2% effective July 1, 2009. Our expenses were as we expected as were our achievement rates for project goals, objectives and activities. Our budget has adequately supported our efforts, with additional support for students and mentors contributed by our communities and CHSW.

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

Partners in Walla Walla included: Walla Walla School District, College Place Public Schools, Farm Labor Homes, Friends of Farm Labor Homes, Walla Walla Public Library, Walla Walla Community College, Friends Program, Walla Walla University, Whitman College, Americorps, Mom's Network, and the Walla Walla Senior Center.

Partners in Wenatchee included: Wenatchee, Eastmont, Orondo and Entiat School Districts, Wenatchee World Newspaper, Bank of America, Washington Mentor Association, Wenatchee Wild hockey team, North Central Home Builders Association, Cherry Creek Radio, Together for Drug Free Youth, Wenatchee Community Center, Local TV with Kris Hanson, and the Partnership for Children and Families.

With regard to key personnel, Program Manager Mike Fitzpatrick served as Project Director during the final two months of this grant following the retirement of Peg Mazen. Mr. Fitzpatrick has been the Program Manager of this project since its inception and has been the sole contact with Bryan Williams at the US Department of Education. Other key personnel on this project included Jaime Robison, Boost Coordinator in Wenatchee; and Mariela Rosas, Boost Coordinator in Walla Walla.

CHSW BOOS

DATA FOR CHILDREN WHOSE MATCHES HIT 3+ MONTH

Wenatchee		2008-2009 School Year																
		Fall Semester 2008							Spring Semester 2009							Fall		
Last Name	First Name	English Reading Writing	Math	Science	Social Studies	Core GPA	Unexcused Absences	Discipline Referrals	English Reading Writing	Math	Science	Social Studies	Core GPA	Unexcused Absences	Discipline Referrals	English Reading Writing	Math	Science
		2	1		3.3	1	0	0					0					
		2.4	2	2	2	2.1	0	0	3.3	2.3	3	3	2.866667	0	0	2	3.3	3
		3	3	3	3	3	0	0					0					
		2.6	3	N/A	3	1.9	0	0					0					
						0			3	3	3	3	3	0	0	3	3	3
						0		0					0			0.3	1.3	1
						0							0			4	2.3	3
						0							0			0.3	3.3	0.3
						0							0			2.3	3	2.3
						0							0			2.6	1.6	1.3
						0							0			1.3	3	2.3
						0							0			3	2.3	4
						0							0			3	2.6	N/A
						0							0			2.3	2.3	0.3
		3	4	3	3	3.333333	0	0	4	3	3.6	4	3.533333	0	0	3	2.3	3
		1.3	1.3	0.3	3.3	0.966667	0	0	1	2.6	3.6	3.3	2.4	0	1	4	2.6	3.3
		2	1.3	0.3	4	1.2	0	1	1	0.3	1	1	0.766667	0	0	2.3	1.6	1.3
		0.6	1.3	1.3	n/a	1.066667	0	0	3	1.6	2.3	n/a	2.3	0	2	3	0.3	1.3
		2	2.6	3	n/a	2.533333	0	3	2.2	2.6	1.6	n/a	2.133333	0	1	3	1.6	0.3
		2.6	2.6	n/a	3.3	1.733333	0	3	2.6	1.6	n/a	2	1.4	0	4	2	3	n/a
		2	0.3	0.3	n/a	0.866667	0	2	3	1	0.3	n/a	1.433333	0	5	3.3	2.3	0.3
		1.3	0.3	0.3	n/a	0.633333	0	8	0.3	0	0	n/a	0.1	0	4	3	3	n/a
		2	1.3	3	1.3	2.1	0	1	1	0.6	2	2.6	1.2	0	1	1.3	2.6	2.3
		IEP	IEP	3	3	1	0	0	IEP	IEP	3	3	1	0	0	IEP	IEP	3
		IEP	IEP	3	3	1	0	0	IEP	IEP	3	3	1	0	0	IEP	IEP	3
		3	2.6	3	3	2.866667	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	3	3	3
		IEP	IEP	2.6	2.6	0.866667	0	0	IEP	IEP	2.6	2.6	0.866667	0	0	IEP	IEP	3
						0							0			0.3	0.3	4
						0							0			3	1	3
						0							0			2	2	2.3
						0							0			3	1.3	2
						0							0			2.6	1	3.6
						0							0			3	3.3	4
						0							0			2.3	1	2
						0							0			2.3	2.1	1
						0			2	2	2	2	2	0	1	2.3	2	2
						0							0			3	2	4
		3	3.6	4	N/A		0	0	2	3	4	4		0	0			

T PROGRAM

S DURING THE 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 SCHOOL YEAR

2009-2010 School Year											Gains and Reduction Calculation 2008-2010							
Semester 2009				Spring Semester 2010							Gains/Reductions							
Social Studies	Core GPA	Unexcused Absences	Discipline Referrals	English Reading Writing	Math	Science	Social Studies	Core GPA	Unexcused Absences	Discipline Referrals	English Reading Writing	Math	Science	Social Studies	GPA Gain/ Loss by Semester	Overall GPA	Unexcused Absences Increase or Decline (-)	Discipline Referrals Increase or Decline (-)
	0							0			0	0	0		0		0	0
3	2.766667	0	0					0	0	0	-1.3	1	0		-0.1		0	0
	0							0			0	0	0		0		0	0
	0							0			0	0	0		0		0	0
3	3	0	0					0			0	0	0		0		0	0
N/A	0.866667	0	0	0.3	0.3	0.3	N/A	0.3			0.3	1.3	1		0.866667		0	0
1	3.1	0	1	4	3.6	1	1	2.866667	0	3	4	2.3	3		3.1		0	1
0.3	1.3	0	1	0.3	3.3	0.3	0.3	1.3	0	3	0.3	3.3	0.3		1.3		0	1
N/A	2.533333	0	8	2.3	3	1.6	N/A	2.3	0	4	2.3	3	2.3		2.533333		0	8
1.3	1.833333	0	5	1.6	2.3	2	1.3	1.966667		3	2.6	1.6	1.3		1.833333		0	5
1.6	2.2	0	1	1	2.3	3	1.3	2.1	0	0	1.3	3	2.3		2.2		0	1
4	3.1	0	0	2	2.6	2	3	2.2	0	0	3	2.3	4		3.1		0	0
1.3	1.866667	0	2	2	1.6	N/A	1.6	1.2	0	0	3	2.6			1.866667		0	2
0.3	1.633333	0	0	2.6	3	2.6	2.3	2.733333	0	0	2.3	2.3	0.3		1.633333		0	0
3	2.766667	0	0					0			-1	-0.7	-0.6		-0.766667		0	0
3.3	3.3	0	0					0			3	0	-0.3		0.9		0	-1
3	1.733333	0	0					0			1.3	1.3	0.3		0.966667		0	0
n/a	1.533333	0	0					0			0	-1.3	-1		-0.766667		0	-2
2.3	1.633333	0	0					0			0.8	-1	-1.3		-0.5		0	-1
n/a	1.666667	0	0					0			-0.6	1.4			0.266667		0	-4
0.3	1.966667	0	0					0			0.3	1.3	0		0.533333		0	-5
0	2	0	0					0			2.7	3			1.9		0	-4
2.6	2.066667	0	0					0			0.3	2	0.3		0.866667		0	-1
3	1	0	0	IEP	IEP	3	3	1	0	0			0		0		0	0
3	1	0	0	IEP	IEP	3	3	1	0	0			0		0		0	0
3	3	0	0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	0	0	0	0	0		0		0	0
3	1	0	0	IEP	IEP	3	3	1	0	0			0.4		0.133333		0	0
N/A	1.533333	0	0					0			0.3	0.3	4		1.533333		0	0
1.6	2.333333	0	0					0			3	1	3		2.333333		0	0
1	2.1	0	0					0			2	2	2.3		2.1		0	0
2	2.1	0	0					0			3	1.3	2		2.1		0	0
2.6	2.4	0	0					0			2.6	1	3.6		2.4		0	0
2.6	3.433333	0	0	3.6	3.6	2.6	4	3.266667	0	0	3	3.3	4		3.433333		0	0
1	1.766667	0	0					0			2.3	1	2		1.766667		0	0
1	1.8	0	0					0			2.3	2.1	1		1.8		0	0
3	2.1	0	0					0			0.3	0	0		0.1		0	-1
n/a	3	0	0	2	2	1	N/A	1.666667	0	0	3	2	4		3		0	0

**CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON
United Way 2009-2010 Outcome Report**

**OUTCOME 2212 – EDUCATIONALLY AT-RISK YOUTH/YOUNG ADULTS
MAKE PROGRESS TOWARD THEIR EDUCATIONAL GOALS.**

Indicator 2212 – 2: Youth/young adults show improved behavior in classroom/school environment.

Fostering to Permanence – 62% of participants achieved outcome. (13 of 21 eligible children)

A comparison evaluation between first and second semester academic records was used to measure this indicator. Students who exhibited a decrease in partial or full-day absences during the second semester were considered as having met the indicator.

Cobb Center for Youth – 88% of participants achieved this outcome. (29 of 33 children)

This indicator was measured using the Children's Functional Assessment Rating Scale (CFARS), which is the outcome measure mandated for residential treatment and behavioral rehabilitation services by the program's primary funding source for the program (DSHS.) The school domain of this tool measures improvements in attendance and classroom behavior.

Indicator 2212 – 5: Youth/young adults show improved academic performance.

Fostering to Permanence – 48% of participants achieved this outcome. (10 of 21 children)

Cobb Center for Youth – 94% of participants achieved this outcome. (31 of 33 children)

A comparative evaluation between past and current official Grade Point Averages (GPAs) was used to measure this indicator. For children who did not participate in an alpha-numeric grading system (such as elementary children or those in special education classes) the school advocate (teacher and/or counselor) based the achievement of this indicator on academic reports provided by the school.

2011 FAMILY CENTER OUTCOME REPORT
NORTH SEATTLE FAMILY CENTER SURVEY RESULTS
Progress Towards Performance Commitments

		# Surveys Submitted	Milestone # of Families		Survey Response Rate
YTD		230	572		40%
YTD - undup #		209	572		37%
Outcomes/Indicators		¹ B1A4-O: Participants report strengthened parenting and family life skills.	² B1A6-O: Participants report increased knowledge and skills in the areas of health, education and employment.	³ B1A3-O: Participants report engaging in more activities with their children that promote early learning and school success.	⁴ B1A7-O: Participants report strengthened social support networks and greater connection to their communities.
Yearly # of Contracted Performance Commitments		100	110	110	140
% of Contracted Performance Commitments Achieved (Undup)		158%	108%	134%	100%
Unduplicated YTD	# COUNTED	163	131	149	141
	% COUNTED	78%	63%	71%	67%
	# ACHIEVED	158	119	147	140
	% ACHIEVED	97%	91%	99%	99%
1 st Implementation Period: Nov 11 2010 to Mar 15 2011	# Counted	30	35	25	37
	% Counted	71%	83%	60%	88%
	# Achieved	29	34	25	37
	% Achieved	97%	97%	100%	100%
2 nd Implementation Period: Mar 16 2011 to Jun 15 2011	# Counted	72	25	71	26
	% Counted	85%	29%	84%	31%
	# Achieved	71	23	71	26
	% Achieved	99%	92%	100%	100%
3 rd Implementation Period: Jun 16 2011 to Nov 10 2011	# Counted	80	88	71	97
	% Counted	78%	85%	69%	94%
	# Achieved	77	78	69	95
	% Achieved	96%	89%	97%	98%

¹ Participants have two ways to achieve this indicator, using the longer participant survey, or the shorter ESL survey. To be counted using the longer survey, respondents must answer at least 3 of the 6 relevant items. To achieve the indicator, two of those responses must show improvement. To be counted using the shorter survey, respondents must answer at least one of the two relevant items. To achieve the indicator, one of those responses must show improvement.

² Participants also have two ways to achieve this indicator (participant survey or ESL survey). If at least 1 of the 3 relevant items is answered on the longer survey, the respondent will be counted. If one of these items shows improvement, the indicator is Achieved. To be counted using the ESL survey, respondents must answer at least 3 of the 6 relevant items. At least 2 must show improvement to achieve the indicator.

³ To be counted, participants must answer at least 4 of the 14 relevant items. To achieve the indicator, at least 3 must show improvement.

⁴ To be counted, participants must answer at least 4 of the 10 relevant items. To achieve the indicator, at least 3 must show improvement.

Note: Figures include only survey respondents that answered the required minimum number of questions related to that specific indicator/outcome