



DRAFT



City of Seattle

**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY**  
**Tuesday, April 21, 2009 • 4:00-5:30 p.m.**  
**LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**  
**7<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Hall**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Someireh Amirfaiz, Tim Burgess, Tim Ceis, Michael DeBell, Kris Hildebrandt, Antonio Hopson, David Okimoto, John Pehrson, Carla Santorno (for Supt. Goodloe-Johnson)

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Peter Aberg (Legislative), Eduardo Armijo (HSD), Wanda Brown (SPS), Carla Bryant (OFE), TJ Cosgrove (PHSKC), Jerry DeGriek (HSD), Holly Ferguson (SPS), Kathleen Groshong (HSD), Kacey Guin (OFE), Bea Kelleigh (HSD), Lauren Lee (HSD), Patricia Lee (Council staff), Holly Miller (OFE), Alan Painter (HSD), Thelma Payne (SPS), Sue Rust (OFE), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Anne Shields (PHSKC)

Deputy Mayor Tim Ceis called the meeting to order. After introductions, the minutes from the February 10, 2009, Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) meeting were approved.

Kacey Guin reviewed the purpose and role of the FEL Mid-Year Report. Tim Burgess asked how course corrections are proposed in collaboration with the Seattle Public Schools (SPS). K. Guin responded that OFE works with program staff on phasing, budgets, course corrections and other programmatic changes. Holly Miller added that OFE works well with program staff. T. Burgess asked if any brainstorming had recently occurred with SPS leadership. H. Miller responded that last happened about one year ago.

Tim Ceis said that he sensed a desire for more collaboration on the leadership level instead of just program staff. T. Burgess agreed, especially as the City moves toward renewing the Levy. T. Ceis asked that OFE propose options and make this a future LOC agenda item.

Carla Santorno noted that the minutes of the previous LOC meeting mention aligning Levy programs with SPS strategic plan. This work provided a good avenue for collaboration. H. Miller said she had recently met with Carol Rava-Treat to discuss performance measures for the strategic plan. T. Ceis asked OFE to take the lead in developing an opportunity for him, T. Burgess, Superintendent Goodloe-Johnson and others to meet to discuss policy level issues.

K. Guin reviewed Early Learning programs. John Pehrson noted SPS was not listed as a member of the Seattle Early Education Collaborative (SEEC) and that concerned him. K. Guin responded SPS has a role with Head Start and kindergarten transition so not listing them was an oversight. Bea Kelleigh added that SPS is a member of the SEEC Advisory Committee.

Michael DeBell asked if OFE knew the demand for or the size of waiting lists for pre-k programs. K. Guin responded that programs serving low income children in Seattle do not have

wait lists. Many of them have trouble recruiting children into their program. B. Kelleigh added that the City estimates we serve about 50% of low income families while states with universal pre-k serve at most 75%. M. DeBell asked if that meant there is a gap of about 20% from the best case. Carla Bryant responded that Georgia serves about 50% of all eligible families while Oklahoma serves about 75% in public school settings. Seattle is currently focused on serving low income, at-risk children. The City is conducting some “soft” research to determine where children are getting pre-k care. They could be in Friend and Family Care, or regular daycare for example. These children are getting served, but not by City-funded programs.

K. Guin reviewed pre-k assessment results. Someireh Amirfaiz asked how the pre-k curriculum was chosen since data is not displayed by language spoken by the child and family. C. Bryant responded the curriculum was chosen by the City in concert with community members. Some programs teach and assess children in their home language as well as in English. In reviewing the assessment results, J. Pehrson noted that children using the Step-Ahead program need to be assessed in comparison to similar children in order to determine if the investment is being effective. OFE shows results in comparison to children in other programs at different income levels.

K. Guin reviewed the Family Support and Family and Community Partnerships (FCP) Program. David Okimoto asked to be reminded of what the FCP program does. K. Guin responded that the program works with community-based organizations and specific schools to engage families in their child’s education. S. Amirfaiz asked if this was the second year of the program. H. Miller responded the program has been in operation since the beginning of the Levy and is now in its fourth school year. J. Pehrson pointed out the program was specifically called out in the development of the Levy.

S. Amirfaiz asked what SPS’ response has been to the recommendation that funding be used in a different way. She had heard the program was successful at engaging families. Wanda Brown responded that SPS agreed the program had some difficulties with data collection and meeting timelines. There have also been some struggles identifying measures of success. SPS is now planning on combining two different family involvement programs.

S. Amirfaiz asked how many Family Support Workers (FSWs) could be hired with the funding now used for the FCP program. She expressed concern that not enough bilingual FSWs could be hired with the funds to meet the language needs of SPS students. C. Santorno responded that, before expansion of FSWs to additional services is considered, the LOC should address the erosion of the base number of FSWs available to the schools. H. Miller agreed that the need for more FSWs to meet specific needs contributed to the recommendation to move funds from FCP to FSW. W. Brown added the change gives SPS additional flexibility to address changing demographics of students and gives support directly to principals.

D. Okimoto noted this discussion was appropriate for the LOC in their role to review ineffectual programs and recommend whether to terminate them. M. DeBell stated he wasn’t sure if the program was ineffective or just that the data was inadequate. K. Guin agreed the FSW program has a more sophisticated data collection system relating activities to outcomes.

K. Guin reviewed the Middle School programs. With respect to the model of data analysis used by Madison Middle School, Kris Hildebrandt asked whether the school had additional funding available to them. K. Guin responded that Madison uses Levy funds for interventions and for planning days. Without Levy funds, Madison would not have made the progress they have shown.

K. Guin reviewed High School programs. A significant number of students at risk of not promoting on time to 10<sup>th</sup> grade have shown substantial gains in credits earned in the first semester. This is a key indicator of success in 9<sup>th</sup> grade. K. Hildebrandt asked if counselors in the middle school health clinics share information about the 8<sup>th</sup> graders with their high school staff. TJ Cosgrove responded this information exchange must be done in the context of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) provisions related to privacy. If the clinics are managed by the same provider, staff can provide information. Where clinics have different operators, information can be shared only with consent.

S. Amirfaiz noted that with the loss of some previous LOC members, there doesn't appear to be as much interest in identifying the needs of LEP students. She pointed out the need to get better information from early learning programs. Sid Sidorowicz responded that early learning programs allow opting out of providing race/ethnicity and language information so it is more difficult to identify student needs at an aggregate level. He also noted that SPS is improving their reporting on LEP students. K. Guin added that two of the course correction recommendations address the needs of LEP students. S. Amirfaiz responded she doesn't see how the proposed strategy of hiring additional bilingual Family Support Workers will compensate for leverage lost by reducing reliance on CBOs.

K. Hildebrandt stated that, as the end of the current Levy nears, the LOC should focus on the programs that are working and reduce funding for less effective ones. She questioned moving Community Learning Center funding to Eckstein and Madrona after Meany Middle School closes. S. Sidorowicz noted this was a shift of funds within the same program area as a result of school closure. K. Hildebrandt questioned whether the funds should instead be moved to another, more effective program area. H. Miller replied that the middle school programs do seem to be working.

K. Hildebrandt asked that the LOC begin reviewing what has been working. H. Miller responded that OFE will be developing issue papers for that purpose.

The meeting was adjourned.