

Levy Oversight Committee

Tuesday, May 15, 2007

4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

City Hall, 7th Floor

Meeting Purpose:

- Briefing on English Language Learners
- Review and Discussion of Course-Corrections and Targets for 2007–08

4:00 pm	Welcome and Introductions	David Della, Councilmember
4:05	Review of Agenda and Approval of Minutes from April 17, 2007 LOC meeting	David Della, Councilmember
4:10	English Language Learners (ELL)	Mary Jean Ryan Holly Miller Sid Sidorowicz
4:25	Review and Discussion of Levy Course-Corrections and Targets for 2007–2008	Holly Miller Jessica de Barros Sid Sidorowicz All
5:30	Adjourn	

Handouts

Minutes of 4/17/07 LOC Meeting

Memorandum on English Language Learners

Presentation: Levy Course-Corrections and Targets for 2006-2007

Next Meeting

June 19, 2007



DRAFT



City of Seattle

**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**
Thursday, April 17, 2007 • 4:00–5:30 p.m.
City Hall, Norman B. Rice Conference Room

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Someireh Amirfaiz, Tim Ceis, Cheryl Chow, David Della, Kris Hildebrandt, Antonio Hopson, Marie Kurose, Carla Santorno for Raj Manhas, David Okimoto, John Pehrson, Debra Sullivan

OTHERS PRESENT: Carla Bryant (Office for Education), Lin Carlson (Seattle Public Schools), Lori Chisholm (Parks), Jessica de Barros (OFE), Jerry DeGriek (HSD), Bob Fortner (Youth Tutoring Program), Donnie Grabowski (OFE), Sonja Griffin (HSD), Kathleen Groshong (HSD), Paula Houston (YMCA), Kathie Huus (Parks), Mary Johnson (HSD), Lauren Lee (HSD), Patricia Lee (Council Central Staff), Patricia McInturff (HSD), Holly Miller (OFE), Jennifer Moon (DOF), Erica Mullen (YMCA), Thelma Payne (SPS), Deeann Burtch Puffert (Child Care Resources), Janet Preston (SPS), Mary Jean Ryan (OPM), Sue Rust (OFE), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Kristi Skanderup (middle school support), Linda Rose Slater (SPS), Josh Sutton (YMCA), Viviana Ulloa (HSD), Meenoo Yashar (Child Care Resources), Billie Young (HSD)

David Della called the meeting to order and asked for introductions. The minutes of the March 8, 2007 Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) were approved with the clarification that Option B from the Middle Schools Options memorandum was adopted by the LOC.

D. Della explained that several LOC members had participated in detailed briefings the previous week on the Levy baseline and indicator data.

Holly Miller said the Office for Education (OFE) would make an abbreviated presentation of the baseline academic data for students currently served by Levy programs and indicator data for the first semester of the current school year in order to leave plenty of time for discussion by the LOC. The May LOC meeting will focus on recommendations for course corrections and program targets for next year. H. Miller said Jessica de Barros and Sid Sidorowicz are to be thanked and highly commended for their excellent work on the mid-year data. They have been thorough, painstaking and unstinting in their efforts to accurately represent progress on Levy programs.

J. de Barros noted that although the presentation would be brief, all of the data would be included in the full mid-year report which the LOC will receive in May.

J. de Barros presented the report program by program and took questions as the presentation proceeded.

Early Learning

Mary Jean Ryan asked why data was missing on the number of students from the Step Ahead preschools that had enrolled in Seattle School District (SSD). J. de Barros said the SSD had been unable to assign student identification numbers (IDs) to the students enrolled in the Step Ahead programs prior to entering kindergarten. OFE has not been able to obtain student ID numbers for these students after they had begun school, so it is now unclear how many students actually enrolled and are attending SSD.

H. Miller said the Partnership Agreement between the City of Seattle and the SSD stated that the District would assign IDs to the Step Ahead students. City and SSD staff are working to operationalize that agreement through an Early Learning Memorandum of Understanding (MOA). M.J. Ryan asked if the first cohort would be lost. Patricia McInturff said it should be possible to assign IDs retroactively and track the academic progress of those students.

J. Pehrson asked if there was planning to adopt an alternative to the DIAL-3, due to its inaccuracy as a kindergarten readiness assessment. H. Miller said the City is working with SSD on their selection of a kindergarten readiness assessment tool which is currently scheduled to be piloted in the fall of 2008 and implemented full scale in the fall of 2009. Carla Santorno said there are not many good kindergarten readiness assessment options on the market. SSD is continuing to look for an accurate instrument that teachers can use. H. Miller said until a kindergarten readiness tool is selected, the City will continue to rely on the curriculum-embedded assessments which assess cognitive readiness with more rigor than the DIAL-3 assessment.

D. Della asked if there was a standard for the number of days preschool offered during a school year. J. de Barros said there has not previously been a standard, but a standard will be created as a course correction for next year. Marie Kurose asked if there was a standard for hours per day of preschool. Sonja Griffin said the standard was 15 hours per week.

J. Pehrson said that programs with better attendance should receive preference for funding next year. H. Miller said the Human Services Department (HSD) is providing coaching and professional development to support programs with attendance problems. P. McInturff said HSD is using both carrots and sticks to improve attendance. Debra Sullivan said she would like to see reports that show outcomes correlated with attendance rates by race and ethnicity.

Elementary Community Learning Centers (ECLCs)

T. Ceis asked what steps were being taken to help improve attendance at Van Asselt Elementary School's CLC. Kathleen Groshong said participation was being monitored monthly and CLC staff were working with Van Asselt Elementary staff to see how to improve attendance for specific children with chronic attendance challenges. K. Groshong said HSD was increasing participation goals and days available for next year's contracts. She noted that the Van Asselt CLC was slow to start up this year.

M. Kurose and Someireh Amirfaiz noted that students in the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) category are low-performing on the WASL. J. de Barros said that was probably because the number of students who are in that category this year, and who also took the WASL last year, is very small. Sid Sidorowicz pointed out that the students status on the charts is for this year, while

the WASL baseline data is from last school year. LEP students who meet both the reading and writing WASL standards last year are no longer maintained in LEP status.

Family Support and Family Involvement (FSW/FI)

J. Pehrson asked why the targets for FSW/FI were lower this year than last. J. de Barros said last year's targets were not value-added and this year's are value-added; that is, last year's targets included both students who had passed the WASL previously and those who had not. This year's targets will count only students who have not passed the WASL previously. J. Pehrson suggested footnoting that distinction in the report.

S. Amirfaiz asked if family activities were disaggregated by race and ethnicity. S. Sidorowicz said that data could be shown but wasn't for this presentation. D. Della said it would be included in the final report.

M. Kurose asked if Student Intervention Team meetings were for discipline purposes. H. Miller replied that they are usually not held for that reason. M. Kurose then asked if absences include suspensions. S. Sidorowicz said he was not sure and would check with SSD. (Follow up on this question: SSD counts suspensions as excused absences.)

D. Sullivan asked if all tables in the report could be disaggregated by race and ethnicity. J. de Barros said many of the tables would be disaggregated in the final report; the LOC power point presentation was meant to give an overview picture of Levy mid-year indicator data. David Okimoto asked if the data could then be revisited. H. Miller said OFE would look at how much they could do by the May LOC meeting and put some time on the agenda, if warranted, to discuss the data.

Middle School Programs

J. Pehrson asked if course corrections next year would address low participation levels in CLCs because it would be hard to be effective with such low participation levels. J. de Barros said course corrections would set higher participation levels and middle school innovation sites are already moving to mandatory attendance requirements for their after school programs. Students would be assumed to be participating in after school programs unless parents specifically chose for them not to participate.

S. Amirfaiz asked for an explanation of LEP/EEP/NON-LEP definitions in the baseline data. S. Sidorowicz said some students who receive Levy services were LEP last year and passed the language proficiency test and became NON-LEP or EEP this year. Debra Sullivan asked, since LEP/NON-LEP is binary, if it was then possible to track how students perform after they are no longer LEP. C. Santorno said LEP students are leveled by their scores on the English language proficiency test only before they pass the test. After LEP students pass the test, they are no longer tracked as part of the LEP category. Marie Kurose and Debra Sullivan asked if it was possible to track former LEP students after they pass the test and move out of LEP status. H. Miller said OFE would look into that question for the next meeting.

C. Santorno asked for a clear statement of the question that needed to be answered. M.J. Ryan said OFE would look at trying to formulate the question for the next meeting.

Seattle Team for Youth (STFY)

J. Pehrson asked if the attendance data included students who dropped out. S. Sidorowicz said if students were actively attending school during any given semester, OFE would get their attendance data.

J. Pehrson asked if receiving a GED was an outcome. J. de Barros said GED's are monitored as indicators. J. Pehrson said they should still be tracked as meaningful indicators. H. Miller said the LOC decided early on not to use GED's as outcomes.

A. Hopson asked if STFY tracks teen pregnancy for the girls being served. V. Ulloa responded that while STFY serves pregnant teens, they do not track data regularly about them. J. DeGriek noted that teen pregnancy is an indicator for health services.

D. Sullivan asked what changes are being considered for STFY. H. Miller said the STFY team is looking at issues such as static assignments of case managers in schools, working with eighth grade students to help them with the transition to high school and successful completion of the freshman year, lengthening case managers' services to students beyond eighteen months and coordination of resources with CASA START.

Date: May 9, 2007

To: Levy Oversight Committee

From: Holly Miller, Office for Education
Mary Jean Ryan, Office of Policy and Management

Issue: English Language Learners

At its last meeting, the Levy Oversight Committee made several requests for additional information related to English Language Learners (ELL) data, including:

- Additional analysis of student data in the Mid-Year Report by race, Limited English Proficiency (LEP)/Equal English Proficiency (EEP) and free/reduced lunch status;
- Review of what is possible to know related to students' immigrant status/country of origin based on School District data;
- Review of whether it is possible it is possible to track LEP students' academic achievement after they move out of LEP status;
- Description of the major questions that need to be answered relative to ELL students.

Mid-Year Report

The Mid-Year report (copies of which are here today and are available on the Office for Education [OFE] website) includes analysis by race, free and reduced lunch status, LEP/EEP status for nearly all indicator data.

Immigrant Status/Country of Origin Data

To determine what is possible to know related to students' immigrant status and/or country of origin based on School District data, OFE staff compiled a report of students in one Levy investment (Family Support) as an example. This example report, which shows language spoken at home for the students participating in the Family Support Worker program, is attached for your review. OFE concludes from this report that a meaningful analysis of the relationship between language spoken at home and indicators and outcomes of academic achievement would have to include greater numbers of students. This could be accomplished by aggregating similar languages or aggregating Levy investments (i.e., analyzing all Levy elementary school students as opposed to students in Family Support). There is also the question of whether information would be useful at the aggregated level for Levy programs.

Tracking LEP students into Non-LEP status

OFE can review academic performance of former LEP students once they move into Non-LEP status.

Major Questions Related to ELL Students

While there is considerable discussion nationally and at the state level about ELL student achievement and successful intervention strategies, there is little data on student success and little consensus on academic strategies that work to improve English language skills and academic achievement. The following questions need to be answered to begin to develop a strategic approach to improve academic achievement for ELL students:

1. What are the criteria for moving a student from LEP to EEP status, at the state and district levels?
2. How do Title One and Title Three support ELL students?
3. How many students who pass the English Proficiency Exam pass the WASL? Are we exiting students from LEP status before they are prepared to pass the WASL? At what level or score on the English Proficiency Exam do students begin to pass the WASL?
4. Can we see a breakdown from the School District on the rates of passage of the English Proficiency Exam by language spoken at home?
5. How do ELL students improve English language ability and progress academically over time? What variables in a student's background, e.g., literacy in language spoken at home, predict greater academic success?
6. What academic interventions are most successful with ELL students from entrance into the educational system through English language acquisition?
7. What strategies are being used at the local level and recommended by the State?

Attachments

FSW Program 2006-07 SY

Data Through 1st Semester

# of Students	Country of Origin	# of Students	Language Spoken at Home
1223	United States	903	English
79	Mexico	222	Spanish
30	Somalia	69	SOMALIAN
14	Philippines	55	Vietnamese
14	Ethiopia	23	Tagalog
11	Vietnam	21	Cantonese
5	China	16	Oromo (S. Ethiopia)
4	El Salvador	13	Tigrigna
3	Japan	12	Cambodian
3	Pakistan	8	Samoaan
2	Guatemala	8	Amharic (Ethiopia)
2	Other	7	Laotian
1	Yugoslavia	6	Mien (Minh-Laos & Cambodia)
1	Ghana	5	Japanese
1	France	4	Ilokano
1	Jordan	3	Mon (Hmong-Laos & Cambodia)
1	Ecuador	2	Toishanese
1	Puerto Rico	2	Urdu (Pakistan)
1	Bolivia	2	Cham
1	American Samoa	2	Creole (Haiti)
1	Algeria	2	Hindi
1	Hong Kong	2	OTHER LANGUAGES
		1	Tibetan
		1	Punjabi
		1	French
		1	Yugoslavian (Serbo-Croatian)
		1	Persian/Farsi (Iran)
		1	Mandarin
		1	Tongan
		1	TWI
		1	BILAN
		1	BERBER
		1	Arabic
		1	MONGOLIAN
		1	Croatian

Data Through March 31

# of Students	Country of Origin	# of Students	Language Spoken at Home
2485	United States	1837	English
159	Mexico	446	Spanish
62	Somalia	142	SOMALIAN
31	Ethiopia	110	Vietnamese
28	Philippines	47	Tagalog
22	Vietnam	42	Cantonese
10	China	36	Oromo (S. Ethiopia)
8	El Salvador	26	Tigrigna
6	Japan	24	Cambodian
6	Pakistan	16	Samoaan
4	Guatemala	16	Amharic (Ethiopia)
3	Other	14	Laotian
2	Yugoslavia	12	Mien (Minh-Laos & Cambodia)
2	Jordan	10	Japanese
2	Ghana	8	Ilokano
2	France	6	Mon (Hmong-Laos & Cambodia)
2	Puerto Rico	5	Urdu (Pakistan)
2	Ecuador	4	Toishanese
2	Bolivia	4	OTHER LANGUAGES
2	American Samoa	4	Hindi
2	Algeria	4	Cham
2	Hong Kong	4	Creole (Haiti)
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	3	Arabic
1		2	BERBER
		2	BILAN
		2	TWI
		2	Tongan
		2	Mandarin
		2	French
		2	Tibetan
		2	Punjabi
		2	Persian/Farsi (Iran)
		2	Yugoslavian (Serbo-Croatian)
		2	Croatian
		1	MONGOLIAN
		1	Greek
		1	Russian

Highlighted Countries and Languages meet 10 student requirement for data display

FSW Participants When Linked to WASL Results

Number of Students	Country of Origin	Number of Students	Language Spoken at Home
630	United States	470	English
37	Mexico	102	Spanish
19	Somalia	33	SOMALIAN
8	Ethiopia	30	Vietnamese
7	Vietnam	15	Tagalog
6	Philippines	13	Cantonese
3	El Salvador	8	Oromo (S. Ethiopia)
2	China	6	Cambodian
2	Japan	5	Mien (Minh-Laos & Cambodia)
2	Pakistan	5	Amharic (Ethiopia)
1	Other	5	Laotian
1	Ghana	5	Tigrigna
1	France	4	Japanese
1	Puerto Rico	3	Urdu (Pakistan)
1	Ecuador	3	Samoan
1	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2	Cham
1	Algeria	2	Mon (Hmong-Laos & Cambodia)
1	Guatemala	1	BERBER
		1	BILAN
		1	TWI
		1	Toishanese
		1	Creole (Haiti)
		1	French
		1	OTHER LANGUAGES
		1	Greek
		1	Hindi
		1	Tibetan
		1	Russian
		1	Persian/Farsi (Iran)
		1	Croatian

Country of Origin
United Arab Emirates
Argentina
American Samoa
Austria
Australia
Bangladesh
Belgium
Bulgaria
Bolivia
Brazil
Burma
Canada
Central African Republic
Congo
Switzerland
Chile
China
Columbia
Costa Rica
Czechoslovakia
Cuba
Cyprus
Germany, Federal Republic of
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Algeria
Ecuador
Egypt
Spain
Ethiopia
Finland
Fiji
France
United Kingdom
Ghana
Greece

Country of Origin
(continued)
Guatemala
Guam
Hong Kong
Honduras
Haiti
Hungary
Indonesia
Ireland
Israel
India
Iraq
Iran
Italy
Jamaica
Jordan
Japan
Cambodia
Korea, Republic of
Kuwait
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Lebanon
Sri Lanka
Liberia
Luxembourg
Morocco
Marshall Islands
Martinique
Mexico
Malaysia
Nicaragua
Netherlands
Norway
New Zealand
Other
Panama

Country of Origin
(continued)
Peru
Philippines
Pakistan
Poland
Puerto Rico
Portugal
Paraguay
Romania
Saudi Arabia
Sudan
Sweden
Singapore
Senegal
Somalia
Suriname
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
El Salvador
Thailand
Tunisia
Turkey
Taiwan
Ukraine
United States
Uruguay
Venezuela
Vietnam
Yugoslavia
South Africa
Zaire
Zimbabwe

Language Spoken at Home
English
Japanese
LATVIA
MONGOLIAN
GEORGIAN
AZERBAIJANI
BULGARIAN
ALBANIAN
EGYPTIAN
KURDISH
RWANDA
SERBO-CROATIAN
Samoan
KAPANG PANNGAN
BILAN
BERBER
XHOSA
LINGALA
Other Chinese Languages & Dialects
Cantonese
CHUUK
EWE
GUJARATI
Other American Indian Languages and Dialects
BEMBA
MANDINGO
NEPALI
SONINKE
TWI
WOLOF
MAM
AKAN
DARI
DINKA
Arabic
CHIU CHOW

Language Spoken at Home
<i>(continued)</i>
Croatian
Serbian
American Sign Language
Other East Indian Languages & Dialects
Bengali
Hindi
Malayalam
Punjabi
Urdu (Pakistan)
French
Danish
Dutch
Eskimo
Finnish
German
Greek
Hawaiian
Hungarian
Italian
Mandarin
Malay
Norwegian
Creole (Haiti)
Palauan
Persian/Farsi (Iran)
Polish
Portuguese
Russian
Swedish
Thai
Other Philippine Languages & Dialects
Tongan
Trukese
Turkish
Ukrainian

Language Spoken at Home
<i>(continued)</i>
Vietnamese
Yiddish
Yoruba (Nigeria)
Yugoslavian (Serbo-Croatian)
Romany (Gypsy)
Toishanese
Tagalog
Cambodian
Fiji
Laotian
Amharic (Ethiopia)
Swahili (The Sudan)
Hausa (Nigeria)
Ibo
Other African Languages & Dialects
Aleut
Blackfoot
Ilokano
Cree
Crow
Haida
Navajo
Nez Perce
Saanich
Sioux
Paiute
Puyallup
Tlingit
Sebuana
Burmese
Chamorro (Guam)
Czech
Estonian
Hebrew
Icelandic

Language Spoken at Home
<i>(continued)</i>
Indonesian
Jamaican
Lapp (Lapland)
Lettish (Latvia)
Korean
Romanian
Tibetan
Flemish
Taiwanese
Kikuyu (Kenya)
Armenian
Pashto
Marathi
Lithuanian
Mon (Hmong-Laos & Cambodia)
Spanish
Fukienese
Mien (Minh-Laos & Cambodia)
Tigrigna
Cham
Kmhmu (Laos)
Oromo (S. Ethiopia)
SOMALIAN
OTHER LANGUAGES
KONGO

Families & Education Levy Mid-Year Report Recommendations 2006-07 School Year

**Levy Oversight Committee Meeting
May 15, 2007**

1

Setting the Context

OFE reports on three sets of data annually:

- Baseline Data
 - Whom are we serving?
 - Demographic and academic data – are we serving the right students?
- Mid-Year Indicator Data
 - How did we do in the first semester?
 - Indicator data – are we on-track to meet targets?
 - Recommended course-corrections
- Outcome Data (Annual Report)
 - How did we do in the first school year, overall?
 - Outcome data – did we meet targets?

2

2006-07 Mid-Year Report

- The 2006-07 Mid-Year Report covers baseline and indicator data.
- Purposes of the report:
 - Determine whether we are reaching the right students
 - Track progress on indicators of kindergarten readiness, academic achievement and dropout prevention
 - Determine whether we're on track to meet 2006-07 targets
 - Make course-corrections and set targets for 2007-08

3

LOC Mid-Year Process

- OFE presented indicator and baseline data to the LOC last month.
- The LOC requested data be further disaggregated.
 - Indicator data are disaggregated by race, income and language ability in the Mid-Year Report.

4

LOC Mid-Year Process

Today we will:

- Review key points from baseline and indicator data.
- Recommend course-corrections and targets for 2006-07 for LOC discussion.

Adopted course-corrections and targets will be included in the Mayor's proposed 2008 budget.

5

Review: Baseline Data

- Gives us information on the students we are serving this school year.
- Data are from the previous school year.
- Data showed the Levy is doing a good job at serving students who are behind academically.
- The Levy is also serving high percentages of students of color, and those who are limited English speaking or low-income.

6

Review: Key Themes From 2006-07 Indicator Data

- We now have detailed data that allow us to make data-driven management decisions.
 - Still need to complete implementation of some program-level data systems.
- Need to define and improve business rules in Levy contracts.
 - Participation levels in Levy programs vary.
 - The number of program days offered varies by provider.
- Still learning which indicators are most meaningful for academic achievement progress.
 - Indicator data could be further improved to track more detailed academic progress throughout the year.

7

Early Learning Observations & Course-Corrections

- The DIAL-3 is not an accurate predictor of kindergarten readiness.
 - Use the curriculum-embedded assessment as the kindergarten readiness measure for 2007-08.
- The number of days of pre-K offered varies by provider.
- Pre-K attendance varies and is low among some providers.
 - Require a minimum number of pre-K days offered each month. Tie attendance requirement to this standard.
 - Establish business rules for management of early learning programs (e.g., standards for enrollment, tracking attendance, assessment).
 - Train pre-K providers in the basics of small business management.

8

Early Learning Observations & Course-Corrections (continued)

- Data collection system needs improvement.
 - Complete implementation of the Early Learning Network Information System.
- Not all teachers in need of professional development are accessing these resources.
 - Redistribute professional development to low-performing sites/teachers.
 - Develop a five-year plan for teacher training that includes a baseline standards and development of a deep understanding of the curriculum.
- The City and District need a process for identifying and tracking pre-K children who enter Kindergarten in SPS.
 - The City and SPS have agreed to issue student IDs to Levy pre-K children entering kindergarten beginning in fall 2007.

9

Early Learning Additional Recommended Course-Corrections

- Require providers to assess 95% of preschool children 3x/year.
- Develop a plan to transition PCHP children to pre-K.

10

Early Learning Recommended 2007-08 Targets

	2005-06 School Year		2006-07 School Year		2007-08 School Year
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target
Pre-K children enrolled	280	155	388	420	Up to 560
Pre-K 4-year-olds ready for K	182 / 65%	77 / 50%	248 / 75%	Avail. Summer '07	405 / 85%
Pre-K children entering kindergarten	238	Not yet Avail.	330	342	476
Pre-K students who meet DRA standard in 2nd grade	97 / 70%	Avail. 2008-09	193 / 77%	Avail. 2009-10	77% / 279
2- and 3-year-olds in ELN child care whose teachers participate in training	131	81	206	239	206
Number of birth to three-year-olds whose teachers meet quality standards by the end of the school year					134 / 65%
Two- and three-year-olds served through PCHP	100	114	200	199	200
3-year-olds who meet standards at the end of 2 years	N/A	Avail. Summer '07	64 / 64%	Avail. Summer '08	75 / 75%

11

Family Support & Involvement Observations & Course-Corrections

- The Family Support program has capacity to serve both “focus” and “non-focus” students.
- These programs are serving students with higher numbers of absences and higher disciplinary rates.
- Families are participating more in family events than teacher conferences or SIT.
 - Set multiple family involvement goals for children’s families.
- Student goals do not always match student needs shown in indicator data (e.g., attendance).
 - Set criteria for assigning student goals (e.g., set attendance goals for focus students with 5% absences).
 - Set quantitative milestones for student goals in FSW improvement plans.

12

Family Support & Involvement Additional Course-Corrections

- Develop a multi-year strategy to help students achieve academically using the following indicators:
 - 200 additional students will pass one WASL section, improve from level 1 to level 2, or improve DRA.
 - 175 students will maintain passage of WASL/DRA.

13

Family Support & Involvement Previous Targets

Family Support Targets Through 2006-07					
	2004-05 School Year	2005-06 School Year		2006-07 School Year	
	Baseline	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Focus students served	N/A	2,000	1,331	1,500	1,404
Focus students who meet the DRA or WASL standard	Total: 405 / 46% DRA: 301 / 66% WASL: 104 / 25%	160 / 8%	326 / 25%	200 / 13%	Avail. Fall '07

Family & Community Involvement Targets Through 2006-07					
	2004-05 School Year	2005-06 School Year		2006-07 School Year	
	Baseline	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Students served	N/A	150	293	400	447
Students served who meet the WASL or DRA standard.	Total: 36 / 29% DRA: 24 / 44% WASL: 12 / 17%	16 / 11%	67 / 23%	50 / 13%	Avail. Fall '07

14

Family Support & Involvement Recommended 2007-08 Targets

Number of students served	1,500
Students served who meet the WASL or DRA standard	275 / 18%

15

Elementary CLC Observations & Course-Corrections

- Elementary CLCs are partnering with Family Support and Family Involvement programs to serve the same children.
 - Continue to build on the foundation set by these programs
- Participation levels vary by site.
 - Increase student participation to at least 75% of available days for at least 60% of students in the program for all sites.
- The number of available days varies by site.
 - Increase the number of available days to at least 150 days at every site.

16

Elementary CLCs Additional Course-Corrections

- Continue work to align CLC programs with schools' academic strategies.
- Develop a multi-year strategy to help students achieve academically using the following indicators:
 - 30 level 1 students will move to level 2 in at least one subject.
 - 28 level 3 students will maintain passage of the WASL/DRA.

17

Elementary CLCs Recommended 2007-08 Targets

	2004-05 School Year	2005-06 School Year		2006-07 School Year		2007-08 School Year
	Baseline	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target
Elementary students served	N/A	200	227	210	220	230
Students who meet the WASL/ DRA standard	Total: 36 / 38% 2 nd Gr. DRA: 24 / 51% 4 th Gr. WASL: 9 / 17%	14 / 7%	76 / 33%	30 / 14%	Avail. Fall '07	50 / 22%

18

Middle School Programs: Actions Taken So Far

- ✓ Innovation Site principals wrote proposals for Levy investments next year. Proposals:
 - Have school-wide targets, instead of separate targets for separate programs;
 - Integrate Levy investments; and,
 - Have much higher academic targets.
- ✓ Expert panel gave feedback.
- ✓ Principals re-wrote proposals.
- ✓ Currently in final stages of negotiations.
- ✓ “Linkage” sites will also write plans for Levy investments.

19

Middle School Observations & Course-Corrections

- Overall Observation: Levy investments should be well-integrated in each school and targets should be higher.
 - Being addressed through proposal process.
- CLC participation is infrequent for some groups of students.
 - Schools plan to make after-school participation mandatory for students who have an academic target.

20

Middle School Programs Observations & Recommended Course-Corrections

- Middle school programs do not have a frequent data collection and analysis system in place to regularly assess student progress toward standards.
 - Implement formative assessments for Levy middle school students to frequently measure progress and tailor academic interventions.
- Middle school programs need to make a much larger impact on academic achievement, particularly in math.
- Yet, the district does not have a clear strategy for improving math skills at the middle school level.

21

Middle School Programs Recommended 2007-08 Targets

- School-wide targets for all Levy programs combined (MSSP & CLCs).
- Innovation Sites have higher targets for higher investment levels & concentration of services.
- Includes multi-year indicators:
 - 50% of level 1 students move to level 2 (Innovation sites)
 - 30% of level 1 students move to level 2 (Linkage sites)

22

Middle School Programs Recommended 2007-08 Targets

	Innovation Sites	Linkage Sites	Total
Students participating	TBD	TBD	TBD
Students meeting WASL standards	200	214	414

Overall Middle School Levy target
Increases from 301 ('06-07) to 414 ('07-08)

50% of level 1 students move
to level 2 (Innovation sites)
30% of level 1 students move
to level 2 (Linkage sites)

23

STFY Observations & Recommended Course-Corrections

- 70% of STFY students enrolled in high school earned credit toward graduation in the first semester.
- School attendance is low for STFY students; more than 60% missed 10 days or more in the first semester.
 - Increase school attendance by placing greater emphasis on this as a performance commitment.
- The City and providers still need to develop an effective system for obtaining SPS ID numbers.
 - Improve collection of SPS student ID numbers.
 - Enforce providers' performance commitments to collect IDs.
 - This will be a performance commitment between OFE and HSD.

24

STFY Observations & Recommended Course-Corrections

- This program faces a significant challenge in helping students achieve academically using the current model.
 - Focus more heavily on entering high school students and work with these students over multiple years.
 - New referrals would be for 2nd-semester 8th graders, 9th & 10th graders
 - Extend the case management time period beyond the current 18-month limit.
 - Focus the academic achievement target on high school students only.

25

STFY Recommended 2007-08 Targets

	2005-06 School Year		2006-07 School Year		2007-08 School Year
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target
High-Risk Youth referred to STFY	665	611	665	621	550
High-Risk Youth referred to STFY with SPS ID numbers	665	447	632	490	523
High-Risk Youth who stay in school/come back to school	365 / 55%	319	250 / 38%	26	300 / 55%
High-Risk Youth who progress to next grade level		282	250	26	300
High-Risk Youth who re-enroll and stay in school for 90 days		87		107	
High-Risk Youth who pass the WASL	11 / 3%	10 / 2.7%	16 / 4%	Avail. Fall '07	16 / 4% (high school students only)
High-Risk 12 th grade youth who graduate		22 / 24%	26 / 45%	Avail. Fall '07	35

26

Student Health Observations & Course-Corrections

- School-Based Health Centers appear to be on-track to serve at least 5,000 students this year.
- While SBHCs have identified many high-risk students, school nurses have fallen short of their goal.
 - Increase the number of high-risk students identified and screened for school nurses.
 - Set separate targets for school nurses and SBHCs to identify and screen students.
 - School nurses should work with Pathway Deans to identify high-risk students.
 - All screenings for the 2007-08 school year target should be completed by December 31, 2007.

27

Student Health Observations & Course-Corrections

- Students identified with chronic conditions and as high-risk had many more absences than other students.
 - Improve coordination of mental health resources in schools.
- Additional Recommended Course-Corrections:
 - Set a graduation target for 12th grade students served by SBHCs and school nurses.
 - SBHCs should support an HPV vaccine campaign.
 - OFE would contribute one-time funding

28

Student Health Recommended 2007-08 Targets

	2004-05 School Year	2005-06 School Year		2006-07 School Year		2007-08 School Year
	Baseline	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target
High school and middle school students using SBHCs	4,839	5,000	4,755	5,000	3,412	5,000
Students brought into compliance with required immunizations	2,500	2,500	4,001	1,500 / 17%	4,187	5,000
Students assisted by school nurses and SBHCs in managing chronic conditions		600	1,700	1,800 / 36%	1,349 / 42%	2,000
High-risk students identified and served through more intensive SBHC interventions that support academic achievement		1,500	436	800	803	600
High-risk students screened for risk factors by school nurses						600
Students helped by school-based health services who pass the WASL	<u>All Students Using SBHCs</u> 7 th Gr: 85 / 35% 10 th Gr: 201 / 29%	100 / 2%	586 / 17%	150 / 3%	Avail. Fall '07	150 / 3%
Students helped by school-based health services who graduate					791 / 77%	825 / 80%

29

Next Steps

- LOC discussion

30