

Levy Oversight Committee

Tuesday, December 11, 2007

4:00 – 5:30 p.m.

City Hall, 7th Floor

Meeting Purpose:

- Update on HPV Campaign
- Review 2006-07 Families & Education Levy Annual Report Outline
- Review proposal for FEL High School Dropout Prevention Program

4:00 pm	Welcome and Introductions	Tim Ceis, Deputy Mayor
4:05	Review of Agenda and Approval of Minutes from September 18 LOC meeting	Tim Ceis
4:10	Update on HPV Campaign	Anne Shields Public Health - SKC
4:25	Review 2006-07 FEL Annual Report Outline	Holly Miller Sid Sidorowicz Kacey Guin
4:45	Review proposal for FEL High School Dropout Prevention Program	Holly Miller Kacey Guin Sid Sidorowicz
5:30	Adjourn	

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, January 22, 2008

Handouts

Minutes from Sept. 18 LOC Meeting
FEL Annual Report Outline
High School Proposal
LOC Calendar for 2008



DRAFT



City of Seattle

**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**
Tuesday, September 18, 2007 • 4:00–5:30 p.m.
City Hall, Norman B. Rice Conference Room

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Someireh Amirfaiz, Cheryl Chow, Frances Contreras, David Della, Kris Hildebrandt, Antonio Hopson, Michelle Corker-Curry and Carla Santorno for Maria Goodloe-Johnson, David Okimoto, John Pehrson, Debra Sullivan

OTHERS PRESENT:

Eric Anderson (Human Services Dept), Carla Bryant (Office for Education), Linwood Carlson (Seattle Public Schools), Mary Beth Celio (Northwest Decision Resources), Lori Chisholm (Parks), TJ Cosgrove (Public Health), Jerry DeGriek (HSD), Donnie Grabowski (OFE), Kathleen Groshong (HSD), Kacey Guin (OFE), Caprice Hollins (SPS), Malia Langworthy (Council), Miryam Laytner (HSD), Lauren Lee (HSD), Patricia Lee (Council Central Staff), Holly Miller (OFE), Erica Mullen (YMCA), Sue Rust (OFE), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Amy Williams (Finance)

Sid Sidorowicz called the meeting to order and asked for introductions. The minutes of the June 19, 2007 Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) were approved.

Briefing on the Budget

Donnie Grabowski gave an update on the budget. The briefing covered planned vs. actual revenues and expenditures, Levy underspend, and highlights of the 2008 Proposed Budget. John Pehrson asked if excess money in the early years means that the Levy takes in less money in the later years. Receiving excess money in the early years does not have any bearing on future money to be collected, as long as the money collected each year remains within the legal collection limits established by ordinance. David Okimoto asked which programs generate the Medicaid matching funds. D. Grabowski stated eligible Family Support Workers program activities generate these funds. Kristine Hildebrandt inquired about whether OFE would reevaluate Levy program allocations, given the small 1 ½% inflation growth from year-to-year once programs are fully ramped up. Holly Miller answered that the 1 ½% inflation factor is set by Levy ordinance. K. Hildebrandt asked if there was a way to raise the 1 ½ % inflationary cap. H. Miller stated that while there is no way of increasing inflationary funding, OFE may consider using excess revenue (if generated) to assist certain programs that warrant additional funding. J. Pehrson asks why investments earning are different from original projections by a factor of 3. D. Grabowski noted that actual Levy spending has been slower than originally anticipated, leaving larger fund balances and therefore higher interest earnings. S. Sidorowicz added that the previous levy had overestimated investment earnings so projections for this levy took a more conservative view. Antonio Hopson asked about the possibility of overspending. D. Grabowski stated that Levy funds are allocated to agencies and then contracted for finite dollar amounts, leaving no possibility of overspending.

Someireh Amirfaiz inquired about Summer College. H. Miller stated OFE is waiting for data from the district and will provide a detailed report as soon as that data is received, but that enrollment was lower than expected. S. Amirfaiz noted that the minutes from the March LOC meeting outlined strategies for recruiting students for Summer College and asked if those strategies were implemented. H. Miller stated that the recruitment strategies were implemented, including having college students call and encourage high school students to enroll. S. Amirfaiz asked what incentives were offered to students to participate. S. Sidorowicz stated that iPod Shuffles were offered to students who enrolled in and completed the program. Cheryl Chow stated the delay of the math WASL as a graduation requirement resulted in more students enrolling in credit courses over the summer, rather than WASL prep courses. H. Miller added that there was a decline in enrollment for all summer school programs, according to Barb Salo, Title I program manager at SPS.

Briefing on Portland Graduation Study

Mary Beth Celio from Northwest Decision Resources presented information to the LOC on key indicators for high school graduation (or dropout). Based on a longitudinal study in Portland, key dropout indicators included failure of a 9th-grade core course, entering a school after the beginning of the year, or having insufficient credits at the end of 11th grade. A similar study is proposed for the class of 2006 in Seattle. This study will analyze these students from the 6th grade, and will provide key indicators for identifying students at risk of dropping out of school across their middle and high school years. Knowledge of these indicators will allow the levy to target investments and interventions to students with the highest risk of dropping out, and will inform both the middle and high school investment areas. Frances Contreras asked if logistic regression was used in this analysis and if correlations between the variables were taken into account. M. Celio stated that the method for this study was multivariate logistic regression analysis which is a form of regression that analyzes data points over time, controlling for correlations between variables. F. Contreras asked if the analysis differentiated between types of core course, such as remedial versus advanced math. M. Celio stated that the Portland data did not provide the level of detail necessary to differentiate, but this could be done for Seattle, provided such detailed data were available. F. Contreras questioned if this type of analysis dismissed the issue of race/ethnicity in the dropout problem. M. Celio stated that this type of analysis provides concrete points, or indicators, for identifying students in most need of help, and does not dismiss race/ethnicity.

David Della asked what programs would be useful to target dropouts. Holly Miller stated that the goal of the study is to understand the indicators that are unique to Seattle and to provide a rich set of information in order to plan time appropriate interventions for middle and high school students. The ultimate goal would be to target students prior to failure. Someireh Amirfaiz asked what Portland was doing with the information, given that service delivery does not take place in a vacuum and context must be considered. M. Celio said that Portland's *Connected by 25* brings the school district, business community, and community-based organizations together to work on intervening with students who are identified by the indicators. For example, once a child misses 10 days of school, a mentor from a community-based organization is assigned to that family. A previous study in Seattle (10+ years ago) indicated that students who dropped out of school (and their families) were never contacted. Context is critical in addressing the needs students who are not succeeding. This study will provide the reddest flags for identifying those students.

A. Hopson expressed appreciation for identifying the key indicators, given the amount of data coming from the district can be overwhelming. Carla Santorno said that the district had already identified some of the milestones for dropouts. A. Hopson questioned if SPS already had similar indicator information, and asked if SPS and OFE were sharing this information. Cheryl Chow noted that SPS did not have this information prior to the arrival of Carla Santorno, but that SPS now has milestones for targeting dropouts. D. Della stated it was critical to align key partners, including SPS, OFE, and others such as the Alliance for Education, in order to identify these important indicators and implement programs in a system that complements, rather than duplicates, efforts. C. Santorno stated that she had met with H. Miller and Superintendent Goodloe-Johnson previously to discuss the feasibility and use of the study for efforts in Seattle. She noted difficulty in obtaining the necessary data. H. Miller stated that she understood the complexity of the data request but that OFE had met with Brad Bernatek, manager of the Research, Evaluation, and Assessment office at SPS, to discuss specific data needs and minimize the use of district resources.

Debra Sullivan asked what schools in Portland were doing with the indicator data, given the frequent disconnect between research and practice. M. Celio noted that PPS had appointed an assistant superintendent to work on this issue, in collaboration with community groups. They have only been working for four months, but the indicator study served to focus both the schools and the community on a common goal. J. Pehrson stated that the study would offer triggers for allocating resources to the right students at the right time. He noted that if a student is failing, we need to intervene as swiftly as possible, regardless of demographics.

D. Sullivan asked when the English Language Learners (ELL) meeting would take place. H. Miller stated that Sue Rust would be scheduling that meeting in the near future.

Following this discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

Families & Education Levy 2007 Annual Report Outline 12/11/07

Levy-funded programs were designed to reflect best practices in helping students achieve academically. Yearly targets are used to measure each program's success in achieving the desired outcomes: school readiness, academic achievement, and reduced dropout /increased graduation rates. This year, baseline data will allow us to measure progress for Levy students, as well as make comparisons with non-Levy peers.

In addition to outcome targets, we need to be able to identify and replicate successful practices within and across Levy programs. In other words, how did we get there, or if targets are missed, how do we get there? This deeper program analysis, including the use of quantitative and qualitative data, will provide better information in order to make important program and investment decisions. The 2007 Annual Report will include the first attempt at this new level of analysis.

❖ Introduction & Background

❖ Summary of Outcomes

- School Readiness
 - Targets
 - Progress Indicators
- Academic Achievement (Elementary, Middle & High)
 - Targets
 - Value-added (Non-Levy Comparison Groups)
 - Progress Indicators
- Dropout Reduction / Increasing Graduation Rates
 - Targets
 - Progress Indicators

❖ Summary of Programs

- Early Learning
 - Outcomes
 - Program Analysis
 - Qualitative data from teachers (Professional Development)
 - Recommendations
- Family Support and Family & Community Involvement
 - Outcomes
 - Program Analysis

- Qualitative data from FSWs and parents
- Recommendations

- Elementary Community Learning Centers
 - Outcomes
 - Program Analysis
 - Qualitative data
 - Recommendations
- Middle School Programs
 - Outcomes
 - Program Analysis
 - Qualitative data from students & teachers
 - Recommendations
- Support for High-Risk Youth
 - Outcomes
 - Program Analysis
 - Qualitative data from students & case managers
 - Recommendations
- Student Health
 - Outcomes
 - Program Analysis
 - Qualitative data from nurses, mental health workers & students
 - Recommendations

❖ Conclusion & Next Steps



City of Seattle
Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

BRIEFING MEMORANDUM

Date: December 11, 2007

To: Levy Oversight Committee

From: Holly Miller, OFE, 4-4508
Patricia McInturff, HSD, 4-0558
Kacey Guin, OFE, 4-8365

Re: 2006-07 STFY Evaluation and Options for 2008-2009 School Year

Briefing Objective: To review the Families and Education Levy's current investment in high school academic achievement and dropout prevention and to make recommendations for future investment.

Background

The 2004 Families and Education Levy established three overarching outcomes: school readiness, academic achievement, and dropout prevention. This brief seeks to evaluate the Levy's current investment and outcomes in high school academic achievement and dropout prevention through Seattle Team for Youth (STFY) and to make recommendations for future investment.

For the past three years, the Levy has invested approximately \$1.2 million annually in STFY as an academic achievement and dropout prevention strategy. STFY was designed in 1989 to divert youth from gang or criminal involvement and help youth return to school. In 2005, when STFY was wholly funded by the Levy, the program dropped juvenile justice and gang diversion from the program targets and replaced them with academic achievement. The Levy Oversight Committee, Human Services Department and Office for Education have been aware of modest results over the past two years and have questioned whether the STFY culturally- and linguistically-matched intensive case management model is the right program for increasing academic achievement as defined by high school graduation and WASL exams. It was probably a mistake to expect rigorous academic outcomes out of a program well designed for gang intervention and return to school.

2006-2007 STFY Outcomes

While the academic targets set for STFY were very modest, this program failed to meet one of its three targets. Although STFY has some success at retaining students in school, this investment has not been very effective at helping students achieve academically, as measured by meeting standard on the WASL and graduating from high school. Over the past two years STFY helped only 10 high school students pass the WASL and 67 students graduate. For 2007-2008, HSD revised STFY in several significant ways to refocus services on younger students still in school, facilitate a strong transition to high school, use academic data to determine the need for more rigorous case management services, and provide case management for a longer period of time.

Recent Developments in Dropout Research

In 2006, only 60 percent of 12th graders graduated with their cohort and over 2200 students dropped out of Seattle Public Schools. Given that only a small percentage of those students can be accommodated and find academic success in STFY, there is a need to focus on academic problems before students decide to leave school. Using early warning systems to identify students at risk of dropping out is critical in tackling the dropout problem. If students are able to find academic success early in high school, they are much more likely to graduate. But schools need assistance targeting their strategies and limited resources. Recent research from several urban districts describes key indicators for predicting which students will drop out. While each individual indicator increases the chances of a student dropping out, the combination of indicators compounds this risk. Some indicators include:

- Failure to meet standard on 8th-grade state assessments
- Failure of a math or English course in middle school
- Failure of any course in 9th grade
- Falling behind in required credits for graduation
- Suspended or expelled from school
- Absent 10% or more of school days
- Failure to be promoted from 9th to 10th grade

While many of these indicators apply across all urban school districts, some may be context specific. To best identify students in Seattle who are at risk of dropping out, Mary Beth Celio is analyzing a cohort of SPS students from 6th through 12th grade. Results will indicate Seattle-specific indicators for identifying students at risk, and provide valuable information on critical points of intervention. In the interim, we applied indicators from previous research to SPS students, and found that the percentage of 9th-grade students at risk of dropping out is approximately 50%. Table 1 below highlights the number of students by school and by the number of risk factors. The risk factors include:

- Student failed to meet standard on Reading or Math WASL in 8th Grade, 2005-06 SY
- Student was absent 18 or more days in 8th grade during 2005-06 SY
- Student received a suspension or was expelled from 8th grade during 2005-06 SY
- Student in 9th grade received fewer than 2.5 credits 1st semester 2006-07
- Student in 9th grade received fewer than 5 credits for 2006-07 SY (proxy for progressing to next grade level)

School	1 Risk Factor	2 Risk Factors	3 Risk Factors	4 Risk Factors	5 Risk Factors	9 th Graders at Risk	Total 9th Graders	Percent with Risk Factors
Ballard	115	49	24	16	4	208	470	44.3%
Cleveland	58	30	12	8	7	115	208	55.3%
Franklin	144	53	70	42	16	325	516	63.0%
Garfield	91	19	22	13	3	148	446	33.2%
Ingraham	94	34	43	17	5	193	337	57.3%
Nathan Hale	98	31	24	6	3	162	312	51.9%
Rainier Beach	33	21	17	7	6	84	158	53.2%
Roosevelt	112	55	29	14	4	214	506	42.3%
Sealth	75	47	24	25	5	176	301	58.5%
West Seattle	141	47	33	20	1	242	424	57.1%
Total with Risk Factor(s)	961	386	298	168	54	1867	3678	50.8%

These data demonstrate that all of Seattle's comprehensive high schools have significant numbers of students at risk of dropping out. Several high schools stand out with both high numbers and percentages of at-risk students, including Franklin, West Seattle, Ingraham, and Sealth.

Strategies for Promoting Academic Success

Once at-risk students are identified, schools and districts can focus their efforts on dropout prevention strategies that focus on academic achievement. Research-based strategies include:

- Provide 9th graders who did not meet standard on 8th-grade tests with additional support, including transition activities between 8th and 9th grade and opportunities for extended learning time to catch up with their peers.
- Intervene immediately when a student fails a core course in 9th grade, providing credit retrieval opportunities through extended day and/or summer school programs.
- Track course enrollment and credit completion through advisories, keeping students (and parents) current on their status and progress toward post-secondary goals.
- Establish clear and consistent attendance policies and follow up immediately with students who have unexcused absences.
- Coordinate school-based health programs to address primary health and mental health needs.
- Greater communication and engagement with parents and the community.

By focusing on school-home communication, attendance, student health, academic skills, and post-secondary goals, these strategies work to keep students in school and achieving, before they make the decision to drop out.

Recommendation for 2008-09 School Year

As described above, a large number of students in Seattle enter high school already at risk of dropping out. To maximize the Families and Education Levy's return on investment, OFE should focus on an early academic achievement intervention and dropout prevention approach. We would seek to align FEL investments with school-level strategies, with an explicit focus on identifying and working with at-risk 9th-grade students before they drop out or accumulate multiple risk factors. OFE staff have been meeting with district staff to discuss this option. We recommend a competitive Request for Investment (RFI) process for the 2008-09 school year that allows high schools to propose how Levy funds could be integrated into the school's efforts to identify students and implement academic intervention strategies, based on the best practices. This RFI process would include:

- Targeting high schools that have the highest numbers and percentages of at-risk students.
- Providing high schools with a summary of best practices, to ensure effective planning and implementation of intervention strategies.
- Aligning investment with current Levy and SPS programs in order to maximize academic outcomes.

At a minimum, high schools receiving Levy dollars would be required to implement strategies in the following areas:

- Transition activities to ensure incoming 9th graders have the academic and study skills necessary for high school-level coursework.
- Advisories that guide students on course selection and academic progress, aligned with individual post-secondary goals.

- Opportunities for additional learning time, both during and after the regular school day and school year (block scheduling, extended day, summer school).

While planning will occur throughout 2008, implementation of the new high school investment would likely begin in early to mid-August to allow for 8th- to 9th-grade transition activities and appropriate planning prior to the beginning of the school year.

Alignment with Current FEL and SPS Programs

- **Middle School Support Program:** The Levy-funded Middle School Support Program (MSSP) can help identify incoming freshman at risk of dropping out and provide detailed academic information on individual students. Alignment with MSSP also provides the opportunity for continuity in programs for students who are struggling.
- **Summer College:** The Levy-funded Summer College program currently targets 10th graders who failed to meet standard on the WASL. Given the low enrollment in this program last summer, Summer College can continue to serve 10th-grade students, while also including 9th graders who are at risk.
- **Pathways:** The Seattle Public Schools Pathways Program targets any 8th- to 12th-grade student who fails to meet standard on any section of the WASL. The program seeks to provide additional resources and learning opportunities for students, mostly during the school day. If the Levy invests in programs that target at-risk 9th- and 10th-grade students, Pathways could narrow its focus to 11th- and 12th-grade students who are at risk of not graduating, due to WASL failure and lack of credits.
- **School-Based Health Centers:** The Levy currently funds school-based health centers (SBHC) in all 10 comprehensive high schools and four middle schools. This program addresses non-academic barriers to achievement by providing primary and mental health care. SBHCs will be able to coordinate with the school-level academic achievement programs to better identify and target at-risk 9th graders.

Preliminary Outcome Estimates

Preventing students from failing or falling behind their freshman year greatly increases their likelihood of graduating. Research in Portland indicates that students who are on-track academically have better than an 80 percent chance of graduating on time, compared to only a 40 percent chance for their failing peers. These findings provide a basis on which to estimate outcomes for the new high school investment. The Levy would seek to serve approximately half of the 9th-grade students identified as at risk, or 900 students. Without intervention, we would expect only 360 out of these students to graduate on time. If the academic achievement strategy is successful, we might expect 80 percent of those at-risk students to graduate on time, increasing the number of graduates to 720 students, or a net gain of 360 on-time graduates.

Status of Seattle Team For Youth

STFY is fully funded and will continue in its present form through the end of the 2007-2008 school year. The Human Services Department and the Office of Policy and Management will evaluate potential approaches for the program as a gang intervention and school retrieval strategy and make recommendations to the Mayor in the context of the City's overall General Fund investment in youth.

D R A F T
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE CALENDAR
2008

DATE	AGENDA
January 22, 2008*	2006-07 Levy Annual Report
February 12	Program Review TBD
March 11** 2:15-4:00 Denny Middle School	Middle School Program Review
April 15*	Mid-Year Report (Indicators from 2007-08)
May 13	Target Setting
June 10	Program Review TBD
<i>July</i>	<i>No meeting</i>
<i>August</i>	<i>No meeting</i>
September 16*	FEL Budget Briefing
October 14	Program Review TBD
November 18*	Program Review TBD
December 16*	Program Review TBD
January 20, 2009	Annual Report

* Generally meetings are on the 2nd Tuesday, 4:00-5:30 p.m., except for January (4th Tuesday) and April/September/November/December (3rd Tuesday).

** March meeting is off site and begins at 2:15 p.m.

Updated: 12/5/07