



DRAFT



**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Tuesday, September 10, 2013**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: José Banda, Tim Burgess, Elise Chayet, Michael DeBell, Jerry DeGriek, Sandi Everlove, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Cristina Gonzalez, Sheeba Jacob, Charles Knutson, Kevin Washington, Greg Wong

OTHERS PRESENT: Kathryn Aisenberg (OFE), Leilani Dela Cruz (HSD), Carmela Dellino (elementary school consultant), Sonja Griffin (OFE), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (OFE), Holly Miller (OFE), Alex Pedersen (Council staff), Adam Petkun (OFE), John Pehrson (LOC alumnus), Pegi McEvoy (SPS), Sara Rigel (Public Health), Sue Rust (OFE), Pat Sander (SPS), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Kristi Skanderup (middle school consultant)

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m. Introductions were made. Tim Burgess welcomed the attendees. The minutes from the August 13 LOC meeting were approved. Holly Miller reviewed the agenda and moved "Preschool for All" to the beginning of the agenda.

PRESCHOOL FOR ALL

T. Burgess handed out copies of the Resolution that City Council is going to entertain on September 23. It establishes a work plan for the next 9-12 months to implement free Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK) for Seattle's 3- and 4-year-olds. He would welcome comments and reactions now or in the future. The Recitals point to research and the attached Appendix A has the citations to this research. He briefly ran through the different sections and noted we are relying on two reports: the State's "Washington Preschool Program: Increasing Access and Outcomes for Children," technical report and the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) report. Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked how he will distinguish this work from what we're doing with the Levy. T. Burgess said in the gap analysis work OFE has done so far, there are a lot of kids in our city who have no preschool exposure at all. Also, for kids enrolled in preschool programs, the quality of those programs is pretty divergent. Even though the Levy has made some movement in this direction, there is still a long way to go. Jerry DeGriek said the Mayor's Office and OFE have been looking into this for some time, and we applaud Councilmember Burgess for this Resolution and look forward to working with him on this. T. Burgess thanked J. DeGriek for saying that and said the Mayor sent a nice note and is very supportive.

Greg Wong commented on the analysis, noting that it appears to be just counting how many kids are in preschool, while the key part is "not high quality" which needs to be clearer. There will be some issues with providers who don't want to be identified as "not high quality." How do we achieve universal preschool and how can it be structured so the high-quality element doesn't get lost.

T. Burgess said these are good points. In UPK, a mix of kids is valuable and helps everybody. He said this is an issue nationally: How do we help preschool providers and teachers who have not achieved the level of quality we'd like? How do we approach this and move them along? The UW will soon launch an online BA completion program specifically targeted at preschool teachers which will be a huge boost for these folks who want to do the right thing and need some assistance to get there.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis thought there were states that started out providing preschool for low-income children and then switched to universal access. T. Burgess said, yes, Georgia, New Jersey, and Oklahoma are such states. H. Miller said for most programs, such as San Francisco Unified School District, the nature of the industry is decentralized. They knit together funding, create standards to help improve quality, and put in place support for teachers. All of the programs look a little different. Sandi Everlove said when California reduced class size and needed to hire new teachers, they were not as qualified. How will we make sure when the doors open all of those kids have quality teachers? T. Burgess said there will be phasing. It may take us two, three, or four years to get there. New Jersey started in 31 of their school districts and used a phase-in program to bring current teachers along, and introduce new providers. It would be great if the City of Seattle could lead our state in closing the opportunity gap. If we apply evidence-based practices, we can achieve that. We could be the first in the U.S. to do so.

BUDGET PRESENTATION

Donnie Grabowski discussed the Levy budget. On Monday, September 23, the Mayor's proposed budget will be presented to City Council. OFE issues 20-25 contracts per year in accordance with the Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan. She reviewed the 7-year estimated and 2012 actual revenues. J. DeGriek asked for clarification on the projected revenue shortfall. D. Grabowski said it is based on the shortage of 2012 property tax and investment earnings. D. Grabowski explained that if current revenue shortage trends continue, we have a solution to this since we had a leftover balance from the 2004 Levy. We received approval from the City Budget Office and Law to transfer expenditures from the current Levy to the 2004 Levy (assuming they were in accordance with the 2004 Levy Implementation & Evaluation Plan). This created a balance in the 2011 Levy that we can reserve to help close the gap.

J. DeGriek asked why the actual revenue is so much lower than the estimated. D. Grabowski said it has to do with market activity. Originally, investment earnings were estimated in the 1.25–2.5% range. We are currently collecting in the .8% range. Sid Sidorowicz added that Finance gave us those estimates. J. DeGriek said it is a very significant difference. D. Grabowski said our goal is to not spend the \$1.5 million balance and that we expect to add to this balance because agencies may not spend their full contract allocations, and OFE may not fully allocate available dollars (for example, if there aren't enough quality applications). T. Burgess asked who manages the Levy fund investments. D. Grabowski said it's the City's general investment pool. T. Burgess said they are very conservative. G. Wong asked how investment earnings projections look long-term, given that these estimates will be more than doubling. D. Grabowski said we've earned about 22% of the 2013 estimated investment earnings. If we project out that if we only earn 38% of estimates, which was what we earned in 2012, we'd have to reserve a little over \$3 million over the life of the Levy. As long as we don't reallocate all of the unspent balances for other purposes, we'll be fine. T. Burgess recognized the good management by D. Grabowski on projecting this out.

D. Grabowski reviewed the estimated and actual expenditures. Once programs are fully ramped up, they inflate 2-2.5% annually. She noted that we now have 10 FTE in our office. Lastly, the 2014 proposed budget mirrors the 2011 Levy expenditure plan.

END-OF-YEAR RESULTS TO DATE FOR 2012-13

S. Sidorowicz introduced the results to date and said while we don't have Measures of Student Progress (MSP) results yet, we have other indicator data. We take an early look at some of the results, revisiting issues and course corrections. He said that looking at aggregate data, MSP results are improving. Individual schools are reconciling their data with the state's findings. Summer Learning data will be done in November, since its results are tied to Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments. Kathryn Aisenberg and Isabel Muñoz-Colón are meeting with schools over the next several months to review results. K. Aisenberg said we have received valid student IDs instead of proxy IDs from SPS so we can help schools identify priority students to serve. She said we have three-hour meetings with schools to which we bring data for each school. At the middle school level, we will review 2012-13 data to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented strategies. Both the Innovation and Linkage middle schools will meet in mid-October to conduct a deeper dive into their prior year data to determine what, if any, strategy modifications are needed to better serve their students this year. This is just one part of OFE's efforts to better support school teams with data analysis.

S. Sidorowicz reviewed the Elementary Innovation tables. He explained the bands in the percentage of the target that was achieved. Anything over 90% is considered success for the goal we set. Each school has two outcomes and three indicators. We also look at first semester versus second semester results. For example, attendance drops off in the second semester.

For the family support tables, the first one shows results for the school district's Family Support Program. For the Levy's community-based family support programs, we have Chinese Information and Service Center (CISC) and Refugee Women's Alliance (ReWA). This year we added the Seattle Indian Health Board as a provider.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if school-based means multiple schools. S. Sidorowicz said the Levy contracts with Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC) which then contracts with schools. Family Support Workers are dispersed across the school district. As we get more elementary innovation schools, the ability to allocate funding for social-emotional support transfers to those schools. Schools decide which service is most important for their students. They can use a school employee or hire an outside agency for social/emotional support services. As innovation schools get phased in, the amount of the OFE –PHSKC contract diminishes. S. Everlove asked what the ARI assessment is on ReWA's Indicator #6. S. Sidorowicz said he would have to check with Isabel, and A. Petkun noted it's for their summer portion of their program.

G. Wong asked if there is anything to be read into community-based programs performing better than school-based programs. S. Sidorowicz said that would be comparing different approaches and different numbers of students. School-Based Family Support serves about 1,000 students. Each community-based organization is targeting only 40 students so they can concentrate more on issues in a wraparound structure. The Family Support Program has

always been very selective and targets students behind academically. Targets have always been low since these students have a variety of social/emotional and health issues.

We're putting in place professional development targeted toward specific interventions. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if we have information by school on the Family Support Program. If so, is there much variation? S. Sidorowicz said, until this last year, the Family Support Workers served all elementary schools in one way or another. Some schools had FSWs that served a caseload of students while others had a referral model. Disaggregating that data by school has been challenging given the variance in the number of children served. Some schools had two FSWs, while others shared one worker. S. Jacob asked if there were any interventions that need to be modified based on results so far or if it's too early. S. Sidorowicz said nothing major with Community-Based Family Support will change, but for School-Based Family Support, reading intervention will be a focus in this next year. Specific training and specific tools to work with students behind are being provided.

H. Miller described another major change. OFE, Health, and SPS are trying to create two parallel comprehensive school health models. SPS' operations now includes family support, nursing, support for school-based health clinics, discipline and nutrition services. Likewise we have consolidated our investments in those areas in the health department to more comprehensively knit together investments. As a result of the evaluation of the Family Support Program, we realized we need to adopt a different model. This consolidation is an effort to start that change. It's been difficult and we're still working on it. Health is beginning to share with SPS some of their data techniques and processes that will help us all do a better job supporting students.

It's a challenge with internal resistance to change in part because the Program has been around a long time. There is now a whole cadre of younger FSWs who in some cases have better training and are eager to use data. Recognizing what Sid said, part of their mission is to work with families of challenged kids; this is what they want to do. We helped find best practices from around the country to help them. K. Washington asked, given what you've said (there aren't a lot of best practices that you can bring to our situation), does that stand in way of redoing training for this group of Family Support Workers because we're not certain where training needs to be applied? H. Miller responded that we are trying individual things that have worked in other settings (for example, improving literacy outcomes). We're giving some of them really intensive training in improving parent capacity to support their child's literacy.

Sara Rigel added that the program is emerging and redeveloping. FSW staff and individual providers are focusing on student needs. For example, there is professional development around attendance, not just for family support per se, but for all our providers. Skill levels are variable so we are building skills to get consistent practice. We provide technical assistance to track progress of students on regular basis. SBHC has brought tools to the FSWs to track attendance, grades, and interventions. All FSWs attended our annual retreat a few weeks ago. Planning about outcomes and goals for students in their buildings involved both health and family support staff.

H. Miller said there are cultural issues to take into account. The FSWs felt they were lone rangers advocating for social/emotional support. They are beginning to see they are not lone rangers and can work with their colleagues. This is a big cultural shift. The other shift is

around use of data. Staff have to be curious about data on a regular basis. Previously, FSW leadership would look at data at end of year. They are now putting into place on-going monitoring processes to use data in everyday work.

S. Sidorowicz added that the FSW evaluation showed that much of the data FSWs collected was seen as compliance with OFE directives. They thought that's what we wanted so they were doing a lot of paperwork around compliance. They are now moving to use the Mental Health Information Tracking System (MHITS) with PHSKC. This will build a system that will set goals for students and monitor results. There was also a recent announcement around trauma-informed schools. This effort addresses the role trauma plays in student behavior and how to build a school culture around addressing that. S. Rigel and others are involved in this effort and have brought in experts to work with schools, health, and family support staff.

S. Everlove asked if we are able to disaggregate to see a particular provider and how students are faring. Are you able to tell your superstar from others? S. Sidorowicz said we typically don't disaggregate by school. We track result for each Innovation school but we do not track individual results for all of the activities they put into place. In the data meetings, Isabel and Kathryn say here's what you set out to do, this didn't work well, why was that? Should we change? We monitor results at the school level. We just look at school-wide results and walk through an analysis. It's the school's responsibility to monitor their partners. K. Aisenberg said we are trying to build capacity with schools. We use spreadsheets to track results. We work closely with the SPS IT team to provide tools to meet the needs of end users. We have ongoing conversations to make improvements.

For the Middle School tables, K. Aisenberg said there are three innovation schools. S. Sidorowicz inquired how the pool of students taking the spring 2013 math changed compared to previous years. K. Aisenberg remarked that the number of high school students taking the MAP assessment decreased from the previous year. Additionally, we anticipate that next year there will be a further reduction given that high schools are not required to administer to all students. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked Superintendent Banda what's going to happen with MAP. J. Banda said we are continuing to use MAP until we are told otherwise. T. Burgess said the SSD chose MAP. From the LOC's position, we do not have a preference what assessment tool the district uses as long as they are doing an assessment. S. Sidorowicz noted the importance of having a balance between standards-based assessments and growth assessments to ensure we can measure both absolute achievement and growth.

G. Wong asked if the performance measures addressed all students or only a subset. K. Aisenberg said the answer varies. For Denny and Mercer, the MAP measure pertains to all students, whereas for linkage schools receiving a smaller investment, the measure may only apply to incoming MSP math level 1 and level 2 students.

For the High School tables, K. Aisenberg said to keep in mind that Franklin for their N tested every student. For Ingraham, the number of students tested was smaller than previous years. Next year will we will reframe that target and those conversations have already begun. S. Everlove asked, back to Interagency, can students earn pieces of credits? K. Aisenberg said credits are earned both in class and online and are awarded in .1 increments. The data analysis is very nuanced. Of those enrolled 20 or more days, how many credits did they earn via both in-class delivery and the online system? S. Everlove asked if we should care more

about students receiving incremental credit in math vs. their attendance. K. Aisenberg said we should care more about credit accumulation as it directly impacts a student's ability to promote to tenth grade. We're worried about promotion to next grade level.

Regarding Health, S. Sidorowicz noted there are three different sets of results: 1) health services in school as a whole; 2) for students just seen by SBHCs; and 3) for School District Health Services. MAP or passing all classes are used as measures because MSP has gaps across various grades. We agreed with SPS that the goal is for students to pass all classes. SBHCs increased targets this year. In school health, immunization compliance is the highest we've seen. It's gone from 7,000 to almost 10,000 students brought into compliance. We will wait until next year before determining whether the target should be as high as this year's actuals. It would be nice to see target go down instead of up.

Behavioral risk screening and referral has gone up. It took a long time for MS and HS clinics to get the screening system in place. A couple of elementary schools also did well this year. J. DeGriek asked if we can look more closely at this at some point. We questioned the behavioral risk indicator in past – is it truly a good measure? We have looked at it off and on over the years. S. Sidorowicz responded that we did start requiring reporting on the follow-up after screening. In a future health briefing we can get a more in-depth look at behavioral screening and referral. S. Rigel noted that it's a natural practice where the school nurse does the initial screen and hands the student over to a Mental Health provider. There is also communication with families about the normal recommended vaccination schedule and what needs to be available in school. There is a broad scope of vaccinations to achieve full immunization, and the schools and SBHCs had a nice combined effort this last year.

E. Chayet asked if we will start getting MHITS data at school level. S. Rigel responded that we are not certain but can look into it. E. Chayet asked, once we get the kid somewhere, what's the intervention? S. Rigel pointed out that MHITS is a case management tool. J. DeGriek asked how extensive MHITS use is. S. Rigel answered that all providers are using MHITS.

T. Burgess congratulated Superintendent Banda on the new school year starting and asked if he knew the school attendance count. Pegi McEvoy said she thinks it is around 52,000 but it's not firm yet. T. Burgess said it's another year of growth and thanked J. Banda for his leadership on contract negotiations and not giving up on the teacher evaluation issue.

C. Gonzalez said we were just given a lot of information at the meeting and need to bring it back up a level. In general most targets are fairly good ones numerically, but what about the substance of the targets? S. Sidorowicz noted that we have funded another cohort study with Mary Beth Celio. Passing core courses and attendance came from her last analysis. We may see from her work a reason to pick some other targets – particularly in elementary school. Her work is going back to 4th grade. We might revisit the current targets but we're pretty happy with the array of measures in place. We can always fine tune how we calculate goals and numbers.

H. Miller said there's an article on preschool attendance done by the University of Chicago and how it affects 3rd grade reading. School-going behavior is now an outcome for our preschool contracts this year. S. Sidorowicz also pointed out that consolidated health also extends to preschool.

H. Miller said this is an interim report, not the final annual report. C. Knutson said, understanding it is preliminary, there is a lot of dark green and light green indicating success; congratulations on that. With a 5-year-old starting kindergarten at Queen Anne Elementary, he said he is a true believer in preschool. T. Burgess said we will reach out to you from the Levy as it relates to transportation. He congratulated C. Knutson for being one of the governor's transportation advisers.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis said it would be useful if documents could be produced on early learning programs similar to the school summaries. Leilani Dela Cruz and S. Griffin said yes, we can prepare that information.

THANK YOU AND ADJOURN

T. Burgess drew the meeting to a close. The meeting was adjourned at 5:28 pm.