



DRAFT



**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY  
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, August 13, 2013**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tim Burgess, Elise Chayet, Jerry DeGriek, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Kevin Washington, Greg Wong

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Kathryn Aisenberg (OFE), Leilani Dela Cruz (HSD), Ellen Flamiatos (Public Health), Sonja Griffin (OFE), Sharon Knight (HSD), Holly Miller (OFE), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (OFE), Alex Pedersen (Council staff), Adam Petkun (OFE), John Pehrson (LOC alumnus), Sara Rigel (Public Health), Sue Rust (OFE), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Tilman Smith (Child Care Resources), Sarah Wilhelm (Public Health)

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m. Introductions were made. Tim Burgess welcomed all. The minutes from the May 14 LOC meeting were approved. Holly Miller reviewed the agenda.

**EARLY LEARNING ACADEMY**

Sonja Griffin and Tilman Smith gave a presentation on the Early Learning Academy draft plan. For the slide "*Seattle Public School Children in Full-Day Kindergarten Meeting Age Level Expectations on WaKIDS, Fall 2012,*" S. Griffin said that 55% are meeting age-level expectations in Language, 64% in Literacy and 48% in Math. There are a significant number not meeting expectations and, if they start behind, they are not going to catch up. T. Burgess asked if this data is for all SPS students and S. Griffin said it includes children who attended Head Start and ECEAP programs; the data is for the 23 Title 1 schools. Sid Sidorowicz said some of the student data is for children from Step Ahead sites. T. Burgess asked if there is more specific data on just them and S. Sidorowicz yes, in aggregate, and it's not much different. Greg Wong asked if we know the assessment results for the nonTitle1 schools, and S. Griffin said nonTitle1 schools are not required to do assessments and we can't compare them to the overall student population until 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. H. Miller said it does raise the fadeout effect by 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> grade if we don't have strong preK-3<sup>rd</sup> alignment. There is a citywide group in place that has developed a P-3 plan, but implementation has been hampered by turnover at the district. One issue has to do with assessment. It's a challenge in the early grades. E. Chayet asked if this is done in other school districts and whether Seattle's experience is similar. S. Griffin said yes, it is similar statewide and on the national level.

T. Burgess asked if the data can be reversed back to where kids received their preschool experience and any that jump out as "Wow, this place/program does really well." S. Griffin said yes, we have data by preschool based on reports provided by the Human Services Dept. Their strategic advisor is able to disaggregate results by individual classrooms. S. Sidorowicz said that what we don't know are results for children that came from non-Seattle Early

Education Collaborative (SEEC) programs. S. Griffin said we are just comparing publicly-funded preschools. John Pehrson asked whether this assessment is given before kindergarten. S. Griffin said WaKIDS uses the same assessment that is used in preschool. About 70% of kids enrolled appear to be where they need to be. Leilani Dela Cruz explained the “N” is 1,259 kids and includes kids from Family, Friends, and Neighbor providers. H. Miller pointed out the huge challenge here.

S. Griffin presented the slide on the *Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) PreK-Emotional Support*. CLASS is an assessment done by the University of Washington to assess the emotional climate and teacher sensitivity in the classroom. Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked for explanation of the scale. S. Griffin said the “N” is 47 classrooms. The yellow vertical line shows the state standard and all classrooms exceeded the state standard. For the slide on *PreK-Instructional Support*, S. Griffin said we’re a little bit below in 12 classrooms. G. Wong asked what good preK instructional support look likes. S. Griffin said it’s how teachers are introducing concepts, scaffolding learning, language modeling, and the number of feedback loops between the teacher and child. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked whether this indicates that professional development is highly needed, and S. Griffin said research on CLASS preK thru elementary shows a lot of teachers score lower in the instructional support domain.

T. Burgess said, of the three areas that CLASS is measuring, we only see two. S. Griffin said the Emotional domain is combined with Classroom Organization. Early Achievers, the state’s voluntary program, uses the CLASS to help determine a programs EA rating.

Tilman Smith and S. Griffin gave an overview of the HighScope Approach and said the Perry Preschool Study shows the effectiveness of this model. H. Miller said when kids come out of well-developed HighScope classrooms, they are very independent which we saw at South Shore. In the early years, kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade teachers had to change their approach to adult/child interactions. South Shore is already using HighScope and plans to add a grade each year. Kevin Washington asked if South Shore is going to leverage 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> and add a new cohort of teachers and students to the approach each year. S. Griffin said yes, they’d like to train a cohort each year. Their preschool teachers loop and follow children to kindergarten. H. Miller said other elementary schools are interested in using the South Shore model for an in-school preschool program. E. Chayet asked if it was up to each school to decide on the curriculum and whether there was a way to deploy HighScope throughout the district as standard. H. Miller said there could be. E. Chayet said she could see how that would be more difficult in a preschool environment. T. Burgess said it would be wise to incentivize that. S. Griffin said, in the previous Levy, SEEC did work on getting preschools to use the same curriculum. This year, programs may use any curriculum that meets the city’s set criteria and almost all are using Creative Curriculum.

T. Smith reviewed the Early Learning Academy components. Child Care Resources will contract with HighScope to provide a 4-week course for 40 teachers and 10 trainers in the first academy. H. Miller said the trainings are not consecutive; there are breaks in between. S. Griffin said there will be in-house capacity to support teaching staff. All will be certified and some will become trainers.

After the implementation timeline was reviewed, Jerry DeGrieck asked if we have started the recruitment process. T. Smith said that process will start at the end of August and into September. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked about the institutes, and S. Griffin said those are additional trainings.

### NEXT RFI/RFQ CYCLE

H. Miller very quickly reviewed the dates and timelines for the next rounds of RFQs and RFIs.

### 2013-14SY TARGET SETTING PROCESS

Isabel Muñoz-Colón and Kathryn Aisenberg presented the Levy School Target Setting Methodology. The data in the tables provided reflect second semester attendance and passing core courses data as well as 2012-13 school year MAP growth data. All data were received in July 2013 from Seattle Public Schools. Final MSP data will be available in September/October.

Referring to the table *Performance Measure Target Intervals*, I. Muñoz-Colón said this table was developed to approach target setting in a standardized way. It shows the different measures we use. In some cases the targets are very similar by grade span and some are not, depending on circumstances. With elementary schools, we have to be careful we don't have too small of an "N." The subgroup could be way too small to set a reliable target every year. Growth is not linear. In the first semester, schools are ramping up v. second semester when they are close to 100%. Higher up in the bands we are expecting less growth because the students being served need more intense intervention. We expect greater growth when schools work with smaller, targeted populations. There may be times we have to deviate from the standardized target intervals because of some issue, e.g. a new assessment.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked, if you are in the 40-49% band of achievement, what does 8% represent? I. Muñoz-Colón said it is the percent increase we expect from schools whose performance falls in this interval. G. Wong asked if it was based on theory or did you go back and look at the data. I. Muñoz-Colón stated that OFE based the targets on general patterns seen in the data. Kathryn Aisenberg said we are looking at four years of historical data and can identify trends. I. Muñoz-Colón said target setting is as much art as it is a science and therefore we will be reassessing target setting each year. In the Cohort 1 target setting slide, Row 2 is ratcheting up and Row 3 maintains the target. J. DeGrieck asked if this is done in discussion with the school. I. Muñoz-Colón said yes, during the summer we confirm the performance measures with school leadership and then run schools' historical data to determine a baseline and apply our target-setting methodology. On Friday we will send out the tables and offer an opportunity for schools to review the proposed targets and discuss any questions or concerns with us. L. Gaskill-Gaddis said since 2009 she has always wondered how targets were set and that what OFE staff are doing is quite good. K. Aisenberg noted an important difference between this Levy and previous levies are the focus on school-specific measures. No longer are performance measures set at a collective "all middle school" level; instead each school selected specific measures with individualized targets determined by their previous performance. Schools now have an increased interest in tracking their own data to ensure they meet their targets. The new system leads to increased school interest and more robust data conversations.

K. Washington stated we've been ramping up into this Levy and asked whether the data begin to settle down as we get into Years 4 and 5 in terms of our ability to control variables and not be so squirrely. K. Aisenberg said there is always the factor of student population changing

and those types of shifts. Another element in Year 4 is the Common Core rollout and whether MAP still exists.

K. Aisenberg discussed leadership changes in Seattle Public Schools. Eight of 29 schools next year will have new key leadership changes. To mitigate the impact, we are meeting with each new principal and team to review their plan and budget, and to discuss the Levy as a whole to give them as strong of a start as possible. T. Burgess asked if the district tells us why the changes occur. I. Muñoz-Colón said no. T. Burgess suggested adding a column to the presentation chart to note new teachers since a lot of teachers are focused on the Levy. K. Aisenberg said it's a challenge getting communication on the human resources end. She remarked that she asks principals about staff changes during summer touch-base meetings to confirm ways in which OFE can lend additional support. I. Muñoz-Colón said some changes are a good thing. H. Miller noted that two of the new principals operating in an interim capacity (Cleveland and Broadview-Thomson). K. Aisenberg said one layer up there are three new Executive Directors out of six.

### UPDATE ON SUMMER LEARNING

Adam Petkun said the first year for Summer Learning is coming to a close. All but two of the programs have ended. While data will not be available until fall, a few anecdotal lessons emerged from site visits and discussions with program leaders.

There were a few unexpected challenges. First, a few sites had trouble meeting their enrollment targets, though enrollment was strong overall. It was more common among the newer programs to have problems with enrollment. More established providers attributed some of their success with recruitment to word of mouth. Second, programs had to work harder than expected to develop curricula that were engaging, with a fun, summer feel.

In addition to strong overall enrollment, highlights included creating meaningful partnerships and marrying strong instruction with fun. One example was Parks learned that the 4-H in another county had STEM materials they were unable to use and these were transferred to King County, where they provided low-cost STEM materials to Parks' middle school summer program.

When data are available in the fall, programs will be evaluated based on their achievement of contracted indicator targets. The data will facilitate comparisons across programs and identify what lessons should be shared among the providers. Though data will surface some need for course corrections, a couple of items are already being considered: First, in the near future, we will issue a survey to summer learning providers. Second, in early spring or late winter we will convene a retreat to help programs with planning and professional development.

K. Washington asked about the possibility of additional funding. A. Petkun said it would be great if we could leverage foundation resources.

A. Petkun said the next summer learning RFI will be revised before release in October. There will be additional funding available at the elementary and middle school levels, though high school funding will not increase. Next summer, we may pilot quality assessment tools. The school district is interested in piloting a walkthrough tool, while the Weikart Center is developing a version of the YPQA that could be used for the summer

J. DeGriek asked why the level of funding and number of students served is variable. What did you find? A. Petkun said some programs did a tremendous job of leveraging other funds. The Seattle World School site was able to serve more than 120 students because ReWA leveraged other funding. When the performance data are available, we will look for a relationship between cost per student and quality.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis commented there is lots of good stuff going on. G. Wong said he was curious which programs were low on attendance. Is there a tie-in between funding and performance in summer? A. Petkun said the SPS high school site got to 200 of 225 slots and opened up to a wider range of students. Parks had one middle school site fall short. Mercer had a waiting list. Eckstein was new and fell short. Next year we'll look at past enrollment and ask whether the focus students are the right ones, and potentially back funding for the next year.

G. Wong asked if there is a commitment to fund multiple years. A. Petkun said yes, if indicator targets are satisfied. H. Miller said it's important to make sure people have a good, long ramp-up to this process. SPS didn't plan early enough and was scrambling last minute. We'd rather see high-quality programs and then expand.

G. Wong asked if we have similar standards for what we're looking for in academic outcomes. A. Petkun replied we scoured research, but there is not a lot out there as far as what to expect. This year we asked programs to ensure students managed, at least, to maintain their skills over the summer, to mitigate summer slide. Some programs are going to share data for sites we're not funding and that should help set expectations for the future. We also need to think of new assessments that might be appropriate for measuring success and comparing programs. While there are no validated best practices yet, we'll improve as more data become available each year.

### **THANK YOU AND ADJOURN**

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