



**DRAFT**



**DEEL LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, May 10, 2016**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Rick Burke, Greg Wong, Sandi Everlove, Hueiling Chan, Allison Wood, Larry Nyland, Cristina Gonzalez.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Sid Sidorowicz (DEEL), Kathryn Aisenberg (DEEL), Dwane Chappelle (DEEL), Dana Harrison (DEEL), Kacey Guin (DEEL), Waslala Miranda (CBO), Brian Goodnight (Council Central Staff), Sarah Wilhelm (PHSKC), Jennifer Samuels (CP Bruce Harrell's Office).

Dwane Chappelle called the meeting to order. Introductions were made and the minutes from the April 19 LOC meeting were approved.

D. Chappelle asked the group to read an excerpt from a recent Seattle Times article on the black-white achievement gap in Seattle Public Schools and to discuss with a partner barriers to reducing that gap in Seattle.

Sid Sidorowicz presented on the 2015-16 Mid-Year Report.

S. Sidorowicz noted that several questions had come up recently regarding family support services in the schools. Per the 2011 Levy Implementation plan, funds for family support services would shift each year from SPS central office to going directly to schools, with the goal of all family support funds controlled by the schools by the end of the Levy. Greg Wong asked what choices schools were making regarding family support services.

S. Sidorowicz said that some schools were choosing to staff a family support position through SPS, and others chose to partner with community-based organizations (CBOs) to provide supports. Dana Harrison said that schools were making decisions based on the needs of their students, and that family support services integrated into each school's overall plan. G. Wong asked if there were any concerns at this point about family support service implementation. D. Harrison said not at this point and that plans for the 2016-17 school year were currently being reviewed.

Sandi Everlove asked what data were being used to determine effectiveness of services. D. Harrison said that process metrics such as number of referrals, relationships with CBOs, school climate and family surveys, as well as student-level metrics such as attendance and academic performance were all considered. Rick Burke asked if there was any difference in staff deployed centrally vs. being school-based and if a position might serve multiple schools. D. Harrison stated that the nature of the family support work, which is largely based on relationships, is typically best located at the school level where a strong presence and knowledge of the school community, culture and dynamic can be leveraged.

R. Burke asked if a position providing family support services had to be full time. D. Harrison said no, the position varies, based on school choice.

D. Harrison provided a mid-year overview of elementary school investments.

S. Everlove asked if we were seeing changes in practice, based on the professional development (PD) and professional learning communities (PLCs). D. Harrison said that a PLC for Levy coordinators this year has focused on increasing the strategic use of data, and schools are showing more evidence of data use in their practice. R. Burke asked how knowledge from Levy-funded PD is shared with a broader audience. D. Harrison said that this year, schools that do not receive Levy funds were invited to participate in PD opportunities, including the Tools of the Trade conference, and that the event had been so successful they were planning for another conference this year, to include more SPS staff. R. Burke asked if resources from the conference were available. D. Harrison said that resources were provided at the conference and most schools had modified them to fit their specific needs. Larry Nyland asked how we might mine the data to determine what is working, so we can replicate it. D. Harrison said that much of the Levy implementation work is focused on putting effective systems and structures in place, so that the work is not dependent on any one individual.

Kathryn Aisenberg asked if materials from the Tools of the Trade Conference, and/or other similar PD, could be housed in an online system for sharing documents so Levy-funded and non-Levy funded schools attending could access at a later date. D. Harrison indicated efforts were made to partner with SPS on this using their new Schoology learning management system, but district staff was not yet prepared to collaborate in this way. S. Everlove said it was important to collect information on how practices learned at conferences are being implemented and to check back in on them over time. D. Harrison said that the PLCs are one way to serve this purpose, as they meet regularly and discuss implementation successes and challenges. R. Burke asked if SPS leadership was involved in Tools of the Trade work. D. Harrison said that SPS leadership/central office staff were always invited, but that participation rates varied.

G. Wong asked about the mid-year data summary sheet, and what caused the drop at Emerson Elementary. D. Harrison noted that this was Emerson's first year of Levy funding and that the school experienced a change in leadership from their RFI writing year to their first year of implementation. She said you could also see clear connections to strategies and successes in the data, noting Sandpoint's focused attendance strategy that resulted in exceeding their performance target. G. Wong asked how we mitigate changes in school leadership. D. Harrison said that we ask principals applying for Levy funds to commit to staying through the first year of implementation. L. Nyland noted this issue came up in the current year, and that Sandpoint had broader staff buy-in, so the plan was able to be implemented with good results. He noted that DEEL needed to consider the circumstances of principal change. D. Chappelle noted that SPS principal training is robust enough to weather an administrative change, if there is buy-in of the existing staff. L. Nyland said that SPS had a very robust three year training and support for incoming principals. S. Everlove noted the importance of the LOC ensuring that Levy funds are spent in the most effective way and there is a need for assurance that the plans can be executed if a leadership change occurs.

Kacey Guin reviewed mid-year highlights of the Middle School Investments.

S. Everlove asked who the Empowerment Math Project point person was from UW. K. Guin said Anita Lenges. G. Wong asked why Denny, who has had consistent leadership, had a significant drop in attendance. K. Guin said there was not an obvious explanation. K. Aisenberg noted this is the 1st full year schools are operating under the new attendance calculation, so that could influence the data. She said that attendance is an indicator, and what we'll really want to connect it to is the academic outcomes data we get at the end of the year. K. Guin said that all schools were knocking it out of the park on passing core courses, but there are lots of Ds and huge opportunity gaps among students receiving Ds. Given these gaps, next year we will be applying a more rigorous metric of C or better. G. Wong said as the Washington Middle School parent, he had the opportunity to participate in the Levy-funded student led conferences, and it was a great experience for families and students. He also noted his student's excitement about a particular college, after a teacher shared her college story with students, so upping the conversation about college and career readiness seems to be working in middle schools.

K. Guin reviewed mid-year highlights of the High School Investments. She noted that the C or better performance metric shift is going to be difficult for schools, but having a more rigorous measure is an important course correction. R. Burke asked about the criteria for selecting students served by College & Career Readiness Case Management. K. Guin said that College Bound Scholars "at greatest risk", due to high absenteeism, not passing courses, or perhaps discipline are identified, and that schools ultimately determine which students to serve, based on these risk factors.

D. Chappelle provided an update of the Mayor's Education Summit. Allison Wood asked if the attendees at the Summit mirrored the turnout at the Community Conversations. D. Chappelle said that the summit had a good turnout, but the demographics of the attendees differed than those at the Community Conversations. S. Sidorowicz said that Summit participants did fill out demographic information cards, but the information hadn't been compiled yet. S. Everlove asked if there a focus on real world work experiences in the Community Conversations. S. Sidorowicz said there was a combination of career exploration, internships, job shadowing, etc. L. Nyland asked if there was anything surprising from the Community Conversations, noting the common thread of affirming and valuing students' race and culture. S. Sidorowicz said there seemed to be more talk about what participants wanted to achieve rather than all about criticism. G. Wong noted that the general themes were very familiar and wondering what was going to be new about this conversation. Cristina Gonzalez asked if there was going to be funding available to address these issues. S. Sidorowicz said there wasn't yet a clear answer to either question, but that the Mayor's Education Advisory Group was using the information to guide their discussions and inform their recommendations to the Mayor. D. Chappelle said that one thing that was consistently mentioned was valuing students and their culture. C. Gonzalez said it would be interesting to think about asking students their opinion and valuing their input. D. Chappelle said students hosted three of the community conversations and that was a theme that came up. G. Wong inquired again about funding, noting that the Mayor's Education Advisory Group process looked similar to the Levy renewal process and said that if this was meant to inform the next Levy, he would

encourage staff to ensure decision makers look at current Levy priorities and to build off the good work that has already been done, and not undo it. R. Burke asked about the process of the Advisory Group, and hoped that they would do a root cause analysis of the issues, rather than focus on the symptoms. S. Everlove wanted to echo C. Gonzalez, saying we can come up with our own interpretation of what the common threads mean, but need to vet with the students themselves, or we may get it wrong. L. Nyland noted the work SPS had done to determine practices used in high performing outlier schools and wondered if students in those schools answer school climate questions differently in the than they do in the non-outlier schools. G. Wong asked if all the outlier schools get Levy funding. S. Sidorowicz said many, but not all. L. Nyland thanked the City for its work on the Summit and noted that the district will be able to use the information to tweak the work they are already doing.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:31 pm.