Seattle's

FAMILIES
&
EDUCATION
LEVY

City of Seattle

Office for Education

Families and Education Levy

Mid-Year Report

July 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Families and Education Levy

2006 Mid-Year Report

Executive Summary

This is the first Mid-Year Report for the 2004 City of Seattle Families and Education Levy (FEL). In 2004, Seattle voters overwhelmingly approved a $117 million, seven-year property tax levy to improve academic achievement and reduce the achievement gap for all Seattle students. In order to measure the Levy's impact on academic achievement, the City committed to tracking indicators of student progress and educational outcomes.

The City has implemented new accountability measures to track the Levy's impact on Seattle students. In developing the policy framework for the 2004 FEL, the Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) identified three overarching outcomes:

- **School Readiness**;

- **Academic Achievement**; and

- **Reduced Dropout Rate/Increased Graduation Rate.**

For the first time, this year the City set numeric targets for each investment. Targets represent a goal for the number of students in each program who will be ready for kindergarten, achieve academically, stay in school or graduate. In addition to the targets, each program set indicators of progress toward targets. Examples of indicators include:

- Students improving attendance

- Reductions in student disciplinary actions

- Three- and four-year-olds who meet developmental standards

- Families attending parent/teacher conferences and other school events

This report will show indicator data for students who are participating in Levy programs.

Another purpose of this report is to recommend course corrections and program changes for Levy investments and to set targets for the 2006-07 school year. Following is a summary of program changes and 2006-07 targets adopted by the Levy Oversight Committee (LOC).

Note that the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) targets for the 2005-06 school year are for the math and reading portions of the tests. Targets for the 2006-07 school year also include the writing portion of the tests for the grade levels where it is given. All targets for 2006-07 are shown in a value-added format, meaning the targets are for students who have not achieved academically before and will be additive to the "baseline" of students who have already achieved standards.

The Office for Education (OFE) will present these targets to the Mayor for approval in August.

Table 1: Early Learning 2006-07 Recommended Targets			
	2005–06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
	Target	Actual	New Target
Total number of Step Ahead children enrolled	280	134[1]	388
Children entering kindergarten that were served by ELN pre-K programs as four-year olds (assumes 15% attrition during the pre-K year)	238	131 registered	330
Four-year-olds in ELN pre-K whose teachers participate in training	280	134	330
Number and percent of ELN pre-K 4 year-olds assessed as school ready by the DIAL-3 at the end of the school year	182 / 65%	Avail. Aug. '06	248 / 75%
Number and percent of ELN students who meet the DRA standard in 2nd grade (assumes 24% attrition since K)	97 / 70%	Avail. 2008-09	193 / 77%
Number of two- and three-year-olds in ELN child care whose teachers participate in training	131	81	206
Number of two- and three-year olds served through teacher training who progress one level on the child assessment at the end of the school year	84/64%	Avail. Aug. '06	150 / 73%
Two- and three-year-olds served through the Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP)	100	114	200 (includes 100 continuing from '05-'06)
Number and percent of two- and three-year olds served by the PCHP who meet developmental standards as measured by the PCHP evaluation at the end of the school year	N/A[2]	Avail. June '07	64 / 64%

Early Learning Recommended Program Changes

a. Administer the Speed DIAL instead of the DIAL-3 for the kindergarten readiness assessment.

b. Slow down the ramp-up of Step Ahead preschools by adding 108 new slots in the 2006-07 school year for a total of 388 slots.

c. Contract with the Public Health Department to provide on-site health consultation services to ensure children have dental, vision, hearing and developmental screenings, are connected to a medical home and have required immunizations.

d. City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) will implement an intensive marketing, recruitment and enrollment campaign.

---

[1] In addition to the 134 four-year-old children enrolled in Step Ahead, 59 younger children are enrolled early, who will be four years old by August 31, 2006 and will continue in Step Ahead in 2006-07.

[2] Children participate in PCHP for two years; outcomes are measured at the end of the two years. Children who started in PCHP in 2005-06 will complete the program in June 2007.

Table 2: Family Support 2006-07 Recommended Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	**2005-06 School Year**		**2006-07 School Year**
	Baseline	**Target**	**Actual**	**New Target**
Number of students served	N/A	2,000	3,288	2,000 (who have not met standards)
Number and percent of students served who meet the 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade WASL standard, or meet the 2nd grade DRA standard.	Total: 405 / 46% DRA: 301 / 66% WASL: 104 / 25%	160 / 8%	Avail. Sept. '06	200 / 10%

Table 3: Family & Community Involvement 2006-07 Recommended Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	**2005–06 School Year**		**2006-07 School Year**
	Baseline	**Target**	**Actual**	**New Target**
Number of students served	N/A	150	293	400
Number and percent of students served who meet the 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade WASL standard, or meet the 2nd grade DRA standard.	Total: 36 / 29% DRA: 24 / 44% WASL: 12 / 17%	16 / 11%	Avail. Sept. '06	50 / 13%

Family Support and Family & Community Involvement Recommended Program Changes

Family Support: No changes; continue to implement academic focus.

Family-Community Involvement: Continue to implement family-community involvement grants to the same schools for a three-year cycle.

Table 4: Elementary School Community Learning Centers 2006-07 Recommended Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	**2005-06 School Year**		**2006-07 School Year**
	Baseline	**Target**	**Actual**	**New Target[3]**
Elementary students served at four CLC sites	N/A	200	195	210
Number and percent of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students served who meet the WASL standard and 2nd grade students who meet the DRA standard	Total: 36 / 38% 2nd Gr. DRA: 24 / 51% 4th Gr. WASL: 9 / 17%[4]	14 / 7%	Avail. Sept. '06	30 / 14%

---

[3] It is assumed no more than 10% of all Elementary School CLC participants will be in 2nd grade; at least 90% of the target will comprise WASL scores.

Elementary School Recommended Program Changes

a. Invest in only three Elementary CLC sites instead of the current four, in order to maximize resources.

b. Implement a professional development training program for CLC instructors and staff to align CLC activities with curricula.

Table 5: Middle School Programs 2006-07 Recommended Targets (View 1)		
MSSP: 1200 Students	**CLC: 4000 Students**	
MSSP Only 350 Students (have not met standards)	**MSSP & CLC** 850 Students (have not met standards)	**CLC Only** 3,150 Students 1,260 attend 2x/week
Targets: 53 / 15% pass WASL (value-added) 20% move from Level 1 to Level 2 on math WASL	Targets: 128 / 15% pass WASL 20% move from Level 1 to Level 2 on math WASL	Target: 120 / 10% pass WASL (value-added)
Total Middle School Targets = 301 meet WASL standards		

---

[4] The 4th grade WASL baseline for Elementary School Community Learning Centers represents students who passed the reading, math and writing WASL assessments. All other baselines represent students who passed the reading and math assessments only.

Table 6: Middle School Programs 2006-07 Recommended Targets (View 2)				
	2004-05 School Year	**2005–06 School Year**		**2006-07 School Year**
	Baseline	**Target**	**Actual**	**New Target**
Students participating in MSSP	N/A	1,200	1,641	1,200 (who have not met WASL standards)
Students participating in MSSP who move from Level 1 to Level 2 on the math WASL		N/A	N/A	20%
Students participating in both MSSP and CLCs	N/A	800	745	850
Number and percent of students in both MSSP and CLCs who meet the WASL standard	32 / 18%	56 / 7%	Avail. Sept. '06	128 / 15%
Students in CLCs only	N/A	N/A	3,212	3,150
Students participating in CLCs 2x/week or more	N/A	N/A		1,260
Number and percent of students in CLCs only who meet the WASL standard	46%	N/A		120 / 10%
Students in MSSP only	N/A	N/A	899	350 (who have not met WASL standards)
Number and percent of students in MSSP only who meet the WASL standard	28 / 17%	N/A		53 / 15%

Middle School Recommended Program Changes

a. Coordinate School-based Levy Leadership: In the Innovation Schools, an Assistant Principal will manage the Levy programs, coordinate academic services, hold core team meetings, organize key players and monitor SLPs and overall student progress.

b. Better link the CLC and MSSP programs.

c. Provide professional development workshops for CLC staff and instructors focused on after-school reading, math and writing skills. This is a strategy to improve student performance on the WASL.

	2004-05 School Year	2005–06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
Table 7: **High-Risk Youth 2006-07 Recommended Targets**				
	Baseline	Target	Actual	New Target
High-Risk Youth referred to the program	N/A	665	611	665
High-Risk Youth referred to the program with SSD ID numbers	N/A	665	447	632[5]
High-Risk Youth who stay in school/come back to school	N/A	365 / 55%	42	250 / 38%
High-Risk Youth who progress to next grade level	N/A	--	0	250
High-Risk Youth who re-enroll and stay in school for 90 days	N/A	--	41	N/A
High-Risk Youth who re-enroll and progress to the next grade level	N/A	--	0	N/A
High-Risk Youth who obtain a GED	N/A	--	1	N/A
High-Risk Youth who pass the WASL[6]	3 / 1%	11 / 3%	Avail. July 2006	16 / 4%
High-Risk 12th grade youth who graduate	N/A	N/A	N/A	26 / 45%

High-Risk Youth Recommended Program Changes

a. Focus case managers on East African youth.

b. Partner with the Seattle Police Department (SPD) to leverage STFY's investment in dropout prevention and academic achievement.

c. STFY service plans will not be considered complete until they are signed and include SPS student ID numbers. ID numbers are required in order to track student-specific data.

---

[5] It is assumed 5 percent of the 665 youth who are referred to STFY will not be enrolled in school and pursue a GED; these youth will not have SSD ID numbers.

[6] The percentage of STFY students who meet WASL standards is calculated by dividing the number of students who meet 10th grade standards by the total number of students in high school. Approximately 62% of STFY students are in high school; 38% are in middle school, dropped out, in a GED program, left STFY before completing an intake and assessment, or have not yet completed an intake and assessment.

Table 8: Student Health 2006-07 Recommended Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	2005–06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
	Baseline	Target	Actual	New Target
High school and middle school students receiving primary care in school-based health centers will be screened for academic risk and receive appropriate support to succeed in school	4,839	5,000	3,517	5,000
Students brought into compliance with required childhood immunizations, focusing on south Seattle neighborhoods[7]	2,500	2,500[8]	4,001	1,500 / 17%
Students assisted by school nurses and health center clinicians in managing asthma, depression, and other chronic conditions	N/A	600	1,700	1,800 / 36%
High-risk students identified and served through more intensive SBHC and school nurse interventions that support academic achievement	N/A	1,500	436	800
# and % who pass the WASL[9]	All Students Using SBHCs 7th Gr: 85 / 35% 10th Gr: 201 / 29%	100 / 2% of all SBHC users	Avail. July '06	150 / 3% of all SBHC Users

Student Health Recommended Program Changes

a. Increase the academic target for the 2006-07 school year, but narrow the number of students identified by SBHCs as academically at-risk, in order to provide more intensive services within current SBHC staffing capacity.

b. Set an academic target for school nurses.

c. More uniformly assess students' risk of academic challenges.

---

[7] There are approximately 8,990 students not in compliance with immunizations.

[8] The 2005-06 immunization target and actual were not value-added (i.e., these numbers included students who would have been immunized without this intervention).

[9] It is assumed that a subset of students served by SBHCs and school nurses will take the WASL. The City will develop a more precise methodology for calculating Student Health academic targets in 2006-07.

Table 9: Overall 2006 Levy Budget	2006 Adopted
Early Learning	$ 2,587,603
Family Support & Family Involvement	$ 2,853,765
Support for High-Risk Youth - Stay in School	$ 1,226,297
Middle School Support/Out-of-School Time	$ 3,092,810
Student Health - Health	$ 3,779,137
Crossing Guards	$ 520,165
Administration & Evaluation	$ 705,541
TOTAL:	**$14,765,318**

The City and Seattle Public Schools mutually believe it is not possible to achieve the outcomes above, or to reduce the achievement gap with respect to the Levy outcomes, without a strong partnership. In 2005, the City and School District created a formal Partnership Agreement outlining the ways in which each partner will contribute to the best outcomes for children and youth in Seattle.

OFE will present the Mid-Year report to the LOC in April 2006. The LOC will provide feedback to OFE on the recommended course corrections and 2006-07 targets. OFE will then present recommendations to the Mayor. Program changes will be reflected in the Mayor's proposed 2007-08 budget to the City Council.

I.   Introduction

This is the first Mid-Year Report for the 2004 City of Seattle Families and Education Levy (FEL). In 2004, Seattle voters overwhelmingly approved a $117 million, seven-year property tax levy to improve academic achievement and reduce the achievement gap for all Seattle students. In order to measure the Levy's impact on academic achievement, the City committed to tracking indicators of student progress and educational outcomes.

The FEL invests in the education of Seattle students, pre-kindergarten through high school. Levy programs help students outside of the classroom, yet are designed to impact academic achievement. Investments are in seven areas: Early Learning, Family Support and Family & Community Involvement, Out-of-School Time for Elementary Students; Middle School Programs; Support for High-Risk Youth; Student Health; and School Crossing Guards. The FEL exists from September 2005 through August 2012.

The overall Levy budget for 2006 is shown below.

Table 10: Overall 2006 Levy Budget	2006 Adopted
Early Learning	$ 2,587,603
Family Support / Family & Community Involvement	$ 2,853,765
Support for High-Risk Youth - Stay in School	$ 1,226,297
Middle School Support/Out-of-School Time	$ 3,092,810
Student Health - Health	$ 3,779,137
Crossing Guards	$ 520,165
Administration & Evaluation	$ 705,541
TOTAL:	**$14,765,318**

The City, School District and community-based organizations began implementing FEL programs in September 2005. The FEL represents a change in direction for City investments in children and youth toward academic achievement. The Levy invests in students who are the most academically challenged, with the goal of directly improving their achievement in school.

The City has implemented new accountability measures to track the Levy's impact on Seattle students. Part of the new accountability system is a commitment to analyze program data, seek to understand the reasons students are succeeding or failing, and make course corrections if students are not achieving.

In developing the policy framework for the 2004 FEL, the Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) identified three overarching outcomes:

- **School Readiness** (measured by the DIAL-3 kindergarten readiness assessment and the Developmental Reading Assessment [DRA]);

- **Academic Achievement** (measured by the Washington Assessment of Student Learning [WASL] and the DRA); and

- **Reduced Dropout Rate/Increased Graduation Rate** (measured by the annual dropout rate and the cohort graduation rate)

All FEL programs contribute to at least one of the above outcomes. For the first time, this year the City set numeric targets for each investment related to the outcomes listed above. Targets represent a goal for the number of students in each program who will be ready for kindergarten, achieve academically, stay in school or graduate.

The FEL uses the Seattle Public Schools and State of Washington's measure for academic achievement, the WASL. In 2005-06, meeting WASL targets for the FEL meant that students would need to meet the standard in reading and math. Beginning in the 2006-07 school year, meeting WASL targets for the FEL will mean students need to meet the standard in **reading, math and writing** for the grade levels where these assessments are administered. This is consistent with the state's graduation requirements.

The 2005 FEL Implementation Plan set targets for all seven years of the Levy, with targets increasing each year. The Implementation Plan targets are listed in Appendix A.

In addition to the targets, each program set indicators of progress toward targets. Examples of indicators include:

- Students improving attendance

- Reductions in student disciplinary actions

- Three- and four-year-olds who meet developmental standards

- Families attending parent/teacher conferences and other school events

This report will show indicator data for students who are participating in Levy programs. Outcome data, including school readiness, academic achievement and dropout and graduation rates, will be available in the summer and fall of 2006; the City will report on outcomes in the December 2006 FEL Annual Report.

Another purpose of this report is to recommend course corrections and program changes for Levy investments and to set targets for the 2006-07 school year. The current (2005-06) school year is the first year Levy programs have set specific targets using the outcome funding approach. Since the outcome focus is new for the City and Seattle Public Schools and baseline data were not available when original targets were set, program staff set relatively low targets for the first year, while agreeing to significantly increase targets with each year of the Levy. This year, baseline data are available, although first-year outcome data will not be available

until summer and fall of 2006. The targets recommended in this report represent modest increases from the first year; the City expects to set much higher targets in future years after accessing and analyzing FEL outcome data. All targets represent additional students meeting academic standards, that will add to the base of students who have already achieved.

The City and Seattle Public Schools mutually believe it is not possible to achieve the outcomes above, or to reduce the achievement gap with respect to the Levy outcomes, without a strong partnership. In 2005, the City and School District created a formal Partnership Agreement outlining the ways in which each partner will contribute to the best outcomes for children and youth in Seattle.

The City of Seattle Office for Education (OFE) presented this report to the LOC in April 2006. The LOC provided feedback to OFE on the recommended course corrections and 2006-07 targets. After deliberating the proposed targets for two months, the LOC recommended the targets included in this report. OFE now recommends these program changes and targets to Mayor Nickels. If the Mayor approves these recommendations, program changes will be reflected in the Mayor's proposed 2007-08 budget to the City Council.

The next section of this report will briefly describe each FEL investment and present the 2005-06 budget for each program. Following the program descriptions, the report will then explain in detail for each investment area: what the investment has "bought" so far; 2005-06 targets compared to the actual progress made so far; indicator data; recommended course corrections; and finally, recommended 2006-07 targets and indicators.

II. Overview of Levy Investment Areas

Early Learning

Program Description
___

The early learning investment consists of two Early Learning Networks in the southeast and southwest neighborhoods of Seattle. The goal of the Networks is to prepare all children in the neighborhoods for kindergarten by investing in a comprehensive set of early learning services in those areas. This approach raises the quality of early learning for all children in a geographic area. The Networks invest in the following five areas in order to prepare children for kindergarten:

1) **Preschool programs** serving low-income four year-old children whose families earn between 110 percent and 300 percent of the federal poverty level. The program focuses on serving children of color including children who are African-American, East African, Latino, Native American, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian and/or Samoan.

2) **Parent-Child Home Program** (PCHP) for low-income families with young children ages two and three who live in Early Learning Network neighborhoods. The program, based on a successful national model, helps parents learn literacy skills to practice with their children.

3) **Teacher Training** (e.g., professional development, on-site mentoring and education on curriculum) for early learning teachers serving children ages birth to three in Network neighborhoods.

4) **Kindergarten Transition** to ensure successful enrollment in kindergarten for children in home and community preschool programs.

5) Increased **compensation** for teachers in early learning programs serving the highest numbers of low-income children in Network neighborhoods. This is a strategy to reduce teacher turnover and reward teacher training and skill building.

The budget for the Early Learning investments for 2005 and 2006 is shown below.

Table 11: Early Learning Budget	2005	2006
	Revised	Adopted
Preschool	$ 838,410	$ 1,648,520
Professional Development for Early Learning	$ 74,477	$ 160,985
Preschool Child Care Subsidies	$ 89,600	$ 270,000
Kindergarten Transition	$ 35,000	$ 74,000
Home Visits	$ 43,542	$ 93,750
Compensation Program for Early Learning	$ 65,951	$ 137,159
Administration	$ 94,003	$ 203,189
TOTAL:	**$1,240,983**	**$ 2,587,603**

Family Support / Family & Community Involvement

Program Description

The Families and Education Levy invests in two types of programs to support families: Family Support, which helps individual students to achieve academically and their families to be involved in the education process; and Family & Community Involvement, which creates partnerships between schools, families and community-based organizations on a systemic level.

The Family Support program helps elementary school children succeed academically by providing resources to help families overcome barriers to their social, emotional and physical well-being. The program invests in Family Support Workers who work directly in elementary and K-8 schools to link students and their families with resources needed to achieve academically. Family Support Workers team up with parents and other professionals – including educators, social service workers, businesses and community members – so that students can succeed in school. During the 2005-06 school year, the program transitioned to an intensive student selection process in order to focus on students and families who are most academically at-risk.

The Family Involvement investment, called Family & Community Partnership (FCP), is a research-based program that aims to strengthen the capacity of schools to partner with families and communities to improve academic achievement and reduce the achievement gap. The program grants FEL funds to elementary schools and community-based organizations to work together in supporting family involvement to increase academic achievement. Ten Seattle elementary schools and five community-based organizations (CBOs) have received FCP grants to reach out to diverse families and involve them in the education of their children.

The budget for Family Support and Family & Community Involvement for 2005 and 2006 is shown below.

Table 12: **Family Support / Family & Community Involvement Budget**	**2005** **Revised**	**2006** **Adopted**
Family Support	$ 768,229	$ 2,359,513
Family & Community Involvement Total	$ 161,262	$ 494,252
TOTAL:	**$ 929,491**	**$ 2,853,765**
Note: In 2005, $80,631 was allocated for community-based family involvement, and $80,631 was allocated for school-based family involvement. In 2006, $247,126 is allocated for community-based family involvement, and $247,126 is allocated for school-based family involvement.		

Elementary School Out-of-School Time

Program Description

The FEL invests in four elementary school Community Learning Centers (CLCs) in the 2005-06 school year. They include Rainier Vista Boys and Girls Club at Brighton, YMCA at Cooper, YMCA at Concord and Tiny Tots at Van Asselt.

Using schools as a hub, CLCs provide a comprehensive set of services, activities and learning experiences that are culturally relevant and tailored to the needs of students and families. Services include homework and tutoring support focused on math and literacy, English as a Second Language instruction, project-based learning, technology activities and numerous other developmentally appropriate learning opportunities. CLC staff coordinate out-of school time activities at the selected sites with school staff to maximize learning by connecting after-school activities to the material students are learning during the school day. CLC programs engage families and provide community resource and referral information as well as parent and family activities during out-of-school time that promote academic achievement.

Each elementary school CLC provides at least 12 hours of after-school programming per week and is involved in up to two family involvement activities per month, in coordination with the school.

The Elementary School Out-of-School Time budget for 2005 and 2006 is shown below.

| Table 13: | 2005 | 2006 |
Elementary School Out-of-School Time Budget	Revised	Adopted
Elementary Community Learning Centers (CLCs)	$ 116,244	$ 326,083

Middle School Investments

Program Description

The FEL makes four investments in middle school students:

- **Middle School Support** (including Innovation Schools and Linkage Schools)

- **Community Learning Centers** in eight middle schools;

- Academically-focused **After-School Activities Programs (ASAP)** in non-CLC middle schools and K-8 schools; and

- **Middle School Athletics**.

Using the Middle School Support approach, each middle school creates a multidisciplinary staff team which identifies students who are not succeeding academically. The teams then:

a) Coordinate existing school, family and community resources to support those struggling students; and

b) Identify and develop individualized interventions for target students, such as extended learning opportunities, mental health services, family outreach or focused skill development.

School teams engage students and families to develop Student Learning Plans (SLPs) that outline steps to helping students meet academic standards. SLP interventions address barriers to learning, such as specific skill deficits, mental health needs, the need for more time to learn, attendance problems or disciplinary issues. A "key player" is assigned in each school to be responsible for monitoring each student's progress on their SLP and recommending course corrections in student interventions as needed. Each MSSP student also participates in a Community Learning Center or ASAP, depending on which program is offered at their school.

The MSSP invests in four "Innovation" schools (Mercer, Denny, Aki Kurose and Madison middle schools) "Linkage" middle schools (including all other middle schools) and "Linkage" K-8 schools. The Linkage Schools use the same individualized approach and provide services similar to Innovation Sites; however, they do so on a smaller scale.

The Middle School Programs budget for 2005 and 2006 is shown below.

Table 14: Middle School Programs Budget	2005	2006
	Revised	**Adopted**
Middle School CLCs	$ 319,103	$ 861,468
After School Activities Program	$ 107,843	$ 244,774
Support (transportation, security, special needs)	$ 144,655	$ 468,153
Middle School Support (Innovation & Linkage)	$ 329,677	$ 1,014,321
Middle School Athletics	$ 58,849	$ 178,011
TOTAL:	**$ 960,127**	**$ 2,766,727**

Support For High-Risk Youth

Program Description

The FEL invests in intensive case management services to return high-risk middle and high school youth to school, keep them in school and graduate. The program, called Seattle Team for Youth (STFY), aims to provide these youth with an opportunity for educational success. Key aspects of the program include:

- 18 case managers who link youth to culturally-appropriate services to ensure academic achievement. Community-based case managers access ethnic and linguistic resources unavailable to mainstream schools. Case management services help youth navigate the school and court systems and access tutoring, mentoring, health, mental health, employment, and drug and alcohol services. Regular contact between case managers, clients, their families, and schools provide a stable, consistent, and positive adult relationship that is often lacking in a young person's life.

- Case management services focused on southwest and south Seattle. These neighborhoods show the highest poverty rates, lowest attendance rates, and largest numbers of youth with low grade point averages. STFY case managers work with high schools with the highest dropout rates and the highest percent of youth failing academically. These schools include Cleveland, Franklin, Rainier Beach, Chief Sealth, West Seattle, South Lake, Marshall, and Interagency.

- The program brings together CBOs with the Seattle Police Department, Seattle Public Schools, and Levy School-Based Health Centers to work collaboratively toward reducing the dropout rate and improving educational outcomes.

The Seattle Team for Youth budget for 2005 and 2006 is shown below.

Table 15: Support for High-Risk Youth Budget	2005 Revised	2006 Adopted
High-Risk Youth	$ 400,108	$ 1,226,297

Student Health

Program Description

The FEL invests in student health services for middle and high school students. There are two types of investments: School-Based Health Centers (SBHCs) in all ten comprehensive high schools and four middle schools, and school nurses in the schools with SBHCs.[10]

SBHCs provide comprehensive primary health care, including both medical and mental health care, to adolescent students. Each health center is sponsored by a local healthcare organization. SBHCs also provide screenings, health assessments, and interventions that focus on students who are at risk of academic problems or dropping out of school. School nursing services focus on improving childhood immunization rates and managing chronic health conditions. In addition, school nurses support integration of SBHCs into the school community.

The budget for Student Health for 2005 and 2006 is shown below.

Table 16: Student Health Budget	2005	2006
	Revised	Adopted
School-Based Health Clinics	$ 883,029	$ 2,712,313
Nurses	$ 224,773	$ 688,910
Administration	$ 123,089	$ 377,914
TOTAL:	**$ 1,230,891**	**$ 3,779,137**

---

[10] The FEL invests in a portion of school nurses' time in schools with SBHCs.

III. Investment Area Detail

Early Learning

What the Investment Has Bought So Far

Preschool Highlights:

- The City launched the new FEL preschool program, called Step Ahead, in September 2005. Thirteen new preschool classrooms opened, six of which are located in Seattle Public School buildings.

- 193 children were enrolled in the Step Ahead preschool program (134 are four-year-olds).[11]

- Step Ahead preschool sites enrolled children from diverse race/ethnicity groups, who were intended to be served, as shown by the following chart.

Table 17: Step Ahead Preschool Enrollment		
Race/Ethnicity	**Percent of Total**	**Number of Children**
Asian	23%	30
African American	25%	32
Hispanic	32%	41
Native American	2%	*
White	8%	11
Other	11%	14

As of Feb. 2006
*Fewer than 10 children

Professional Development

- Preschool teachers were trained in the Creative Curriculum, which the City selected as one of two approved curricula for Step Ahead classrooms.

- The City hired an intermediary agency, Child Care Resources, to manage the teacher training program linked to the higher education system to increase education levels and credentials for ELN teachers.

- Teacher coaches provided 728 hours of on-site coaching (104 hours each month) to 25 teachers in 13 Step Ahead classrooms serving ELN children.

- The City designed the Compensation Initiative, based on best practice research from across the nation. Contracts for compensation funds are in negotiation.

---

[11] As of April 2006.

Kindergarten Transition

- 131 Step Ahead children have been registered for kindergarten for the 2006-07 school year.

Parent-Child Home Program

- Through a collaboration with the Business Partnership for Early Learning (BPEL), the City established the Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP) in southeast and southwest Seattle. This collaboration has enabled the ELN to extend its reach to 200 low-income toddlers.

- 1,583 home visits have been completed with 114 children so far (200 children will receive visits by December 2006).

Targets/Actuals

The table below shows the targets the City set for this year for Early Learning investments, compared to the actual progress the program has made so far. As the numbers show, the preschool program has faced a significant challenge in enrolling students up to the planned capacity of 280. As of April 2006, the program had enrolled 134 four-year-olds and 59 three-year-olds.

Although the FEL preschool program was intended to serve only four-year-old children, due to the number of open slots, in mid-February the program opened up enrollment on a one-time basis to three-year-old children who would continue in the preschool program the following year.

Enrollment in the Parent-Child Home Program is above target at 114 children served out of the target of 100.

Table 18: Early Learning Targets vs. Actuals		
	2005–06 School Year	
	Target	Actual*
Total number of Step Ahead children enrolled	280	134[12]
Children entering kindergarten that were served by ELN Pre-K programs as four-year-olds (assumes 15% attrition during the pre-K year)	238	131 registered
Four-year-olds in ELN pre-K whose teachers participate in training	280	134
Number and percent of ELN pre-K four-year-olds assessed as school ready by the DIAL-3 at the end of the 2005-06 school year (assumes 15% attrition during the pre-K year)	182 / 65%	Avail. Aug. '06
Pre-K students served who meet the DRA standard in 2nd grade (assumes 24% attrition from K)	97 / 70%	Avail. 2008-09
Number of two- and three-year-olds in ELN child care whose teachers participate in training	131	81
Number of two- and three-year-olds served through teacher training who progress one level on the child assessment by the end of the 2005-06 school year	84 / 64%	Avail. Aug. '06
Two- and three-year-olds served through the Parent-Child Home Program	100	114
Number and percent of two- and three-year olds served by the PCHP who meet developmental standards as measured by the PCHP evaluation in December 2006	128 / 64%	Avail. June '07

* Actuals represent data as of February 2006

Indicator Data

Early Learning indicators include:

- The number and percent of preschool students meeting developmental standards of learning;

- The number and percent of early learning classrooms receiving high classroom assessment scores; and

- The number of families receiving home visits (shown in table above).

---

[12] In addition to the 134 four-year-old children enrolled in Step Ahead, 59 younger children are enrolled early, who will be four years old by August 31, 2006 and will continue in Step Ahead in 2006-07.

Developmental Child Assessment

Preschool teachers conducted the baseline developmental child assessments in fall 2005 on 103 children attending Step Ahead preschools. To assess children, teachers used the Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum Assessment System (CCDCAS) for ages three through five. The CCDCAS addresses four areas of development: Social/Emotional, Physical (both fine motor and large motor), Language, and Cognition. The CCDCAS focuses on the whole child and what children can do, rather than documenting what they cannot do.

The CCDCAS is conducted three times per year in Step Ahead classrooms: in the fall (initial baseline), winter (midpoint checkpoint), and spring (final checkpoint). The CCDCAS assessment system is based on a child's development across two years; children are not necessarily expected to move across the entire continuum in a one-year period, or reach the top developmental step, but they are expected to make progress.

The CCDCAS uses a sequence system of four "steps" (Forerunner, I, II and III) to show children's progress. The City has converted this four-step system into a raw scoring system in order to quantify the results.

Table 19: Developmental Assessment Scoring Scale	
Range of Assessment Scores	**Explanation of the Score**
1.0 -------- 1.9	**Forerunner** – Children who show beginning evidence of reaching the initial level for typical preschool development.
2.0 -------- 2.9	**Step 1** – Children who demonstrate the beginning level of typical preschool development.
3.0 ------- 3.8	**Step 2** – Children who demonstrate intermediate levels in the sequence of development for each objective.
3.8 ------- 4.0	**Step 3** – Children who demonstrate mastery in each objective.

The City assumed that at the beginning of the Step Ahead program, 65 percent of children would be assessed at Step 1, or Score between 2.0 and 2.9 on the first developmental assessment. This assumption is consistent with research on development of low-income children who have not had prior high-quality preschool experience. The table below shows the number and percentage of Step Ahead children who scored at Forerunner, Step 1, and Steps 2 or 3. A higher percentage – 73 percent of Step Ahead children – scored at Step 1 than expected. However, based on these first assessment results, the City still expects at least 65 percent of Step Ahead students to be ready for kindergarten by next fall.

Table 20: Step Ahead Child Assessment Results: First Assessment, December 2005		
	2005 - 2006 School Year	
	Target	**Actual**
# and % of Step Ahead students who are assessed at Forerunner/Score 1.0 – 1.9	N/A	7 / 10%
# and % of Step Ahead students who are assessed at Step 1/Score 2.0 – 2.9	**182 / 65%**	**53 / 73%**
# and % of Step Ahead students who are assessed at Steps 2 or 3/Score 2.9 – 4.0	N/A	13 / 18%

Indicator Data as of Dec. 2005

The next table shows the first developmental assessment scores disaggregated by race. Scores represent the average (mean) for students in each race category. Average scores for groups of children in all race categories are 2.00 or above, which was the assumed baseline level of development. When interpreting these data, one should take caution as the sample sizes are very small.

Table 21: Step Ahead Preschool 1st Developmental Assessment Baseline Results - Fall 2005 by Race/Ethnicity				
	Average Score[13] by Category			
RACE	**Social & Emotional Development**	**Cognitive**	**Physical**	**Language**
Asian	2.33	2.33	2.37	2.36
African American	2.34	2.35	2.68	2.38
Hispanic	2.34	2.35	2.51	2.34
Native American	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
White	3.06	2.94	3.16	3.13
Other	2.37	2.09	2.13	2.36

Indicator Data as of Dec. 2005

---

[13] ** Forerunner = 1.0 to 1.9; Step One = 2.0 to 2.9; Step Two = 3.0 to 3.8; Step Three = 3.8 to 4.0.

The following table shows average developmental child assessment scores by provider. It is interesting to note children in one provider's preschool classrooms scored slightly lower than the expected baseline of child development (2.00). However, the sample size in this assessment was very low and the scores are extremely close to the assumed baseline. The City does not believe this is a concern and will closely track results of the second child assessment this spring.

Table 22: Step Ahead Preschool 1st Developmental Assessment Results - Fall 2005 by Provider				
	Average Score[14] by Category			
	Social & Emotional Development	Cognitive	Physical	Language
Jose Marti Child Development	2.30	2.29	2.41	2.31
Tiny Tots	2.55	2.44	2.67	2.44
Seed Of Life	3.14	3.04	3.42	3.39
Refugee Women's Alliance	1.99	1.91	1.90	1.91
Community Day School Assn	2.28	2.23	2.63	2.42
Other Providers	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.62

Indicator Data as of Dec. 2005

Classroom (Teacher) Assessment

The City administered the Creative Curriculum for Preschool Implementation Checklist tool to assess how well classroom teachers are implementing the curriculum. The target is for classroom teachers to meet 65 percent of the core standards on the teacher practice components of the checklist by June 2006. The core standards include standards for the learning environment (e.g., adequate materials that are organized properly), standards for teacher-child interaction, as well as standards for the daily routine (e.g., offering both child- and teacher-initiated activities). The classroom assessment is conducted two times per year. In addition, there is one annual program assessment.

All classroom teachers at ELN sites receive four to eight hours of on-site coaching per month from Child Care Resources or the Experiential Education Unit at the University of Washington to support transfer of knowledge from early childhood coursework into classroom practice and to ensure fidelity in implementation of the curriculum. Staff from the City's Human Services Department provided start-up coaching and will offer ongoing technical assistance as needed.

---

[14] Forerunner = 1.0 to 1.9; Step One = 2.0 to 2.9; Step Two = 3.0 to 3.8; Step Three = 3.8 to 4.0.

The following table shows classroom assessment scores for each preschool classroom by provider.[15] Eight classrooms have met the target of teachers meeting at least 65 percent of core standards, and five classrooms have not yet met the target. Classroom coaches review the classroom assessments and develop action plans to focus on areas where teachers need help.

Table 23: Preschool Classroom Assessment Scores Fall 2005* by Provider	
Agency Names	**Classroom Checklist Score**
Seed of Life, LLC	78%
Community Day School Association, Sanislo	80%
Jose Marti (classroom 1)	73%
Jose Marti (classroom 2)	70%
Jose Marti (classroom 3)	75%
Tiny Tots (Excelling Eagles)	52%
Tiny Tots (Gentle Dragons)	50%
Tiny Tots (Main)	43%
Refugee Women's Alliance	61%
Tiny Tots (Bright Bellbirds)	65%
Tiny Tots (Main- PM)	50%
ReWA-ECEAP	90%
Praxis (La Escuelita)	68%

As of 12/31/2005

Kindergarten Transition

Out of 134 ELN preschool four-year-olds, 131 have enrolled in kindergarten for the 2006-07 school year.

Recommended Course Corrections for 2006-07

1. *Administer the Speed DIAL instead of the DIAL-3 for the kindergarten readiness assessment.*

   Last year the City and School District jointly selected the DIAL-3 as an appropriate kindergarten readiness assessment; however, SPS teachers did not administer the assessment for several reasons: teachers were provided training and assessment materials late, the assessment required more time than teachers had anticipated, and SPS decided it would not administer the assessment without extra Levy funds to pay for substitutes (no extra Levy funds had been budgeted). The Speed DIAL requires less time to administer and SPS has indicated this assessment would be preferable to kindergarten teachers. However,

---

[15] CDSA (Maple), CDSA (Highland Park) and ReWA (Bethany) will be assessed in spring 2006.

SPS has not committed to using the assessment, either to develop a baseline or on an ongoing basis. The City will hire external, trained testers to conduct the Speed DIAL in summer 2006 and each year thereafter to ensure that all Step Ahead children are assessed.

2. *Slow down the ramp-up of Step Ahead preschools by adding 108 new slots in the 2006-07 school year, for a total of 388 slots.*

   The original ramp-up schedule would have added 140 new slots for a total of 420. The "excess" slots would be added during expansion in future years, giving the City more time to leverage gains made in the first year. The City learned that helping new providers establish Step Ahead classrooms, recruit, and enroll children was far more intensive and time-consuming than anticipated. Further, the uncertainty of school closures impedes the City's ability to plan with SPS for future school-based Step Ahead sites.

3. *The City Human Services Department will implement an intensive marketing and recruitment campaign to boost enrollment.*

   The recruitment and enrollment effort will begin much earlier than recruitment efforts occurred this year and will include specific enrollment targets to be met prior to any preschool opening, in order for Step Ahead preschools to ensure full enrollment in the 2006-07 school year. The City recommends a target of full enrollment 30 days prior to the first day of school for new preschool classrooms and a target of full enrollment 60 days prior to the first day of school for continuing preschool classrooms.

4. *Contract with the Public Health Department to provide on-site health consultation services to ensure preschool children have dental, vision, hearing and developmental screenings, are connected to a medical home, and have required immunizations.*

   Health services were not included in original assumptions about preschool services, but the City believes it is necessary to add this service in order to fully prepare children for kindergarten. After the 2006-07 school year, HSD will use an RFI to seek proposals to provide required health services for Step Ahead preschools.

5. *The City will review the Early Learning Network budget to analyze whether the current preschool per-child reimbursement paid directly to providers is adequate to ensure kindergarten readiness and is comparable to other high-quality preschool investment levels.*

   In the current school year, the average unit cost for new Step Ahead slots is $5,104 per child. In 2006-07, the investment is projected to increase to $5,304 per child. In addition to contracted per-child dollars, providers will receive funds for equipping new classrooms, child care subsidies for full-time children, annual fees for CC.Net (the preschool data tracking system), marketing and recruitment materials and other services, bringing the total direct benefit for each Step Ahead-funded child to $7,438. Providers also receive a value of $2,134 for each additional child served via other funding sources (such as ECEAP) for professional development, classroom materials, data tracking and marketing.

6. *HSD will contract with Child Care Resources to add even more intensive training on the curricula (Creative Curriculum and High/Scope) for Step Ahead teachers and coaches.*

The purpose of this training is to ensure fidelity to the curriculum, high-performing classrooms, and kindergarten readiness outcomes for children. The Professional Development Systems Plan will be completed in January 2007.

2006-07 Targets

The table below shows the City's recommended targets for the 2006-07 school year in the far right column. These targets are compared to the 2005-06 targets and actuals.

Table 24: Early Learning Recommended Targets			
	2005–06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
	Target	**Actual**	**New Target**
Total number of Step Ahead children enrolled	280	193[16]	**388**
Children entering kindergarten that were served by ELN Pre-K programs as four-year-olds (assumes 15% attrition during the pre-K year)	238	131 registered	**330**
Four-year-olds in ELN pre-K whose teachers participate in training	280	134	**330**
Number and percent of ELN pre-K four-year-olds assessed as school ready by the DIAL-3 at the end of the school year	182 / 65%	Avail. Aug. '06	**248 / 75%**
Pre-K students served who meet the DRA standard in 2nd grade (assumes 24% attrition from K)	97 / 70%	Avail. 2008-09	**193 / 77%**
Number of two- and three-year-olds in ELN child care whose teachers participate in training	131	81	**206**
Number of two- and three-year olds served through teacher training who progress one level on the child assessment at the end of the school year	84 / 64%	Avail. Aug. '06	**150 / 73%**
Two- and three-year-olds served through the Parent-Child Home Program	100	114	**200** (includes 100 continuing from '05-'06)
Number and percent of two- and three-year-olds served by the PCHP who meet developmental standards as measured by the PCHP evaluation at the end of the calendar year	N/A[17]	N/A	**64 / 64%**

[16] In addition to the 164 four-year-old children enrolled in Step Ahead, 34 younger children are enrolled early, who will be four years old by August 31, 2006 and will continue in Step Ahead in 2006-07.

[17] Children participate in the PCHP for two years; outcomes are measured at the end of the two years. Children who started PCHP in 2005-06 will complete the program in June 2007.

2006-07 Indicators

The City recommends continuing to track the same indicators for the Early Learning investments next year: developmental child assessments, classroom (teacher) assessments and the number of children who are enrolled in the Parent Child Home Visitor Program. In addition, through the preschool new recruitment and enrollment campaign, the number of students enrolled in preschool will be tracked and reported on much earlier in the year in order to take action as soon as enrollment challenges arise, if any.

Family Support and Family & Community Involvement

What the Investment Has Bought So Far

The Family Support investment has transitioned from its former focus on social services to a new, enhanced focus on academic achievement. In the 2005-06 school year, 40.9 full-time Family Support Workers (FSWs) worked in 28 schools full-time and in 21 additional schools part-time. As of February 2006, FSWs had identified 1,110 "focus families" in need of specific assistance with academic achievement, with whom FSWs work more intensively.

The Family & Community Involvement program, called Family & Community Partnerships (FCP) invested in 10 elementary schools in 2005-06. All schools have chosen their target group of students and families with whom to work, organized family involvement events and activities in the schools, and achieved the first indicator of ensuring target group attendance at parent-teacher conferences and family involvement events. It has become clear that program staff must invest up-front in solidifying working relationships between schools and CBOs and creating a framework for the work they do together to increase family involvement and academic achievement.

Targets/Actuals

The following tables show targets for the Family Support and FCP investments, compared to the baseline data and actual results so far this school year. Both programs have exceeded their targets for the number of students served. In addition, as the baseline data show, the Family Support program appears to be serving some students (46 percent all served) who have already met the academic target. Twenty-nine percent of students served by FCP met the academic targets last year. As was explained earlier in this report, baseline data were not available when the City set 2005-06 targets.

Table 25: Family Support Targets			
	2004-05 School Year	2005-06 School Year	
	Baseline[18]	Target	Actual*
Number of students served	N/A	2,000	3,288
Number and percent of students served who meet the 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade WASL standard in reading and math, or meet the 2nd grade DRA standard.	Total: 405 / 46% DRA: 301 / 66% WASL: 104 / 25%	160 / 8%	Avail. Sept. '06

* Actuals as of Feb. 2006

---

[18] Baseline data represent 2004-05 4th grade WASL and 2nd grade DRA scores for students who are currently served by FSWs. Baseline data are only available for these two grades. Beginning in the current 2005-06 school year, students will take the WASL in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade and continue to take the DRA in 2nd grade.

Table 26: Family & Community Involvement Targets			
	2004-05 School Year	**2005 – 2006 School Year**	
	Baseline[19]	**Target**	**Actual***
Number of students served	**N/A**	**150**	**293**
Number and percent of students served who meet the 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade WASL standard in reading and math, or meet the 2nd grade DRA standard.	**Total: 36 / 29%** DRA: 24 / 44% WASL: 12 / 17%	**16 / 11%**	Avail. Sept. '06

* Actuals as of Feb. 2006

Indicator Data

Family Support and Family & Community Involvement indicators include:

a) Number and percent of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade passing either the reading or math WASL (available in September 2006);

b) Number and percent of students in 1st and 2nd grade improving their DRA score;

c) Students improving attendance as measured by percentage of school days attended;

d) Improved student behavior as measured by reduced average number of disciplinary actions per student;

e) Increased number of families attending parent/teacher conferences, attending School Intervention Team (SIT) meetings, or receiving home visits; and,

f) Increased school retention rate (available in July and October 2006).

Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)

The tables below shows the difference in DRA scores from spring 2004 to fall 2005 for students who participate in the Family Support and FCP programs. Data represent scores for current 2nd grade students who took the DRA in the spring of 2004 as 1st graders and in the fall of 2005 as 2nd graders. Out of 414 students served this year by FSWs who took the DRA in both years, 23 (6 percent) improved to meet the standard in fall 2005.

Interestingly, the same percentage of students in the FCP program (6 percent, or 2 students) improved their DRA scores. It should be noted that since the fall DRA is administered in the fall, students had little exposure to the programs before taking the test this year.

---

[19] Baseline data represent 2004-05 4th grade WASL and 2nd grade DRA scores for students who are currently served by FCP. Baseline data are only available for these two grades. Beginning in the current 2005-06 school year, students will take the WASL in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade and continue to take the DRA in 2nd grade.

Table 27: Students Served by Family Support Workers, 2005-06 Number of Students Improving Developmental Reading Assessment Scores Spring 2004 to Fall 2005	
	Number of Students
FSW students not meeting DRA standard in either Spring '04 or Fall '05	206 / 50%
FSW students not meeting DRA standard Spring '04, but met standard in Fall '05	**23 / 6%**
FSW students meeting DRA standard Spring '04, but not in Fall '05	41 / 9%
FSW students meeting DRA standard in both Spring '04 and Fall '05	144 / 35%
Total number of students	414 / 100%

Indicator data as of Feb. 2006

Table 28: Students Served by Family & Community Involvement, 2005-06 Number of Students Improving Developmental Reading Assessment Scores Spring 2004 to Fall 2005	
	Number of Students
FCP students not meeting DRA standard in either Spring '05 or Fall '05	21 / 66%
FCP students not meeting DRA standard Spring '05, but met standard in Fall '05	**2 / 6%**
FCP students meeting DRA standard Spring '05, but not in Fall '05	5 / 16%
FCP students meeting DRA standard in both Spring '05 and Fall '05	4 / 13%
Total number of students	32 / 100%

Indicator data as of Feb. 2006

Attendance

The next tables show the average attendance rates, as measured by the percentage of days attended out of possible school days, for students participating in Family Support and FCP. The goal is for students participating in these programs to reduce their number of absent days by 20 percent. The first two tables compare students' average attendance rates in the 2004-05 school year to their average attendance rates in the first semester of the 2005-06 school year.

In the first table, data are shown for FSW students who have set increased attendance as a goal, all FSW students, and all K-5 students in the Seattle Public Schools. Out of 2,488 FSW students, 150 have a goal to improve attendance. For these students, attendance declined slightly from 87.5 year last year to 87.1 percent this year. FSW students with an attendance goal have lower overall attendance rates than other students, which suggests FSWs are assigning appropriate goals based on students' needs.

	2004-05 School Year		2005-06 First Semester	
Table 29: **Students Served by Family Support Workers, 2005-06** **Average Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester**				
	Number of Students	**Average Attendance Percentage**	**Number of Students**	**Average Attendance Percentage**
FSW Students with Attendance Goal	125	87.5%	150	87.1%
All FSW Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	2,488	93.5%	3,197	93.4%
All Students K–5th Grade With An Attendance Measure Recorded	22,732	94.6%	22,652	95.0%

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows average attendance from 2004-05 to 2005-06 for students served in the current year by FCP. Surprisingly, attendance rates for students in FCP were exactly the same in the first semester of this year as they were for the prior year. The City will continue to monitor this indicator to determine whether it provides helpful information to the Family Support and Family Involvement programs.

	2004-05 School Year		2005-06 First Semester	
Table 30: **Students Served by Family & Community Involvement, 2005-06** **Average Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester**				
	Number of Students	**Average Attendance Percentage**	**Number of Students**	**Average Attendance Percentage**
All FIP Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	250	93.9%	288	93.9%
All Students In Family Involvement Schools With An Attendance Measure Recorded	2,331	94.8%	3,099	94.8%

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the number of FSW students – with and without attendance goals – who increased, maintained or decreased their attendance rates from the 2004-05 school year to the first semester of 2005-06. Attendance rates improved for about half of FSW students with an attendance goal (63 students), and attendance rates declined for about half of FSW students with an attendance goal (60 students). Interestingly, attendance rates improved for a greater number of all FSW students (1,423) – who did not necessary set an attendance goal – than for all FSW students whose rates declined (1,009).

Table 31: Students Served by Family Support Workers, 2005-06 Number Improving Average Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	**No Change**	**Attendance Declined**
FSW Students with Attendance Goal	63	1	60
All FSW Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	1,423	48	1,009

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The table below shows the number of FCP students who increased, maintained or decreased their attendance rates from the 2004-05 to the 2005-06 school year. Out of 250 students served by FCP for whom attendance records are available, attendance improved for 148 students (59 percent) from the prior year to the first semester of this year. Attendance declined for 99 students.

Table 32: Students Served by Family & Community Involvement, 2005-06 Number Improving Average Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	**No Change**	**Attendance Declined**
All Family Involvement Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	148	3	99

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Disciplinary Actions

The next tables show disciplinary actions for students served by FSWs and FCP. Data are shown only for students who had disciplinary actions recorded. Disciplinary rates are compared from the first semester of 2004-05 to the first semester of 2005-06. As the data show, students served by FSWs had greater numbers of disciplinary actions, on average, in the current year than last year.

Table 33: Students Served by Family Support Workers, 2005-06 Average Disciplinary Rates, 1st Semester 2004-05 vs. 1st Semester 2005-06				
	1st Semester 2004 – 05 SY		1st Semester 2005 – 06 SY	
	Number of Students	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student	Number of Students	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student
FSW Students with Discipline Goal Who Had a Disciplinary Action	5	1.00	14	1.43
All FSW Students Who Had a Disciplinary Action	44	1.30	66	1.36
All Students K – 5th Grade Who Had a Disciplinary Action	112	1.27	130	1.24

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the same comparison of disciplinary actions for students in the FCP program. Disciplinary rates were higher in the first semester of this year than in the first semester of last year, similar to students in the FSW program.

Table 34: Students Served by Family & Community Involvement, 2005-06 Average Disciplinary Rates, 1st Semester 2004-05 vs. 1st Semester 2005-06				
	1st Semester 2004–05 SY		1st Semester 2005–06 SY	
	Number of Students	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student	Number of Students	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student
All FIP Students Who Had a Disciplinary Action in 2004–05	6	1.00	3	1.33
All Students In Family Involvement Schools Grade Who Had a Disciplinary Action in 2004–05	23	1.52	38	1.37
All Students K–5th Grade Who Had a Disciplinary Action	112	1.27	130	1.24

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the number of students served by FSWs for whom the number of disciplinary actions decreased, stayed the same or increased from the first semester of 2004-05 to the first semester of 2005-06. Out of all FSW students with a discipline goal, three had no decreased disciplinary actions, two had no change and 12 increased the number of disciplinary actions.

Table 35: Students Served by Family Support Workers, 2005-06 Number of Students Reducing Disciplinary Actions: 1st Semester 2004–05 vs. 1st Semester 2005–06			
	Number of Students		
	Disciplinary Actions Decreased[20]	No Change[21]	Disciplinary Actions Increased[22]
FSW Students with Discipline Goal	3	2	12
All FSW Students with Disciplinary Actions	29	15	50

Family Involvement

The table below shows the types of family involvement activities supported by FSWs from September 2005 through February 2006. The highest number is for the family involvement activities category, which represents families attending school activities and other events.

Table 36: Families Served by Family Support Workers Family Involvement Activities, Sept. 2005 – Feb. 2006		
	Number of Families	Number of Activities 2005 – 06 SY
Family Involvement Activities	1063	1392
Home Visits	342	403
Families Attending Parent/Teacher Conference	199	199
Families Attending Student Intervention Team Meeting	65	65
Unduplicated Number of Families Participating and Total Number of Activities	1231	2059

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the number of families who have been involved in each type of family involvement supported by the FCP program, as well as the number of activities. Families in the FCP program have been involved so far solely through attending parent-teacher conferences. As the table shows, 223 families attended conferences this school year.

[20] "Disciplinary actions decreased" denotes FSW students who had a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2004-05 but not in the first semester of 2005-06.

[21] "No change" denotes FSW students who had a disciplinary action in both the first semester of 2004-05 and in the first semester of 2005-06.

[22] "Disciplinary actions increased" denotes FSW students who did not have a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2004-05 but did have a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2005-06.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">**Table 37:**
Family & Community Involvement
Increased Family Involvement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>**Number of Families**</td><td>**Number of Activities 2005 – 06 SY**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Family Involvement Activities</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Home Visits</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Families Attending Parent/Teacher Conference</td><td>223</td><td>223</td></tr>
<tr><td>Families Attending Student Intervention Team Meeting</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Unduplicated Number of Families Participating and Total Number of Activities</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Progress on FSW Plan Goals

The FSW program keeps track of the amount of amount of progress students make on their FSW plans. FSWs work with students and their families to set goals in the areas shown in the table below, such as attendance, class preparation or reduced suspension. Students are expected to make significant or full progress by the end of the school year. Out of 1,110 students in the FSW program, 10 have made full progress and 17 have made significant progress.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7">**Table 38:**
Student Progress on FSW Plan Goals, 2005 – 2006</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="6">**Number of Students**</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Goal**</td><td>**No Report to Date**</td><td>**Little Progress**</td><td>**Some Progress**</td><td>**Significant Progress**</td><td>**Full Progress**</td><td>**Total**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Attendance</td><td>112</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td>118</td></tr>
<tr><td>Class Preparation</td><td>290</td><td>1</td><td>10</td><td>3</td><td>5</td><td>309</td></tr>
<tr><td>Homework</td><td>403</td><td>4</td><td>13</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>425</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mobility</td><td>45</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>50</td></tr>
<tr><td>Parent Involvement</td><td>139</td><td>0</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>147</td></tr>
<tr><td>Suspension</td><td>49</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>2</td><td>0</td><td>61</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Total**</td><td>**1038**</td><td>**8**</td><td>**37**</td><td>**17**</td><td>**10**</td><td>**1110**</td></tr>
</table>

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Recommended Program Changes

Family Support Recommendations

The recommendation is to continue to implement the major program shift in the FSW program from social services to academic achievement. The 2005-06 school year has been a transition for FSWs to begin learning best practices for working with focus families and meeting the new academic outcomes. The program will build continuity and train FSWs in order to fully establish the increased and changed data collection requirements, and to deal with challenges of moving beyond providing services to all children and their families who are in need of services, to a focus family priority centered on academic achievement. The FSW program will work together with the FCP program to develop a collaborative and comprehensive service delivery model to be used in ten schools identified by FCP.

Family & Community Involvement Recommendations

1. *It is recommended that the FCP be implemented over the course of three school years at elementary school sites, potentially with same CBO partners. Continue FEL funding of $10,000 to 10 elementary schools that are committed to changing their internal systems to involve families and improve academic achievement.*

   The City and School District have learned it takes time to create systemic school change and to develop collaborative relationships. In addition, a longer implementation period will allow the Levy to collect longitudinal data on FCP outcomes. Rather than issuing an RFI for the 2006-07 and 2007-08 school years, it is recommended that the program offer each current participating school a continued annual $10,000 allocation that will include an earmarked sum to hire a Family Partnerships Coordinator and a budget to implement family involvement activities centered on student learning.

   Schools currently participating in this program would be notified of changes and given an opportunity to continue or opt out of the program in spring 2006. Replacement schools would be found for available grants.

   Participating schools would be required to:

   - Establish a multi-disciplinary team.

     The FCP model requires an established, high-functioning multi-disciplinary school team that includes the principal, teachers, nurse, counselor, FCP Coordinator, FSW, after-school program representative and other pertinent school staff. This team examines data and identifies and assesses students and families to focus on. The group triages responsibilities in order to provide appropriate services to students and families based on individual needs. The team would connect families with partner CBO services.

- Create family involvement plans for the identified target group of students and families.

  Each school's multidisciplinary team will create a family involvement plan for the target group of students and families they jointly select. The plan may delineate family involvement group activities or individualized, culturally relevant strategies. The plan will complement the FSW student service plan, include partner CBO services and be centered on student achievement.

- Create family-community-school partnerships.

  Families will be partners in the implementation of family involvement plans and share in the vision and responsibility of the outcomes. We envision the Family Partnership Coordinator, CBO representatives, and FSWs working in partnership to coordinate this piece.

- Focus on student learning at home.

  FCP schools and partner CBOs will focus on family literacy and parent information/education and training to support learning at home. Programs will be culturally competent and tailored to the target families.

2. *Make CBO grant decisions in summer 2006, pending the achievement of current contract outcomes and evaluation of their work.*

   It is recommended the Levy continue to fund five CBOs in the 2006-07 school year.

Recommended 2006-07 Targets

Family Support

Increase the target to 200 students (10 percent) achieving academically, as measured by meeting WASL standards in reading, writing and math or passing the 2nd grade DRA. Different from the first year, the 2,000 families served by FSWs will be students who have not yet met the WASL or DRA standards; the target will be purely value-added.

Table 39: Family Support 2006-07 Recommended Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	2005 – 2006 School Year		2006-07 School Year
	Baseline	Target	Actual*	New Target
Number of students served	N/A	2,000	3,288	**2,000** (who have not met standards)
Number and percent of students served who meet the 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade WASL standard, or meet the 2nd grade DRA standard.	Total: 405 / 46% DRA: 301 / 66% WASL: 104 / 25%	160 / 8%	Avail. Sept. '06	**200 / 10%**

* Actuals as of Feb. 2006

Family Involvement

Increase the academic achievement target from 16 students meeting standards this school year to 50 students meeting standards for the 2006-07 school year. The 50 students will not have previously met the WASL or DRA standards. The number served would also increase. Schools and CBOs will work together to identify students who are struggling academically. Of the 50 students in the Family Involvement target, CBOs will be responsible for helping at least 20 of those students achieve academically.

	2004-05 School Year	2005–06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
Table 40: **Family & Community Involvement 2006-07 Recommended Targets**				
	Baseline	**Target**	**Actual***	**New Target**
Number of students served	N/A	150	293	**400**
Number and percent of students served who meet the 3rd, 4th, or 5th grade WASL standard, or meet the 2nd grade DRA standard.	Total: 36 / 29% DRA: 24 / 44% WASL: 12 / 17%	16 / 11%	Avail. Sept. '06	**50 / 13%**

* Actuals as of Feb. 2006

Recommended Indicators for 2006-07

The Family Support and Family Involvement programs will continue to use the indicators listed above. In addition, the FCP program will propose a new set of indicators to add, based on the Epstein[23] family involvement research model. The program will specify how they will collect the indicator data.

---

[23] Dr. Joyce Epstein is a nationally-recognized researcher from Johns Hopkins University, Maryland.

Elementary School Out-of-School Time

What the Investment Has Bought So Far

This year, Elementary School Community Learning Centers (CLCs) have implemented a program that is more focused on serving students who are academically at-risk and that aligns after-school activities with the material students are learning in the classroom. Students are participating in CLCs at least two times per week. The City and School District are implementing elementary school Out-of-School Time investments in a coordinated manner with other Levy services, such as preschool, Family Support Workers and Family Involvement.

Targets/Actuals

The table below shows the academic target that was set for the 2005-06 school year for Elementary CLCs: 14 students, or seven percent of those served, would meet the WASL standard (or DRA standard for 2nd grade students). Baseline data were not available at the time the target was set; however, those data show 38 percent of students served this year by Elementary CLCs already met the academic target. The program is very close to meeting its enrollment target of 200 students.

Table 41: Elementary School CLC Targets			
	2004-05 School Year	2005 – 2006 School Year	
	Baseline[24]	Target	Actual*
Elementary students served at four CLC sites	N/A	200	195
Number and percent of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students served who meet the WASL standard in reading and math for their grade level, or 2nd grade students who meet the DRA standard	Total: 36 / 38% 2nd Gr. DRA: 24 / 51% 4th Gr. WASL: 12 / 26%	14 / 7%	Avail. Sept. '06

* Actuals as of Jan. 2006

Indicator Data

Indicators for Elementary CLCs include:

a) Number and percent of students improving their reading or math WASL performance (available in September 2006);

b) Number and percent of students meeting either the reading or math WASL standard (available in September 2006);

---

[24] Baseline data represent 2004-05 4th grade WASL and 2nd grade DRA scores for students who currently participate in Elementary School CLCs. Baseline data are only available for these two grades. Beginning in the current 2005-06 school year, students will take the WASL in 3rd, 4th and 5th grade and continue to take the DRA in 2nd grade.

c) Number and percent of students improving their DRA scores;

d) Number and percent of students progressing on time to next grade level (available November 2006);

e) Number and percent of students improving attendance; and

f) Families participating in CLC events and classes (available January 2007).

Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)

The number of students participating in Elementary CLCs who took the DRA in both spring of 2005 and fall of 2006 was very low; this report does not include data on this indicator.

Attendance

The table below compares attendance rates from the 2004-05 school year to the first semester of 2005-06 for students participating in Elementary CLCs and for all students in schools with Elementary CLCs. Attendance rates appear to have improved this year from last year; however, one should interpret this table with caution since the 2005-06 data are only reflective of one semester. Attendance rates are higher for students participating in the CLC programs than for all other students in their schools.

	2004-05 School Year		2005-06 First Semester	
Table 42: **Students Participating in Elementary Community Learning Centers, 2005-06** **Average Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester**				
	Number of Students	**Average Attendance Percentage**	**Number of Students**	**Average Attendance Percentage**
All Students in Elementary CLC Programs	183	94.94%	201	95.7%
All Students in Schools with Elementary CLC Programs	1,419	93.48%	1,374	94.06%
All Students K–5th Grade With An Attendance Measure Recorded	22,732	94.6%	22,652	95.0%

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Recommended Program Changes

1. *Invest in only three CLCs (a reduction from the current four) starting in fall 2006. The City would issue an RFI for the 2007-08 school year.*

   The Levy Elementary School CLC budget would be divided among three sites in order to increase the resources necessary to run a quality CLC program and to bring Elementary CLC investment levels to comparable levels of Middle School CLCs. All three Elementary CLCs would have minimum staffing of 1.0 FTE at each CLC.

   Although the vision of coordinated services to support student academic achievement is similar between Elementary and Middle School CLCs, the available resources are much lower for Elementary CLCs. The current Elementary CLC annual budget per site, $76,736, pays for a .75 FTE coordinator per CLC, regardless of the number of students

served. The coordinator directly supervises children during program hours, which limits organizational/planning time. The existing available compensation, part-time hours and limited benefits hinder the agencies' ability to attract and retain staff with the expertise needed to manage a quality CLC. As a result, program quality varies across CLCs.

2. *Better coordinate multiple Levy investments in elementary schools.*

   Continue to build a team approach to serving students among CLC staff, school principals, teachers, Family Support Workers and the Family Involvement program to identify students struggling academically, share student assessment data, determine student learning needs and support the academic success of individual students.

3. *Contract with School's Out Washington to provide professional development workshops for CLC staff and instructors focused on after-school reading, math and writing skills.*

   This is a strategy to improve student performance on the WASL.

4. *Implement contracts with organizations serving specific ethnic and cultural communities for CLC activities.*

   This is a strategy to ensure elementary and middle school CLCs offer high-quality activities that reflect the cultures and languages of children participating in programs.

Recommended 2006-07 Targets

a) Increase number of students served per site from 50 to 70 students per site, for a total of 210 students across three sites.

b) Increase the academic achievement target to 30 students (14%) passing all three sections of the WASL or meeting the 2nd grade DRA standard.[25] None of the 30 students in the target will have met standards previously. The City recommends contracting for WASL achievement as bonus payment based on a range of students meeting the WASL target (with a higher bonus payment for greater numbers of students meeting the target, and the maximum bonus being awarded for meeting the target of seven per site).

c) Increase the target for student CLC participation from 30% of students served to 50% of students served participating two times per week for three months.

The table below shows the 2004-05 targets and actuals compared to the recommended 2006-07 targets. The new target represents an increase from 7 percent to 10 percent of students achieving academically.

---

[25] It is assumed no more than 10% of all Elementary School CLC participants will be in 2nd grade; at least 90% of the target will comprise WASL scores.

Table 43: Elementary School Community Learning Centers Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	**2005–06 School Year**		**2006-07 School Year**
	Baseline	**Target**	**Actual***	**New Target**[26]
Elementary students served at four CLC sites	N/A	200	195	**210**
Number and percent of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students served who meet the WASL standard and 2nd grade students who meet the DRA standard	Total: 36 / 38% 2nd Gr. DRA: 24 / 51% 4th Gr. WASL: 12 / 26%	14 / 7%	Avail. Sept. '06	**30 / 14%**

* Actuals as of Jan. 2006

---

[26] It is assumed no more than 10% of all Elementary School CLC participants will be in 2nd grade; at least 90% of the target will comprise WASL scores.

Middle School Programs

What the Investment Has Bought So Far

Middle School Support Programs (MSSP)

Middle School Support schools have focused on identifying students who are at high risk of failing academically, determining their specific academic needs, and targeting school and community resources to those needs. MSSP and school staff monitor student progress more frequently in order to track whether students are progressing and the effect of student interventions on academic performance. Examples of investments in Innovation and Linkage schools include: a Saturday Math class; WASL "camps"; WASL parent information nights; Student Success Coordinators who work with key players in the school and community to organize support systems and programming for target students; before-, during- and after-school tutors; mental health services; a study skills advisory; second math and reading classes; and family outreach.

In the coming year, schools will have specific outcome data from student interventions by mid-year. Since this program started up later than expected this year, target students were identified in late fall (as opposed to early fall) and student learning plans were not written until mid-year. Some interventions were not implemented until second semester. This was also the first time schools operated under a performance-based system, so a great deal of learning and planning has been necessary to fully implement the student intervention, monitoring and tracking system.

Middle School CLCs

The Middle School CLC investment has resulted so far in greater numbers of students participating in CLCs more often (at least two times per week), writing Student Learning Plans (SLPs) in coordination with the Middle School Support Program, and completing school assignments. In addition, like the elementary school CLCs, activities are more aligned with the material students are learning in the classroom.

Other highlights for the 2005-06 school year include:

- The YMCA, Seattle Public Schools and the Schools Out Washington Association established the first-ever professional development system for Seattle middle school out-of-school time instructors.

- Out-of-School Time providers and Seattle teachers created an after-school curriculum outlining how recreation activities can be integrated with the state Essential Academic Learning Requirements.

- CLC staff partnered with the Associated Recreation Council to secure a Recreation Technology grant funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. This grant will install state-of-the-art computer labs in seven Parks Community Centers located in southeast and southwest Seattle. The labs will assist students in math, reading, writing and science. Additionally, the labs will provide training and access to parents in the Seattle Public Schools' on-line student data information system, The Source.

- The City and School District continued to collaborate to design programming, staff training and evaluation. Staff from both City-funded and District-funded CLCs are working closely together.

Targets/Actuals

The charts below show the academic targets set for MSSP and Middle School CLCs compared to the baseline data and actuals available so far.

There are 61 students in MSSP who passed both the reading and math WASL. These students should not have been selected as target students since MSSP focuses on working only with students who did not pass one or more sections of the WASL. Next year, MSSP will communicate more clearly to schools who the target population is and will screen school lists at the beginning of the year to ensure schools have targeted the correct group of students. Since the Levy database can only access data for students from the 2004-05 school year and subsequent years, it is unknown whether current-year target students in 6th and 7th grade were mis-identified as well. MSSP is serving many more students (1,641) than expected (1,200).

Table 44: Middle School Support Program Targets			
	2004-05 School Year	2005–06 School Year	
	Baseline[27]	Target	Actual*
Middle school students participating in Middle School Support	N/A	1,200	1,641
Number and percent of students served who meet the WASL standard in reading and math	61/16%	84 /7%	Avail. Sept. '06

* Actuals as of Feb. 2006

The baseline for academic achievement (18 percent) is also higher than the target (seven percent) for Middle School CLCs.

---

[27] Baseline data represent 2004-05 7th grade reading and math WASL scores for students who currently participate in Middle School Support. Baseline data are only available for students who are currently in 8th grade. In the current MSSP target group of 1,641 students, 218 are in 8th grade. Beginning in the current 2005-06 school year, students will take the WASL in 6th, 7th and 8th grades.

Table 45: Middle School Community Learning Centers Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	**2005-06 School Year**		
			Actual*	
	Baseline[28]	**Target**	**Total**	**In MSSP**
Number of students served	N/A	800 (in both CLCs & MSSP)	3,957 (in CLCs)	745 (in both CLCs & MSSP)
Number and percent of students served who meet the WASL standard in reading and math for their grade level	32 / 18%	28 / 7%	Avail. Sept. '06	Avail. Sept. '06

* Data as of Feb. 2006

Indicator Data

Indicators tracked for middle school programs include:

a) Number of students with MSSP individual learning plans participating in CLCs;

b) Number of MSSP students who participated in CLC programs twice a week or more;

c) Number of MSSP students who participated in CLC programs twice a week or more who achieved their learning goals (data tracking system will be established in 2006-07 to report this indicator);

d) Increased number of families attending after-school activities;

e) Number and percent of students improving their attendance;

f) Number and percent of students improving their Grade Point Average;

g) Student behavior as measured by the average number of disciplinary actions per student;

h) Number of students with improved attitudes about school and their personal ability to succeed, as measured by the Search Institute Asset Development Survey (available in May 2006);

i) Number and percent of students improving their reading or math WASL performance (available Sept. 2006); and

j) Number and percent of students meeting either the reading or math WASL standard (available Sept. 2006).

In addition, MSSP uses the following indicators although data are not yet available: DRA scores; Gates McGinite (reading, vocabulary and comprehension); EduSoft Math; and classroom-based assessments.

---

[28] Baseline data represent 2004-05 7th grade WASL scores for students who currently participate in both Middle School Support and Middle School CLCs.

CLC Participation

In order for CLCs to impact academic achievement, students must attend frequently, defined by the Levy as at least two times per week. The next two tables show the number of MSSP students who have participated in CLCs and the frequency of their participation through January 2006. The first table shows participation for the three CLCs administered by the Parks Department and the second table shows participation for the five CLCs administered by the YMCA. While the YMCA CLCs served a greater number of students than did the Parks CLCs overall, the number of students participating two times per week or more is comparable between the two providers (138 and 105, respectively).

Table 46: Parks CLC Participation for MSSP Students, 2005-06		
	Number of Students	Average CLC Days Attended per Student October 2005 through January 2006
All Students Participating in Both Parks CLC and MSSP	247	11 days
Number of MSSP students who participated in CLC programs 2 times per week or more	105	39 days

Table 47: YMCA CLC Participation for MSSP Students, 2005-06		
	Number of Students	Average CLC Days Attended per Student October 2005 through January 2006
All Students Participating in Both YMCA CLC and MSSP	498	15 days
Number of MSSP students who participated in CLC programs 2 times per week or more	138	35 days

Family Participation in CLCs

CLCs place a high priority on increasing family involvement, and track how many families are involved in CLC activities. From October 2005 through February 2006, 1,355 families participated in events at CLCs. The City will continue to track this indicator to determine the impact on academic outcomes.

Table 48: Family Participation in CLCs, Oct. 2005–Feb. 2006	
Number of Families	1,355

Attendance

The next table shows attendance rates for students participating in MSSP and all middle school students. The data compare attendance from the 2004-05 school year to attendance from the first semester of the 2005-06 school year. Attendance rates for MSSP students declined by approximately two-and-one-half percent, while attendance rates for all middle school students declined slightly.

Table 49: Students Participating in Middle School Support in 2005-06 Student Attendance: 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester				
	2004-05 SY		2005-06 First Semester	
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage
Students in MSSP	1,566	94.9%	1632	92.5%
All Students in 6th-8th Grades	9,251	94.4%	10,092	94.1%

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the number of current MSSP students whose attendance improved, did not change or declined from the 2004-05 school year to the first semester of 2005-06. Out of 1,559 students who had attendance records, 745 improved their attendance, 43 did not change the percentage of days they attended, and 771 decreased their attendance from the prior year. Therefore, the greatest percentage of students' attendance decreased.

Table 50: Students Participating in Middle School Support, 2005-06 Number Improving Average Attendance Percentage 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All Students Who Are in MSSP With Attendance Measure Recorded	745	43	771

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The following four tables show attendance data for students who participate this year in both Middle School CLCs and MSSP. The first two tables compare attendance from the 2004-05 school year to the 2005-06 school year for students who currently participate in both programs. The first table shows data for the three CLCs operated by the Parks Department, and the second table shows data for the five CLCs operated by the YMCA. For both the Parks and YMCA CLCs, attendance is slightly lower than attendance for all middle school students in both years. Attendance for all students appears to be slightly lower in 2005-06 than in the prior year.

Table 51: Students Participating in Middle School Community Learning Centers (Parks) & MSSP, 2005-06 Student Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester				
	2004-05 School Year		**2005-06 First Semester**	
	Number of Students	**Average Attendance Percentage**	**Number of Students**	**Average Attendance Percentage**
Students in Parks CLC and MSSP Programs	236	93.7%	247	92.5%
All Students in Schools with Parks CLC Programs	2023	93.9%	2179	93.2%

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Table 52: Students Participating in Middle School Community Learning Centers (YMCA) & MSSP, 2005-06 Student Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester				
	2004-05 School Year		**2005-06 First Semester**	
	Number of Students	**Average Attendance Percentage**	**Number of Students**	**Average Attendance Percentage**
Students in YMCA CLC and MSSP Programs	479	93.4%	498	92.6%
All Students in Schools with YMCA CLC Programs	3563	94.4%	3839	93.8%

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next two tables show the number of students who participate in both Middle School CLCs and MSSP whose attendance increased, remained the same or decreased from 2004-05 to the first semester of 2005-06. The first table shows data for students participating in Parks CLCs and MSSP, and the second table shows data for students participating in YMCA CLCs and MSSP. Out of 236 students who had attendance records in Parks CLCs, 110 improved their attendance, 10 had no change and 116 decreased their attendance. The second table shows that out of 479 students who had attendance records in YMCA CLCs, 221 improved their attendance, 4 had no change and 254 decreased their attendance.

Table 53: Students Participating in Community Learning Centers (Parks) & MSSP, 2005-06 Number Improving Average Attendance Percentage 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	**No Change**	**Attendance Declined**
All Parks CLC Students Who Are Also in MSSP With Attendance Measure Recorded	110	10	116

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Table 54:
Students Participating in Community Learning Centers (YMCA) & MSSP, 2005-06
Number Improving Average Attendance Percentage 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester

	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	**No Change**	**Attendance Declined**
All YMCA CLC Students Who Are Also in MSSP With Attendance Measure Recorded	221	4	254

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Grade Point Average (GPA)

Another indicator of student academic achievement is GPA. The following tables show students' cumulative middle school GPAs compared to their GPAs for the first semester of the 2005-06 school year. Data are for students who participate in both Middle School CLCs and MSSP. The first table shows data for Parks CLCs and the second table shows data for YMCA CLCs. It is interesting to note that students' first-semester GPAs are lower than their cumulative GPAs for students in the Parks' CLCs, and the opposite is true for students in the YMCA CLCs. The City will continue to monitor GPAs and seek to understand how the reasons for the difference in GPA trends and how they may relate to academic outcomes.

Table 55:
Students Participating in Parks Middle School CLCs and Middle School Support Programs, 2005-06
Grade Point Average

	Cumulative Middle School GPA Through 2004-05 SY	First Semester GPA 2005–06
Asian	2.98	2.75
African American	2.44	2.30
Hispanic	2.54	2.29
Native American	2.42	2.42
White	2.67	2.53
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.72	2.61
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.50	2.29
Not LEP	2.51	2.38
Equal English Proficiency	2.93	2.73
Limited English Proficiency	2.67	2.24
All Parks CLC/MSSP Students	2.63	2.48

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Table 56: Students Participating in YMCA Middle School CLC and Middle School Support Programs, 2005-06 Grade Point Average		
	Cumulative Middle School GPA Through 2004-05 SY	**First Semester GPA 2005–06**
Asian	2.95	3.01
African American	2.24	2.34
Hispanic	2.39	2.49
Native American	1.90	1.73
White	2.54	2.65
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.64	2.73
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.39	2.47
Not LEP	2.36	2.44
Equal English Proficiency	2.87	2.97
Limited English Proficiency	2.50	2.63
All Ymca CLC/MSSP Students	2.49	2.58
All Students 6th – 8th Grade	3.06	2.99

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next chart shows GPAs for students who are served only by MSSP. Like the previous tables, student GPAs in the first semester of 2006-07 appear to be lower than their cumulative GPAs. It is possible Levy program staff have selected students who are struggling academically and who are experiencing lower grades than usual.

Table 57: Students Participating in Middle School Support Program, 2005-06 Grade Point Average		
	Cumulative Middle School GPA Through 2004-05 SY	**First Semester GPA 2005–06**
Asian	2.89	2.81
African American	2.27	2.28
Hispanic	2.50	2.41
Native American	2.07	1.93
White	2.62	2.50
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.69	2.64
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.44	2.39
Not LEP	2.42	2.39
Equal English Proficiency	2.82	2.74
Limited English Proficiency	2.60	2.49
All MSSP Students	2.52	2.47
All Students 6th – 8th Grade	3.06	2.99

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Disciplinary Actions

In order to understand the impacts of Levy programs on student behavior, the City tracks discipline rates for students participating in Levy programs. The next table shows the average number of disciplinary actions per student for the first semester of 2004-05 and the first semester of 2005-06. Data is shown for MSSP students and all middle school students. Seattle Public Schools defines a disciplinary action as a suspension or expulsion. Disciplinary rates were higher for MSSP students in the first semester of 2005-06 and lower for all middle school students. However, discipline rates in 2004-05 were higher for all students than they were for MSSP students. Rates for all students decreased more in 2005-06 than rates for MSSP students.

Table 58: Students Participating in Middle School Support, 2005-06 Average Number of Disciplinary Actions per Student, 2004-05 vs. 2005-06				
	1st Semester 2004 – 05		1st Semester 2005 – 06	
	Number of Students	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student	Number of Students	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student
All MSSP Students Who Had a Disciplinary Action in 2004–05	162	1.41	169	1.47
All Middle School Students Who Had a Disciplinary Action	502	1.48	604	1.37

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the number of students participating in MSSP whose discipline rates decreased, stayed the same or increased from the first semester of 2004-05 to the first semester of 2005-06. Disciplinary actions appear to have decreased and increased for approximately the same number of students (102 and 109, respectively).

Table 59: Students Participating in Middle School Support, 2005-06 Number of Students Reducing Disciplinary Actions: 1st Semester 2004–05 vs. 1st Semester 2005–06			
	Number of Students		
	Disciplinary Actions Decreased[29]	**No Change**[30]	**Disciplinary Actions Increased**[31]
MSSP students	102	60	109

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Analysis of MSSP

This was the first year of growing a performance-based system in Seattle middle schools. Many critical structures and systems were not in place that are necessary to an effective performance-based system. While the City and School District have made much progress this year, the areas listed below posed challenges this year and need attention.

- This was the first year of identifying target students who were struggling academically and creating Student Learning Plans (SLPs) for each target student. Key challenges have included: agreeing on a common middle school SLP format; getting the District to place the SLPs online so they could be easily shared and updated; and developing structures for who will write the plans, how they will be shared with parents and students and how they will be monitored over time.

- In order to effectively monitor student progress, schools need access to reliable, easy-to-use assessments that are predictive of the desired outcome, passing the WASL. Teachers need access to and training in the use of those assessments. MSSP will continue to work on providing teachers with the necessary access and training in the next year.

- To make the most of MSSP Levy dollars, schools need to effectively coordinate existing school and community services and identify and develop services that are missing that

[29] "Disciplinary actions decreased" denotes MSSP students who had a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2004-05 but not in the first semester of 2005-06.

[30] "No change" denotes MSSP students who had a disciplinary action in both the first semester of 2004-05 and in the first semester of 2005-06.

[31] "Disciplinary actions increased" denotes MSSP students who did not have a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2004-05 but did have a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2005-06.

students need to succeed. It takes a high level of skill and coordination to break down the existing 'silos' and build teams that work together on behalf of students.

- Math is a significant challenge in Seattle Public Schools. It is necessary to build the instructional skill level of math teachers in order to see improvements in students' math scores.

- Since this was the first year of the new MSSP program, many of the practices and timelines need to now be institutionalized to make them a central part of school functions.

Recommended Program Changes

1. *Better link the CLC and MSSP programs, shifting the mindset among program staff about how the two work together.*

   These two strategies for student success are intricately linked, yet during 2005-06 operated as though they were different programs. Ideally, all staff would have a joint vision of a school program day running from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. The schools, MSSP, CLCs and other programs all would provide services to students (education, social-emotional, recreational-educational) during these hours. The programs would be well-coordinated and have the same goals of increased academic achievement for youth in the schools. This shift in mindset will enhance the relationships at the schools and increase the ability of all partners to offer seamless services and interventions for students and families.

2. *Coordinate school-based Levy leadership.*

   In the Innovation Schools, an Assistant Principal will manage the Levy programs, coordinate academic services, hold core team meetings, organize key players and monitor SLPs and overall student progress. CLC staff will participate in core team meetings. The team will also coordinate a comprehensive plan for multiple academic support interventions for students, including CLC programming and family involvement. This effort is possible due to collaboration with the Nesholm Foundation Kids in the Middle Project.

3. *Create a master Levy calendar.*

   In the spring of 2006, MSSP coordinators will work with the City, District, School and CLC leaders to develop a Levy calendar for the 2006-07 year. The calendar will include monthly Innovation Principal meetings, quarterly Linkage School meetings, SLP monitoring timelines, LOC site visits and walk-throughs the spring MSSP Showcase and planning retreat. The calendar will allow the MSSP and CLC staff to plan collaboratively in the best interests of students.

4. *Contract with School's Out Washington to provide professional development workshops for CLC staff and instructors focused on after-school reading, math and writing skills.*

   This is a strategy to improve student performance on the WASL.

5. *MSSP staff will work with Seattle Public Schools to improve the on-line system for building and maintaining Student Learning Plans and develop protocols for how and when SLPs are developed and monitored.*

6. *Continue to work with district leadership to adopt system-wide assessments that are predictive of WASL scores so schools can more effectively monitor student progress and make mid-course corrections.*

7. *Collaborate with the District Middle School Director to build math capacity at the school and district level.*

8. *Highlight and expand effective family outreach, especially strategies that build family awareness of and support for SLPs.*

9. *Pilot student-led parent-teacher conferences at one or more schools to model a strategy for increasing student ownership of their own learning.*

10. *The Parks Department will implement the Recreation Technology grant awarded from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.*

11. *Ten families of color will be identified and case managed at each Innovation Site. Student Success Teams provide and/or refer students to intensive services—educational, social-emotional, and recreational-educational. Schools, CLCs, and MSSP hope to learn which strategies really make a difference in academic achievement at the middle school level.*

12. *YMCA CLCs will use a mentoring model to encourage interaction between MSSP students and their key players.*

Recommended 2006-07 Targets

The tables on the next page show recommended targets for the 2006-07 school year. There are three different sets of targets: one joint target for students who participate in both MSSP and Middle School CLCs; one target for students who participate only in MSSP; and one target for students who participate only in Middle School CLCs. All three sets of targets represent additional students meeting academic standards. For MSSP, the City recommends specifically serving students who have not met all three WASL standards (reading, writing and math). In addition, a new target is recommended to reduce the percent of students who score Level 1 on the math WASL by 20 percent. The numeric target will be set at the beginning of the school year.

Table 60: Middle School Programs 2006-07 Recommended Targets (View 1)		
MSSP **1200 Students**		**CLC** **4000 Students**
MSSP Only 350 Students (have not met standards)	MSSP & CLC 850 Students (have not met standards)	CLC Only 3,150 Students 1,260 attend 2x/week
Targets: 53 / 15% pass WASL 20% move from Level 1 to Level 2 on math WASL	Targets: 128 / 15% pass WASL 20% move from Level 1 to Level 2 on math WASL	Target: 120 / 10% pass WASL
Total Middle School Target = 301 pass WASL		

Table 61: Middle School Programs Recommended Targets (View 2)				
	2004-05 School Year	2005–06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
	Baseline	Target	Actual	New Target
Students participating in MSSP	N/A	1,200	1,641	1,200 (who have not met WASL standards)
Students participating in MSSP who move from Level 1 to Level 2 on the math WASL		N/A	N/A	20%
Students participating in both MSSP and CLCs	N/A	800	745	850
Number and percent of students in both MSSP and CLCs who meet the WASL standard	32 / 18%	56 / 7%	Avail. Sept. '06	128 / 15%
Students in CLCs only	N/A	N/A	3,212	3,150
Students participating in CLCs 2x/week or more	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,260
Number and percent of students in CLCs only who meet the WASL standard	46%	N/A	Avail. Sept. '06	120 / 10%
Students in MSSP only	N/A	N/A	899	350 (who have not met WASL standards)
Number and percent of students in MSSP only who meet the WASL standard		N/A	Avail. Sept. '06	53 / 15%

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Recommended 2006-07 Indicators

Middle School programs will continue to track the same indicators; however, the MSSP will no longer use GPA as an indicator of academic achievement.

High-Risk Youth Case Management

What the Investment Has Bought So Far

The Seattle Team for Youth (STFY) case management program has received 611 youth referrals, conducted 433 intakes and assessments, completed 342 Individualized Service Plans, and provided case management to more than 300 youth who face the highest risk of dropping out of school or who have already dropped out.

STFY has built a stronger relationship with the school system, working directly with middle and high school staff. This working relationship has helped tremendously to increase the number of referrals from the schools. From September 2005 through January 2006, 66 percent of referrals sent to the Referral Coordinator were from Seattle Public Schools. The Implementation Plan originally aimed for 50 percent of referrals coming from the school system.

Targets/Actuals

The table below shows 2005-06 targets for STFY, compared to the actuals available so far and the 2004-05 baseline. STFY is close to meeting its referral target of 665 referrals, although only 447 of those referred students have School District identification numbers. The program has faced a challenge in obtaining student identification numbers for many students referred.

This year, STFY defined its target of staying in school or coming back to school with four combined targets: progressing to the next grade level; re-enrolling and staying in school for 90 days; re-enrolling and progressing to the next grade level; and obtaining a GED. This school year, so far, 41 students have re-enrolled and stayed in school for 90 days and one student has obtained a GED. The combined target for all four definitions is 365 by the end of the school year.

Table 62: Seattle Team for Youth 2005-06 Targets			
	2004-05 School Year	2005 – 2006 School Year	
	Baseline[32]	Target	Actual*
High-Risk Youth referred to the program.	N/A	665	611
High-Risk Youth referred to the program with SSD ID numbers.	N/A	665	447
High-Risk Youth who stay in school/come back to school.	N/A	365 / 55%	42
High-Risk Youth who progress to next grade level	N/A	--	0
High-Risk Youth who re-enroll and stay in school for 90 days	N/A	--	41
High-Risk Youth who re-enroll and progress to the next grade level	N/A	--	0
High-Risk Youth who obtain a GED	N/A	--	1
High-Risk Youth who pass the WASL[33]	3 / 1%	11 / 3%	Avail. July 2006

Actuals as of March 2006

Indicator Data

Indicators tracked by STFY include:

- Number and percent of students making progress on Individual Service Plans[34];

- Number and percent of students increasing school attendance;

- Number and percent of students reducing disciplinary referral rates;

- Number and percent of students meeting either the math or reading WASL (available June 2006);

- Number and percent of students improving their reading or math WASL performance; and (available June 2006),

- Number and percent of students completing a GED.

---

[32] Baseline data represent 2004-05 10th grade WASL scores for students who currently participate in STFY. Baseline data are only available for students who were in 10th grade in 2004-05. Beginning in the current 2005-06 school year, students have the option to take the 10th grade WASL in 9th grade, students must take the WASL in 10th grade, and students have the opportunity to re-take the test in 11th and 12th grade.

[33] The percentage of STFY students who meet WASL standards is calculated by dividing the number of students who meet 10th grade standards by the total number of students in high school. Approximately 62% of STFY students are in high school; 38% are in middle school, dropped out, in a GED program, left STFY before completing an intake and assessment, or have not yet completed an intake and assessment.

[34] The number and percent of students making progress on Individual Service Plans is not shown in this report due to challenges tracking and collecting this data. This indicator will be reported on in the future.

Attendance

STFY tracks attendance for the high-risk middle and high school students served, as low attendance is a strong predictor of dropping out. The table below shows the average attendance percentages for students participating in STFY, disaggregated by race and by school, as well as all attendance percentages for all middle and high school students. The table compares attendance rates from the full 2004-05 school year to the first semester of 2005-06. Overall, attendance rates for STFY students are lower than rates for all middle and high school students. In addition, the rates for STFY students are lower in the first semester of 2005-06 than for the full prior year. The disaggregated data show the largest gap between years is for white students, whose attendance decreased from 78.65 in 2004-05 to 62.61 in 2005-06. Attendance for high school STFY students appears to have decreased more than attendance for middle school students. The STFY attendance data suggest the program is carefully targeting students at precisely the time in which they need help. The City will continue to track attendance for STFY students in order to understand how it may correlate with academic outcomes.

Table 63: Students Participating in Seattle Team for Youth, 2005-06 Average Attendance				
	2004-05 School Year		**2005-06 First Semester**	
	Number of Students	**Average Attendance Percentage**	**Number of Students**	**Average Attendance Percentage**
STFY Students – Attendance Measure Recorded	**289**	**76.91%**	**291**	**71.54%**
Asian	68	75.22	63	73.02
African American	109	78.76	103	74.81
Hispanic	63	79.10	70	71.81
Native American	17	66.86	27	64.15
White	29	78.65	28	62.61
Aki Kurose	**	75.75	7	70.06
Denny	15	90.99	18	82.62
Madison	**	93.45	**	90.44
Meany	**	89.12	**	86.40
Mercer	19	87.96	19	85.31
All Other Middle Schools	15	84.06	15	78.31
Cleveland	22	70.12	25	68.13
Ed Service Center	33	65.61	13	79.30
Franklin	17	84.74	17	75.48
Garfield	44	84.57	44	72.41
Interagency	31	64.96	43	68.62
Marshall	10	70.60	10	64.69
Rainier Beach	13	83.71	14	73.77
South Lake	20	63.14	20	57.51
West Seattle	10	78.24	11	74.59
All Other High Schools	42	78.00	46	55.11
All Students 6th–12th Grade With An Attendance Measure Recorded	**25,319**	**89.67%**	**24,866**	**90.47%**

** Data are for fewer than 10 students.
Indicator Data as of Feb. '06

The next table shows the number of students in STFY this year who have increased, maintained or decreased their attendance rates since the 2004-05 school year. Out of 293 students who had attendance records, 113 increased their attendance and 180 decreased their attendance.

Table 64: Students Participating in Seattle Team for Youth, 2005-06 Number Improving Average Attendance Percentage 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	**No Change**	**Attendance Declined**
All STFY Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	113	0	180

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Disciplinary Action

The next table shows the number of STFY students with disciplinary actions and the average number of actions per student, as well as disciplinary data for all middle and high school students. Data are disaggregated by race. The table compares disciplinary actions from the first semester of 2004-05 to actions from the first semester of 2005-06. Disciplinary rates are lower in the 2005-06 first semester overall, for all groups except Latino students.

Table 65: Students Participating in Seattle Team for Youth, 2005-06 Disciplinary Actions per Student, 2004-05 vs. 2005-06				
	2004-05 First Semester		**2005-06 First Semester**	
	Number of Students	**Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student**	**Number of Students**	**Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student**
STFY Students Who Had A Disciplinary Action	72	1.58	61	1.41
Asian	15	1.73	12	1.17
African American	32	1.44	30	1.43
Hispanic	16	1.56	13	1.62
Native American	**	1.33	**	1.00
White	**	1.67	**	1.40
All Middle School Students Who Had A Disciplinary Action	502	1.48	604	1.37
All High School Students Who Had A Disciplinary Action	836	1.28	672	1.19

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the number of students in STFY whose disciplinary rates decreased, stayed the same or increased from the first semester of 2004-05 to the first semester of 2005-06. Out of 111 students, 50 decreased their rates.

	Table 66: Students Participating in Seattle Team for Youth, 2005-06 Number of Students Reducing Disciplinary Actions: 1st Semester 2004–05 vs. 1st Semester 2005–06		
	Number of Students		
	Disciplinary Actions Decreased[35]	**No Change**[36]	**Disciplinary Actions Increased**[37]
STFY students	50	22	39

Indicator Data as of Feb. 2006

Grade Point Average (GPA)

Another indicator of academic success and graduation is GPA. The next table shows GPAs for students in STFY, disaggregated by race, income status and English language ability, as well as GPAs for all students. The table compares cumulative GPAs through the first semester of the 2004-05 school year to average GPAs for the same students from the first semester of the 2005-06 school year. For all STFY students and all students, GPAs are lower in the first semester of 2005-06, however, GPAs for STFY students decreased more than did GPAs for all students. The largest decrease between years appears to be for Hispanic high school students in STFY – a decrease from an average 2.16 cumulative GPA to an average 1.76 first-semester GPA. There is also a very large decrease for Equal English Proficiency high school students in STFY, from 2.21 to 1.80 over the same time period.

---

[35] "Disciplinary actions decreased" denotes MSSP students who had a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2004-05 but not in the first semester of 2005-06.

[36] "No change" denotes MSSP students who had a disciplinary action in both the first semester of 2004-05 and in the first semester of 2005-06.

[37] "Disciplinary actions increased" denotes MSSP students who did not have a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2004-05 but did have a disciplinary action in the first semester of 2005-06.

	Cumulative GPA through First Semester 2004–05				Average GPA First Semester 2005-06			
	Middle School		High School		Middle School		High School	
	STFY	All Students	STFY	All Students	STFY	All Students	STFY	All Students
Asian	**2.80**	3.26	**2.38**	3.13	**2.53**	3.21	**2.17**	3.09
African American	**1.73**	2.53	**2.02**	2.55	**1.48**	2.46	**1.84**	2.51
Hispanic	**1.75**	2.76	**2.16**	2.79	**1.38**	2.67	**1.76**	2.76
Native American	**3.67**	2.61	**.97**	2.70	**2.83**	2.52	**.60**	2.67
White	**1.36**	3.30	**2.1**	3.15	**1.13**	3.26	**2.06**	3.15
Non Free/ Reduced Lunch	**1.98**	3.31	**2.11**	3.08	**1.66**	3.27	**1.92**	3.07
Free/Reduced Lunch	**1.96**	2.70	**2.12**	2.75	**1.66**	2.61	**1.86**	2.71
Not LEP	**1.64**	3.04	**2.08**	2.96	**1.39**	2.99	**1.86**	2.96
Equal English Proficiency	**2.81**	3.15	**2.21**	3.04	**2.75**	3.09	**1.80**	3.00
Limited English Proficiency	**1.99**	2.84	**2.18**	2.89	**1.48**	2.70	**2.06**	2.81
All Students	**1.97**	**3.03**	**2.12**	**2.97**	**1.66**	**2.98**	**1.87**	**2.95**

Table 67:
Students Participating in Seattle Team for Youth, 2005-06
Grade Point Average, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester

Recommended Program Changes for 2006-07

1. *Focus case managers on East African youth.*

   STFY has received 35 referrals for East African youth. Currently, STFY does not have a full-time African-speaking case manager. Having one or two East African case managers would allow STFY to continue its model of matching culturally appropriate case managers with youth.

2. *Partner with the Seattle Police Department (SPD) to leverage STFY's investment in dropout prevention and academic achievement.*

   The Compulsory School Attendance and Admission Law[38] requires all school-age children below the age of 18 to attend school; SPD will use this opportunity to bring youth back to school and educate them about the legal consequences of being truant.

3. *STFY service plans will not be considered complete until they are signed and include SPS student ID numbers.*

   ID numbers are required in order to track student-specific data. This will encourage agencies to provide clients' student ID Numbers.

---

[38] 28A.225 RCW

Recommended 2006-07 Targets

1. *Narrow the definition of meeting the target of staying in school or returning to school.*

   In 2006-07, this outcome will be defined solely by youth who progress to the next grade level. The other outcomes which are currently tracked will continue to be used as indicators, except for "re-enroll and progress to the next grade level," which program staff feel is very similar to other indicators. The recommended target is for 250 students to progress to the next grade level. STFY will continue to monitor and contract for the indicators of re-enrolling and staying in school for 90 days and obtaining a GED.

2. *Set a graduation target for STFY.*

   The recommended target is 45 percent of 12th grade STFY students graduating in the same school year. The numeric target is estimated to be 26 based on the current percentage of the STFY caseload in 12th grade.

3. *Modestly increase the target for passing the WASL from 11 to 16.*

   The Levy Implementation Plan stated STFY would set higher targets after baseline data from the program were established; since first-year data showing the impact of the program are not yet available, the target will be modestly increased at this time. The City expects to significantly increase the target in 2006-07.

Table 68: Seattle Team for Youth 2006-07 Recommended Targets				
	2004-05 School Year	2005–06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
High-Risk Youth Targets	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual**	**New Target**
High-Risk Youth referred to the program.	N/A	665	611	**665**
High-Risk Youth referred to the program with SSD ID numbers.	N/A	665	447	**632**[39]
High-Risk Youth who stay in school/come back to school.	N/A	365 / 55%	42	**250 / 38%**
High-Risk Youth who progress to next grade level	N/A	--	0	**250**
High-Risk Youth who re-enroll and stay in school for 90 days	N/A	--	41	**N/A**
High-Risk Youth who re-enroll and progress to the next grade level	N/A	--	0	**N/A**
High-Risk Youth who obtain a GED	N/A	--	1	**N/A**
High-Risk Youth who pass the WASL[40]	3 / 1%	11 / 3%	Avail. July 2006	**16 / 4%**
High-Risk 12th grade youth who graduate	N/A	N/A	Avail. July 2006	**26 / 45%**

Recommended 2006-07 Indicators

STFY will continue to track the indicators listed earlier in this report. The program will change the way it tracks progression to the next grade level in order to align with Seattle Public Schools policy. Prior to this academic year, students have progressed to the next grade level regardless of their credit standing. For example, in the past it was possible for juniors (3rd year students) to have only four credits, even though they needed at least 10 credits in order to qualify as a junior "officially." Beginning this academic year, students must earn an appropriate number of credits based on a set scale in order to progress to the next grade level. Therefore, as an example, at the end of the school year a junior will not be promoted to the senior (12th grade) level unless s/he has at least 15 credits. STFY will align its measurement of students' progression to the next grade level with this new School District credit policy and scale. Students will qualify as meeting an indicator if they progress to the next grade level based on their credits, regardless of how many years they have been in high school. Thus, a 3rd-year student who earns the credits necessary to be granted sophomore (2nd-year) standing will be recognized as achieving an indicator. The scale requires 5 credits for 10th grade, 10 credits for 11th grade and 15 credits for 12th grade.

---

[39] It is assumed 5 percent of the 665 youth who are referred to STFY will not be enrolled in school and pursue a GED; these youth will not have SSD ID numbers.

[40] The percentage of STFY students who meet WASL standards is calculated by dividing the number of students who meet 10th grade standards by the total number of students in high school. Approximately 62% of STFY students are in high school; 38% are in middle school, dropped out, in a GED program, left STFY before completing high an intake and assessment, or have not yet completed an intake and assessment.

Student Health

What the Investment Has Bought So Far

School-Based Health Centers (SBHCs) are on track to provide primary care to at least 5,000 adolescent students in the current school year. Most importantly, the health centers continue to provide these services to proportionally more African American, Latino, Limited English Proficient and low-income students than are in the overall student population. These tend to be the same student populations that are not achieving academically.

Organizations sponsoring SBHCs have developed formal agreements with each of the ten high school and four middle schools with SBHCs to jointly develop and implement strategic work plans to support students' success in school. SBHC sponsors, the City Human Services Department and Public Health Seattle-King County are working to develop their role in academic support, but implementing a more intensive level of service for students at risk of academic failure has been slower than expected. This is due to two issues: the coding system for identifying at-risk students has been difficult to implement effectively; and demands for student health care, particularly for mental health counselors, exceed staff capacity in SBHCs.

Health centers have been able to make the strongest contributions to academic achievement where educational leadership has already put in place school-level work plans, work teams, and other resources to help students pass the WASL. Implementation of health and academic interventions has been slowest in schools that are not yet well-organized to address students' challenges in meeting academic standards.

In early 2006, school nurses at SBHC schools began to pilot health screenings and interventions to identify and assist students who are at greatest risk for academic problems or dropping out of school. School nurses will deliver these interventions as part of the contract for school nursing services in the 2006-2007 school year.

Targets/Actuals

The table below shows the 2005-06 targets, actuals and baseline data from the prior year. As of February 2006, SBHCs had provided primary care to 3,517 students (the target for the entire school year is 5,000). The Student Health investment has served many more students than targeted with regards to immunizations and chronic conditions.

This year, student health services began to identify and provide interventions to students who were academically high-risk. Students are considered at high risk of academic problems if an identified medical or mental health concern is clearly impacting school performance, and addressing the concern is likely to lead to improved school performance. There have not been as many students identified for academic support as targeted (436 have been supported so far; the target is 1,500). The academic target for 2005-06 is for 100 students, or 7 percent of the 1,500 who are to be supported academically, to pass the WASL in reading and math. Although baseline data were not available when the City set 2005-06 targets, baseline data show this target is much lower than the rates of WASL passage even for high-risk students who have used SBHCs this year.

Table 69: Student Health Targets			
	2004-05 School Year	**2005-06 School Year**	
	Baseline[41]	**Target**	**Actual**
High school and middle school students receiving primary care in SBHCs will be screened for academic risk and receive appropriate support to succeed in school	4,839	**5,000**	**3,517**
Additional students brought into compliance with required childhood immunizations, focusing on south Seattle neighborhoods[42]	2,500	**2,500**[43]	**4,001**
Students assisted by school nurses and health center clinicians in managing asthma, depression, and other chronic conditions	N/A	**600**	**1,700**
High-risk students identified and served through more intensive SBHC interventions that support academic achievement	N/A	**1,500**	**436**
# and % who pass the WASL	All Students Using SBHCs 7th Gr: 85 / 35% 10th Gr: 201 / 29%	**100 / 2%** of all SBHC Users	Avail. July 2006

Indicator Data

Student Health investments track the following indicators:

1. Number and percentage of students meeting standard on one or more WASL tests (available June 2006);

2. Number and percentage of students progressing on-time to the next grade level (available November 2006);

3. Students improving attendance;

4. Student Grade Point Averages; and,

---

[41] Baseline data represent 2004-05 7th and 10th grade WASL scores for students who currently participate in SBHCs. Baseline data are only available for students who were in 7th and 10th grades in 2004-05. Beginning in the current 2005-06 school year, middle school students will take the WASL in 6th, 7th and 8th grade, and in high school students have the option to take the 10th grade WASL in 9th grade, must take the WASL in 10th grade, and will have the opportunity to re-take the test in 11th and 12th grade.

[42] There are approximately 8,990 students not in compliance with immunizations.

[43] The 2005-06 immunization target and actual were not value-added (i.e., these numbers included students who would have been immunized without this intervention).

5. The number of transfers to alternative school settings where school dropout rates are higher than other schools (available July 2006).

Attendance

The table below shows attendance rates for students who have used SBHCs this year. The attendance rates for the same students are shown for both the 2004-05 school year and the first semester of 2005-06. Attendance rates appear to have decreased for students who are using SBHCs this year, particularly for students who have been identified as high risk. Attendance rates also decreased for all other students, by a smaller percentage.

Table 70: Students Using School-Based Health Centers, 2005-06 Student Attendance, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester				
	2004–05 SY		2005–06 First Semester	
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage
Students Using SBHCs With Attendance Measure Recorded	3,155	90.5%	3,363	88.7%
High-Risk Students Using SBHCs With Attendance Measure Recorded	397	87.9%	417	82.4%
All 6th through 12th Grade Students in Schools With SBHCs	14,573	92.4%	15,828	91.0%

Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table shows the number of students using SBHCs in 2005-06 who have improved, maintained or decreased their attendance. Out of 3,113 students using SBHCs with attendance records, 1,436 have improved, 26 have maintained and 1,651 have decreased their attendance from the prior year.

Table 71: Students Using School-Based Health Centers, 2005-06 Number Improving Average Attendance Percentage 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 First Semester			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All Students Using Health Clinics With Attendance Measure Recorded	1,436	26	1,651

Data as of Feb. 2006

Grade Point Average (GPA)

The two tables below show GPAs for students using SBHCs. Each table compares students' cumulative GPAs through the 2004-05 school year to students' first-semester GPAs from the current 2005-06 school year. The first table, including data for middle school students using SBHCs, shows students using SBHCs earned slightly lower GPAs in the first semester of this school year than previously.

Table 72: Middle School Students Using School-Based Health Centers, 2005-06 Cumulative MS GPA Through 2004-05 SY vs. First Semester GPA 2005-06		
	Cumulative GPA	First Semester 2005-06 SY
Asian	3.00	2.85
African American	2.39	2.33
Hispanic	2.43	2.25
Native American	1.89	1.99
White	2.87	2.75
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	3.03	2.90
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.40	2.31
Not LEP	2.64	2.54
Equal English Proficiency	2.76	2.58
Limited English Proficiency	2.62	2.51
ALL MS STUDENTS USING SBHCs	**2.70**	**2.59**
All Students 6th–8th Grade	3.06	2.99

Data as of Feb. 2006

The next table, including data for high school students using SBHCs, follows the same trend as GPAs for middle school students; GPAs appear to have declined first semester.

Table 73: High School Students Using School-Based Health Centers, 2005-06 Cumulative HS GPA Through 2004-05 SY vs. First Semester GPA 2005-06		
	Cumulative GPA	First Semester 2005-06 SY
Asian	2.99	2.89
African American	2.45	2.35
Hispanic	2.62	2.53
Native American	2.62	2.54
White	2.93	2.84
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.89	2.82
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.58	2.45
Not LEP	2.74	2.65
Equal English Proficiency	2.86	2.75
Limited English Proficiency	2.71	2.62
ALL HS STUDENTS USING SBHCs	**2.80**	**2.76**
All Students 9th–12th Grade	2.98	2.95

Data as of Feb. 2006

Recommended Program Changes for 2006-07

Based on this year's program experience, the following course corrections are recommended in Student Health for the coming school year:

1. *More uniformly assess students' risk of academic challenges across all school health programs next year by carrying out the following strategies in 2006-07:*

   - Health centers will identify and provide more intensive interventions to an academically high-risk student population identified in each school. This high-risk population will include students who need health-related interventions to support academic achievement. The City will track academic outcomes for high-risk students separately as a subset of all SBHC users.

   - Demographics, academic indicators and targets will be tracked for all SBHC users, but there will be an increased emphasis on reaching school populations that tend to fall into the achievement gap. The emphasis will be on African American, Hispanic, Native American, immigrant and refugee, and low-income students.

   - SBHC providers will obtain students' self-reports of academic concerns and challenges, as part of routine behavioral risk assessments conducted with all clinic users.

   - Develop a system to identify and track high-risk students for which more intensive service levels for health-related academic support are determined necessary and feasible. Using this system, academic indicators and targets can be tracked separately for this subset of clinic users.

   - The School District will provide school nurses with computerized access to student academic data, which nurses can then use to efficiently screen, assess and prescribe interventions for students.

2. *Increase the target for the number of students achieving academically for the 2006-07 school year, but identify fewer students who are academically at-risk, in order to provide more intensive services within current SBHC staffing capacity.*

3. *Set an academic target for school nurses for the first time.*

   School nurses will conduct more in-depth screenings and assessments of students with health and academic concerns, and provide appropriate linkages and interventions:

   - Public Health Seattle-King County (PHSKC) will work with school nurses to implement standardized clinical tools for screening students at risk of academic challenges. Validated clinical tools under consideration include the pediatric symptom checklist made available from HRSA's Maternal and Child Health Bureau and the Depression Scale for Children developed by the Center for Epidemiological Studies.

   - School nurses will focus on screening students at key school transition points, such as transition from grade school to middle school, middle school to high school, and the Secondary Bilingual Orientation Center to regular schools. Nurses will support students' capacity to learn primarily by providing referrals and linkages to academic and/or social services, depending on their needs.

4. *The Student Health staff team will analyze academic data collected from SPS by the Office for Education to evaluate whether SBHCs are reaching academically high-risk student populations.*

   This is a strategy to resolve SBHC staff concerns with diagnostic coding accuracy, inefficiencies obtaining academic data, and possibly "labeling" students. Currently, it is difficult for SBHC providers to obtain academic data to guide health interventions at the school level; even if parental permission is granted, obtaining academic data through the schools is time-consuming, and providers have limited time.

5. *The City and PHSKC will work with community-based public health organizations to plan and develop funding sources to pilot programs that more effectively engage and support immigrant parents and teens in education.*

   Immigrant students and those who are English language learners are among the fastest-growing population in Seattle Public Schools. The pilots will include academic targets aligned with Levy targets of increasing rates of meeting WASL standards and graduation, as well as reducing the achievement gap.

6. *HSD and PHSKC are seeking funding to explore, plan and pilot innovative mental health interventions for African American students who are struggling academically.*

   The planning for this work will begin in 2006-07.

7. *Establish one high school innovation site in 2006-07.*

   This site would replicate and build on the experience of middle school innovation sites, where a team of multidisciplinary school staff have collaboratively identified students who are at high risk of failing academically, determined their specific academic needs, and targeted school and community resources to those needs. School staff would monitor student progress more frequently in order to track whether students were progressing and the effect of interventions on academic performance. Examples of middle school investments that could be adapted to high schools include: WASL "camps"; WASL parent information nights; Student Success Coordinators who work with key plays in the school and community to organize programming for target students; second math and reading classes; and family outreach. Program staff will write a proposal in collaboration with other Innovation Site partners and one high school by May 15, 2006.

Recommended 2006-07 Targets

For 2006-07, the City recommends continuing to serve the same number of students for primary care, immunizations and chronic conditions but to narrow the number of students identified for academic support in response to the challenges described earlier. However, the target will still increase from 100 this year to 150 in 2006-07. The target will be measured as a percentage of all SBHC users, which is different from the way it was measured in 2005-06, as a percentage of high-risk SBHC users. The target of 150 is 3 percent of all SBHC users.

	2004-05 School Year	2005-06 School Year		2006-07 School Year
Table 74: **Student Health 2006-07 Recommended Targets**				
	Baseline	**Target**	**Actual**	**New Target**
High school and middle school students receiving primary care in SBHCs will be screened for academic risk and receive appropriate support to succeed in school	4,839	5,000	3,517	**5,000**
Students brought into compliance with required childhood immunizations, focusing on south Seattle neighborhoods[44]	2,500	2,500[45]	4,001	**1,500 / 17%**
Students assisted by school nurses and health center clinicians in managing asthma, depression, and other chronic conditions	N/A	600	1,700	**1,800 / 36%**
High-risk students identified and served through more intensive SBHC and school nurse interventions that support academic achievement	N/A	1,500	436	**800**
# and % who pass the WASL[46]	All Students Using SBHCs 7th Gr: 85 / 35% 10th Gr: 201 / 29%	100 / 2% of all SBHC Users	Avail. July 2006	**150 / 3%** of all SBHC Users

---

[44] There are approximately 8,990 students not in compliance with immunizations.

[45] The 2005-06 immunization target and actual were not value-added (i.e., these numbers included students who would have been immunized without this intervention).

[46] It is assumed that a subset of students served by SBHCs and school nurses will take the WASL. The City will develop a more precise methodology for calculating Student Health academic targets in 2006-07.

Recommended 2006-07 Indicators

Student Health investments will continue to track the indicators reported above. In addition, the program staff will track broad trends in health indicators including:

- County and school district childhood immunization rates;

- Teen pregnancies and birth rates to females age 15-17 years;

- STD rates among adolescents;

- Prevalence studies and other local surveys and studies documenting the impact of chronic conditions such as asthma and depression;

- Linkages to Medicaid coverage and/or other health care or social service resources;

IV. Conclusion and Next Steps

In 2002, the City changed the way it invested in children and youth to an outcomes funding approach, in order to help *every* young person in Seattle enter kindergarten ready to succeed, achieve academically, graduate and to help close the achievement gap. This report is an important milestone in the City's new framework; for the first time, the City is reporting on the impacts of its investments using rigorous indicators. Although the data in this report represent only the first semester of the new Families and Education Levy, and in many cases it is too early to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of investments, the report symbolizes a commitment from the City and School District to tracking indicators and outcomes in the interest of closing the achievement gap.

The recommendations in this report were presented to the Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) on April 25. The LOC deliberated for two months, agreeing on the recommended targets and program changes included in this report. Next, City staff will present recommendations to Mayor Nickels. The Mayor's recommended program changes will be reflected in his proposed 2007-08 budget to the City Council. The City Council will pass an adopted 2007 and endorsed 2008 budget in November 2006.

The City will continue to track indicator data for the second semester of the 2005-06 school year. In late July 2006, outcome data will be available for 10th grade students' WASL scores. The City will receive scores for students in other grades in November 2006. The Office for Education will issue an Annual Report in December 2006 describing the first-year outcomes, as well as second-semester indicators, for Families and Education Levy investments. If outcome data show areas for improvement, the City will recommend course corrections for Levy investments. Continuing to use the outcomes funding approach will ensure the City is investing in the most effective strategies to help all students succeed in school and graduate, and to help close the achievement gap.

Appendix A: Target Schedules

The target schedule for FEL investments included in the Implementation Plan are as follows.

Table 75: Early Learning Target Schedule							
	Fall 2006	**Fall 2007**	**Fall 2008**	**Fall 2009**	**Fall 2010**	**Fall 2011**	**Fall 2012**
Children entering kindergarten that were served by network preschools as four-year olds[1]	280	420	560	700	700	700	700
# and % school ready[2]	182 / 65%	315 / 75%	476 / 85%	600 / 85%	600 / 85%	600 / 85%	600 / 85%
# and % who meet the DRA standard in 2nd grade (of those still enrolled in Seattle Public Schools)[3]			97 / 70%	175 / 73%	279 / 77%	351 / 77%	351 / 77%
Two- and three-year-olds served by the ELN[4]	202	302	402	503	503	503	503
# and % who meet developmental standards	131 / 64%	226 / 73%	342 / 85%	427 / 85%	427 / 85%	427 / 85%	427 / 85%

[1] of approximately 1,600 five-year-olds from the primary population within the ELN neighborhoods
[2] The Oklahoma pre-K program showed test score gains of 16% for four-year-olds, with much higher gains for Hispanic and African American youth (54% and 17%, respectively). While we do not have a Seattle baseline of kindergarten readiness, we estimate the 85% target is a stretch, but achievable. The Levy will use the DIAL-3 kindergarten readiness assessment.
[3] The current 2nd grade DRA baseline is 63% (in 2004). The rate for low-income students is 47%. Approximately 76% of children entering SPS kindergarten are still in SPS schools at grade 2.
[4] of approximately 3,300 three- and four-year-olds from the primary population within the ELN neighborhoods

Table 76: Family Support & Family Involvement (Joint Targets) Target Schedule							
	2006	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
# of students served	2,200	2,540	3,150	3,450	3,475	3,500	3,500
# and % of students who pass the WASL in reading and math or meet the DRA standards for their grade level	176 / 8%	305 / 12%	630 / 20%	863 / 25%	1043 / 30%	1225 / 35%	1400 / 40%

- Assumes community-based family involvement will ramp up over three years.
- Assumes it will take three years for coordination/referral teams to be fully functional and for changes to Family Support program to become institutionalized.
- Approximately 60% of elementary school students currently pass the WASL in reading and math. Lowest performing schools (13 schools) have an average of less than 25%.
- Approximately 63% of 2nd grade students currently meet the DRA standard (the rate is 47% for low-income children). Lowest performing schools (13 schools) have an average of 22%.

Table 77: Elementary and Middle School Students (Combined) Target Schedule							
	2006	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
Middle school students served*	1,200	2,000	3,000	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
# and % who pass the WASL in reading and math	84 / 7%	175 / 9%	396 / 13%	578 / 17%	718 / 21%	910 / 26%	1,120 / 32%
Elementary students served**	200	275	375	475	575	575	575
# and % who pass the WASL in reading and math	14 / 7%	25 / 9%	49 / 13%	81 / 17%	121 / 21%	150 / 26%	184 / 32%
* At ten middle schools through MSS programs, middle school Community Learning Centers (CLCs), and ASAP **At four elementary CLC sites							

Table 78: High-Risk Youth Target Schedule							
	2006	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
High-risk youth referred	665	665	665	665	665	665	665
High-risk youth who stay in school/come back to school	365 (55%)	375 (56%)	400 (60%)	400 (60%)	415 (62%)	430 (65%)	430 (65%)
High-risk youth who pass the WASL*	11	11	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
* Approximately 4.1% of students in alternative schools pass the WASL. This target number represents approximately 4.1% of the students served who will take the WASL. We will establish accurate baselines and targets for WASL success beyond 2007.							

Table 79: Student Health Target Schedule							
Health Targets	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
Citywide access to care: High school and middle school students receiving primary care	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
School targets in childhood immuniza-tion, focusing on South Seattle neighborhoods*	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
School targets in managing asthma and other chronic conditions**	600	600	600	600	600	600	600

* Estimate based on School District data on students not in compliance with required immunizations as of October 2004.

** Estimate based on 2001 National Health Interview Survey data, which found that 13 percent of children under 18 years had been diagnosed with asthma. Asthma is one of the most common chronic conditions among children and has a significant impact on school absenteeism. Rates are highest among African American and low-income children.

Targets will be updated annually based on interim results.

Student Health Academic Targets	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**
High-risk students served through interventions that support academic achievement	1,500	1,667	1,834	2,000	2,167	2,334	2,500
# and % who pass the WASL	100 / 7%	150 / 9%	200 / 11%	250 / 13%	300 / 14%	350 / 15%	400 / 16%

Appendix B: List of Tables