



DRAFT



DEEL LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, September 12, 2017

MINUTES

Members Present: Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Saadia Hamid, Council President Bruce Harrell, Larry Nyland, Erin Okuno, Hueiling Chan, Shouan Pan, Phyllis Campano, and Greg Wong

LOC Members Absent: Sandi Everlove, Allison Wood, Ruth Kagi, and Betty Patu

Others Present: Dwane Chappelle (DEEL), Sid Sidorowicz (DEEL), Brian Goodnight (Council Central Staff), Donnie Grabowski (DEEL), Veronica Gallardo (DEEL), Monica Liang-Aguirre (DEEL), Mike Stone (Seattle Public Schools), Samantha Yeun (Public Health – Seattle & King County), Sara Stevens (DEEL), and Eleftheria Galinou (DEEL)

Dwane Chappelle called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and reviewed the meeting agenda. The minutes from May 9, 2017 were approved. Dwane Chappelle and the LOC members in attendance were photographed for the City's Boards and Commissions Website.

Donnie Grabowski presented the Levy Budget Memo, an overview of the organization of the City's Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL), and its past, current, and expected revenue and expenditures (2012-2019). D. Grabowski also reviewed DEEL's proposed 2018 budget and gave a financial overview of the Families and Education Levy (FEL) and the Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) Levy including underspend.

During the FEL Revenue Summary, Greg Wong asked if there was any call for concern for the \$1.1 million interest earnings shortfall. D. Grabowski answered no and this will be clarified on page six of the FEL Underspend section. G. Wong asked how can we under collect on property taxes. Sid Sidorowicz noted the we have a fixed dollar amount set for the Levy that the City is legally entitled to collect. If property values fluctuate then the millage rate changes to meet the Levy amount. Under-collections are due to delinquent property taxes.

During the FEL underspend summary, D. Grabowski discussed the examples of reinvestment that DEEL has identified as potential uses of these funds. Since there is a balance remaining, DEEL is also discussing how to create an internal filter for receiving additional funding requests. We plan to ask the following questions: 1) Does this request tie back to the implementation and evaluation plan? 2) Is there evidence that the requested item will work or be successful? 3) Is the request one-time and is it sustainable? 4) How would this request be prioritized? 5) Do we have internal capacity to handle the request? 6) But the biggest question we would ask is does the request align with the items that we will be including in the next Levy? D. Chappelle explained that overall, the filtering questions will focus on how the request relates to equity and eliminates the opportunity gap. D. Chappelle asked if there are any questions before D. Grabowski moves on to the Seattle

Preschool Program Financial Overview. Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked how much underspend is still available. D. Grabowski answered \$3 million dollars. G. Wong asked if we are creating new programming from the funding from the Sweetened Beverage Tax or are we expanding existing programming. D. Grabowski answered that some funding would go to expanding and some funds would replace programs that were funded by the General Fund in 2017.

S. Sidorowicz noted a couple of the expanding and existing programs are the High School Innovation Program and the Parent Child Home Program. New programming, which began in the summer, includes a Culturally Responsive summer academic and enrichment program. In addition, Summer Melt is a post high school graduation program that ensures students transition to colleges that had already accepted them. D. Chappelle noted that Culturally Responsive summer learning programs generated a high number of applications. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked for an example of a Cultural Responsive summer learning program. D. Chappelle answered that the Urban League focused on a program which had enrichment activities and implemented the freedom schools model of summer learning that took kids through a social justice curriculum. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if these programs are specifically responsive to particular cultures of the children. D. Chappelle answered yes.

D. Grabowski reviewed the financial overview of the Seattle Preschool Program beginning on page seven. D. Chappelle asked if there were any more questions on D. Grabowski's presentation before turning the meeting over to Sid Sidorowicz. G. Wong noted that we have a continual discussion around SPP on tuition and classrooms and we should look at this as we go into the planning process. The expenditures we were spending on Pathways, about 50 percent on school readiness and 13 percent on administration, can be looked at not in an entirely positive light so we need to think about how we explain these categories. We should think about the lessons learned and how we want to translate them into the next levy. Although it has nothing to do with budgeting it does raise some of the issues we have discussed before.

S. Sidorowicz reviewed the Families and Education and Seattle Preschool Program Levy Renewal memorandum. D. Chappelle asked if there are any thoughts or questions from Sid's presentation. L. Gaskill-Gaddis raised questions on how much will get done with the changes in the City's leadership. S. Sidorowicz explained that we have to be prepared to present a set of options to a new administration, irrespective of who comes in as the new Mayor. We already have two years of groundwork in getting community feedback and we have been given a good set of guidelines, a goal, and a mission so we can say that we will expand SPP in way and implement Levy programs in ways that address equity.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked how DEEL came up with a \$700 million estimate for the next Levy and what are we spending between the two levies now. S. Sidorowicz answered that the estimate includes carry forward of existing programs, some additions, inflation, and add 200 more SPP slots per year. The \$700 million estimate also includes the Education Action Plan, experiential learning, internships, and postsecondary access. G. Wong stated that it appears that the Levy is doubling and asked if \$700 million is a mid or on the high range scale. S. Sidorowicz answered this is in the middle range - it's \$667 million just doing what we do in preschool and K-12 and adding the 200 slots of preschool per year. The LOC can recommend options and we can discuss those at the retreat.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis stated that since the SPS District Levy comes out three months after the FEL Levy, it would be important to get some idea at what SPS is going to be looking at in terms of planning. We don't want to burn out the electorate by the time the school levy arrives. Larry Nyland noted that we need to work on both sides and coordinate messaging and what that means to tax payers. S. Sidorowicz noted that if our goal is to address equity in the district through a variety of programs, we need to look at the levy packages we will put together concurrently.

D. Chappelle stated equity should be the driver of our decisions. G. Wong asked what does that mean in terms of how the levy structure funds right now. DEEL made a big shift to fund schools directly and asked if that is up for discussion or are we focusing on student outcomes. S. Sidorowicz answered with an example around high school funding. Years ago, we focused the 9th grade program on students passing courses. Then it was on passing core courses with a C or better. This year, looking back at data, we see huge disparities between white and non-white students in terms of grades. This year, we have a specific outcome measure on gap closing for the high school contracts. D. Chappelle noted that we need to make sure we do not strip the autonomy schools need so we need to come up with a good model when we cross that path.

Veronica Gallardo added that we are working closely with Seattle Public Schools so we understand their priorities but this is also an opportunity to re-envision additional support and how we do it. It's going to be a collaborate effort. L. Gaskill-Gaddis stated equity and closing the opportunity gap is why we started SPP in the first place and if putting both levies together is where it really makes a difference, I will see it as one levy. S. Sidorowicz noted that DEEL is operating on the sense it will be one levy, but it is quite possible that someone may decide that there will be two separate levies. We will be discussing this at the retreat and provide you with materials we briefed the Mayor on. There is no question about it that the bulk of Levy funds will go to early learning.

G. Wong noted equity is a term we know that's used by a lot of different people in a lot of different ways. The 2004 levy was researched based and what does the research show is a good way to get there. Wong encouraged the LOC to get there by looking at equity in a more objective way. S. Sidorowicz noted that he will send out the Education Action Plan that will be helpful to read. He also mentioned that the Education Action Plan talks about youth of color having the opportunity to be successful in postsecondary education and eliminating the opportunity gap in the District.

V. Gallardo noted that the EOG (Eliminating the Opportunity Gap) work with the SPS district have identified eight outlier schools (schools that out-perform those with similar students). Six of these outlier schools are levy schools and we can also send that information out to you. G. Wong stated that it shows we are funding good things and in the past years we have built a lot of expertise. We should look at these outcomes and the success we've had in the past.

Saadia Hamid asked about trying something new by creating the capacity for innovation and trying new ideas. S. Sidorowicz noted that SPP has an advantage over FEL since there is an explicit capacity building line of funding which allows us to do build capacity of director and teachers. We don't have that in capacity in FEL. The current FEL has a line item for innovation but no money was ever put in. So, to the intent we put any innovation together, it is using underspend for

professional development and training but there are no explicit funds for it. Other innovative practices include bringing in new programs or interventions that have been working elsewhere. The best thing we heard from the Education Advisory Group is how do we build space for that. The culturally specific summer program was a different thing for us this year, which was new and not based on a model with explicit academic outcomes.

L. Nyland noted that there is not enough money to go around and that we often ask how do you know what you are doing works, how to best eliminate opportunity gaps, and that we are gradually working that out by using a research model. We should use the underspend to fund innovation. G. Wong noted that he was surprised that we have not funded innovation because that was a big thing that was discussed with methods and outcomes and data improvement. If we have underspend, he would like to see it spent on innovation. D. Chappelle suggested the proposed Education Round Table will be able to help with some of the money. We developed the Education Action Plan; we hoped to raise some of the funding for the initiatives from other partners.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis noted that with the earlier levies we never got inside the classroom, but now we spend a lot on instruction. She raised the question of how do we distinguish between what the District should be doing and what we are doing since we have more money now. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked why the City is funding things that the school district should be funding, what is the state's responsibility and she commented that we are always having to step in so the distinction is not as clear as it was earlier.

S. Sidorowicz stated that in lieu of a high school visit in October, we will coordinate a half day retreat to discuss on the following: materials and presentations that we have prepared for the Mayor, discussions from the district, and some of the work that Veronica Gallardo and Monica Liang-Aguire's teams have done with priorities of the levy. A survey poll will be sent to you and details will be coordinated soon.

D. Chappelle asked if there are any more questions before closing the meeting.

The last five minutes of the meeting, L. Nyland shared an update about the start of school - 104 schools in operation (up from 99) and four new schools opened. He also mentioned that SPS added more seats than they consumed, about 2000 new seats, and made a catch up in regards to having enough seats. This didn't help all the schools, but we still added approximately 25 portables and we added over 60 classrooms by taking over libraries, computer labs and other spaces. We participated with the Seattle Education Association (SEA) and our principal's group on our second annual professional development day, which focused on positive beliefs, positive relationships, and resiliency with students. L. Nyland asked if Phyllis Campano would like to comment on our TRI day, which is a state term that is used for professional development and stands for Time, Responsibility, and Incentive (TRI).

P. Campano noted that in 2015 we reenergized the relationship between SEA and SPS. Their task was to develop professional development for one of those TRI days. Last year, we had great success; they did a video module and this year it was about implicit bias. We are moving on ahead with another ten of those and partnering with SEA on providing some support.

L. Nyland responded that the school board set four goals in place: 1) excellence and equity, 2) eliminate the opportunity gap, 3) budget, and 4) engagement. With the recent actions taken by the Legislature to address the McCleary decision, right now, SPS is worse off than if the legislature had done nothing.

D. Chappelle thanked everyone for coming and reminded members that a poll will be sent soon regarding retreat dates. He adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.