



DRAFT



**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Tuesday, March 12, 2013**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Burgess, Elise Chayet, Sandi Everlove, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Charles Knutson, Greg Wong

OTHERS PRESENT: Kathryn Aisenberg (OFE), Jeanette Blankenship (CBO), Jerry DeGriek (Mayor's Office), Matthew Fulle (Seattle Youth Commission), Sonja Griffin (OFE), Patricia Lee (Council Central Staff), Grace McClelland (HSD), Pegi McEvoy (SPS), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (OFE), Holly Miller (OFE), Adam Petkun (OFE), Sara Rigel (Public Health), Sue Rust (OFE), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Kristi Skanderup (Middle School Investment), Kian Vesteinsson (Seattle Youth Commission)

Tim Burgess called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM. Introductions were made. The minutes from February 12, 2013 were approved. Holly Miller reviewed the agenda which included an update on the 2nd cycle of funding for schools and a presentation on the 2004 Levy Seven-Year Summary Report and results for 2011–12. H. Miller gave a brief update on the school request for investment (RFI) process. She reviewed a memo to the LOC that gives highlights of the 2nd year of planning and implementation of the Families and Education Levy. She reminded the committee that it is a two-step process: First is the Request for Qualification (RFQ) process for community-based organizations to apply, demonstrate whom they serve, and show results. The second step is the RFI process directed at schools. They go through a rigorous process to identify focus students and how they will use Levy funding to support struggling students. Eligible schools this round included 28 elementary, all middle schools, and six high schools.

Last year OFE funded four elementary, three middle, and four high school innovation investments. Funding was available this year for four more elementary, two middle and one high school innovation investments. H. Miller expressed thanks to Sandi Everlove for participating on the high school evaluation panel.

All of the school RFI applications were in technical compliance. Twelve elementary schools applied and four were selected (Graham Hill, Highland Park, South Shore and Wing Luke). All of the middle school applicants were funded: Linkage (Broadview-Thomson, Jane Addams K-8, Orca K-8, and Salmon Bay K-8) and Innovation (Aki Kurose and Eckstein). Cleveland was funded for High School Innovation. H. Miller asked Isabel Muñoz-Colón and Kathryn Aisenberg to talk about the schools and application elements.

I. Muñoz-Colón led the elementary innovation process. Four elementary schools were selected, three in SE and one in SW Seattle. She noted the average quality of the applications improved this year, and it was harder to select the top schools. The evaluation panel

interviewed eight schools. One commonality they saw was that schools were looking at the Levy investment to enhance the work they were doing, not as a way to buy add-ons. They wanted to improve core instruction and use Levy funds to do that work. Many of their proposed interventions intend to enhance their work to implement the Common Core.

Another interesting thing was the schools' focus around pre-K–3rd grade. One other exciting piece was the level and the quality of family engagement being proposed. Elementary schools are moving away from occasional evening activities and looking at how to provide consistent engagement with parents and their role as first teacher. Graham Hill engaged Somali mothers in developing interventions for their children.

I. Muñoz-Colón added that a lot of the ideas used by schools in the first funded cohort became popular, and other schools are now starting to adopt those interventions. OFE will provide more detailed summaries at the next LOC meeting.

H. Miller then announced that I. Muñoz-Colón has been appointed to the State Board of Education and Charles Knutson is working with Governor Jay Inslee as a senior policy advisor on transportation.

Kathryn Aisenberg led the middle school and high school processes. The quality of the middle school applications was far above last year's, and K. Aisenberg thanked Kristi Skanderup for her hard work in providing technical support to schools. The location of the six new middle schools are two in NE Seattle, two in NW Seattle, and two in SE Seattle. Aki and Eckstein were selected for Middle School Innovation investments. The four schools selected for Middle School Linkage investments are Broadview-Thomson, Jane Addams K-8, Orca K-8, and Salmon Bay K-8. The common strategies in the applications were math and after-school interventions. The common themes were a stronger focus on parent engagement (Aki is hiring a family engagement coordinator, and Broadview-Thomson is leading parent-student conferences); developing systems and structures (feedback loops); and improved ability to leverage data to diagnose needs. OFE saw improvement in schools' ability to diagnose their own needs in this second round of RFIs compared to the first round.

K. Skanderup and K. Aisenberg will meet with schools over the next few weeks to finalize strategies and provide feedback on approved plans.

Cleveland High School is the new Innovation high school. Their strategies include math, reading, passing courses, and attendance interventions. They plan to hire a 9th grade intervention specialist, leverage partnerships, provide case management services to the highest-need students, support student peer mentoring programs, and incorporate a parent engagement component.

Greg Wong asked what was compelling in Eckstein's Middle School Innovation application, given the significant amount of Levy funding requested. K. Aisenberg said that due to its size (it's one of if not the largest middle school in Washington), Eckstein serves a very large number of struggling students. The "N" or number of eligible "Levy focus students" is comparable to the other Levy Innovation school sites. G. Wong asked about their proposed strategies. K. Aisenberg replied that Eckstein proposed dedicated Levy funds to supporting additional math and reading intervention classes, supporting after-school tutoring, and implementing best practices from other Levy Innovation schools that were adapted for Eckstein.

T. Burgess asked if only two middle schools applied for Innovation investments and if both were funded. K. Aisenberg said that was correct. T. Burgess asked if any eligible middle schools did not apply, and K. Aisenberg said Madison and Whitman could have applied for additional funding beyond what they are currently allotted but didn't. T. Burgess asked if the number of students qualifying for assistance and where they are on the level of need, plus the content of what Eckstein wants to do, are driving factors in the decision to award them funds. K. Aisenberg said she looked at a number of the variables and Eckstein is similar to Mercer and Denny in terms of need.

Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis said she was impressed by the cross fertilization and spreading of strategies that are successful.

Jerry DeGriek noted the Elementary Innovation schools that are funded this current year and the new cohort for the next school year are funded at the same level. The same is true for high schools. He asked for the rationale behind the two current Middle School Innovation sites receiving more funding next year than their peers. K. Aisenberg responded that the three Round 1 schools are adding college and career case management in their second year (2013-14) as part of the Levy implementation roll-out plan. OFE did not require schools to implement a case management program during their first year of implementation given the challenges of implementing just the core new interventions. Therefore, Aki and Eckstein will receive additional funding in their second year (2014-15) for case management. H. Miller added that case management helps support high-need students for post-secondary success.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if this is replacing the Seattle School District's cutback on counselors and if this will help with that work. H. Miller said it is a more stratified approach where some students will get advisories and others will have more intensive support. It is not the same model that SPS had in the past. K. Aisenberg said the Round 1 schools are identifying strategies for college and career support. In terms of case management, OFE outlined the core objectives of the program and basic requirements that must be met, but then gave leeway to schools to customize so as to best meet their individual school needs. There could be similar or different plans from the three schools.

Charles Knutson asked a question about the eligibility process. He recalled Susan Enfield's concern that schools that would be most apt to apply for Levy funds and match the criteria might not be the schools that need to be served. C. Knutson asked if OFE felt that her concern was taken care of through the eligibility criteria and thresholds. I. Muñoz-Colón said the focus for elementary investments is on Title 1 schools and those that are level 1 and 2 in the SPS segmentation process. Those are all high-need schools. K. Aisenberg said the elementary application process was different because funding is phased in over time. For high schools there was a high rate of participation, with five of the six eligible schools applying.

T. Burgess asked to shift to high school and look at why Cleveland got funding and the other four applicants did not. He also asked if the high school application process is closed now or will there be other rounds in this Levy. K. Aisenberg said this was the final year for funding. Cleveland was the top-rated application by the majority of the review panelists. There were a number of criteria – data analysis, strategies, and implementation. S. Everlove said the decision was not unanimous but was well thought out. S. Sidorowicz clarified that it was the last year of funding unless significant changes occur.

T. Burgess asked what we would say to parents from Chief Sealth, Rainier Beach, Seattle World School, or South Lake whose schools will have to wait six years before they can apply again for Levy funding. H. Miller responded that that is the way the Levy was structured—a competitive application process and not enough funding for all eligible schools. T. Burgess said he understands the technical reasons but that won't be a satisfactory response.

K. Aisenberg said schools received high-level feedback and were offered meetings to go through their applications. T. Burgess asked which school scored 2nd behind Cleveland and S. Everlove said it was Seattle World School. T. Burgess asked about Rainier Beach and K. Aisenberg said it was a distant 3rd or 4th.

Of the schools that didn't make it, T. Burgess asked about the shortcomings. S. Everlove said that Seattle World School had a good plan. She said the panelists talked about lowering the dollar amount awarded Cleveland and freeing up a smaller amount to partially fund another school. K. Aisenberg did an excellent job facilitating the funding discussion and in the end the panel decided partially funding two schools would have compromised the plan of the successful applicant.

T. Burgess added that we knew not all needy schools would get funding but these schools need support. G. Wong said this is an issue for Pegi McEvoy and the Seattle School District. All these schools need help and they need help with how to use their school data. He asked the District to look at schools that applied but that were not funded, as well as what the best practices were for the ones that received funding awards. SPS could help schools become competitive for the Levy or other grants. There should be some sort of follow through with schools not receiving awards and this is a shared responsibility with the District.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if this should be addressed at budget time. P. McEvoy said SPS has a high school graduation grant, and they are working with the schools eligible for Levy funds. The challenge is how to get them sustainable funding.

T. Burgess asked if any of the four high schools that didn't get funding qualify as Creative Approach schools. P. McEvoy said she will need to check but that it wouldn't drive additional funding. T. Burgess said that goes to G. Wong's point—if schools are not qualifying for Levy funding or as Creative Approach schools, they need serious interventions. G. Wong added that funding is not the only issue but that schools need to improve how they use data to improve instruction. That will result in getting more funding.

S. Everlove said while she was reading the applications, she was almost desperately crying out for a logic model for the school plans. She tore them apart and rearranged them around budget, strategies, and outcomes. She scored higher the ones that pieced together well.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis said cross fertilization goes beyond what the Levy funds. How is successful Levy intervention integrated into planning at the School District? H. Miller responded that Susan Toth at Mercer did a good job of building professional learning communities. SPS could expand the same approach for schools not funded by the Levy. E. Chayet said at the last LOC meeting there was discussion on how to create a better data infrastructure which would be useful for all of the schools. P. McEvoy responded that SPS has been working with the Road Map Project and the High School Graduation Grant to develop risk reports for schools. She would be happy to present this work to the LOC.

J. DeGriek added that he thought this was a great conversation about the role of the Levy. There will never be enough funding to meet all the schools' needs. The Levy should be a catalyst to drive system change. T. Burgess asked if there is a common framework or logic model for the Levy applications. K. Aisenberg replied that OFE presents this information at the RFI information session. Potential applicants are instructed to examine school data elements, identify which students are struggling and in which specific areas, identify the best practices that will be effective in moving the needle for these identified students, and then provide a rationale for choosing the strategies. School must provide a plan for management oversight and ensure that the budget ties directly to the proposed strategies. K. Skanderup said schools need technical assistance. It is a huge challenge at the school level to access data without an Excel spreadsheet pivot table guru, very time consuming and very difficult. What OFE is asking schools to do is a huge challenge for them. SPS is working hard on that. Principals see other schools with access to data that they want and it's frustrating for them. They are hungry and ready and are learning from each other. H. Miller said one issue to think about is "application fatigue." An idea OFE is considering is to let it be known early in the process next year that we will potentially approve up to eight elementary schools with sequential funding. T. Burgess clarified that this would be for the 2014-15 school year. I. Muñoz-Colón said two schools had applied before; they took our feedback and used it in this year's application. It's really tough for schools to re-apply every year.

To kick off S. Sidorowicz' presentation on the 2011-12 Annual Report and Seven-Year Summary, H. Miller said she was struck as she reviewed it about how it confirms the direction that the Levy Planning Committee (LPC) took in planning this Levy. We learned a lot.

S. Sidorowicz said the report covers the last school year of the 2004 Levy, combined with a summary of the Levy's seven years and how things have changed over three Levies. He will send an electronic copy to the LOC members with comments due at the end of business two weeks from now (March 26). The final report will be ready by the April 9 meeting.

S. Sidorowicz said there are six sections in the report and he will mostly talk about two of them: the 2011-12 SY results and the seven-year summary. In the background section is the history of the 1990 and 1997 Levies. Then the recommendations from the 2004 LPC, which L. Gaskill-Gaddis sat on, set the tone to focus more on academic achievement.

S. Sidorowicz said OFE then worked with The Rensselaerville Institute and adopted the outcome funding framework with performance pay tied to achieving results. Over time, the measures of results have changed with the state adopting the WELPA for English Language Learners, dropping the WASL and creating the MSP, HSPE and End Of Course exams. OFE has tried to accommodate these changes and aligned with the SPS strategic plan and the Road Map Project. At the beginning of the 2004 Levy, course corrections were voluminous, but as things settled in, these diminished.

With respect to evaluation, there are challenges in using Levy data for comparison or longitudinal analysis since the students and schools are chosen specifically for their needs and the quality of their plans. There is no random assignment of students to interventions or random choice of schools. Even within schools, not just the targeted students feel the results of interventions. Some of the strategies have school-wide effects. For these reasons, it's

difficult to choose comparison groups. One evaluation identified a comparison group using statistical methods while another could not.

Longitudinal analysis is also problematic. Many programs were new and had startup challenges. The first high school 9th grade class served by the Levy just reached 12th grade this year. We are finally seeing middle school students in a stabilized cohort reaching high school. The first early learning cohort for whom we have SPS IDs is now in 2nd grade. We thought in theory we could look back at the end of the 2004 Levy and determine what the experience and long-term benefit was for students receiving Levy-funded supports. We should be able to do that in the next levy period as programs have matured. OFE evaluated School-Based Health Centers and the Family Support program because these had long histories.

OFE also funded the Mary Beth Celio research on the class of 2006. This research influenced the Levy's outcomes and indicators.

Patricia Lee asked if anyone had gone back to try to find data from the 1990 Levy. S. Sidorowicz said no data was collected on an ongoing basis and evaluations were done at end of year. Evaluators looked at data and put together summaries of activities for the programs. In this report, OFE is comparing Levy students demographically with the general student body. In Early Learning, SEEC is working with students who historically have been behind when entering kindergarten. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked about the total population and S. Sidorowicz said there are over 4,000 four-year-olds in the city of Seattle at any given time. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked how many children were in the Step-Ahead program and S. Sidorowicz said about 600.

S. Sidorowicz highlighted that, going forward, we have Teaching Strategies GOLD (TSG) as a measure for pre-K students. There are no assessments in 1st and 2nd grade that align with TSG but we now have the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developmental Skills (WaKIDS). An analyst at HSD is looking at WaKIDS and TSG to see how results differ in various programs. S. Sidorowicz moved on to Elementary Investments – Family Support focus students and students in Elementary CLCs. The FSW program met indicator goals but has not seen much improvement in academic results. The same is the case with the CLCs which is why OFE moved to a new model of funding elementary schools. There is a more integrated model for schools to decide on the best strategies for their students. We're expecting that we'll begin to see a lot more progress in elementary grades going forward.

S. Sidorowicz moved on to Middle School Investments which have broader reach. About two-thirds of middle school students participate in the CLCs or MSSP. Middle School programs once again far exceeded their academic target, while some indicators fell short. SPS set a high bar for MAP growth, expecting that if these schools come up to standard, they need higher than average growth rate. OFE and SPS set fairly ambitious targets in that area.

While targets are set school by school, results are calculated in the aggregate. Individual school results are obscured in the reported data. S. Everlove asked if OFE knows which middle schools might have hit it out of the park for students exceeding typical growth. S. Sidorowicz responded that OFE and SPS know and give Kristi Skanderup results for each school. K. Skanderup said that schools love to see their data compared to other schools. The new Levy will have outcomes and indicators set and reported at the school level. S. Sidorowicz said this

will be more transparent. Everybody will see school results. E. Chayet asked if absentee data include time away for expulsion and S. Sidorowicz replied that it includes both excused and unexcused absences. E. Chayet said it might be interesting in the future to see that difference.

S. Sidorowicz moved on to High School Investments. High School Innovation is in three schools and serves first-time 9th graders. We are starting to see improvements; there is more movement toward standard-based grading, and investments in college/career preparation. H. Miller noted that the data shows red flags for Chief Sealth High School. L. Gaskill-Gaddis note that Sealth used to be fine and this may be an indication about school personnel. S. Sidorowicz replied that there was a change in their entire team and there's no continuity in the way their next plan looks.

S. Sidorowicz moved on to Health Investments. Indicator targets were exceeded. MSP/HSPE targets were not met but high school graduation goal was exceeded. The combined academic goal was met. OFE is moving away from these measures for health clinics. Many students served by the SBHCs do not have to take state tests, so passing courses will be used as the outcome measure for health investments. H. Miller added that we are looking at attendance also. S. Sidorowicz noted that research by the UW indicates that students who used SBHCs saw improvements in GPA and attendance. S. Everlove pointed out that it seems like targets are always low relative to outcomes. Will that be addressed? S. Sidorowicz replied that targets have been increased. S. Sidorowicz moved on to the seven-year summary. Many students were served by the Levy. There were 12,050 students served by FSWs; 23,000 used CLCs; and 22,000 used SBHCs. These are unduplicated numbers.

The next tables show targets and the actual result for seven years. When reading the section on course corrections, you can crosswalk how and when changes happened. The last table was suggested by CM Burgess' staff. It shows how much the Levy invested in the different SPS regions over seven years. The results are somewhat confusing because a number of programs are funded through SPS headquarters and are not clearly allocated by schools.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.