



DRAFT



**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 8, 2013**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tim Burgess, Jerry DeGriek, Sandi Everlove, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Sheeba Jacob, Kevin Washington, Greg Wong

OTHERS PRESENT: Kathryn Aisenberg (OFE), Daisy Catague (Parks), Leilani Dela Cruz (HSD), Sonja Griffin (OFE), Patricia Lee (Council staff), Holly Miller (OFE), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (OFE), Alex Pedersen (Council staff), Adam Petkun (OFE), Sue Rust (OFE), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Michael Tolley (SPS), Sarah Wilhelm (Health), Brian Callanan (Seattle Channel), John Giamberso, (Seattle Channel), John Robinson (Read and Rise)

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. Introductions were made. Tim Burgess welcomed the attendees. The minutes from the September 10 LOC meeting were discussed. Kevin Washington said he was late to the last meeting and asked about Holly Miller's comment on the parallel structure. H. Miller said there still will be separate organizations and the parallel structure on the Health side will allow the organizations to work together really well. One example, we moved the Family Support Program out of our office and it is part of our consolidated health now, as it is at the District. So it is all integrated. After this discussion, the minutes were approved.

H. Miller reviewed the agenda and added an item for "Read and Rise." T. Burgess moved Seattle Channel to the first item on the agenda.

SEATTLE CHANNEL PROPOSED VIDEO SERIES

John Giamberso gave a quick overview of Seattle Channel. It is part of the City's Department of Information Technology and is funded through a fee on cable customers. They have 35,000 weekly viewers. The proposed shows about the Levy will be on video archive. He then turned the presentation over to Brian Callanan.

B. Callanan said he has been working in TV since 1995 and with Seattle Channel since 2011. He said he was not sure a lot of people are aware of the Levy investments in Seattle public schools. In 2011 he put together a show that featured Matt Griffin and H. Miller. He is proposing five shows based on the five divisions. Each show would be 30 minutes and would focus on one topic. The show could be shot on location at a Seattle public school. One topic he proposed was Middle School Health. The costs for OFE would be \$5,000 per show.

Greg Wong asked him, as a reporter, whether he tries to get the objective critical look. B. Callanan said they try to get different viewpoints on topics as best they can and open a dialog. Some of those voices may offer some different criticism or advice. The focus is on

highlighting programs and he provides the critical view wherever he can. J. Giamberso said the critical view is important to developing credibility for the show. It's not an investigate look but a balanced look at what the Levy is doing. In the 2011 Levy show, they had some critics of the Levy on the show. They laid out issues for voters, looking for different ways to offer constructive criticism.

Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked whether the costs for OFE were for salaries. H. Miller said the costs were not for salaries, just a cash cost, and would come from the administration pot. K. Washington asked if OFE would serve as a collaborator on the segments, and B. Callanan said yes, they very much want the strongest topics. Having five pieces allows some room but not a ton. They are hoping to work with OFE to find the strongest voices out there. H. Miller said she'd like to involve some of the LOC members so the LOC's role is illustrated and citizens become aware that there is oversight. B. Callanan said that would work well in the discussion segment.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked where SPS fits into this structure. B. Callanan said SPS plays a big role, including location. H. Miller said she told Lesley Rogers we would not go anywhere not pre-approved by SSD. There are some constraints and we don't want to bust up the school day, which still leaves a lot of opportunities including after-school, summer learning, and early learning programs. A show on Health would be interesting to people and could cover the comprehensiveness of programs. K. Washington asked if there would be opportunities for video programs at schools to involve students in production work. B. Callanan said perhaps during the five takeaways piece at the end. It could be fun to highlight the work they're doing at a certain school. K. Washington said Reel Girls would be another in-school video program.

G. Wong asked whether this is an OK use of Levy funds; \$25,000 from administration. H. Miller said it is and offers substantive publicity. It's an opportunity to explore use of what we have available to get word out on progress of the Levy. Seattle Channel has agreed to do a short four-minute Levy overview we can use to explain the Levy to groups. Sandi Everlove said this is great; the more people understand the Levy, the better. Even those who voted for it don't understand. B. Callanan said he will be researching topics as well. He will ask challenging questions in a respectful way; that's the way we get to the credibility. K. Washington asked about the number of shows and B. Callanan said it could be more than the initial five. Once we get thru these, we can go from there. He is open to doing more. S. Everlove suggested one on state standards for math. T. Burgess said the standalone piece will be really valuable to OFE.

READ AND RISE

T. Burgess said we have a special guest here today. H. Miller said we have been working collaboratively with City Council staff on a two-year, general fund, pilot program called Read and Rise (R&R). This is a parent literacy program that has been successful in Houston. Mr. John Robinson is the leader in Houston and has taken it from a small initial effort to a huge citywide literacy training program. We've heard a lot about him from others. He is here in Seattle training the trainers both at the preschool and elementary levels. Sonja Griffin added that this is an opportunity we didn't want to miss; she was really inspired by him and was reminded why she does the work she is doing in early learning.

John Robinson thanked the LOC and said he is going to Atlanta, then New York, and then Cleveland to do training. Every child in Seattle deserves to read and rise and that will happen only if we engage parents at birth. Kids need a basic foundation before school starts and that

begins at home. Unfortunately the foundational skills that children need are not always developed early at home. Home has counted on the system to educate and raise children. Children are in our courts, in our jails. It is not the school's responsibility alone to get them reading. Families are the most important teachers and role models. We had a great training today and teams are learning a lot. They are ready to begin facilitating the R&R conversations with parents. The brain science is clear that if we wait until preK, the children's brain cells have started to be deleted, and they won't ever catch up. R&R brings together family, parents, care providers, community, and schools. H. Miller asked whether the National Urban League is adopting this program as a national effort. J. Robinson said there was a partnership between Scholastic and the Urban League but due to changes at both organizations, all of the funding is coming to Houston. He has taken on the executive role for training. The National Urban League is trying to pull together the Urban League movement to be involved in R&R. This will be a major topic at the Atlanta training. H. Miller said the Seattle Urban League will be at that conference and is very interested in learning more.

Isabel Muñoz-Colón said the University of Washington came to us last year with their recommendations for improving the Family Support Worker program. Driven by these recommendations, the FSWs decided focus on reading interventions. We looked at programs they could use to work with parents on improving literacy for their children, and found R&R to be very well scripted to teach building blocks of reading. We are launching this program at five elementary sites that have FSWs. For example, at Highland Park, Pam Rago and one of the bilingual school staff will lead a mixed Spanish/English parent group. At Beacon Hill, a Spanish-speaking Instructional Assistant will lead group. Early Learning sites have Mandarin, Vietnamese, and Somali-speaking trainers. We are doing R&R the Seattle way. There are also five preK sites. Early learning outreach is going to Family, Friends and Neighbor caregivers for children not enrolled in preK, and outreach to bring families to family literacy nights. H. Miller said we will develop assessments of parent behavior before and after training to use to decide the impact. J. Robinson said the R&R family conversations curriculum supports Common Core state standards.

T. Burgess asked J. Robinson to talk about his experience in Houston with R&R and success is measured. J. Robinson responded that Houston was having lots of trouble in the Houston Independent School District. Kids were dropping out and graduation rates were down. The R&R program was started in 2001. To date, of the 12 schools that were poor performing, all 12 today are exemplary. They track the 25,000 families they work with. Graduation rates have risen, test scores are up, and dropout rates are down. They identified the R&R kids and they're graduating with the highest scores.

G. Wong asked if, in the City of Seattle's pilot, we will track kids as they go into early learning. H. Miller said the outcomes we're reporting to Council are parent behavior. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked if R&R is Levy funded and H. Miller said it's not Levy funded. T. Burgess said it's a program of the Office for Education.

SUMMER LEARNING RECAP

H. Miller said we would like to brief the LOC on summer learning interim results and noted that we don't have the MAP data yet. Adam Petkun went through the presentation and discussed the students served this summer, including Special Education and ELL students. He noted high school summer learning is at its peak for funding whereas elementary and middle

school summer learning will ramp up. Jerry DeGriek said we have great demographics on which students we served and asked if we captured academic data. A. Petkun said that is after the fact. The switchover to Powerful Schools slowed down. K. Washington asked whether the purpose of the program was to be enhancement or remediation and A. Petkun said that is left up to the providers. He said we set enrollment goals and some providers had problems meeting theirs. Next year we will tie financial incentive to hitting enrollment targets. If they fail to come within 90%, it will be all or nothing and they will lose 5 percent.

A. Petkun said the average attendance in summer learning programs was 95 percent. Looking at Denise Louie Education Center Indicators, going across is the Target. Setting targets was as much art as science. J. DeGriek asked why we have 100% targets and A. Petkun said those four Indicators are for Teaching Strategies Gold. We picked WAKIDS categories. At this age group in theory we hoped to see some development and so we set a high bar. We wanted to make sure students were progressing. TS Gold has subcategories. For student to get counted as meeting goal, they had to advance within each element of a given domain. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked how many levels there are and A. Petkun said he would get that information to her. Sheeba Jacob asked why, at that age level, the attendance rate was 73%. A. Petkun said 73% was the average. K. Washington asked how it compared to other summer programs in Seattle for that age level. A. Petkun said this is the only one for early learning. He jumped to the extra slides in his presentation to show one on Combined Attendance Data which showed where students fell. The next slide showed where the students were. There was no obvious correlation between attendance and factors like program size or age level. H. Miller said, like early learning, a lot of folks may not feel the importance of attendance with summer learning. This is the first year we've used attendance. The parent education piece we will have to build over time working with district and providers. K. Aisenberg said it is also a timing issue. Some programs enrollment very last minute and families already had vacation trips planned. A. Petkun said DLEC achieved 91% of its Indicator which was worth 5%.

Looking at the Seattle Parks & Rec at Northgate Elementary slides, L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked what "rising" means. A. Petkun said it means "going into." J. DeGriek said he was confused about the MAP results: how will they be used and is MAP given in spring. A. Petkun said it's given in spring and fall, for the beginning and end of program, delayed by time got into school. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked what RIT means. K. Washington asked how far into the school year does the MAP test fall. A. Petkun said it ends November 6. Michael Tolley said they had to move it. A. Petkun said it's not known whether next summer MAP will still be around and said we will work with our schools to see if there can be early testing in fall. We hope to make better use of the data. G. Wong asked what the 80% target is based on. A. Petkun explained that the first year targets were set through negotiations starting from what RFI awardees proposed, and that ideally he will be able to draw on historical data in the future. The literature on summer learning provides little guidance in this regard, so far. Sid Sidorowicz said Northgate had a modest pilot program the year before. A significant number of students completed who had no loss in their RIT score. So it's not a complete shot in the dark. S. Everlove asked whether we will compare kids and whether or not had any loss. A. Petkun said we will try to figure out who those comparable kids are. S. Sidorowicz said the other problem is we don't really know if a kid went to another summer program. A. Petkun said, since recruitment wasn't easy, there might be some correlation. K. Washington asked if all kids at Northgate were students at Northgate during the year. A. Petkun said yes and he will try to note that for you.

A. Petkun said for the middle school Parks & Rec, the enrollment was disappointing, particularly at the new Eckstein site. It seemed as though sites running the summer before had an advantage in recruiting students, perhaps due to word of mouth among families. Next year we will add a performance pay indicator tied to enrollment in programs. Early on, if we find out about problems, we will have conversations about trimming budgets back a bit. We did make changes to budget. K. Washington asked when agencies start recruitment. A. Petkun said in reality it turned out to be recruitment up until the last minute. He questioned how realistic it is for them to lock down recruitment earlier. K. Aisenberg said the academic data isn't available until later on. S. Everlove: what proportion of the parks students were entering 6th, 7th, and 8th? A. Petkun said 1/3 in rising 6th graders and 2/3rds in rising 7th and 8th. J. DeGriek asked if rising 6th graders had different programs with different measures. A. Petkun said yes, they will have different ones next year. K. Washington: 6th grade transition boot camp. S. Jacob asked for the reason why different weight was given to different schools. A. Petkun said that was where they fell on their targets. S. Sidorowicz explained how performance pay is allocated within bands aligned to proportional achievement of the targets. G. Wong said he was a bit concerned for giving performance pay on MAP results that aren't tied to anything. It seems fundamentally unfair. 70% could be really great or really poor. Has the School District looked at this? We need a stronger benchmark. H. Miller said we will have this year's experience. G. Wong suggested we work more with the District to have a body of data to use as a control group. J. DeGriek asked G. Wong if his argument is why 70%? G. Wong said it's decisions on targets. If not tied to a control group that says 70% is a good target or a poor target, he feels uneasy. L. Gaskill-Gaddis said we have looked at targets forever and it's hard to start from scratch. Isabel did an incredible presentation on how they came up with targets. Give them a little slack here. G. Wong said the data exist. Get the data from the District. Figure out spring and fall MAP. There is room for improvement. S. Sidorowicz said in the past we set targets and everybody falls short or exceeds and we adjust for that. Our arc wasn't quite good enough. Look at history as we go forward. A. Petkun said, at the middle school level, the target was 70% for all of them. In the RFI they proposed outcomes and we met in the middle. G. Wong said his comments are not a critique of what Levy staff are doing. K. Washington asked if next year we are back to square one. A. Petkun said yes, he talked with Eric Anderson about ideas. He is also asking folks around the country what they're using.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis said look at Denny v. Cleveland, same making gains on ready. Denny didn't do well and Cleveland did. A. Petkun said the principal at Denny let him know they were falling short. They already had a program and asked to merge programs. We said ok for this summer. Next year we will work more closely with the executive directors. J. DeGriek asked whether the demographics were on all 145 or just the 6th graders. A. Petkun said they covered all 145. S. Everlove asked, if disaggregated, how did they compare. Did they use the same pre-post test at Denny as at Mercer? A. Petkun said no, MAP was comparable across programs. They identified pre-post tests. At Denny, they will choose more appropriate ones next year. At his site visits, some providers expressed having trouble identifying pre-post tests. They graded on a 1-4 scale and he encouraged them to develop a wider scale for their scores.

For high school programs, A. Petkun said Cleveland had hoped to serve ELL students but didn't really. J. DeGriek said there were very high rates of making gains. A. Petkun said there

was variability in scores and they weren't cooking the books. He said the YMCA did well on enrollment.

ReWA did well on enrollment. Some students had to work over summer or leave town for vacations. Another issue was leadership turnover. There were four different program managers at ReWA during that time. One theory is no one told World School about the performance indicators. J. DeGrieck asked if World School staff did the instruction. He said their credit retrieval was pretty good. A. Petkun said it is reassuring to know 18% didn't pass the class. A. Petkun explained that the pre-post test was not administered to students in credit retrieval and that there was an attendance goal for all students, with a separate goal for earning credit. L. Gaskill-Gaddis said they are either not the right measures or are too difficult for kids. S. Everlove asked the difference between attendance rate for credit retrieval.

A. Petkun said Seattle Public Schools was up front about having trouble enrolling students. Perhaps the message didn't get out.

Next Steps: We will have honest conversations with agencies about whom they served and how they did, and whether their enrollment target was right.

T. Burgess asked for final comments or questions. H. Miller apologized that we didn't get to Sid's presentation. S. Everlove asked if we have an historical information MAP file. A. Petkun said the MAP RIT scores. S. Sidorowicz said it's part of the Berk student, Title 1 schools, P-3 planning.

THANK YOU AND ADJOURN

T. Burgess drew the meeting to a close. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.