

CB  
117103  
#2

**ORDINANCE** \_\_\_\_\_

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

AN ORDINANCE relating to regular property taxes; requesting that a special election be held concurrent with the November 8, 2011 general election for submission to the qualified electors of the City of a proposition to lift the limit on regular property taxes under Chapter 84.55 RCW and authorize the City to levy additional taxes for up to seven years for the purpose of providing Seattle School District No. 1 public school students, Seattle children, and their families education-support services designed to improve academic achievement; authorizing creation of a new subfund; creating an oversight committee; and authorizing implementing agreements for this levy lid lift commonly known as the Families and Education Levy.

WHEREAS, providing equal access to a quality education is a cornerstone of our democracy, which thrives on an engaged and educated citizenry; and

WHEREAS, Seattle is a dynamic city, with a strong arts and literature community, and enjoys a strong economic base with a variety of industries and a skilled and educated workforce; and

WHEREAS, in order to maintain its competitiveness, keep existing employers and attract new family-wage jobs and economically sustainable industries, Seattle needs to provide a well educated and trained workforce with the advanced skills and abilities needed to compete in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; and

WHEREAS, a 2010 Georgetown University study of workforce needs found "that by 2018 the United States economy will need 22 million new workers with college degrees but will fall short by at least 3 million. In addition, nationwide we will need at least 4.7 million new workers with postsecondary certificates." The Georgetown University study analyzed workforce needs by state and forecasts that by 2018 67% of the jobs in Washington state will require a college degree or career credential; and

WHEREAS, it is incumbent upon the Seattle School District No. 1 ("School District") and the community at large to ensure all children within Seattle have the opportunity to attain the skills and education needed to participate in their community, be effective civic actors, and contribute to a strong Seattle economy; and

WHEREAS, while the School District is directly responsible for promoting academic excellence in our schools and classrooms, the support and assistance of families, businesses, non-profit and community organizations and the City is also needed to help children realize their full academic potential; and



1 WHEREAS, in 1990 Seattle residents came together in an Education Summit convened by  
2 Mayor Norm Rice to develop strategies so Seattle children could take advantage of their  
3 educational opportunities and the School District could focus its resources on teaching;  
4 and

5 WHEREAS, in 1990 Seattle voters approved a \$69 million, seven year property tax lid lift which  
6 became known as the Families and Education Levy (Levy) which invested in health,  
7 academic enrichment and support services for Seattle children and their families with the  
8 stated goal of helping children be safe, healthy and ready to learn; and

9 WHEREAS, in 1997 Seattle voters approved a \$69 million, seven year renewal of the Levy with  
10 the continued goal of helping children be safe, healthy and ready to learn; and

11 WHEREAS, in 2004 a citizen advisory committee convened to review the 1997 Levy-funded  
12 strategies and services, and recommended deeper Levy investments with a clearer stated  
13 goal of helping students succeed academically; and

14 WHEREAS, in 2004 Seattle voters approved a \$117 million, seven year renewal of the Levy  
15 with the expanded goal of helping children be ready to learn, succeed academically and  
16 graduate from high school; and

17 WHEREAS, since 1990 Seattle voters have generously approved three successive seven year  
18 Families and Education levies to support and improve student academic achievement  
19 within the city by significant margins of 56% in 1990, 61% in 1997 and 62% in 2004;  
20 and

21 WHEREAS, the 2004 Levy focuses on programs and services intended to prepare children for  
22 kindergarten, improving academic achievement, closing the achievement gap, and  
23 increasing high school graduation rates; and measures all Levy investments by their  
24 ability to contribute to these goals; and

25 WHEREAS, in 2010 Seattle residents participated in a series of community meetings throughout  
26 the city and a day-long Congress to identify challenges faced by Seattle's youth and  
27 families and resources and strategies to address them, in an effort that became known and  
28 continues forward as the Youth and Families Initiative (YFI); and

WHEREAS, helping all students succeed academically in school was identified as an important  
goal by parents and community members participating in the YFI; and

WHEREAS, in 2010 the City adopted Resolution 31206 setting forth a structure, process and  
schedule to develop and place a seven year renewal of the Levy on the November 8,  
2011, ballot, and providing for a Families and Education Levy Advisory Committee  
(Levy Advisory Committee) to make recommendations regarding a Levy renewal; and



1 WHEREAS, the 24 member Levy Advisory Committee is comprised of the 12 member Levy  
2 Oversight Committee (LOC), which oversees the current Levy, and 12 additional  
3 citizens. The LOC members are the School Board President, a School District  
4 representative, the chair of the Council's Public Safety and Education Committee, a  
5 representative of the Mayor and eight citizens. The 20 citizen members on the Levy  
6 Advisory Committee, including the eight who serve on the LOC, collectively have  
7 professional and personal experience working with students and families, and in  
8 evaluating evidence-based programs and education strategies. The members include  
9 parents, community-based service providers, former teachers and researchers; and

10 WHEREAS, in 2010 the Levy Advisory Committee spent six months reviewing current Levy  
11 programs, research on best practices and evidence-based programs, education reform  
12 efforts and School District data and recommends that the Levy goals again be expanded  
13 and Levy investments be deepened because graduation from high school is no longer  
14 sufficient; post secondary work is necessary in the current and future economy and  
15 students must graduate with the skills necessary to succeed in college or their chosen  
16 career path; and

17 WHEREAS, the Levy Advisory Committee Report is contained in Clerk File 311309, in which  
18 all research references cited in this ordinance may be found; and

19 WHEREAS, the Levy Advisory Committee recommends the overarching goal for our children  
20 should be that all students will graduate from Seattle high schools ready for college  
21 and/or career; and

22 WHEREAS the Levy Advisory Committee further recommends that the goals for the 2011 Levy  
23 should be to: 1) help children be ready for school, 2) help all students succeed  
24 academically and reduce the academic achievement gap, and 3) help all students graduate  
25 from high school college and career ready; and

26 WHEREAS, the Levy Advisory Committee recommends the City place on the November 8,  
27 2011, ballot a measure to renew the Families and Education Levy for seven years, at a  
28 funding level that requires a Levy of \$231,562,000, which would add approximately  
\$0.27 per \$1,000 of assessed value of additional taxes and cost the owner of a home with  
2012 average residential assessed value of \$462,000 approximately \$124 annually; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle School Board and School District actively participated in the Levy  
Advisory Committee, held a retreat to discuss how the Levy investments could align with  
and strengthen the School District's core mission of helping all children succeed  
academically and endorsed the recommendations of the Levy Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, Proceeds from the Families and Education Levies are supplemental to the basic  
education financed by the State of Washington and the Seattle School District Levies and  
do not displace nor reduce State or School District funding for Seattle Public Schools;  
and



1 WHEREAS, the collection of taxes from the current Levy will end in 2011 and services funded  
2 by the Levy will end unless the Levy is renewed; and

3 WHEREAS, because the School District alone cannot address all barriers to academic  
4 achievement, and because Seattle residents support the economic, social and civic well-  
5 being of the city, supplemental funding provided through the Levy is a legitimate City  
6 purpose; NOW THEREFORE,

6 **BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:**

7 **Section 1. Findings and Declarations.** The City Council makes the following findings and  
8 declarations:

- 9 A. Seattle's children are its future and the quality of that future depends on providing all  
10 students a high quality education.
- 11 B. Seattle needs an educated population that is actively engaged in its civic life and  
12 contributes to the economic and social well-being of the city.
- 13 C. Graduating from high school and completing college or post-secondary training improves  
14 an individual's earnings potential and economic self-sufficiency. A high school diploma  
15 alone is insufficient to prepare our children to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century economy.
- 16 D. The need for all our children to succeed academically and the challenges to their doing so  
17 are even greater in 2011 than in 1990 when a Families and Education Levy was first  
18 approved by Seattle voters.
- 19 E. In order to earn a high school diploma, students must now pass standardized tests or  
20 approved alternatives to those tests that show competency in math, science, reading, and  
21 writing.
- 22 F. According to School District data of the 46,000 students enrolled in the School District in  
23 the 2009-2010 academic year, 40% qualified for the free and reduced lunch program,  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1 14% qualified for special education services, 12% qualified for the transitional bilingual  
2 program and 0.6% were in foster care.

3 G. The School District has developed and published a District Scorecard. For the 2009-2010  
4 academic year it reports 67% of the students graduated from high school in four years or  
5 less, 70% graduated in 6 years and only 46% of the high school graduates were prepared  
6 for admission to a four-year college.

7  
8 H. The School District has also developed and published a school report on the performance  
9 of each school in the district. Many of the lowest performing schools are predominately  
10 in the central, southeast and southwest parts of Seattle and these schools have a  
11 concentration of students who face difficult barriers and encounter significant challenges  
12 to academic achievement.

13  
14 I. The Seattle School District has adopted a new student assignment plan that emphasizes  
15 enrollment in neighborhood schools.

16 J. In recent years, research on child development has informed new strategies and across the  
17 nation there are examples where well-executed, research-based interventions can  
18 effectively improve a child's academic achievement.

19  
20 K. Since the 2005-2006 school year, Levy-funded programs and services have provided  
21 preschool support for approximately 4,000 children, out-of-school activities for more  
22 than 20,000 children and youth, parent engagement and family support services to at least  
23 12,000 students' families, academic support and intervention to more than 19,000  
24 students, and physical and mental health services to over 40,000 students.

25  
26 L. Research findings have underscored the importance of quality early childhood education  
27 by identifying critical periods when a child's brain development facilitates the acquisition

1 of certain skills, such as language, and the need to capitalize on those learning  
2 opportunities. Children acquire a larger vocabulary and stronger language skills if  
3 exposed to adults with a larger vocabulary. Since the 2005-2006 school year, Levy  
4 investments in providing high quality preschools, professional development for preschool  
5 workers, and assisting at-home childcare givers have helped 1,600 children enter  
6 kindergarten ready to succeed in school.

7  
8 M. Education experts and advocates stress the need to provide a continuum of services from  
9 cradle to college. For example, Geoffrey Canada, founder of the Harlem Children's Zone,  
10 emphasizes that such services need to be consistent and provide appropriate support for  
11 children through each developmental stage and through key school transition years.

12  
13 N. This understanding of the need for consistent and sustained supportive services has led to  
14 the development of "road maps" from birth to the completion of college or career  
15 certification which identify key education milestones and transition years, and helps  
16 focus efforts to improve education outcomes. The Community Center for Education  
17 Results (CCER) in Seattle has developed such a road map for students in South Seattle  
18 and South King County which is modeled after those adopted in other parts of the  
19 country. CCER has brought together government, education, philanthropic and  
20 community partners who have endorsed the CCER project and its goal of doubling the  
21 number of students in our region who are on track to graduate from college or earn a  
22 career credential by 2020. Mayor Michael McGinn and all members of the current City  
23 Council have endorsed the CCER approach, and the City of Seattle's Office for  
24 Education and the School District are collaborating with CCER and its partners in this  
25 effort.  
26  
27  
28



1 O. Mary Beth Celio's recent studies of School District students has found that while most  
2 students don't drop out of school until their junior or senior year of high school, there are  
3 dropout early warning signs as early as 6<sup>th</sup> grade. These include a high rate of unexcused  
4 absences; very low scores on state proficiency tests in 7<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades; a grade point  
5 average below 1.5 in middle school; more than one out-of-school suspension during  
6 middle or high school; and failing one or more grades in any one year from 6<sup>th</sup> through  
7 10<sup>th</sup> grades. The School District and Levy-funded programs use these key indicators to  
8 identify and respond to students who have these early warning signs.  
9

10 P. Research also shows there are key indicators of whether a child is on the path to  
11 academic achievement. For example, there is an instructional shift in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade from  
12 teaching children to read to having children learn through reading. Instruction relies  
13 increasingly on assigned written materials, including math directions and word problems.  
14 If a child is not reading at grade level in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade they are at great risk of never catching  
15 up and dropping out of school.  
16

17 Q. Many students enter middle school with reading and math skills several years behind  
18 their grade level. Data from the current Levy's investments in middle school show the  
19 effectiveness of extended learning opportunities that provide students additional time to  
20 master the academic skills they're lacking. Since the 2005-2006 school year Levy  
21 investments have helped 2,500 middle school students meet the required standard on state  
22 proficiency tests for the first time. In addition, Levy investments have helped 1,500  
23 elementary school students meet the required standard on state proficiency tests so they  
24 enter middle school ready to succeed academically.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 R. Healthy eating and an active lifestyle are fundamental components of being ready to  
2 achieve academically. Levy investments should incorporate strategies that promote  
3 healthy eating and active living for students and their families when feasible and  
4 appropriate.

5  
6 S. Since 1990, the Levy has invested in health services for Seattle students. Research  
7 findings in a 2009 study by Sarah Cusworth Walker and others at the University of  
8 Washington show that school-based health centers improve student health and emotional  
9 well-being, and that these in turn aid academic performance by increasing attendance  
10 rates and student grade point averages over time.

11  
12 T. Increasing the academic skill level of high school graduates is as important as increasing  
13 the number of students who graduate. Today, many high school graduates do not have the  
14 academic skills necessary for apprenticeship programs or college level work and must  
15 take remedial courses. The need for remedial coursework increases the financial barriers  
16 to post-secondary education for these students. Top administrators of Seattle post-  
17 secondary institutions confirmed this problem in testimony to Council on November 15,  
18 2010.

19  
20 U. The School District's graduation requirements are not presently aligned with  
21 requirements for entering or succeeding in post-secondary institutions.

22 V. The School District Board of Directors agrees that students should leave high school  
23 college and career ready and adopted the following Instructional Policy in March 2010:

24 "The Board of Directors of Seattle Public Schools believes that every student can  
25 and must learn at grade level and beyond, and that all students will be afforded the  
26  
27  
28



1 opportunity to reach their potential and graduate from high school ready for  
2 college, career, and life. We recognize that in today's global economy, college  
3 ready and career ready standards are the same and are appropriate for all students.  
4 It is the responsibility of the School Board and the Superintendent to ensure that  
5 all students receive an education that meets these goals.”

6  
7 W. The academic and financial challenges facing the School District and its students have  
8 been and are being experienced throughout the country. Bold initiatives have been  
9 undertaken and positive results are possible. The management of the current Levy has  
10 relied heavily on the evaluation of outcomes and future investments should and will be  
11 made in areas of demonstrated effectiveness.

12  
13 X. An urgent need exists to continue the provision of City Education-Support Services that  
14 support academic achievement to be funded by regular property taxes. This urgency  
15 requires submission of a proposition authorizing regular property tax levies for up to  
16 seven years in excess of the levy limitations in Chapter 84.55 RCW. The proposition  
17 should be submitted to the qualified electors of The City of Seattle at a special election to  
18 be held in conjunction with the general election on November 8, 2011.

19  
20 **Section 2. Statement of Policy.** It is the paramount duty of the State “to make ample provision  
21 for the education of all students.” The School District is directly responsible for providing a  
22 quality education for all students. However, the School District cannot do this essential work  
23 alone. Government, business, community and families should collaborate and together all can  
24 contribute to the academic success of Seattle's children. The City endorses the following  
25 Priorities for Levy Funding and Implementation Principles adopted and recommended by the  
26 Levy Advisory Committee. The School District and its Board were active participants on the  
27



1 Levy Advisory Committee, endorsed these Priorities and Principles and agreed that they are  
2 aligned with the School District's strategic goals.

3  
4 **Priorities for Levy Funding:**

- 5 1. Children at risk, including English Language Learners,
- 6 2. Children, birth to age 5, likely to attend low performing schools,
- 7 3. Students with the highest level of academic need,
- 8 4. Schools with the highest level of academic need,
- 9 5. Maximizing impact by funding a targeted number of schools and students,
- 10 6. Build on the success of previous investments, where possible,
- 11 7. Use evidence-based and/or promising practices to improve academic outcomes,
- 12 and
- 13 8. Invest in family strengthening practices.

14  
15 **Implementation Principles:**

- 16 1. Use an accountability structure based on student outcomes, indicators and
- 17 performance-based contracts,
- 18 2. Encourage course corrections to improve outcomes; defund projects that do not
- 19 achieve outcomes,
- 20 3. Report on student performance at least annually,
- 21 4. Continue data-sharing agreement with Seattle Public Schools,
- 22 5. Maximize partnerships to achieve outcomes,
- 23 6. Provide support for innovative academic strategies aimed at dramatically
- 24 improving academic achievement, and
- 25
- 26
- 27



- 1                   7. Help support academic elements of place-based community strategies for  
2                   transformation of schools or feeder patterns of schools.

3  
4 **Section 3. Definitions.** As used in this ordinance, the following words when capitalized have  
5 the following meanings:

- 6           A. "City" means The City of Seattle.  
7           B. "Education-Support Services" means the array of programs and activities referred to in  
8           Section 6, with such modifications as the City Council may from time to time authorize  
9           by ordinance.  
10          C. "Proceeds" means that portion of regular property taxes levied and collected as  
11          authorized by voter approval pursuant to this ordinance that are above the limits on levies  
12          provided for in RCW 84.55.010, and all interest and other earnings derived from that  
13          portion of the Levy.  
14          D. "Seattle School Board" and "School Board" mean Seattle School District No. 1 Board of  
15          Directors.  
16          E. "Seattle School District" and "School District" mean Seattle School District No. 1.

17  
18 **Section 4. Levy of Regular Property Taxes - Submittal.** The City hereby submits to the  
19 qualified electors of the City a proposition as authorized by RCW 84.55.050 to exceed the levy  
20 limitation on regular property taxes contained in Chapter 84.55 RCW, as it now exists or may  
21 hereafter be amended, for property taxes levied in 2011 through 2017 for collection in 2012  
22 through 2018, respectively, raising up to \$231,562,000 in aggregate over a period of up to seven  
23 years. The proposition shall be limited so that the City shall not levy more than \$32,101,000 in  
24 the first year, in addition to the maximum amount of regular property taxes it would have been  
25 limited to by RCW 84.55.010 in the absence of voter approval under this ordinance, plus other  
26 authorized lid lifts. Proceeds shall be used to provide Education-Support Services for Seattle  
27



1 School District students, Seattle youth, and their families. Pursuant to RCW 84.55.050(4), the  
2 maximum regular property taxes that may be levied in 2018 for collection in 2019 and in later  
3 years shall be computed as if the levy lid in RCW 84.55.010 had not been lifted under this  
4 ordinance.

5  
6 **Section 5. Application of Proceeds.** Unless otherwise directed by ordinance, Proceeds shall  
7 be deposited in the Education-Support Services Fund. The Director of Finance and  
8 Administrative Services, or the Director's designee, is authorized to create subfunds or accounts  
9 within the Education-Support Services Fund as may be needed or appropriate to implement the  
10 purposes of this ordinance. Proceeds may be temporarily deposited or invested in such manner  
11 as may be lawful for the investment of City money, and interest and other earnings shall be used  
12 for the same purposes as the Proceeds.

13  
14 **Section 6. Education-Support Services.** Education-Support Services funded by Proceeds are  
15 intended to promote school readiness and learning, support academic achievement and reduce  
16 the academic achievement gap, and prepare graduates for college and the career of their choice.  
17 Levy investments shall be guided by the Statement of Policy, Priorities for Funding and  
18 Implementation Principles in Section 2. Initially, these core strategies will be pursued through a  
19 variety of Education-Support Services that include the following:

- 20  
21 A. **School readiness and early learning.** Major program elements include preschool for  
22 low-income three and four year olds; access for low-income families to high quality  
23 childcare; professional development for early education providers; school readiness  
24 support for children in home day-care situations, including home visits; health  
25 screenings; and preschool to kindergarten transition services.



- 1     **B. Academic achievement in elementary school.** Major program elements include  
2         extended learning time, out-of-school time activities, and summer learning programs; and  
3         school- and community-based family support services.
- 4     **C. Academic achievement and college/career preparation in middle school.** Major  
5         program elements include extended learning time; out-of-school time activities; social,  
6         emotional, and behavioral supports; summer learning programs; and advising, guidance  
7         and related support for college readiness.
- 8     **D. Academic achievement and college/career preparation in high school.** Major program  
9         elements include extended learning time; social, emotional, and behavioral supports;  
10         summer learning programs; and advising, guidance and related support for college  
11         readiness.
- 12    **E. Student health.** Major program elements include school-based student health clinics and  
13         physical, mental and dental support services at clinic sites in middle and high schools,  
14         school based health services at high need elementary schools, and health services for  
15         high-risk middle and high school students in alternative school settings.
- 16    **F. Community partnership fund.** Major program elements include funding for community  
17         and school-based partnerships to achieve Levy goals.
- 18    **G. Research and Evaluation.** Major program elements include research and evaluation of  
19         the individual programs and services in the foregoing categories and of the overall  
20         outcomes of Education-Support Services funded by Proceeds.

21  
22         These program elements are illustrative examples. In the annual City budget or by  
23         separate ordinance, the City shall from year-to-year determine the Education-Support Services  
24         and funding allocations that will most effectively achieve the Levy goals and outcomes. Within a  
25         budget year the City is authorized to reallocate unexpended and unencumbered funds from one  
26         core strategy to another by making operating budget transfers consistent with SMC 5.08.020.



1 The Council requires that before the Executive submits to the Council any proposed changes in  
2 Levy funding requiring Council approval by ordinance, the Executive will seek the  
3 recommendation of the Oversight Committee.

4 Unexpended appropriations of Proceeds shall carry forward to subsequent fiscal years  
5 until they are exhausted or abandoned by ordinance.

6 The City's expenditures on administrative costs over the seven-year period of the Levy  
7 shall not exceed a total of five percent of the total expenditure authority of the Proceeds.

8  
9 **Section 7. Oversight Committee.** Conditioned upon voter approval of the ballot proposition  
10 submitted by this ordinance, there is established an Oversight Committee (Committee) to make  
11 recommendations on the design and funding of Levy programs and to monitor the progress of  
12 Levy programs in meeting Levy outcomes and goals.

13  
14 A. The Committee shall make recommendations on the Implementation and Evaluation Plan  
15 called for in Section 8 and on the Partnership Agreement called for in Section 10.

16 B. The Committee shall each year:

- 17
- 18 • By February review the annual report of Levy outcomes and indicators for the previous  
19 school year;
  - 20 • By April review mid-year indicators of progress for the first semester of the current  
21 school year;
  - 22 • By May review and advise on proposed course corrections, program modifications, or  
23 program eliminations;
  - 24 • By September review and advise the City Council on proposed expenditures and  
25 reallocations, including the annual Levy budget; and
  - 26 • Periodically review and advise on program evaluations.
- 27  
28



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28
- C. The Council requires that before the Executive submits to the Council the Implementation and Evaluation Plan, Partnership Agreement or proposes any changes in Levy funding requiring Council approval by ordinance, the Executive will seek the recommendation of the Committee.
- D. The Committee shall consist of twelve (12) members: the Mayor, the Chair of the City Council's Public Safety and Education Committee or its successor with respect to education issues, the Superintendent of the School District, a member of the School District Board, and eight (8) citizens. The Mayor and City Council shall each appoint four (4) of the citizen Committee members. All members appointed by the Mayor shall be confirmed by the City Council.
- E. The eight citizen members shall be appointed to three (3) year staggered terms subject to reappointment, except that two of them (one Mayoral appointee and one Council appointee) shall be initially appointed for a single year term, three (two Mayoral appointees and one Council appointee) for a two (2) year term, and three (one Mayoral appointee and two Council appointees) for a three (3) year term. Upon the resignation, retirement, death, incapacity or removal of a Committee member, the authority appointing such member may appoint a replacement for the balance of the term. The appointing authority may remove any member who is absent from two or more consecutive meetings without cause. The appointing authority may remove any member for other good cause shown or to ensure compliance with subsection F of this section.
- F. The eight citizens should have professional, personal or research experience associated with the growth and development of children, including their academic success. For example, this experience may come from classroom teaching, student mentoring, or education policy research. The City will also seek candidates to serve on the Committee who have an understanding of and experience working with new immigrants and refugees, communities of color, Native American tribes, children of different abilities,



1 and others who have historically not been academically successful in traditional  
2 education programs.

3 G. At all times no more than three (3) Committee members shall be an officer, director,  
4 board member, trustee, partner or employee of an entity that receives or competes for  
5 funding under this ordinance; or be a member of the immediate family of, or an  
6 individual residing with, an officer, director, board member, trustee, partner or employee  
7 of an entity that receives or competes for funding under this ordinance; or be a person  
8 seeking or having an arrangement concerning future employment with an entity that  
9 receives or competes for funding under this ordinance. For the purposes of this ordinance  
10 an individual's "immediate family" means an individual's spouse or domestic partner,  
11 child, child of a spouse or domestic partner, sibling, sibling of a domestic partner,  
12 brother-in-law, sister-in-law, parent, parent of a spouse or domestic partner, a person for  
13 whom the individual is a legal guardian, or a person claimed as a dependent on the  
14 individual's most recently filed federal income tax return. Subject to the preceding  
15 sentence and applicable law, an individual serving as an officer, director, board member,  
16 trustee, partner or employee of an entity that receives or competes for funding under this  
17 ordinance, or who has an interest in such an entity, shall not thereby be disqualified from  
18 serving on the Committee, but shall fully disclose any such relationships and shall not  
19 vote on any matter in which the interest of such entity is directly involved. For purposes  
20 of this section, "entity" does not include a City department or office. The provisions of  
21 this section are in addition to the requirements of SMC chapter 4.16.

22 H. The Mayor and the Chair of the City Council's Public Safety and Education Committee  
23 or successor committee overseeing education, or their respective designees, will co-chair  
24 the Committee. The Committee will generally meet every other month or as needed  
25 beginning January 2012. The Office for Education shall provide staff and logistical  
26 support for the Committee. Members shall serve without pay. The Committee shall  
27  
28



1 continue in existence through December 31, 2018, and thereafter if so provided by  
2 ordinance.

3 **Section 8. Implementation and Evaluation Plan.** Proceeds may be spent only in accordance  
4 with the Implementation and Evaluation plan (the Plan) approved by ordinance. The Plan may be  
5 amended by ordinance.

6 The Plan shall set forth the criteria, measurable outcomes and methodology by which  
7 programs funded by Proceeds will be selected and evaluated. The evaluation methodology shall  
8 measure both individual programs and overall effects of the Education-Support Services. The  
9 achievement of all stated outcomes shall be evaluated and no one component will be  
10 determinative of an individual programs' effectiveness or the overall effectiveness of the  
11 Education-Support Services.

12  
13 **Section 9. Implementing Agreements.** If this proposition is approved by the voters, the City  
14 may carry out the Education-Support Services with City staff or by agreements with the School  
15 District, with Public Health Seattle-King County, and with such other agencies and persons as  
16 may be appropriate. It is the intent of the City Council that all 2011 Levy investments, including  
17 services previously funded in the 2004 Levy, shall be awarded through a competitive process.  
18 The Implementation and Evaluation Plan will set out a process and schedule for how programs  
19 will be selected and contracted.

20 The Mayor or the Mayor's designee is authorized to enter into such agreements,  
21 consistent with Section 10 below. The City shall, when soliciting businesses for goods or  
22 services agreements, perform outreach to small, economically disadvantaged businesses,  
23 including those owned by women and minorities. City agreements with other public entities shall  
24 encourage those entities to actively solicit bids for the subcontracting of any goods or services,  
25 when such subcontracting is required or appropriate, from qualified small businesses, including  
26 those owned by women and minorities. City agreements with businesses for goods and services  
27



1 and with other public entities and non-profits shall encourage these entities to employ a  
2 workforce reflective of the region's diversity. All City agreements for goods and services shall  
3 require the contracting entities to comply with all then-applicable requirements for non-  
4 discrimination in employment in federal, state, and City of Seattle laws and regulations.

5 All City agreements funded by Proceeds will stipulate that no assurances are made of  
6 continuation beyond the 2018-2019 school year after the levy lid lift authorized by the voters has  
7 expired.

8  
9 **Section 10. City of Seattle/Seattle School District Partnership Agreement.** There shall be a  
10 Partnership Agreement (the Partnership Agreement) developed by the City and the Seattle  
11 School District in which the roles and responsibilities of the City and the School District in  
12 developing the Implementation and Evaluation Plan, referenced in Section 8, and in  
13 implementing Education-Support Services are established. The Partnership Agreement shall set  
14 forth the parties roles and responsibilities for achieving the desired outcomes for Education-  
15 Support Services. It shall outline, in a variety of areas, ways in which both the City and the  
16 School District shall work collaboratively toward better results for children and youth. The  
17 Partnership Agreement shall cover items including, but not limited to: data sharing necessary to  
18 implement program evaluations and course corrections, standards for delivery of services, and  
19 methods for identifying and targeting students and schools most in need of support.

20 The City cannot enter into the Partnership Agreement, or materially amend the  
21 Partnership Agreement, until the Partnership Agreement or the amendment, as the case may be,  
22 is approved by the Seattle City Council and the School District's Board of Directors. Proceeds  
23 may be spent on School District programs or functions only in accordance with an effective  
24 Partnership Agreement.



1 **Section 11. Reporting.** The Director of the Office for Education will prepare and submit to the  
2 Oversight Committee, City Council, the Mayor and citizens of Seattle annual progress reports on  
3 the implementation of the Education-Support Services covering each of the core strategies and  
4 the actions taken as a result of the adopted City of Seattle/School District Partnership  
5 Agreement.

6  
7 **Section 12. Election - Ballot Title.** The City Council directs that the City Clerk file this  
8 ordinance with the Director of Elections of King County, Washington, as ex officio supervisor of  
9 elections, requesting that the Director of Elections call and conduct a special election in the City  
10 in conjunction with the state general election to be held on November 8, 2011, for the purpose of  
11 submitting to the qualified electors of the City the proposition set forth in this ordinance. The  
12 City Clerk is directed to certify to the King County Director of Elections the ballot title approved  
13 by the City Attorney in accordance with his responsibilities under RCW 29A.36.071. The  
14 following ballot title is submitted to the City attorney for his consideration:

15  
16 THE CITY OF SEATTLE

17  
18 PROPOSITION NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

19 REGULAR TAX LEVY INCLUDING

20 FAMILIES AND EDUCATION

21  
22 The City of Seattle's Proposition concerns renewing and enhancing Education-Support Services  
23 to improve academic achievement.

24 This proposition would fund City services, including school readiness, academic achievement in  
25 elementary, middle and high school, college/career preparation, and student health and  
26 community partnerships as provided in Ordinance \_\_\_\_\_. It authorizes regular property taxes  
27  
28



1 above RCW 84.55 limits, allowing additional 2012 collection of up to \$32,101,000  
2 (approximately \$0.27/\$1000 assessed value) and up to \$231,562,000 over seven years. In 2012,  
3 total City taxes collected would not exceed \$3.60 per \$1,000 of assessed value.

4 Should this Levy be approved?

5 Levy, Yes

6 Levy, No

7 Those in favor shall vote "Yes;" those opposed shall mark their ballots "No."  
8

9 **Section 13. Ratification.** Certification of such proposition by the City Clerk to the King County  
10 Director of Elections in accordance with law prior to the date of such election on November 8,  
11 and any other act consistent with the authority and prior to the effective date of this ordinance,  
12 are hereby ratified and confirmed.  
13

14 **Section 14. Severability.** In the event any one or more of the provisions of this ordinance shall  
15 for any reason be held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect any other provision of this  
16 ordinance or the levy of the taxes authorized herein, but this ordinance and the authority to levy  
17 those taxes shall be construed and enforced as if such invalid provisions had not been contained  
18 herein; and any provision which shall for any reason be held by reason of its extent to be invalid  
19 shall be deemed to be in effect to the extent permitted by law.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1           **Section 15.** This ordinance shall take effect and be in force 30 days after its approval by  
2 the Mayor, but if not approved and returned by the Mayor within ten days after presentation, it  
3 shall take effect as provided by Seattle Municipal Code Section 1.04.020.

4  
5           Passed by the City Council the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011, and  
6 signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this  
7 \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

8  
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10           President \_\_\_\_\_ of the City Council

11  
12           Approved by me this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

13  
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15           Michael McGinn, Mayor

16  
17           Filed by me this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2011.

18  
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20           City Clerk

21 (Seal)



**FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Contact Person/Phone:</b>	<b>CBO Analyst/Phone:</b>
Department of Neighborhoods	Donnie Grabowski / 206-233-2603	Kristi Beattie / 684-5266

**Legislation Title:**

AN ORDINANCE relating to regular property taxes; requesting that a special election be held concurrent with the November 8, 2011 general election for submission to the qualified electors of the City of a proposition to lift the limit on regular property taxes under Chapter 84.55 RCW and authorize the City to levy additional taxes for up to seven years for the purpose of providing Seattle School District No. 1 public school students, Seattle children, and their families education-support services designed to improve academic achievement; authorizing creation of a new subfund; creating an oversight committee; and authorizing implementing agreements for this levy lid lift commonly known as the Families and Education Levy.

**Summary of the Legislation:**

The proposed ordinance would submit a \$231,562,000 seven-year Education-Support Services Levy ("Levy") package to the voters of Seattle for their approval in the fall of 2011. The proposed Levy would be raised under the provisions of RCW 84.55.050, which allows a city to obtain voter approval to exceed the "lid" on regular property taxes for any purposes. Levy proceeds would be intended for the following programs for the period September 2012-August 2019:

- 1) **School readiness and early learning: \$61,050,064**  
High quality preschool for low-income 4-year-olds, access for low-income families to high quality childcare, professional development for early education providers, school readiness support for children in home day-cares, health screenings, and preschool to kindergarten transition services.
- 2) **Academic achievement in elementary school: \$54,007,694**  
Includes extended learning time, out-of-school time activities, summer learning programs, and school-and community-based family support services.
- 3) **Academic achievement and college/career preparation in middle school: \$44,593,762**  
Program elements include extended learning time, out-of-school time activities, social, emotional, and behavioral supports, guidance and related support for college readiness.
- 4) **Academic achievement and college/career preparation in high school: \$20,728,408**  
Programs include extended learning time, social, emotional, and behavioral supports; summer learning programs; and advising, guidance and related support for college readiness.

A circular stamp in the bottom right corner of the page. The text inside the stamp is partially legible and appears to say "CITY CLERK".

**5) Student health: \$44,365,128**

Program elements include school-based student health clinics and physical, mental, and dental support and other health services at clinic sites in middle and high schools; school-based health services at high need elementary schools.

**6) Community partnerships: \$0\***

Major program elements include funding for community and school-based partnerships to achieve Levy goals.

\*This item is noted as a placeholder item in the event that programming dollars from other areas are used for these purposes.

**7) Research and Evaluation: \$1,400,000**

Major program elements include evaluation of the individual programs and research in the foregoing components and the overall effects of Education-Support Services funded by Levy proceeds.

The proposed Levy also includes **\$9,364,377** (or approximately 4% of the total 7-year Levy amount) for administration. The Levy would have a 5% overall administration cap over its 7-year life, though administration percentages may be higher or lower than 5% in any given year.

**Background:** (Include a brief description of the purpose and context of legislation and include record of previous legislation and funding history, if applicable.)

The current educational and developmental services Levy, approved by voters in 2004, expires in mid-2012. Despite the success of the 2004 and prior levies, Seattle still has an urgent need to continue the provision of services to address deficiencies in school readiness, academic achievement, drop-out prevention, and college readiness. The proposed Levy recommended by the Levy Planning Committee will enable the City to continue and more effectively address Seattle's educational needs.

Previously, Seattle voters have approved:

- a \$69.5 levy in 1990;
- a \$69.5 million levy in 1997; and
- a \$116.8 million levy in 2004

Please check one of the following:

**This legislation does not have any financial implications.**

**This legislation has financial implications.** (Please complete all relevant sections that follow.)

This legislation does not directly result in appropriation or position changes. If the proposed Levy is passed by Seattle citizens, the Education-Support Services Levy 2012 budget appropriation as adopted by the City Council will reflect the corresponding appropriation and revenue amounts in 2012 and subsequent years. Passage of the proposed Levy would likely



result in staffing changes and additions, and these staffing changes would be included in a future ordinance authorizing the proposed Levy's implementation plan. The Levy rate and average cost to a homeowner of the proposed Levy are highlighted in Attachment 1 to this fiscal note. Projected Expenditure and Revenues for the 2011 Education-Support Services Levy are included in Attachment 2.

**What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?**

The current 2004 Educational and Developmental Services Levy expires with the collection of 2011 property taxes. The City's capacity to respond to Seattle children's educational needs will be significantly reduced starting in mid-2012 if this legislation is not implemented.

**Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?**

This legislation would impact the Human Services Department, Department of Neighborhoods, and Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation as there are staffing positions in each of these departments that are currently funded by the 2004 Educational and Developmental Services Levy. These positions are proposed to be maintained should the proposed Levy be passed by the voters. Staff members in these departments are aware that the current Levy expires in mid-2012 and that the positions may not be maintained if the proposed Levy is not passed. Staff are aware that the Levy Planning Committee has recommended this legislation to the Executive and City Council.

**What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?**

There are no other funding sources available to the City that will accomplish these objectives. Our declining economy has decreased the amount of General Subfunds available for general government activities, making it an unfeasible funding source for supplemental educational levy programs.

**Is the legislation subject to public hearing requirements?**

The City Council has prepared a Special Committee on Educational Achievement for Seattle Schoolchildren schedule to review the proposed Levy from January-March 2011. A public hearing is tentatively scheduled for Thursday, February 17 from 5:30-7:30 p.m. Public comment will also be available during each meeting.

**Other Issues:** (Include long-term implications of the legislation.)

**List attachments to the fiscal note below:**

Attachment 1: Levy Rate and Annual Cost to Homeowner

Attachment 2: Projected Expenditures and Revenues for 2011 Education-Support Services Levy



**Attachment 1: Levy Rate and Annual Cost to Homeowner**

**Levy Rate and Annual Cost to Homeowner**

**Total Levy Amount: \$231,562,000**

Tax Year	Assessed Value Estimate	% Growth	Annual Levy Amount	Rate per \$1,000 of Assessed Value	Annual Cost to Owner of Average Residential Assessed Value	Average Residential Assessed Value
2011	119,466,161,527	-2.92%				\$452,985
2012	119,298,908,901	-0.14%	\$32,100,950	\$0.269	\$124.33	\$462,045
2013	123,199,983,222	3.27%	\$32,421,960	\$0.263	\$125.85	\$478,216
2014	128,596,142,487	4.38%	\$32,746,180	\$0.255	\$126.04	\$494,954
2015	134,382,968,899	4.50%	\$33,073,641	\$0.246	\$126.08	\$512,277
2016	140,430,202,499	4.50%	\$33,404,378	\$0.238	\$126.12	\$530,207
2017	146,749,561,612	4.50%	\$33,738,421	\$0.230	\$126.16	\$548,764
2018	153,353,291,884	4.50%	\$34,075,806	\$0.222	\$126.21	\$567,971



**Attachment 2: Projected Expenditures and Revenues for 2011 Education-Support Services Levy**

2011 LEVY EXPENDITURES:	CY 2012	CY 2013	CY 2014	CY 2015	CY 2016	CY 2017	CY 2018	CY 2019	Total
Early Learning	\$1,706,007	\$5,765,435	\$7,249,028	\$8,178,208	\$9,153,954	\$10,173,376	\$11,084,099	\$7,739,956	\$61,050,064
Elementary	\$1,394,262	\$4,610,427	\$5,759,323	\$6,965,430	\$8,234,147	\$9,484,236	\$10,383,276	\$7,176,592	\$54,007,694
Middle Schools	\$1,421,180	\$4,695,173	\$5,656,949	\$6,213,582	\$6,694,169	\$7,184,799	\$7,564,130	\$5,163,780	\$44,593,762
High Schools	\$ 831,385	\$2,546,532	\$2,605,103	\$2,719,222	\$2,946,049	\$3,182,518	\$3,425,816	\$2,471,783	\$20,728,408
Health	\$1,711,236	\$5,509,470	\$6,187,471	\$6,335,971	\$6,494,370	\$6,656,729	\$6,816,491	\$4,653,391	\$44,365,128
Administration	\$ 409,396	\$1,253,981	\$1,282,823	\$1,313,611	\$1,346,451	\$1,380,112	\$1,413,235	\$964,768	\$9,364,377
Research and Evaluation	\$66,667	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$133,333	\$1,400,000
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</b>	<b>\$7,540,134</b>	<b>\$24,581,019</b>	<b>\$28,940,696</b>	<b>\$31,926,024</b>	<b>\$35,069,140</b>	<b>\$38,261,770</b>	<b>\$40,887,046</b>	<b>\$28,303,603</b>	<b>\$235,509,433</b>
2011 LEVY ESTIMATED/ACTUAL REVENUES:	CY 2012	CY 2013	CY 2014	CY 2015	CY 2016	CY 2017	CY 2018	CY 2019	Total
Levy Legal Allocation (per Ordinance)	\$32,100,950	\$32,421,960	\$32,746,180	\$33,073,641	\$33,404,378	\$33,738,421	\$34,075,806	\$0	\$231,561,336
Estimated property taxes to be collected	\$31,659,216	\$32,195,453	\$32,565,347	\$32,916,694	\$33,257,454	\$33,597,548	\$33,934,150	\$508,897	\$230,634,758*
Investment Earnings (Est)	\$264,175	\$573,199	\$682,361	\$908,013	\$894,941	\$811,131	\$663,642	\$77,213	\$4,874,675**
<b>TOTAL REVENUES:</b>	<b>\$31,923,391</b>	<b>\$32,768,652</b>	<b>\$33,247,708</b>	<b>\$33,824,706</b>	<b>\$34,152,395</b>	<b>\$34,408,679</b>	<b>\$34,597,792</b>	<b>\$586,110</b>	<b>\$235,509,433</b>

\*estimate assumes anticipated cash receipts for the period 2012-2024

\*\*Annual investment earning assumption ranges from 1.72% to 2.5%



City of Seattle  
Office of the Mayor

February 1, 2011

Honorable Richard Conlin  
President  
Seattle City Council  
City Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

Dear Council President Conlin:

I am pleased to transmit the attached proposed Council Bill that requests a proposition be put forth to the voters to lift the property tax limit to levy additional taxes for the purpose of providing education-support services through what is commonly known as the Families and Education Levy. The proposed Council Bill would levy \$231,562,000 over seven years to prepare young children to enter school, support academic achievement and reduce the achievement gap, and to help students graduate from high school. The proceeds from the levy would be invested in five areas including Early Learning; Elementary, Middle and High School Academic Achievement improvements; and Student Health services. The overall goal of these investments is to ensure all Seattle Public School students graduate from high school ready for college or a career.

The Seattle Public School District Scorecard for the 2009-2010 academic year reported that 67% of students graduated from high school in four years, and only 46% of those graduates were prepared to enter a four year college. Clearly, we are failing to prepare our children for the economy they are entering and to face the challenges of a complex world. Proceeds from the Families and Education Levy would be focused on helping children who are preparing to enter or are attending the 23 elementary schools with the highest concentrations of low income students. Students in five middle schools and five high schools would benefit from coordinated investments aimed at improving academic achievement for struggling students. Students in these middle and high schools would also receive support planning and preparing for post secondary success. All 10<sup>th</sup> grade students throughout the district would be assessed for post secondary readiness, while 800 students would receive more intensive support preparing for life after-high school. Over 2,700 students at all grades would receive an opportunity to participate in summer school, regardless of the school attended. Our highly regarded school based health centers would be maintained and expanded to two additional sites including the Secondary Bilingual Orientation Center where refugee and immigrant children enter into the education system. Health services would also be extended into 10 elementary schools.

During my inauguration as Mayor, I launched the Seattle Youth and Families Initiative. Over 2,800 people attended community caucuses, small group meetings, or submitted information electronically. The predominant concerns raised by these families addressed academic issues. Families and young people described the myriad obstacles they faced in trying to prepare for and successfully complete school. Many participants raised specific concerns about how we fail to support low income, minority and English Language Learner students. City Council members were fully supportive of this Initiative and engaged in many of the meetings and caucuses. They too heard of the challenges facing our families.

Michael McGinn, Mayor  
Office of the Mayor  
600 Fourth Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
PO Box 94749  
Seattle, WA 98124-4749

Tel (206) 684-4000  
Fax (206) 684-5360  
TDD (206) 615-0476  
mike.mcginn@seattle.gov





City of Seattle  
Office of the Mayor

The City Council adopted Resolution 31206 setting forth a structure, process and schedule for developing a Families and Education Levy renewal proposal for the 2011 election. Collaboratively, we appointed twenty citizen members with strong backgrounds in education, advocacy, community organizing and research to develop three recommended levels of funding for the Levy. For six months, the Levy Advisory Committee followed a thoughtful and challenging process to review the investments of the current levy, to hear from experts about promising approaches for improving academic achievement, and to get feedback from the community about their recommendations. The attached proposal to levy additional taxes in the amount of \$231,562,000 to support the programs described above reflects the unanimous recommendation of the members of the Levy Planning Committee.

Development of this proposal has truly been a collaborative venture. The City Council, Mayor's Office, and Seattle Public Schools have worked closely together to ensure that proposed levy investments have the greatest likelihood of success. Recommendations from the planning committee closely align the findings from the Youth and Families Initiative, the principles laid out in Resolution 31206 and the Seattle Public Schools Strategic Plan. I am confident that the partnerships engendered during the development of this proposal will strengthen our ability to deliver on our promise to Seattle's students and families: *All children will graduate from school college/career ready.*

Thank you for your consideration of this legislation. Should you have questions, please contact Holly Miller, Director, Office for Education, at 684-4508.

Sincerely,

Michael McGinn  
Mayor of Seattle

cc: Honorable Members of the Seattle City Council

