

#22
CB117395

ORDINANCE _____

AN ORDINANCE relating to the 2011 Families and Education Levy; approving an implementation and evaluation plan as required by Ordinance 123567; and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts.

WHEREAS, by Ordinance 123567, the City placed before voters a proposition to authorize the City to levy regular property taxes for up to seven years in excess of the 101% limitation and any other limitation on levies in Chapter 84.55 RCW for the purpose of providing City services, including providing Seattle School District public school students, Seattle youth, and their families with education support; and

WHEREAS, on November 8, 2011, the City's voters approved that proposition; and

WHEREAS, Section 8 of Ordinance 123567 states that proceeds from the voter-approved additional taxes and interest earnings may be spent only in accordance with an implementation and evaluation plan (the "Plan") approved by ordinance; and

WHEREAS, Section 8 of Ordinance 123567 also states that the Plan will set forth the criteria, measurable outcomes and methodology by which programs funded by those additional taxes and interest earnings will be selected and evaluated; and

WHEREAS, City Departments have developed plans for investments of levy proceeds to achieve specific, measurable outcomes for school readiness, academic achievement and reduction of the academic achievement gap, dropout reduction, and college and career readiness; and

WHEREAS, the Families and Education Levy Oversight Committee has reviewed the implementation and evaluation plan as required by Ordinance 123567; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Families and Education Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan attached as Attachment 1 is approved as required by Section 8 of Ordinance 123567. The plan is consistent with the City Council's intent expressed in Section 9 of Ordinance 123567 that all 2011 Levy investments, including services previously funded by the 2004 Families and Education Levy, be awarded through a competitive process.



1 Section 2. 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 Section 3. Ratify and Confirm. Any act consistent with the authority of this ordinance
5 taken prior to its effective date is hereby ratified and confirmed.

6 Passed by the City Council the ____ day of _____, 2012, and
7 signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this
8 ____ day of _____, 2012.

9 _____
10
11 President _____ of the City Council

12
13 Approved by me this ____ day of _____, 2012.

14
15 _____
16 Michael McGinn, Mayor

17
18 Filed by me this ____ day of _____, 2012.

19
20 _____
21 Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

22 (Seal)

23 Attachment 1: The Families and Education Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan
24
25
26
27
28



Attachment 1: The Families and Education Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan

OVERVIEW

This Families and Education Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan sets forth the criteria, measurable outcomes and methodology by which Families and Education Levy (Levy) programs will be selected and evaluated for the Levy approved by voters in November 2011.

All Levy investments will be made for the purpose of achieving the outcomes described below. Progress towards those outcomes will be used to measure success and to provide information for course corrections. Specific numeric targets will be set each year so that organizations receiving investments are clear of their goals and understand how their success will be evaluated.

All Levy programs will be selected and evaluated using an outcome funding framework. In this approach the City is investing Levy proceeds to achieve the following three city-wide outcomes:

- Children will be ready for school
- All students will achieve academically and the achievement gap will be reduced
- All students will graduate from school college/career ready

School readiness is measured by:

- The Washington Kindergarten Assessment of Developmental Skills

Academic achievement is measured by:

- The Measurements of Student Progress;
- The Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment;
- The High School Proficiency Exam;
- On-time promotion to 10th grade; and,
- End-of-Course Math Exams.

Students graduating from school college/career ready is measured by:

- On-time graduation;
- Graduating with the Washington State requirements for entry into a four-year college, and/or completion of a career and technical education course of study;
- Graduates enrolling in post-secondary education;
- Graduates not needing to enroll in remedial education courses; and,
- Graduates continuously enrolled in college for one year.

To achieve the three Levy outcomes, the City will set clear numeric targets for each Levy program and define and track indicators that measure progress toward targets. These indicators include, but are not limited to:

- Families demonstrating increased positive behavior on the PACT and the CBT
- Children making gains in the Standard Score from the fall pre-PPVT to the spring post-PPVT
- Children with a minimum of two assessments meeting age-level expectations on Teaching Strategies Gold
- Children are in classrooms meeting an ECERS standard of 4 in each subscale or an average of 6 in all subscales
- English Language Learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- Elementary students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Elementary students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on math MAP
- Elementary students with fewer than 5 absences per semester
- Middle school students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Middle school students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on math MAP
- Middle School students passing all courses
- Middle School students with fewer than 5 absences per semester
- 7th and 8th grade students enrolled in the College Bound Scholarship Program
- 9th grade students making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- 9th grade students making or exceeding annual typical growth on math MAP
- High School students passing all courses
- High School students with fewer than 5 absences per semester

Progress toward outcomes and indicators will be measured using assessments in effect during the 2011-12 school year. Should these be changed or terminated during the period Levy programs are in effect, OFE will substitute the appropriate assessment replacements.

Measurable outcome, methodology, and criteria for program evaluation:

The outcome funding framework includes the tracking and verification of results as the key tool of program evaluation. The City will consistently review progress toward targets and make course corrections. Targets will be updated annually based on results.

Levy-funded programs will rely on approaches that have demonstrated success at achieving results. OFE and Levy partners will track to success on a regular basis through a system of data collection, analysis and evaluation, and course corrections.

Each program using Levy investments will be required to collect specific data that is likely to be predictive of successful outcomes. Staff will be expected to review and consider student and program data on an ongoing basis to determine whether course corrections are necessary.

Through a data-sharing agreement with SPS, OFE will provide Levy programs with periodic summaries of student progress on the specific indicators listed above. Because the data-sharing agreement will provide for OFE to receive anonymized individual-level records, comparisons can be made with students in the same school, across the district, or with similar characteristics.

Periodic, in-depth analysis or evaluation of Levy programs can be conducted to provide direction for course correction. As resources are available, and as program needs dictate, the Levy database will be used for more rigorous statistical analysis of the effects of Levy investments on academic achievement. The database is robust enough to allow for modeling of statistically controlled comparison groups with appropriate safeguards for student confidentiality and protection of subjects' privacy.

Results from these methods of tracking to success are shared with Levy partners and are reported to the Levy Oversight Committee. During the annual review cycle, course corrections are adopted as informed by the different levels of data analysis.

Measurable outcomes, methodology and criteria by which Levy programs will be selected:

OFE will use a combination of Requests for Qualifications (RFQ) and Requests for Investments (RFI) to competitively award Levy proceeds. Health service investments will be awarded as described in the Health section below.

First, OFE will use the RFQ process to identify organizations with various areas of expertise to determine which of them meet OFE standards, using criteria described below, for providing Levy-funded programs. Organizations intending to partner with schools for programs funded by Levy investments will submit an application to OFE responding to specific questions regarding their experience with improving academic outcomes. OFE will review responses and identify those organizations that demonstrate qualifications for achieving results. When schools submit RFIs, as described below, they may select any organizations approved through the RFQ process that are likely to achieve the school's specific results. There is no Levy funding directly resulting from the RFQ process.

Second, OFE will require schools to compete for Levy investments by submitting an RFI application that outlines how they will achieve Levy outcomes. The RFI application will require schools to develop and commit to a plan that will improve academic outcomes for specific groups of students. OFE will review plans and contract with the School District to invest in those schools that propose and are most likely to achieve the greatest results for the amount of funding requested.

In the RFI application, schools may directly provide program elements or may partner with any organizations approved by OFE in the earlier RFQ process. Schools proposing to partner with organizations that have not participated in the RFQ process and who are proposed to receive \$5,000 or more in Levy funding in any school year will be required to include an RFQ response from the organization in the school's RFI application. OFE will not allocate Levy funding for partner organizations that do not meet RFQ standards, with the exception of organizations that will receive no more than \$5,000 per school year in Levy investments.

RFIs will also be used to award Levy proceeds for Early Learning, Summer Learning, and Health programs. These investments may be awarded either to schools or community partners. Once OFE has selected a particular school or organization through the RFI process, OFE may negotiate changes to specific program elements to meet the intended targets or to adjust for available funding.

When evaluating RFQ and RFI submittals, OFE will use a variety of methods to determine which proposals sufficiently demonstrate an ability to achieve academic results. OFE will review past success at achieving results, the means and methods proposed, and the commitment of leadership to improving outcomes. Additionally, OFE may consider the costs of programs as a factor, though this shall not be the sole determinative factor. Depending on the RFQ or RFI under consideration, OFE will use some, or all, of the criteria listed below. In addition, in its performance of due diligence prior to investing Levy proceeds, OFE may use other approaches to ensure proposers have the capacity and commitment to achieve results.

RFQ and RFI Criteria for Non-School Partner Organizations:

1. Knowledge and demonstrated use of best and/or promising practices
2. Experience and evidence of achieving academic outcomes previously
3. Use of data to monitor progress of students
4. Evidence of ability to change course if data warrants
5. Expertise in working with students and families from groups that over populate the academic achievement gap – immigrants/refugees, low income and students of color
6. Experience working in school settings or collaborating with schools
7. Use of English language learner instruction techniques
8. Use of quality assessment tools
9. Ability to leverage additional funds

RFI Criteria for Schools

1. Title One School/Schools with high numbers of low performing students
2. Experience and evidence of achieving academic results
3. Ability to provide schedule flexibility
4. Ability to provide hiring stability
5. Ability to identify target student populations and their academic needs
6. Collective effectiveness and expertise of the team of community providers the school includes in their plan to comprehensively address the academic (and other relevant) needs of students targeted for improvement
7. Pre-School – 3rd grade framework in place
8. Active use of data to guide instructional practice
9. Use of Common Core Standards
10. Standards-based grading
11. College-going culture
12. Teachers and principals trained in English Language Learner acquisition
13. In-School suspension policy
14. Algebra I in 8th grade

15. Integration of social, emotional, behavioral and family support
16. Ability to leverage additional funds

The specific uses of the RFI and RFQ processes and their frequency are described in the Investment Area section that follows.

The City shall use the process established under SMC Chapter 20.50 for selection of consultants.

LEVY INVESTMENT AREAS:

Ordinance 123567 established the following primary investment areas for Levy proceeds:

- Early Learning and School Readiness
- Elementary School Academic Achievement
- Middle School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation
- High School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation
- Student Health

1. EARLY LEARNING AND SCHOOL READINESS

Early Learning and School Readiness consists of the following strategies:

- Professional development for early learning educators
- High-quality preschool programs
- Home visiting program
- Health and mental health screening and support

Early Learning investments will contribute toward the following outcomes:

- Children meeting age level expectations on WaKIDS
- 3rd graders meeting MSP reading standard

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English Language Learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- Students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students at all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

Methodology:

Early learning providers for high-quality preschool programs and health and mental health screening and support will be selected using a competitive RFI approach. Providers of professional development and assessment will be selected through a combination of RFI, RFQ, and consultant contract approaches. The City will contract with United Way King County to manage the home visiting program, and the agreement will require United Way to award investments to subcontractors through a competitive process. Early learning programs will be phased in over the course of six school years so RFIs will be issued each year as

additional programs are implemented. In addition, RFIs will be issued to replace providers who have been unable to achieve results.

Early learning programs may also be proposed as part of an elementary school RFI as described below.

2. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Elementary School Academic Achievement consists of the following strategies:

- Elementary school innovation sites
- Community based family support services for immigrant, refugee, and Native American students
- Summer learning

Elementary School investments will contribute toward the following outcomes:

- Children meeting age level expectations on WaKIDS
- 3rd graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 4th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 5th graders meeting MSP science standard

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English Language Learners in all grades making gains on the State English language proficiency test
- Students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students at all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

Methodology:

Elementary school investments will be awarded using a combination of RFQ and RFI processes. For elementary innovation sites, schools will submit an RFI that describes in detail the outcomes and indicators to be achieved, the means and methods to achieve the results, and the proposed partners for the school year. Levy proceeds may be applied only to partners who were qualified by OFE through the RFQ process. Elementary innovation sites may also submit an RFI that includes a partner approved through the early learning RFI, or may propose to provide pre-k programs directly if the school had responded to the RFI for Early Learning Pre-School Providers.

Elementary innovation sites must address five key areas:

- Pre-K-3 Alignment and Collaboration
- Extended in-school learning time
- Social/emotional/behavioral support
- Student and family support services
- Out-of-school time programs

Four new elementary innovation sites will be added each year for five years, until approximately 23 schools are using this approach. In addition to new sites, each participating school must resubmit an RFI annually.

In addition to school based student and family support services, investments in community based family support will be awarded through an RFI process separate from the school innovation site RFIs.

Summer learning may be awarded as part of an elementary innovation RFI, either in combination with an RFQ approved partner organization or provided directly by the school. Summer learning may also be awarded directly to non-school partners through an RFI. Summer learning will be phased in over six school years, beginning with the 2012-13 school year.

3. MIDDLE SCHOOL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND COLLEGE/CAREER PREPARATION

Middle School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation consists of the following strategies:

- Middle school innovation sites
- Middle school linkage sites
- Summer learning
- Supporting middle school strategies - athletics and transportation

Middle School Investments will contribute toward the following outcomes:

- 6th graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 7th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 8th graders meeting MSP science standard

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English Language Learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- Students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students in all grades passing all courses
- Students in all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester
- 7th and 8th graders enrolled in College Bound

Middle school investments for innovation sites and linkage sites will be awarded using a combination of RFQ and RFI processes. For both innovation sites and linkage sites, schools will submit an RFI that describes in detail the outcomes and indicators to be achieved, the means and methods to achieve the results, and the proposed partners for the school year. Levy proceeds may be applied only to partners who were qualified by OFE through the RFQ process.

Middle schools must address five key areas:

- Extended in-school learning time
- Social/emotional/behavioral support
- College and career planning
- Family involvement
- Out-of-school time programs

All investments for middle school innovation and linkage sites will be awarded in the 2012-13 school year, although full investments for extra learning time and college/career planning will be phased in over two years. Each participating school must resubmit an RFI annually.

Summer learning may be awarded as part of a middle school innovation site RFI, either in combination with an RFQ approved partner organization or provided directly by the school. Summer learning may also be awarded directly to non-school partners through an RFI. Summer learning will be phased in over five school years, beginning with the 2012-13 school year.

Funding for middle school athletics and transportation will be awarded through a direct contract with Seattle Public Schools on a non-competitive basis and will be negotiated annually.

4. HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND COLLEGE/CAREER PREPARATION

High School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation consists of the following strategies:

- High School innovation sites
- Summer learning

High School investments will contribute to the following outcomes:

- 9th graders promoting on time to 10th grade
- Students graduating on time
- Students graduating with HECB requirements for entry into college
- Students completing CTE course of study before graduation
- Students passing end-of-course math tests
- Graduates enrolling in post-secondary education
- Graduates taking fewer remedial courses in college
- Graduates continuously enrolled in post secondary education for one year

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English Language Learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- 9th grade students making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- 9th grade students making or exceeding annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students in all grades passing all courses
- Students in all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

High school investments for each strategy will be awarded using a combination of RFQ and RFI processes. For innovation sites, schools will submit an RFI that describes in detail the outcomes to be achieved, the means and methods to achieve the results, and the proposed partners for the school year. Levy proceeds may be applied only to partners who were qualified by OFE through the RFQ process.

High schools must address five key areas:

- Extended in-school learning time
- Social/emotional/behavioral support
- College and career planning
- Family involvement
- 8th to 9th grade transition

All investments for high school innovations sites will be awarded in the 2012-13 school year, although investments for college/career case management will be phased-in starting in 2015. Each participating high school must resubmit an RFI annually.

Summer learning may be awarded as part of a high school innovation site RFI, either in combination with an RFQ approved partner organization or provided directly by the school. Summer learning may also be awarded directly to non-school partners through an RFI. Summer learning is awarded beginning with the 2012-13 school year.

5. STUDENT HEALTH

Student Health consists of the following:

- School-based health centers (SBHCs)
- School district health services
- Interagency health services
- Mental health and dental enhancements
- Elementary health

Health investments will contribute to the following outcomes:

- Children meeting age level expectations on WaKIDS
- 3rd graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 4th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 5th graders meeting MSP science standard
- 6th graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 7th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 8th graders meeting MSP science standard
- Students graduating high school on time
- Students graduating with HECB requirements for entry into college
- Students completing CTE course of study before graduation
- Students passing end-of-course math tests
- 9th graders promoting on time to 10th grade

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English Language Learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- Students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students in all grades making or exceeding annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students at all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

Health services investments will be awarded as follows:

SBHCs

- The City will directly contract with Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC) for SBHCs.
- Prior to receiving Levy investments, operators of SBHCs will be required to submit to PHSKC detailed plans that illustrate
 - Program enhancements and new strategies under their continuing partnership
 - Collaboration with other Levy-funded strategies,
 - Coordination with schools to identify and address the academic and health needs of the Levy's priority students, and
 - New academically oriented performance targets.
- Failure to achieve Levy outcomes will result in competitive RFI processes to re-award Levy proceeds.

School District Health Services

- The City will directly contract with Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC) for School District Health Services.
- Prior to receiving Levy investments, SPS will submit to PHSKC a plan that:
 - Illustrates how the Levy investment:
 - Maximizes school district health service capacity.
 - Explores alternative service delivery methods or staffing models to increase efficiencies.
 - Demonstrates how district health services will collaborate with other Levy-funded investments.
 - Includes new academically oriented performance targets.

Interagency Health Services

The City will directly contract with PHSKC for interagency health services. PHSKC will present an RFI process to the Levy Oversight Committee in the first quarter of 2013. Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC) will coordinate the RFI process in partnership with OFE and HSD.

Mental Health and Dental Enhancement

The City will directly contract with Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC) for Mental Health Enhancement. PHSKC will manage a technology implementation and quality improvement process in SBHC mental health services.

The City will directly contract with PHSKC for dental enhancement services. PHSKC will present an RFI process for dental enhancement to the Levy Oversight Committee in the first quarter of 2013. PHSKC will coordinate the RFI process in partnership with OFE and HSD.

Elementary Health

The City will directly contract with PHSKC for elementary health services. PHSKC will coordinate the RFI process for Elementary Health in partnership with OFE and HSD. An RFI for Elementary Health investments beginning in the 2012-13 school year will be issued in early 2012. An RFI for additional investments starting in the 2013-14 school year will be issued in the first quarter of 2013.

Criteria for selection

- Previous experience providing similar services and achieving results.
- Demonstrated use of data to design, implement and modify programs.
- Demonstrated ability to jointly plan and implement strategies with schools and with community-based organizations to achieve results.
- Demonstrated willingness to implement innovative strategies.
- Demonstrated ability to leverage financial and in-kind resources to achieve results.

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Department of Neighborhoods/Office for Education	Donnie Grabowski 233-2603	Amanda Allen 684-8894

Legislation Title: AN ORDINANCE relating to the 2011 Families and Education Levy; approving an implementation and evaluation plan as required by Ordinance 123567; and ratifying and confirming certain prior acts.

Summary of the Legislation:

This legislation approves a Families and Education Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan (the "Plan") as required by Section 8 of Ordinance 123567. Ordinance 123567, which authorized a \$231.6 million, 7-year education support services Levy package, directs that Levy proceeds can be invested only in accordance with an approved Plan. The Plan, attached to this Council Bill, sets out the criteria, methodology, and required program outcomes for the following Levy investment areas: Early Learning and School Readiness, Elementary School Academic Achievement, Middle School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation, High School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation, and Student Health. A ratify-and-confirm clause approving actions prior to the ordinance effective date is included because it has been necessary to start the RFQ and RFI processes by early 2012 so that funding decisions and contract negotiations can occur prior to the start of the 2012-2013 school year. The Office for Education will make final selections for Levy investments following Council approval of the ordinance.

Exhibit 1 to this fiscal note, "The 2011 Families and Education Levy - Achieving Results for Students," provides a more detailed Levy implementation plan for each of the investment areas noted above. It describes the outcomes of the Levy investments, the primary populations served, indicators showing progress toward results, critical partnership elements with the Seattle School District, management and phase-in of programs, methodology for selecting providers, and other important issues.

Background:

In November 2011, Seattle voters passed a \$231.6 million levy lid lift to provide education support services for Seattle families and students to improve academic achievement in public schools. This is the fourth Families & Education Levy passed in the City of Seattle, and it substantially increases the overall funding available to support children and their families.

The Office for Education (OFE) is conducting a Request for Qualification (RFQ) process (outlined in the Plan) that will identify and prequalify community partners who may then be selected by elementary, middle, and high schools to compete for Levy investments via a separate Request for Investment (RFI) process. Early learning and several health programs will also



conduct RFI processes. Following this process, OFE expects to begin contract negotiations for the 2012-2013 school year, the first school year funded by this Levy.

Please check one of the following:

This legislation does not have any financial implications.

(Appropriations for Levy programs will be made during the City's annual budget process or by separate legislation if necessary.)

Other Implications:

a) **Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?**

If the Legislation is not implemented, the City would not be able to award educational service contracts and Seattle's children would not receive academic support services beginning in the 2012-2013 school year.

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

By not implementing this legislation, the City will not be able to invest the overall funding available to support children and their families available through the voter approved Families & Education Levy passed in November 2011.

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

The Implementation and Evaluation Plan will be implemented by the Office for Education (OFE), the Human Service Department (HSD), and the Department of Parks & Recreation (DPR).

d) **What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?** None; Section 8 of Ordinance 123567 directed that Levy proceeds be invested only in accordance with an approved Implementation and Evaluation Plan.

e) **Is a public hearing required for this legislation?**

No.

f) **Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?**

No.

g) **Does this legislation affect a piece of property?**

No.

h) **Other Issues:**

None.

List attachments to the fiscal note below:

Exhibit 1: "The 2011 Families and Education Levy - Achieving Results for Students"



The 2011 Families and Education Levy - Achieving Results for Students

Goals of the 2011 Families and Education Levy:

- Children will be ready for school.
- All students will achieve academically and the achievement gap will be reduced.
- All students will graduate from school college/career ready.

In order to meet this ambitious goal, students must receive support from early learning through high school to ensure they are at grade level every step of the way. Currently this is not the case. Forty-six percent of kindergarten teachers report that over half of the children in their classrooms have problems following directions and working in a group. Children from low-income families score lower on academic tests prior to kindergarten than children from high-income families. Similarly, minority children, who are three times more likely than their peers to grow up in poverty, score lower on academic tests prior to kindergarten than their peers. In addition, low-income children are more likely to face environmental and health risk factors which present obstacles to school achievement. Children who enter school behind their peers are unlikely to ever catch up resulting in a persistent "achievement gap."

Seattle data show that many students in the early grades are already being left behind. For example, while 90% of white students are reading at grade level in 3rd grade, only half of African American students and students who qualify for free-and-reduced lunch are meeting the same bar. Similar patterns are seen in math, with fewer than 40% of African American, Latino and low-income 4th grade students performing at grade level, compared to 80% of white students. Among 4th grade students who are English Language Learners, only 20% are at grade level in math. Based on research, we know that students who are not reading by the end of 3rd grade, or have not mastered basic mathematical concepts by the end of the 4th grade, face significant barriers to succeeding in school. These findings hold true for Seattle, where data show a growing achievement gap as students get older, with even fewer English Language Learners, students of color, and low-income students meeting standard on state tests in middle and high school. The Implementation Plans lay out Seattle Public Schools' academic targets for key grade levels and describe the strategies the Levy will invest in to help the district meet those targets, and ensure students get and remain on track to graduate from high school college/career ready.

What we will help achieve – District-wide targets for Outcomes over 7 Years

The Seattle Public Schools (SPS) is responsible for educating all students with a curriculum and high quality instruction that will allow students to achieve necessary academic skills at each grade level so they can graduate college and career ready. The Families and Education Levy is intended to support this goal through a variety of strategies including academic, health and social/emotional support from early learning through high school.



In order to measure progress towards the graduation goal and to ensure Levy investments are having an impact, the City is aligning with the current SPS Strategic Plan and the efforts of the Community Center for Education Results (CCER) to double the number of students who graduate and go on to obtain a post-secondary career credential by the year 2020. As part of this effort, the city has drafted "Seattle's Road Map to Success" which identifies key milestone years in the course of a child's life. While it is important that students achieve at all grade levels, these key years can give community members a sense of how well we are supporting our children's academic progress. Goals have been proposed for SPS students for each of the milestone years through the life of the Levy so the community can collaboratively focus on improving academic results for our students. These goals apply to students in SPS as a whole, not just those who participate in Levy-funded programs.

Table 1: Outcome Targets for Milestone Years for All SPS Students^{1,2}

Targets	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Children meeting age level expectations on WaKIDS	65%	69%	72%	75%	79%	82%	85%
3 rd graders meeting MSP reading standard	79%	79%	80%	81%	82%	84%	85%
4 th graders meeting MSP math standard	65%	65%	66%	68%	70%	72%	74%
5 th graders meeting MSP science standard	64%	65%	66%	68%	71%	74%	78%
6 th graders meeting MSP reading standard	78%	79%	80%	82%	83%	84%	86%
7 th graders meeting MSP math standard	67%	69%	71%	73%	75%	76%	78%
8 th graders meeting MSP science standard	71%	72%	73%	74%	75%	76%	77%
Students passing EOC math 2 test	70%	71%	72%	73%	75%	78%	80%
9 th graders promoting on time to 10 th grade	89%	90%	91%	92%	92%	93%	94%
Students graduating on time	75%	78%	80%	82%	85%	87%	90%
Students graduating with HECB requirements for entry into college	63%	65%	66%	68%	70%	72%	73%
Students completing CTE course of study before graduation *	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
SPS graduates enrolling in post-secondary education	68%	69%	69%	70%	71%	72%	72%
SPS graduates not taking remedial courses in college	66%	68%	69%	71%	72%	74%	75%
SPS graduates continuously enrolled in college for one year	74%	75%	77%	79%	81%	82%	84%

*New measure under development by CCER

¹ See attached glossary for definitions of terms and assessments

² Should these assessments be replaced or terminated by the state or district, OFE will substitute the appropriate alternative.



What we will help achieve through the Levy – Setting targets for Levy investments

We know there are students who are not obtaining the necessary academic skills expected at each grade level. These students are the primary focus of the Families and Education Levy investments. To a great degree, these are low-income, minority students, and/or children from refugee or immigrant families. Since many of these students are substantially below grade level, we do not expect they will achieve, in the aggregate, at the levels in Table 1. The role of Levy investments is to improve the academic performance of these students in particular so that SPS can realize the goals adopted above.

When accepting requests for Levy investments, OFE will identify the programs most likely to improve academic achievement for the students who are our focus. Specific performance targets are set by the Levy Oversight Committee and OFE by considering how much each Levy investment will be able to help move performance from the current baseline level to the outcomes in Table 1. Targets will be substantial enough that measurable progress can be toward overall SPS goals by improving the performance of the most struggling students.

Where we are now- Baselines for outcomes

Table 2 shows where SPS students are now with respect to the milestones in Table 1. This baseline data is for students in the aggregate. Disaggregated data for minority, low income, and non-English speaking students is displayed in Attachment A.

Table 2: Outcome Baselines for SPS Students

2010-11 Outcome Baselines	Number of Students Meeting Results	Percent of Students Meeting Results
Children meeting age level expectations on WaKIDS	N/A	62%*
3 rd graders meeting MSP reading standard	2,962	78.6%
4 th graders meeting MSP math standard	2,364	64.6%
5 th graders meeting MSP science standard	2,322	63.7%
6 th graders meeting MSP reading standard	2,498	76.6%
7 th graders meeting MSP math standard	2,039	65.6%
8 th graders meeting MSP science standard	2,101	69.7%
EOC math 2 assessment	1,340	70.1%
9 th graders promoting on time to 10 th grade		88%
Students graduating on time		72.7%
Students graduating with HECB requirements for entry into college		61%
Students completing CTE course of study before graduation	TBD	TBD
SPS graduates enrolling in post-secondary education	1,935	73%
SPS graduates taking remedial courses in college	510	35%
SPS graduates continuously enrolled in college	1,049	72%

*Based on a 2009-2010 statewide pilot of WaKIDS



How we will track progress - Indicators

Over time, Levy investments are intended to help SPS achieve the higher result we jointly aspire to in Table 1. To track to these results, OFE uses indicator measures. These indicators show progress toward meeting expected results and are ideally measured two or more times during the year. The Levy will contribute to the increase in the number and percentage of students meeting the targets outlined in the table below.

Table 3: Indicator Targets for SEEC Children and SPS Students

Indicator Targets	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Families demonstrating increased positive behavior on the PACT and the CBT	83%	84%	85%	86%	87%	88%	89%
Children making gains in the Standard Score from the fall pre-PPVT to the spring post-PPVT	70%	73%	76%	80%	83%	86%	89%
Children with a minimum of two assessments meeting age level expectations on Teaching Strategies Gold	73%	75%	78%	81%	84%	87%	89%
Children are in classrooms meeting an ECERS standard of 4 in each subscale or an average of 6 in all subscales.	62%	67%	71%	76%	80%	85%	89%
English language learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains*	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Elementary students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP	65%	66%	68%	70%	72%	73%	75%
Elementary students in all grades making annual typical growth on math MAP	70%	71%	72%	72%	73%	74%	75%
Elementary students with fewer than 5 absences per semester	68%	72%	76%	79%	83%	86%	90%
Middle school students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP	59%	62%	64%	67%	70%	72%	75%
Middle school students in all grades making annual typical growth on math MAP	62%	64%	66%	68%	71%	73%	75%
Middle School students passing all courses	86%	87%	88%	89%	89%	90%	91%
Middle School students with fewer than 5 absences per semester	59%	63%	66%	70%	73%	77%	80%
7 th and 8 th grade students enrolled in College Bound	85%	86%	88%	90%	92%	93%	95%
9 th grade students making annual typical growth on reading MAP	55%	58%	62%	65%	68%	72%	75%
9 th grade students making annual typical growth on math MAP	57%	60%	63%	66%	69%	72%	75%
High School students passing all courses	75%	78%	80%	82%	85%	87%	90%
High School students with fewer than 5 absences per semester	52%	54%	57%	60%	63%	66%	69%

*The state is implementing a new English language proficiency test starting in 2011-12 school year.



Where we are now- Baselines for indicators

As with outcomes measures, OFE will focus on students who are struggling academically in order to help SPS achieve higher levels of results. We will jointly improve from the baselines below to the proposed indicator results in Table 3.

Table 4: Indicator Baselines for SEEC Children and SPS Students

2010-11 Indicator Baselines	Number of Students Meeting Indicator	Percent of Students Meeting Indicator
Families demonstrating increased positive behavior on the PACT and the CBT	35/42	83%
Children making gains in the Standard Score from the fall pre-PPVT to the spring post-PPVT	657/935	70%
Children with a minimum of two assessments meeting age-level expectations on Teaching Strategies Gold	397/546	73%
Children are in classrooms meeting an ECERS standard of 4 in each subscale or an average of 6 in all subscales.	397/636	62%
English Language Learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains	TBD	TBD
Elementary students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP	14,126	63%
Elementary students in all grades making annual typical growth on math MAP	15,464	69%
Elementary students with fewer than 5 absences per semester	16,001	65%
Middle school students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP	4,898	56%
Middle school students in all grades making annual typical growth on math MAP	5,211	60%
Middle School students passing all courses	7,770	85%
Middle School students with fewer than 5 absences per semester	5,524	56%
7 th and 8 th grade students enrolled in College Bound	2,268	83%
9 th grade students making annual typical growth on reading MAP	1,459	51%
9 th grade students making annual typical growth on math MAP	1,430	54%
High School students passing all courses	8,173	73%
High School students with fewer than 5 absences per semester	6,946	49%

Primary Populations Served by the Levy Investments

FEL investments are primarily intended to serve students who are struggling academically. While a number of investments are available to all students, priority is given to students who are not at grade level.

Early Learning investments will serve low-income children, ages 0-5, who live in the attendance areas of low-performing elementary schools. Data from the Seattle School District show these



schools have the highest concentration of children from low-income families and children most at risk of academic failure, including:

- Children with Immigrant or Refugee status
- Children who are English language learners
- Children in families/friends/neighbor (FFN) care or children not currently in preschool who would benefit from a Pre-K program
- Children in foster care
- Children who are homeless
- Children with special needs

In a cohort study commissioned by the City's Office for Education, Mary Beth Celio found that, for the SPS class of 2006, certain risk factors such as absenteeism and course completion are linked to rates of long-term academic success. Expanding on the risk factors identified in the study, the FEL school-age investments serve students in low-performing schools (including but not limited to Title I/Level 1 schools or schools with large numbers of low-performing students) that exhibit one or more of the following risk factors:

- Failure to meet kindergarten readiness expectations as measured by SEEC assessments and WaKIDS
- Failure to make typical growth on MAP
- Failure to meet grade-level standard on state assessments
 - Math
 - Reading
 - Science
 - Writing
- Failure to make gains on the State English proficiency test
- Poor attendance (as defined by missing more than 5 days per semester or more than 10 days per year, excused or unexcused)

Tracking to Results Framework

Levy-funded programs rely on approaches that have demonstrated success at achieving results. OFE and Levy partners track to success on a regular basis through a system of data collection, analysis and evaluation, and course corrections.

Collecting timely information about program services, clients, and outcomes provides a capability to improve Levy-funded programs to ensure they are getting the intended results. Each program using Levy investments is required to collect specific data that is likely to be predictive of successful outcomes. Some of that data is provided to OFE on a regular basis, but more importantly, staff are expected to review and consider student and program data on an ongoing basis to determine whether course corrections are necessary. For example, out-of-school time programs monitor the percent and number of students who participate at a rate



suggested by research to be effective. In addition, they have begun implementing a quality assessment tool to inform program improvements and professional development needs.

Through a data-sharing agreement with SPS, OFE is able to provide Levy programs with periodic summaries of student progress on specific indicators listed in Tables 1 and 3. Because the data-sharing agreement provides for OFE to receive anonymized individual-level records, comparisons can be made with students in the same school, across the district, or with similar characteristics.

Periodic, in-depth analysis or evaluation of Levy programs can be conducted to provide direction for course correction. As resources are available, and as program needs dictate, the Levy database can be used for more rigorous statistical analysis on the effects of Levy investments on academic achievement. The database is robust enough to allow for modeling of statistically-controlled comparison groups with appropriate safeguards for student confidentiality and protection of subjects' privacy.

Results from these methods of tracking to success are shared with Levy partners and are reported to the Levy Oversight Committee. During the annual review cycle, course corrections are adopted as informed by the different levels of data analysis.

Quality Implementation and Management of Investment

The following measures will be taken to ensure quality of implementation:

- Site visits to observe programs and provide program staff with feedback
- Evidence of systems in place to monitor data
- Documentation of data use and program modification in response to such data
- Training and emphasis on the elements of high quality program implementation
- Implementation of quality assessment tools

Course corrections are implemented in the following way:

- Programs will monitor data on a regular basis (i.e. attendance on a daily basis or grades on a weekly or biweekly basis)
- Data will be reviewed by OFE on a quarterly basis.
- After reviewing data, determine what actions, if any, have been taken to date to improve outcomes.
- Provide technical assistance to program staff to try different strategies, if actions to-date have not resulted in improved outcomes.
- Defund school/program/provider if measurable improvements are not made within a year.

Elements Critical to the Partnership between the City and the School District

In order to increase the chances of achieving the results in Table 1, the City needs the following support from Seattle Public Schools:



- Flexibility in choice of supplemental curriculum for low-performing students.
- Flexibility in scheduling additional in-school learning time.
- Stability in hiring, assigning and retaining core staff team members.
- Ability to identify teachers who are most likely to achieve results.
- School principals skilled in building collaboration teams with community partners.
- District Leadership must be willing to leverage funds to achieve targets.
- Dedicated space in school buildings to provide services.
- Access to district buildings after school, during breaks, and in the summer.
- Facility planning that incorporates the need for health services and early learning and afterschool providers.
- School staff must understand how to use daily and weekly data to inform selection of appropriate interventions, academic materials and instructional strategies.
- School staff must understand how to access daily and weekly grade and attendance data, and how to respond to such data.
- School staff must understand how to use standards-based curriculum, instruction and assessments to inform practice.
- School staff must demonstrate effective advisory practices.
- Schools may need to leverage training provided by SPS in order to serve priority populations, such as English language learners.
- Cultural competency training specific to populations of students being served.

The following Memoranda of Understanding, data-sharing agreements, and/or partnership agreements are needed between the City and SPS:

- Renewal of current SPS/City of Seattle partnership and data-sharing agreements, with modifications, including identifiable student level data for Levy-funded providers.
- Community-based partners working during and after school, offering family support services, and providing summer learning opportunities need access to student level data in real time.
- Free space for all aligned school-based community partners.

Community Partnerships and Leveraging Strategies

Community-based partners, both Levy- and non-Levy-funded, will be critical in providing programs and other support services that will help make this a comprehensive and collaborative approach. Many families with struggling students rely on community agencies to provide support in culturally specific ways and to help connect them with schools. These agencies often bring their own resources to support services or combine them with Levy funds to improve results.

Philanthropic organizations interested in education may want to be involved in implementing Levy programs in order to leverage their resources in a more comprehensive way. A number of philanthropies have invested in current programs that receive Levy funds for specific targeted interventions.



Specifically, Levy-funded health programs are conducted in partnership with the school-based health center providers. The home visiting program will be funded in collaboration with United Way King County's efforts to expand the program throughout the area. Out-of-school providers have been investing additional funds in Levy community learning centers. We are aware that a number of organizations are participating in college and career advising and will be looking to collaborate with OFE.

Community-based staff have specific needs to be successful:

- Community-based staff must understand how to use daily and weekly data to inform selection of appropriate interventions.
- Community-based staff must understand how to access daily and weekly grade and attendance data, and how to respond to such data.
- Out-of-school time providers must use a quality assessment tool (TBD).
- Cultural competency training specific to populations of students being served.

Overall Alignment with City Resources

Seattle's Road Map to Success

As mentioned earlier, the City has adopted Seattle's Road Map to Success to provide a framework for coordinating investments for youth and families. The Road Map represents key milestones in educational achievement for children and youth, based on research and best practice. For example, students who are not reading by the end of 3rd grade face significant barriers to succeeding in school. The same holds true for students failing to master basic mathematical concepts by the end of the 4th grade. Additional milestones, such as attendance, passing core courses in 6th grade, or promoting on-time to 10th grade, are strong predictors of graduating from high school. Children and youth failing to meet the milestones on the Road Map are considered at risk for academic failure, making their life prospects quite bleak. The City's purpose for using these milestones was three-fold. First, the milestones provide an easy way to identify children who are at risk for academic failure. Second, they provide a structure for developing investments areas and recommending strategies. Third, they provide a clear means for measuring success.

The Road Map's education milestones are aligned with goals set forth in the Seattle Public School's District Scorecard. The Road Map also includes a number of family and community support milestones, recognizing that factors influencing student success occur within and outside of the classroom.

While the Families and Education Levy is a significant investment in the Road Map milestones, additional resources support either the education or community and family factors. The City anticipates investing approximately \$90 million in programs supporting youth & families in 2011. Efforts are underway, through the Youth and Families Subcabinet, to coordinate investments targeted at specific milestones.



Youth and Families Initiative

Through the numerous YFI caucuses, workshops, the youth summit, and ultimately the Kids and Families Congress, thirteen priority Education issues were identified that must be addressed in order to improve the outcomes for youth and families in Seattle. The priority issues are:

- Teacher Quality
- Cultural Competency
- Equity
- Family Support
- Curriculum
- Academic Support
- Collaboration
- Bilingual Education
- Funding/Resources
- Family/Community Involvement
- Early Learning
- School-Based Health
- Safe Schools

Levy funding will directly impact a number of the priorities identified through the YFI effort. Other priorities identified by the community, such as teacher quality, are beyond the role of the Levy, but the success of our investments depends heavily on the SPS' ability to improve in this area. Still other non-education issues identified during the YFI effort are being addressed by other subcabinets and are being coordinated by the Executive.

Methodology and Timeline for Awarding Investments

First, OFE will use a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process to identify organizations with various areas of expertise to determine which of them meet OFE standards, using criteria described below, for providing Levy-funded programs. Organizations intending to partner with schools for programs funded by Levy investments will submit an application to OFE responding to specific questions regarding their experience with improving academic outcomes. OFE will review responses and identify those organizations that demonstrate qualifications for achieving results. When submitting an RFI, a school may select any organizations approved through the RFQ process that are likely to achieve the school's specific results. There is no Levy funding resulting directly from the RFQ process.

Second, OFE will require schools to compete for Levy investments by submitting an RFI application that outlines how they will achieve Levy outcomes. This is the successful strategy used for middle school Levy funding in the current Levy. Schools can select any partners approved by OFE in the earlier RFQ process. The RFI application will require schools to develop and commit to a plan that will improve academic outcomes for specific groups of students. OFE will review plans and contract with the School District to invest in those schools that propose and are most likely to achieve the greatest results for the amount of funds requested.



In the RFI application, schools may directly provide program elements or may partner with any organizations approved by OFE in the earlier RFQ process. Schools proposing organizations that have not participated in the RFQ process will be required to include an RFQ response from the organization in the school's RFI application. OFE will not allocate Levy funding for organizations that do not meet RFQ standards. Schools using organizations not approved in the RFQ process will be required to demonstrate in the RFI that the organization or its program is most likely to achieve the program's intended results.

RFIs will also be used to award Levy proceeds for Early Learning, Summer Learning, and Health programs. These investments may be awarded either to schools or community partners.

Outlined below is a proposed sequence of activities for OFE to issue RFQs and RFIs and then prepare and process contracts for the 2012-2013 school year. The Levy Ordinance 123567 states City Council's intent that all 2011 Levy investments, including services previously funded in the 2004 Levy, shall be awarded through a competitive process. More specific details regarding how health investments will be awarded are contained in the Health Implementation Plan.

Sequence of Activities

Office for Education (OFE) issues Requests for Qualifications (RFQs)

- Elementary, Middle and High School Extended Learning Opportunities
- Elementary Social, Emotional, Behavioral and Family Support
- Middle and High School Social, Emotional and Behavioral Support
- Middle and High School College and Career Readiness and Planning

OFE issues Request for Investments (RFI):

- Early Learning Pre-School Providers

OFE makes decisions on RFQs and Early Learning RFI (after City Council action on the Implementation and Evaluation Plan)

OFE issues Requests for Investments (RFIs)

- Early Learning Professional Development
- Elementary Innovation Schools (~ 4 schools per year)
- Middle School Innovation Sites (~ 5 Innovation Schools)
- Middle School Linkage Sites (~14 Linkage Schools)
- High School Innovation Schools (~ 5 schools)
-

OFE issues Request for Investments (RFIs)

- Early Learning Home Visiting

OFE issues Request for Investments (RFIs)

- Early Learning Health and Mental Health



OFE makes decisions on second round of RFIs

OFE issues Requests for Investments (RFIs)

- Elementary Health
- Family Support: Refugee, Immigrant and Native American

Contract Negotiations for 2012 – 2013 School Year

OFE makes decisions on third round of RFIs

SCHOOL RANKING AND REVIEW FOR RFIs

When evaluating RFQ and RFI submittals, OFE will use a variety of methods to determine which proposals sufficiently demonstrate an ability to achieve academic results. OFE will review past success at achieving results, the means and methods proposed, and the commitment of leadership to improving outcomes. Additionally, OFE may consider the costs of programs as a factor, though it shall not be the sole determinative factor. Depending on the RFQ or RFI under consideration, OFE will use some, or all, of the criteria listed below. In addition, in its performance of due diligence prior to investing Levy proceeds, OFE may use other approaches to ensure proposers have the capacity and commitment to achieve results. Once OFE has selected a particular school or organization through the RFI process, OFE may negotiate changes to specific program elements to meet intended outcomes or to adjust for available funding.

Criteria:

1. Title One School (> 40% Free and Reduced Lunch)/School with high numbers of low-performing students
2. Experience and evidence of achieving academic results
3. Ability to provide schedule flexibility
4. Ability to provide hiring stability
5. Ability to Identify target student populations and their academic needs
6. Collective effectiveness and expertise of the team of community providers the school includes in their plan to comprehensively address the academic (and other relevant) needs of students targeted for improvement
7. Pre-School – 3rd grade framework in place
8. Active use of data to guide instructional practice
9. Use of Common Core Standards
10. Standards-based grading
11. College-going culture
12. Teachers and principals trained in English language learner acquisition
13. In-School suspension policy
14. Algebra I in eighth grade
15. Integration of social, emotional, behavioral and family support
16. Ability to leverage additional funds



PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS RANKING AND REVIEW FOR RFIs OR RFQs

Criteria:

1. Knowledge and demonstrated use of best and/or promising practices
2. Experience and evidence of achieving academic outcomes previously
3. Use of data to monitor progress of students
4. Evidence of ability to change course if data warrants
5. Expertise in working with students and families from groups that over-populate the academic achievement gap – immigrants/refugees, low-income and students of color
6. Experience working in school settings or collaborating with schools
7. Use of English language learner instruction techniques
8. Use of quality assessment tools
9. Ability to leverage additional funds

REVIEW PROCESS

Bidders Workshops

Review of RFQs/RFIs

Recommendations to OFE Director or HSD/PHSKC Directors as appropriate

OFE Director will make final decisions

These processes will apply to the use of Levy funds for education support to students. All other uses of Levy funds will comport with provisions of Ordinance 123567 regarding agreements with Seattle Public Schools and King County Public Health or required City purchasing and contracting procedures.

The City shall use the process established under SMC Chapter 20.50 for selection of consultants.



2011 Families and Education Levy Implementation Plan Early Learning and School Readiness Investment Area Birth – 5 Years

What we will help achieve – Early Learning and School Readiness Outcomes and Indicators

Early Learning investments will contribute toward the following District-wide outcomes:

- Children meeting age-level expectations on WaKIDS
- 3rd graders meeting MSP reading standard

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English language learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- Students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students at all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

Strategies that will Achieve Results

There are four overarching strategies for helping to prepare young children for kindergarten and long-term school success: Professional Development for Early Learning Educators, High-Quality Preschool Programs, Home Visiting Program, and Health and Mental Health Screening and Support. This section describes each strategy and the rationale for it, lists specific elements that must be included in implementation, and cites the evidence-based research that supports this approach.

1. Professional Development for Early Learning Educators

What is Professional Development for Early Learning Educators?

Comprehensive and intentional training and mentoring to increase the effectiveness of instruction of preschool teachers, the leadership of principals and directors in building an aligned P-3 system, and support of parents and other adult caregivers in guiding children's positive development.

- Includes Pre-K teachers, birth-three teachers, family child care and family friend and neighbor caregivers.
- Increase their ability to prepare young children for kindergarten.
- Develop skills and strategies that support children's English language acquisition.

Why is this strategy important?

Professional development provides teachers with the tools and background knowledge needed to support children's positive social, emotional, cognitive, language, health and physical development. Ongoing professional development also provides teachers with new



approaches to help guide children's explorations of the learning environment and strategies to create a safe, stimulating and supportive classroom environment.

What are the key elements of Professional Development for Early Learning Educators?

Through the Seattle Early Education Collaborative (SEEC), the following professional development components will be provided for early learning educators and caregivers:

- **Pre-K Teachers**
 - Coaching/mentoring an average of 8 hrs per month per classroom
 - 100 hours of required core competency training that is aligned with K-3rd (i.e. family engagement, child development, math and science, cultural competency, and reflective teaching practice)
 - Classroom materials, quality improvement plans and targeted technical assistance
 - Early Learning college level coursework or continuing education
 - Teacher practice – curriculum and assessment
 - Pre-K – 3rd training institutes for Pre-K through 3rd grade cohorts at Title I schools or schools with high numbers of low-performing students

- **Birth-Three Center-Based Providers at Step Ahead sites**
 - Coaching/mentoring an average of 8 hrs per month per classroom
 - 100 hours of required core competency training that is aligned with Pre-K (i.e., family engagement, social and emotional development, cultural competency, and reflective teaching practice)
 - Classroom materials, quality improvement plans and targeted technical assistance
 - Early Learning college level coursework or continuing education
 - Teacher practice – curriculum and assessment

- **Family Child Care Providers**
 - Coaching/mentoring
 - Training in core competencies (e.g., health nutrition and safety, child development social and emotional development, language and literacy, school readiness, development of child's portfolio and home personal safety, cultural competency and reflective teaching practice)
 - Resource materials, quality improvement plans and targeted technical assistance

- **Family, Friend and Neighbor Providers**
 - Training in health nutrition and safety, child development social and emotional development, language and literacy, school readiness, development of child's portfolio and home personal safety, and working with families
 - Focus on strengthening families
 - Facilitated groups for FFN to help model positive caregiver/child interactions and conduct caregiver assessments



How will Professional Development for Early Learning Educators be phased in and managed? Professional Development will be phased in beginning in the fall of 2012. Full phase-in will be achieved by the 2017 school year.

2. High-Quality Preschool Programs (Step Ahead)

What is Step Ahead?

- Full-day and part-day preschool slots for children not served by Head Start or ECEAP.³
- Preschool programs may be administered by an elementary school principal, located within an elementary school and administered by a community-based organization, or located near an elementary school and administered by a community-based organization. Preference will be given to sites associated with a Title 1 or low-performing school.
- Will serve low-income children ages 3-4 who are likely to attend low performing elementary schools
- Step Ahead preschool standards will be aligned with K-3rd national, state, and local standards. Preschools will be required to use an approved research-based curriculum that is aligned with Seattle Public Schools elementary school curriculum for grades K-3, state benchmarks, Seattle Kindergarten Readiness Guidelines and the Common Core.
- Preschool programs will be required to conduct regular assessments to monitor children's progress toward school readiness and participate in outside assessments to measure teacher and classroom quality.
- Kindergarten Transition and Family Engagement will be integrated into the preschool delivery model.

Why is this strategy important?

- Children who participate in high-quality preschool programs have improved educational outcomes, including language and math skills, as well as better classroom behavior and peer relations.
- This strategy builds on the success in the current Levy, where children enrolled in Step Ahead preschool programs have made statistically significant gains on kindergarten readiness measures.

What are the key elements of Step Ahead?

- Programs are required to use an approved research-based curriculum that is aligned with Seattle Public Schools elementary school curriculum for grades K-3.
- Standards will be aligned with K-3rd national, state, and local ELL standards.

³ Head Start serves families with incomes below 130% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL); ECEAP serves families with incomes at or below 110% of the FPL. Step Ahead has been serving families with incomes up to 300% of poverty.



- Use of dual-language and child-centered instructional approaches.
- Programs will be located in or around low-performing elementary schools.
- Programs may be operated by Seattle Public Schools or by community-based early learning providers.
- Intentional use of culturally and linguistically congruent teaching strategies for ELL children.
- Assessments are used to inform and guide teacher practice

How will Step Ahead be phased in and managed?

Step Ahead will be phased in beginning in the fall of 2012. Full phase-in will be achieved by the 2017 school year at which time approximately 740 children will be served.

3. Home Visiting Program (Parent-Child Home Program),

What is the Home Visiting Program?

The Parent-Child Home Program is a research-based and validated early childhood literacy and school readiness program.⁴

Why is this strategy important?

The Parent-Child Home Program promotes school readiness by involving children, ages 2 & 3, in educational play during home visits. The program stresses the development of parent-child verbal interaction as an important component of early childhood cognitive and social-emotional development.

What are the key elements of the Home Visiting Program?

- Serves families with children ages 2-3 who are not enrolled in a formal early learning program.
- A Home Visitor (para-professional) is matched with the family and visits them for half an hour, twice-a week, on a schedule that is convenient for the family.
- On the first visit of each week, the Home Visitor brings the curricular material for the week, a carefully-selected book or educational toy.
- In the twice-weekly home sessions with the parent (or other primary caregiver) and the child, the Home Visitor models interaction, reading, and play activities, demonstrating how to use the books and toys to build language and emergent literacy skills and promote school readiness.
- The curricular material remains with the family for future use as modeled in the home visits. Over the course of the two years in the program, families acquire a library of children's books and collection of educational and stimulating toys.
- Each program year or cycle consists of a minimum of 23 weeks of home visits or 46 home visits.

⁴ www.parent-child.org



NOTE: This program model does allow for some modifications, if they do not affect the validity of the model and are approved by the National Center, in order to appropriately serve families in diverse communities.

How will the Home Visiting Program be phased in and managed?

The Home Visiting program will be phased in over two years, serving 100 children in 2012-13, and 160 each year thereafter. This investment is being coordinated with the United Way's efforts to increase Home Visiting throughout the county.

4. Health and Mental Health Screening and Support

What is Health and Mental Health Screening and Support?

- Early Learning Health will promote the physical, social, and psychological well being of children served in child care and preschool settings and enhance the opportunities for positive early learning experiences and future success at school.
- An interdisciplinary team that addresses mental health, nursing, nutrition, and social work will support early learning teachers, children, and families within Levy-supported early learning settings.
- Services and supports will target Step Ahead preschool programs and some in-home care and FFN settings in areas of low-performing elementary schools.

Why is this strategy important?

- Low-quality early care and education puts children at greater risk for infectious diseases, injuries, and inadequate nurturing.
- Quality early care and education is a critical component of the healthy growth necessary for children's readiness to learn and is associated with long-term health and well-being.
- The role of child care health consultation is to minimize health and safety risks, promote healthy behaviors, and link families with community-based health and developmental services.
- Health consultation can improve overall child care quality and school readiness among children.
- Health consultation reduces illnesses and injuries and improves:
 - Child care providers' health knowledge and compliance
 - Children's immunization status
 - Access to health care
 - Health screenings, early identification and referral of health, developmental and behavioral concerns
 - Care for children with special health care needs
- Preschoolers in Washington are expelled at a rate of 7-10 per 1,000 enrolled, three times the rate of K-12 students. Most expulsions are due to perceived behavior problems.
- Expulsion decreased significantly when classrooms have access to consultation from mental health professionals.



- Ongoing training to early childhood staff supports appropriate, positive approaches to children's behavioral problems.
- Mental health consultation is effective in:
 - Increasing pro-social behaviors, which decreases negative-social behaviors (positive social interaction, emotional regulation)
 - Increasing teacher competencies (feelings of self-efficacy, positive interactions with children, and feelings of responsibility and control of their work, better skills in observation, reflection, and planning).

What are the key elements of Health and Mental Health Screening and Support?

- Professional development for child care providers and preschool teachers related to the normal growth and developmental/socio-emotional needs of children birth to third grade.
- Train child care providers to identify at-risk children by using standardized screening tools, including those for social-emotional/behavioral health.
- Routine social-emotional/behavioral health screening of children.
- Provide individual observations, assessments and remedial behavior management strategies for children of concern.
- Assist families to access health care home, Medicaid enrollment, community health services and follow-up care.
- Identify FFN settings to be served; use natural FFN gathering places to access child care providers and children.
- When possible, services will be coordinated with Levy elementary health strategies to assure health supports are maintained during transitions to the K-5 environment.

How will Health and Mental Health Screening and Support be phased in and managed?

- Half of the early learning health investment will start in 2012; the remainder will start in 2013. This is in contrast to the early learning Step Ahead investment which is phased in over the course of seven years.

Ways in Which the Investment Builds on the Last Levy

- Focus on serving children and families are likely to attend low-performing elementary schools.
- Intentional focus on training families and family friend and neighbor caregivers to support learning.
- Support and early identification of children with social and emotional issues and training for their caregivers.
- All district full-day kindergartens will be required to use the WaKIDS assessment of kindergarten readiness.
- Children will be supported and their progress tracked across a continuum of aligned and coordinated services from birth through 3rd grade.



Elements Critical to the Partnership Between the City and the School District

- P-3 curriculum, assessment and professional development alignment.
- Alignment with district family engagement strategies.
- Rent-free space in all school buildings for preschool programs.
- Programs once established will not be displaced.
- District liaison – at the management level.
- Strong relationship with schools and before- and after-school programs.
- Principals need to be included and accountable for the Alignment Initiative.
- Training kindergarten teachers in child development observing young children.
- Standardized and full adoption and implementation of WaKIDS.
- Process for communication back to early learning providers on WaKIDS results.
- Training for kindergarten teachers on the SEEC Kindergarten Readiness guidelines and the Washington State Early Learning Guidelines.
- Stability in hiring, assigning and retaining of core staff team members.
- Data-sharing agreement that includes sharing student I.D. numbers.

Alignment with Other City Resources

Other City General Fund Investments

- Refugee & Immigrant Family Support services (possible opportunity to align with Levy community-based family support investment area).
- School's Out Washington Professional Development for Before- and After-School Providers at elementary schools (possible opportunity to align with Levy elementary school investment area).
- Health Department provides infant visits to child care centers (aligns with the Levy health and mental health investment area).
- Comprehensive Child Care Program (CCCP) Quality provides FTEs and funding for professional development.
- CCCP Subsidy provides child care assistance for 600 children ages birth to 12 years old.
- Child Care Nutrition provides nutrition training and education.
- Summer Food Program provides nutritious lunches during the summer to children 0-18 years old.
- Aging and Disability Services (ADS) case management (outreach and identify elders receiving case management services through ADS who are providing family, friend or neighbor care).
- Youth programs (outreach to teens engaged in youth development programs that provide child care for younger siblings).
- Domestic Violence Programs (outreach to families to provide assistance with child care or other early learning services).



- HSD Homeless Services (outreach to families to provide assistance with child care or other early learning services).

Community Partnerships and Leveraging Strategies

Specify any other organizations, individuals or communities whose involvement is critical for the strategies in this investment area to work.

- Culturally and linguistically specific agencies
- Seattle Public Schools
- University of Washington (National Head Start Training and Technical Institute)
- Public Health – Seattle & King County
- Seattle Public Library
- Seattle University
- Region X Head Start

Quality Implementation and Management of Investment

- All Early Learning investments will be managed by the Human Services Department (HSD).
- Community-based organizations will respond to a competitive process for the Home Visitor Program, Step Ahead Preschool, Professional Development, and Early Learning Health and Mental Health Screening and Support.

Indicators to Manage Investment

In addition to the indicators identified for the Levy as a whole, early learning investments will use the following:

- Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP) – Caregivers/Adults will demonstrate increased positive behavior on the Parent and Child Together tool (PACT).
- PCHP – Children will meet standard on the Child Behavior Traits (CBT) and the Teacher Rating of Oral Language and Literacy (TROLL).
- Family Friend and Neighbor's (FFN's) Care Providers – Caregivers/Adults will demonstrate increased positive behavior on the Parent and Child Together tool (PACT).
- Step Ahead Preschool Programs – Children enrolled will meet the Standard Score and/or make gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-4 (PPVT-4) of Receptive English by the end of the preschool year.
- Step Ahead Preschool serving children who are English Language Learners: Children will make statistically significant gains in English Language Acquisition at the end of the preschool year on the PPVT-4.
- Step Ahead Preschool – Children will meet age level expectations at the end of the preschool year on Teaching Strategies Gold Child (TSG)⁵ assessment.

⁵ Teaching Strategies Gold is an observational assessment of children's development in language/literacy, cognitive, social/emotional and physical domains.



- Children served by Step Ahead and SEEC and enrolled in full-day kindergarten – Children will meet the age-level expectations on Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS).⁶
- SEEC Pre-K - Classrooms will meet the Environmental Rating Scale (ERS) standard at the end of the program year.
- SEEC Pre-K - Teachers will meet standard on the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) at the end of the program year.
- Children enrolled in Step Ahead Pre-K program will have fewer than 5 absences per semester.
- Children served by a Step Ahead Preschool will be assessed at level 2 or higher on the district English assessment test at the beginning of kindergarten.
- Number of early learning and child care settings receiving targeted consultation or training.
- % of children who enroll in kindergarten on time.
- % of children enrolled in full-day kindergarten.
- % of children who attend 90% of school days.
- % of children who meet the birth to 3-year indicator for health (TBD).
- % of 4-year-olds who meet standard on the curriculum-embedded assessment in preschool.

Early Learning Health

- Number of early learning and child care settings and providers receiving targeted consultation or training.
- Number of children in early learning and child care settings receiving developmental assessments.
- Number of children in early learning and child care referred for mental health therapy and/or medical follow-up.
- Number of low-income families linked to a health care home, Medicaid coverage, and/or other health care resources.

The following measures will be taken to ensure quality of implementation:

The SEEC assessment model will be utilized to set standards, define outcomes, gather data on progress, analyze data, develop quality improvement plans (QIPs) and implement the QIPs.

ASSESSMENT TOOLS:

Formative Assessments

- Child: Teaching Strategies Gold (administered fall, winter and spring of the Pre-K year)
- Classroom: Curriculum-embedded classroom checklist (administered annually)
- CLASS: Annual voluntary observation of Pre-K and kindergarten- 3rd grade teachers to measure teacher effectiveness.

⁶ The assessment tool used by WaKIDS is the same assessment tool used in Pre-K Teaching Strategies Gold.



Summative Assessments

- Child – PPVT-4 (administered fall and spring of Pre-K)
- Child – WaKIDS (administered fall and spring of kindergarten)
- Classroom - ECERS (administered annually)

Funding Assumptions

Specify program costs by major cost category.

- Professional Development for Early Learning Educators
- High-Quality Preschool Programs (Step Ahead)
- Home Visiting Program (Parent-Child Home Program)
- Health and Mental Health Support

List of possible funding sources other than the Levy.

- New School/LEV Foundation
- Head Start
- ECEAP
- Multiple other pre-school providers
- Seattle Public Schools
 - Title I funds
 - Title III funds
 - Title IV funds
 - State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program Funding
 - Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
 - Refugee Impact Grant
- United Way

What are the financial expectations of partners?

- Seattle Public Schools: We assume that schools that apply for investments will use the other funds available to them to maximize their overall school plan to implement a P-3 strategy to achieve results.
- Partner Organizations: We expect that Partner Organizations will braid Levy funding with other resources to provide stronger and more coordinated professional development and assessments.



RESEARCH APPENDIX

Professional Development for Early Learning Educators

- Barnett, W. S. (2003). "Better Teachers, Better Preschools: Student Achievement Linked to Teacher Qualifications." *Preschool Policy Matters*, 2. New Brunswick, NJ: NIEER.
<http://nieer.org/resources/policybriefs/2.pdf>
- Brandon, Rick. (August 2005) "Enhancing Family Friend and Neighbor Caregiving Quality: The Research Case for Public Engagement." Human Services Policy Center, University of Washington. <http://www.aphsa.org/publications/doc/brandon-family-friend-and-neighbor-paper.pdf>
- Brunson Day, Carol. (July 2004). "Recommendations to Assure a Well-Prepared Early Childhood Education Workforce in New Jersey." In *Universal Prekindergarten in New Jersey: Teacher Preparation and Professional Development in New Jersey's Abbott Districts*. Washington D.C.: NBCDI.
- Clifford, Dick and Kelly Maxwell. *The Need for Highly Qualified Prekindergarten Teachers*, presented at the Preparing Highly Qualified Prekindergarten Teacher's Symposium, April 15-16, 2002. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~npc/pdfs/need.pdf>
- Coffman, J. and M. Elena Lopez. (July 2003). *Raising Preschool Teacher Qualifications: With A Case Study on How New Jersey's Early Childhood Teachers are Getting Four-Year Degrees and Certification Under a Four-Year Deadline*. (Washington D.C.: Trust for Early Education)
<http://www.acnj.org/admin.asp?uri=2081&action=15&di=298&ext=pdf&view=yes>
- Lobman, C., Ryan S., McLaughlin, J. and Ackerman D. (2005) *Educating Preschool Teachers: Mapping Teacher Preparation and Professional Development System in New Jersey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Graduate School of Education: Rutgers.
http://slic.njstatelib.org/slic_files/digidocs/e24/e242004h.pdf
- Mathews, H. and Danielle Ewen. (October 2007). "Title I and Early Childhood Programs: A Look at Investments in the No Child Left Behind Era." *Center for Law and Social Policy Child Care and Education Series*.
<http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/0379.pdf>

Family Engagement in Early Learning

- The 2000 Head Start FACES Study found children with parents who were more involved in the program scored higher on vocabulary, book knowledge, early writing, early math, and letter identification.
http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/hs/faces/reports/faces00_4thprogress/faces00_4thprogress.pdf
- The number of activities parents engaged in with their child was positively related to positive child behaviors (2000 Head Start FACES Study).



- Children with parents who were more involved scored higher on all assessments. These positive effects are across demographics, education levels and ethnicities (Georgia Pre-K data results).

High-Quality Preschool

- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2004). *Educating English Language Learners*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association.
- Kauerz, K. (October, 2009). *Understanding and Implementing a PreK-3rd Vision*. Presented at 1st Annual Leadership Training Conference, Jamesburg, NJ.
- Peisner-Feinberg, E.S., Burchinal, M.R., Clifford, R.M., Culkin, M.L., Howes, C., Kagan, S.L., Yazejian, N., Bylter, P., Rustici, J., & Zelazo, J. (1999) *The Children of the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Study Go to School: Executive Summary*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center.
<http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~ncedl/pdfs/cqo-es.pdf>
- Pianta, R., Hamre, B., Haynes, N., Mintz, S., & La Paro, K. (2006). Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS). Unpublished measure, University of Virginia.
- Principals Lead the Way for PK-3: Early Investment, Strong Alignment, Better Results. (2006) National Association of Elementary School Principals and Foundation for Child Development. <http://fcd-us.org/sites/default/files/PrincipalsLeadTheWayForPK3.pdf>
- Rice, C. (2007). *Building Strong Rungs to Build Sturdy Ladders: The Status of Preschool-3rd Grade Systems in New Jersey*. Newark, NJ: Association for Children of New Jersey.
<http://www.acnj.org/admin.asp?uri=2081&action=15&di=970&ext=pdf&view=yes>
- Uebelacker, Klaus, "Assessing Kids' Progress at School: Fair Testing for English-language learners." *SFGate.com*. October 6, 2005. <http://sfgate.com>.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1991) "When Learning a Second Language Means Losing the First," *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* 6, p. 323-346.

Kindergarten Transition

- Betty Hart and Todd R. Risley, "The Early Catastrophe: The 30 Million Word Gap by Age 3." *American Educator*, spring 2003, <http://www.aft.org>.
- Hernandez, D. (June 2011) "Double Jeopardy: How Third Grade Reading Skills and Poverty Influence High School Graduation." Annie E. Casey Foundation. <http://aecf.org>
- Rouse C, Brooks Gunn J., McLanahan S. School eds, (Spring 2005) *School Readiness: Closing Ethnic and Racial Gaps* (Volume 15, No. 1).
http://futureofchildren.org/futureofchildren/publications/docs/15_01_01.pdf
- Schorr, L. and Marchand, V. (June 2007). [Pathway to Children Ready for School and Succeeding at Third Grade.](http://www.familyresourcecenters.net/assets/library/109_3rdgradepathway81507.pdf)
http://www.familyresourcecenters.net/assets/library/109_3rdgradepathway81507.pdf



Early Learning Health

- Alkon, A., Ramler, M. & MacLennan, K. (2003). "Evaluation of mental health consultation in child care centers." *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 31(2), 91-99.
- Gilliam, W. (2005). *Pre-Kindergarteners left behind: Expulsion rates in state Pre-Kindergarten systems*. New Haven: Yale University Child Study Center.
- Green, B., Everhart, M., Gordon, L. & Gettman, M. (2006). "Characteristics of effective mental health consultation in early childhood settings: Multilevel analysis of a national survey." *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 26(3), 142-152.
<http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/Characteristics%20of%20Effective%20Mental%20Health%20Consultation.pdf>
- Perry, D., Dunne, C., McFadden, L. & Campbell, D. (2008). "Reducing the risk for preschool expulsion: Mental health consultation for young children with challenging behaviors." *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 17, 44-54.
<http://www.utaccs.org/pdf/Reducing%20the%20risk%20for%20preschool%20expulsion%20ecmhc%20pery%202007.pdf>
- Ramler, M., Nakatsukasa-Ono, W. Loe, C. & Harris, K. 2006. The influence of child care health consultants in promoting children's health and well-being: A report on selected resources. <http://apha.confex.com/apha/137am/recordingredirect.cgi/id/28695>



2011 Families and Education Levy Implementation Plan Elementary School Academic Achievement Investment Area K-5th Grade

What we will help achieve – Elementary School Academic Achievement Outcomes and Indicators

Elementary School investments will contribute toward the following District-wide outcomes:

- Children meeting age-level expectations on WaKIDS
- 3rd graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 4th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 5th graders meeting MSP science standard

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English language learners in all grades making gains on the State English language proficiency test
- Students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students in all grades making annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students at all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

Strategies that will achieve results

There are three overarching strategies for achieving these elementary school results: Elementary School Innovation Sites, Community-Based Family Support Services, and Summer Learning. This section describes each strategy, outlines the rationale for it, identifies specific program requirements, and describes program phase-in.

1. Elementary School Innovation Sites (4 schools the first year, building to ~ 23 schools over 6 years)

What is an Elementary School Innovation Site?

- Through a competitive process, schools are given a block grant in exchange for agreeing to achieve specific results. The amount of each block grant will depend on the level of need.
- Funding is flexible to allow schools to decide how best to meet the needs of their students, within the context of their particular school.
- School leadership and teachers work with early learning and out-of-school time providers to ensure easy transition between Pre-K to kindergarten.



- Schools develop a tiered approach to intervention with students who are performing below grade level. For example, if a student is not meeting standard on the state math assessment, tutoring may be provided for the student after school.
- Multidisciplinary teams use data on a daily or weekly basis to assess a student's needs, identify appropriate interventions, and track student progress.
- School based support strategies address student's academic, social/emotional/behavioral, and health barriers.
- School staff collaborate with early learning, after-school, and summer school providers on data sharing and analysis.
- Systems are in place to modify strategies and interventions when they are not meeting targets.
- School provides professional development to prepare the principal, administrators, teachers, and instructional assistants and afterschool staff on instructional strategies specific to the needs of their students.
- School must address five key areas:
 - Pre-K-3 Alignment and Collaboration
 - Extended in-school learning time
 - Social/emotional/behavioral support
 - Student and family support services
 - Out-of-school time programs

Why is this strategy important?

- The early grades are fundamental developmentally for many students. Research shows that reading proficiency at the third grade is highly correlated to future success in school and high school graduation.
- Elementary school is where the largest numbers of English language learners enter into the K-12 system. With interventions and supports that focus on language acquisition, ELL students will transition in a reasonable timeframe and perform as well as their native-English-speaking peers.
- Elementary schools that partner and align curriculum, assessment and professional development with Pre-K providers have been successful in raising student achievement.

What are key elements of an Elementary School Innovation Site?

➤ Pre-K –3 Alignment and Collaboration

For some children, an achievement gap exists prior to entering kindergarten. Early learning providers and elementary school teachers need to work collaboratively to develop a coherent framework of programs and services to improve academic outcomes for struggling students. Innovation Elementary schools may have:

- Aligned curriculum and assessments across the P-3 continuum
- System for tracking and sharing data and information
- Transition plan for students across the levels
- Processes for assessing student progress K-3



- Academic supports for students not meeting standards for K-3.
- Professional Development that includes Pre-K through 3rd grade teachers and administrators
- Preschool classrooms and after-school care in the building

➤ Extended in-school learning time

Extended in-school learning time provides students with additional focused instruction from a certified teacher for 30 minutes to two hours per day during the week, on Saturday, or during winter or spring breaks. Extending the traditional school day provides the following:

1. More time mastering academic skills;
2. Greater depth and breadth of learning;
3. More time for planning and professional development;
4. More time for enrichment and experiential learning; and
5. Stronger relationships between teachers and students.

Extending in-school learning time can be effective in closing the achievement gap between poor and minority student and their more affluent peers. Schools with effective extended in-school learning do the following:

- Use standards-based instruction that provides students with the additional math or literacy they need;
- Use appropriate assessments to track student learning and determine when modifications in instruction need to be made;
- Ensure that teachers have appropriate quality professional development; and
- Minimize distractions in the classroom.

Extended in-school learning time is a particularly good strategy for improving academic performance of English language learners (ELL). Characteristics of schools effectively serving ELLs include:

- All instructional staff (principal, teachers, instructional aides, and early learning and afterschool providers) trained in second language acquisition strategies. For example, instructional staff could participate in SPS' "Scale Up 101" training.
- A research-based instructional strategy for English language learners. This includes everything from sheltered-immersion programs to late-exit bilingual classes.
- Supplemental materials that fill in gaps in core curriculum programs for English language learners.
- Appropriate assessments that allow teachers to monitor gains in English proficiency and content knowledge in subjects like math and science.



➤ Family Support Services (School-based)

Barriers to learning take on many different forms. For this reason, family support is critical to the success of students struggling academically. School-based family support will help students achieve academic outcomes by providing the following services:

- Provide case management for high needs and academically at-risk students and their families
- Work with school principal, teachers, guidance councilors, school nurses early learning providers and other school staff to identify students with non-academic barriers and develop a multidisciplinary intervention plan to address student and family needs.
- Connect families in need to resources and supports in the community.
- Act as a liaison between school staff and families.
- Ensure families know how to access school attendance and performance data and information on their student (The Source).
- Provide internet access information for families without home computers.
- Provide parents with information on what their student should be doing to succeed in school including activities they can do at home with students to improve academic outcomes.
- Support parents in advocating for their student's education.
- Engage families with preschool children to prepare them for enrollment into kindergarten.
- Work with Early Learning and other adult caregivers to identify children who may need family support services upon entering kindergarten.

The University of Washington is currently conducting an evaluation of the Family Support Worker Program. The purpose of the evaluation is to identify the link between services provided by the program and student's academic outcomes. Information from this evaluation will be used to make improvements in the program.

➤ Social, Emotional, Behavioral, and Health Support

Both mental and physical health can be a barrier to student learning. For this reason, elementary school-based health services will link with community-based care to address the health needs of students and families in elementary school.

The FEL will support five to six elementary schools in providing social, emotional, behavioral, and health services. Key features of the program:

- Services include:
 - Well-child care, management of chronic conditions, and minor acute care
 - Mental health individual counseling, case management, and preventive services
 - Care coordination with family, medical home, and Medicaid access



- Services are provided on-site at elementary schools, within community health settings, and at Middle School Wellness Center as appropriate.
- Care for students is coordinated during transitions from Early Learning settings to elementary school and from elementary school to middle school.

The Elementary Health Investment is discussed in more depth in the Student Health Implementation Plan.

➤ Out-of-School Time programs

Out-of-school-time (OST) programs (after-school programs) are operated by community organizations in partnership with schools. These programs provide:

- One-on-one or small group tutoring in reading and math for academically struggling students.
- Activities and instruction that is aligned with and builds on what students are learning in class and or the school curriculum.
- OST staff trained to provide academic support to a variety of students including, English language learners, immigrant, and refugee.
- Additional learning time provided by a certificated teacher when possible.
- Homework support for struggling students, especially English language learners with parents unable to help their student at home.
- Additional opportunities for English language learners to practice their academic English in formal and informal classroom settings.
- Partner with schools on family events such as Family Math or Literacy Night.
- Enrichment activities such as soccer, volleyball, and art classes.
- Implementation of quality assessment tools.

How will Elementary Innovation Sites be phased in and managed?

- Elementary Innovation Sites will be phased in over a six-year period in up to 23 low-performing elementary schools.
- In the first year (2012-13 school year), up to 4 innovation sites will be selected.
- Approximately 4 additional sites will be selected each subsequent year, until the Levy is funding up to 23 elementary innovation sites in the 2017-18 school year.
- The Elementary School Support Program Manager and elementary school principals (or their designee) are primarily responsible for managing the implementation.
- Starting in the 2012-13 school year, the school-based Family Support Services investment will be included as part of the innovation school investment for up to four schools. The balance of the Family Support Investment will continue to be allocated across low-performing elementary schools.
- Each year that schools are added to the elementary innovation investment, the school-based Family Support Services will be included as part of the innovation school investment.



2. Community-Based Family Support Services for Immigrant, Refugee, and Native American Students

What are Community-Based Family Support Services (FSS)?

- Designed to address the needs of struggling immigrant, refugee, and Native American students and their families.
- Provides culturally appropriate family support interventions.
- Includes social and health services for children and their families.

Why is this strategy important?

- Refugee and immigrant families often come to this country with few resources.
- Some refugees and immigrants have also faced serious trauma in their native countries.
- Native American families cope with the challenges of living with the historical trauma and loss that was a result of colonization and later forced assimilation.
- Some Native American families face the daily struggle to meet basic needs like food or shelter.
- Dropout rates for immigrant, refugee and Native American students are some of the highest in the district.

What are the key elements of Community-Based Family Support Services (FSS)?

- Collaborate closely with schools serving immigrant, refugee and Native American students.
- Provide case management for high needs and academically at-risk students and their families.
- Work with school principal, teachers, guidance councilors, school nurses, early learning providers and other school staff to identify immigrant, refugee and Native American students with non-school-related academic barriers and develop a multidisciplinary intervention plan to address student and family needs.
- Train school staff on the best ways to support their immigrant, refugee and Native American students and their families.
- Train parents how to engage with the school and advocate for their child's education.
- Connect in-need families to resources and supports in the community.
- Act as a liaison between school staff and families.
- Ensure parents have access to data and information on their child.
- Provide training on The Source (on-line student information) and internet access for those without home computers.
- Provide parents with information on what their child should be doing to succeed in school.
- Engage families with preschool children to prepare them for enrollment in kindergarten.
- Work with early learning and other adult caregivers to identify children who may need family support services upon entering kindergarten.



How will Community-Based Family Support Services be phased in and managed?

- Community-Based Family Support and Engagement, explicitly for immigrant, refugee, and Native American families, will begin in the first school year of the new Levy (2012-13).
- Community-based organizations do not have to be co-located at an innovation school site.
- These services will be provided by community-based organizations, determined by a competitive RFI process.
- Funding will depend on the number of students and families served.

3. Summer Learning

What is Summer Learning?

- Provided for low-performing students from across the district.
- Summer Learning includes structured academic programs with the explicit purpose of building students' skills.
- Summer Learning should provide at least six weeks and/or 90 hours of extra learning time.
- Additional components, such as enrichment activities, may be paired with Summer Learning to provide a comprehensive program.

Why is this strategy important?

- Provides students with additional learning time to catch up with peers.
- Prevents summer learning loss, most prevalent among low-income students.
- Provides students with a safe and structure place to go in the summer.

What are key elements of Summer Learning?

- Targeted recruitment, to ensure program is matched to student need
- Individualized instruction and smaller class sizes
- Maximizing student attendance
- Family involvement component
- Providing structures that support high-quality instruction
- Aligning summer content with school year curriculum
- Using data to track effectiveness
- Including content that goes beyond remediation
- Implementation of quality assessment tools.

How will Summer Learning be phased in and managed?

- Summer Learning is a new component in the Elementary School Investment.
- Programs will be phased in over a six-year period. In the first year (Summer 2013), ~125 elementary school students will be served by summer learning.
- Approximately 125 elementary school students district-wide will be added each subsequent year until the Levy is serving 875 elementary school students in summer learning programs.
- Summer learning may be awarded as part of an elementary innovation RFI, either in combination with an RFQ approved partner organization or provided directly by the



school. Summer learning may also be awarded directly to non-school partners through an RFI.

- The focus of Summer Learning will depend on student need, determined from an ongoing analysis of the data. Some potential options include:
 - Focus on serving newly-arrived English language learners who are Level 1 or Level 2 on the State English Proficiency Exam
 - Focus on serving long-term English language learners (> five years in program)
 - Focus on helping student pass required state assessments in reading, math, science and/or writing
 - Focus on students with very low math skills (Level 1 on MSP or below grade-level on MAP)
 - Focus on students with very low literacy skills (Level 1 on MSP or below grade-level on MAP)
 - Focus on students entering kindergarten without prior Pre-K experience.

Ways in Which the Investment Builds on the Last Levy

- Adds the elementary innovation strategy, which focuses substantial funds on low-performing schools.
- Adds summer learning programs to provide additional learning time and reduce or prevent summer slide.
- Adds community-based family support program to improve academic outcomes of students by removing barriers to learning.
- Requires programs to have explicit strategies for English language learners.
- Outcome targets will be tailored to each school and will be monitored on a quarterly basis.
- Includes a focus on alignment with Pre-K.
- Implements quality assessments tools.

Alignment with Other City Resources

City General Fund Investments

- Multiple City departments are involved in providing out-of-school time activities for students. Such departments include the Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs, Seattle Center, Human Services Department (HSD), Parks, and Seattle Public Library (SPL).
- HSD funds child care subsidies for children ages birth – 2 in school-based child care programs.

Funding Assumptions

Specify program costs by major cost category.

- Elementary School Innovation Sites (combined funds)



- School-Based Student and Family Support
- Community-Based Student and Family Support
- Summer Learning

List of possible funding sources other than the Levy.

- New School/LEV Foundation
- Multiple other after-school and service providers
- Seattle Public Schools
 - Performance Management funds
 - Title I funds
 - Title III funds
 - Title IV funds
 - State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program Funding
 - Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
 - Refugee Impact Grant

What are the financial expectations of partners?

- Seattle Public Schools: We assume that schools that apply for investments will use the other funds available to them to maximize their overall school plan to achieve targets.
- Partner Organizations: We expect that Partner Organizations will braid Levy funding with other resources to provide a wider and deeper area of services than what could be supported by Levy funds alone.



RESEARCH APPENDIX

Extended Learning Time/Out-of-School Time

Farbman, D. and Kaplan, C. (2005). *Time for a change: The promise of extended-time schools for promoting student achievement*. Boston, MA: Massachusetts 2020. Retrieved July, 2011, from [http://www.mass2020.org/files/file/Time-for-a-change\(1\).pdf](http://www.mass2020.org/files/file/Time-for-a-change(1).pdf)

On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Use Time (January 2007). Education Sector. <http://www.educationsector.org/sites/default/files/publications/OntheClock.pdf>

Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement. NCEE 2009-012. U.S. Department of Education. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf

English Language Learners

Autio, E.; Motamedi, J.; Deussen, T. 2010. *What We Know About Programs for English Language Learners*. Portland, OR: Education Northwest.

Duessen, T., Autio, E., Miller, B., Turnbaugh Lockwood, A., Stewart, V. 2008. *What teachers should know about instruction for English language learners: A report to Washington State?*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Elfers, A. M.; Stritikus, T.; Calaff, K.; Soo Von Esch, K.; Lucero, A.; Knapp, M.; Plecki, M. 2009. *Building Systems of Support for Classroom Teachers Working with Second Language Learners*. <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/ELLStudy-July2009.pdf>

Francis, D. J., Rivera, M., Lesaux, N., Keiffer, M., & Rivera, H. (2006a). *Practical guidelines for the education of English language learners: Research-based recommendations for instruction and academic interventions*. Portsmouth, NH: Center on Instruction. Retrieved July, 2011, from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/ELL1-Interventions.pdf>

Goldsmith, J., Jucovy, L. & Arbretton, A. (2008). *Gaining Ground: Supporting English Learners through After-School Literacy Programming*. The James Irvine Foundation. Retrieved July 2011 from, http://www.ppv.org/ppv/publications/assets/229_publication.pdf

London, R.A., Norman, J.R., & Gurantz, O. (2008). *The Effect of Afterschool Program Participation on English Language Acquisition*. Stanford, CA: John W. Gardner Center for Youth and their Communities. Retrieved July 2011 from: http://gardnercenter.stanford.edu/docs/YDA_ResearchBrief_BGCP-EL6.pdf

McNeir, G. & Wambalaba, J. (2006). *Literacy in Afterschool Programs: Focus on English Language Learners*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Literature Review. Retrieved July 2011 from, http://www.sedl.org/afterschool/toolkits/literacy/pdf/AST_lit_literature_review_ell.pdf

Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2003). *Effective reading programs for English language learners: A best-evidence synthesis*. (Report No. 66). Baltimore: Center for Research on the



Education of Students Placed at Risk. Retrieved July 2011 from:
<http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/Report66.pdf>

Family Support and Engagement

- Adelman, H.S. & Taylor, L. (2000). Looking at school health and school reform policy through the lens of addressing barriers to learning. *Children's services: Social policy, research, and practice*, 3(2), 117-132.
- Adelman, H.S., & Taylor, L. (2010). Creating successful school systems requires addressing barriers to learning and teaching. *The F.M. Duffy Reports*, 15(3), 1-11.
- Comer, J.P., & Hayenes, N.M. (1991). Parent Involvement in Schools: An Ecological Approach. *The Elementary School Journal*, 91(3), 271-277.
- Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein, J. L. (2002). Getting students to school: Using Family and community involvement to reduce chronic absenteeism. *The School Community Journal* (Fall/Winter), 39-56.

P-3 Alignment

- Colorado Department of Education. (2008). *P-3 Successful Practices: A Guide to Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment*. Retrieved July 11 from:
<http://www.cde.state.co.us/communications/download/PDF/20081113p3report.pdf>
- Hernandez, D. (2011). *Double Jeopardy: How Third-Grade Reading Skills and Poverty Influence High School Graduation*. Retrieved July 2011 from
<http://www.aecf.org/~media/Pubs/Topics/Education/Other/DoubleJeopardyHowThirdGradeReadingSkillsandPoverty/DoubleJeopardyReport040511FINAL.pdf>
- Marietta, G. (2010). *Lessons for PreK-3rd from Montgomery County Public Schools*. Retrieved July 11 from <http://fcd-us.org/sites/default/files/FINAL%20MC%20Case%20Study.pdf>

Use of Leading Indicators

- Foly, E. et. al.(2010). *Beyond Test Scores: Leading Indicators for Education*. Annenberg Institute for School Reform. <http://www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/LeadingIndicators.pdf>
- Musen, L. *Early Reading Proficiency* (May 2010). Annenberg Institute for School Reform. http://www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/LeadingIndicator_Reading.pdf



**2011 Families and Education Levy Implementation Plan
Middle School Academic Achievement and College/Career
Preparation Investment Area
6th – 8th Grade**

**What we will help achieve – Middle School Academic Achievement and College/Career
Preparation Outcomes and Indicators**

Middle School Investments will contribute toward the following District-wide outcomes:

- 6th graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 7th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 8th graders meeting MSP science standard

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English language learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- Students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students in all grades making annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students in all grades passing all courses
- Students in all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester
- 7th and 8th graders enrolled in College Bound

Strategies that will achieve results

There are three overarching strategies for achieving middle school results: Middle School Innovation Sites, Middle School Linkage Sites and Summer Learning. Two additional investments, Middle School Athletics and Transportation, support the Middle School strategies. This section describes each strategy and the rationale for it, lists specific elements that must be included in implementation, and cites the evidence-based research that supports this approach.

1. Middle School Innovation Sites (~5 schools)

What is a Middle School Innovation Site?

- Middle School Innovation Sites are schools that have large concentrations of low-performing students in 6th, 7th and 8th grade.
- Through a competitive process, schools are given a block grant, in exchange for agreeing to achieve specific results. The amount of each block grant will depend on the level of need.
- Schools are required to develop a tiered approach to intervention with students who are performing below grade level. This approach should be able to address multiple barriers students have to being successful in school, including academic, social/emotional/behavioral, and health barriers.



- Funding is flexible to allow schools to decide how to best meet the needs of their students, within the context of their particular school.
- Data is used at innovation sites on a daily or weekly basis to assess the success of the strategies.
- Systems must be in place to modify strategies when they are not successful.
- Innovation Sites develop a protocol for assessing and serving students who enter a school mid-year, a major risk factor for student success.
- School must address five key areas:
 - Extended in-school learning time
 - Social/emotional/behavioral support
 - College and career planning
 - Family involvement
 - Out-of-school time programs

Why is this strategy important?

- Recognizes the importance of middle grades as a make-or-break time for academic achievement. Outcomes in these grades are highly correlated to high school graduation.
- Continues the success of this strategy in the current Levy by serving approximately five innovation middle schools.
- Keeps families involved in their student's education in the middle school years. Family involvement drops off after elementary school.
- Acknowledges that the content in middle school becomes more rigorous and that students are now required to "read to learn," making it more critical to meet the needs of English language learners and other struggling readers.
- Acknowledges that middle students have an increased responsibility to organize time, multiple classes, and assignments.
- Adds a new college/career readiness component in order to get students to understand what is needed to prepare academically for their post-secondary plans.

What are key elements of a Middle School Innovation Site?

➤ **Extended in-school learning time**

Extended in-school learning time provides students with additional focused instruction from a certified teacher for 30 minutes to two hours per day during the week or during school breaks. Extending in-school learning provides:

- More time mastering academic skills
- Greater depth and breadth of learning
- More time for enrichment and experiential learning
- Stronger relationships between teachers and students
- More time for planning and professional development for staff



Extending learning time can be effective in closing the achievement gap between poor and minority students and their more affluent peers. Schools with effective extended in-school learning do the following:

- Use standards-based instruction that provides students with the additional math or literacy learning opportunities aligned to their specific academic needs.
- Use appropriate assessments daily and weekly to track student learning and determine when modifications in instruction need to be made.
- Ensure that teachers have appropriate quality professional development.
- Provide opportunities for small group learning.

Extended learning time is an effective strategy for English language learners (ELL). Characteristics of schools effectively serving ELLs include:

- All instructional staff (principal, teachers, and instructional aides) trained in language acquisition instructional strategies.
- A clearly articulated, research-based instructional strategy for English language learners. This includes everything from sheltered-immersion programs to late-exit bilingual classes.
- Supplemental materials that fill in gaps in core curriculum programs for English language learners.
- Appropriate assessments that allow teachers to monitor gains in English proficiency and content knowledge in subjects like math and science.

➤ **Addressing non-academic barriers to learning and school success (social/emotional, behavioral, health and attendance)**

By identifying and addressing the non-academic barriers to learning, schools provide support that students need as they transition from middle and throughout high school. It is well documented that these types of issues have significant impact on a student's ability to succeed in high school or not. Schools effectively addressing non-academic barriers to learning have been found to:

- Provide students encountering discipline issues with alternatives to suspension.
- Collaborate with nurses, school psychologists, counselors, Levy-funded school-based health centers* and/or other providers to address physical and mental health issues.
- Create intentional strategies to "connect" students to their school and a significant adult advocate.
- Provide support to students encountering drug- and/or alcohol-related issues.
- Develop multi-tiered strategies to address attendance issues of differing severity.
- Provide intensive case management for students encountering multiple or severe barriers to success.



- * The Middle School Health Investment is discussed in more depth in the Student Health Implementation Plan. Coordination of services with school-based health centers is required by all innovation schools.

➤ College and career planning

Over the past ten years it has become increasingly clear that high school graduation is no longer the goal. In order for the vast majority of young people to find living wage careers, they will need to obtain education beyond high school. This reality has driven the addition of this new element to the Levy.

College and career planning must be a collaborative process between educators, students and families that allows for exploration of interests and aptitudes, goal setting, mapping out an educational plan and receiving the necessary information and support to achieve success.

Innovation schools must implement the following components:

- A comprehensive guidance and counseling model that:
 - Provides students with (at least) monthly, curriculum-based meetings between advisor and advisees in accordance with best practices.
 - Provides for the administration and interpretation of career and interest inventories, etc.
 - Includes "College knowledge" activities and information related to post-secondary options and financial aid.
- Student-led conferences for all students at least once per year.
- Students identified as needing additional, intensive support in middle school will be assigned a college and career readiness case manager that may follow them into 9th and through high school graduation.

➤ Family Involvement

- Family involvement must be integrated into the school's overarching plan.
- Ensure families know how to access school attendance and performance data and information on their student (The Source).
- Provide internet access information for families without home computers.
- Provide families with information on what their student should know within each subject, at each grade level (common core standards).
- Provide families with information on what their student should be doing to succeed in school and to get ready for post-secondary opportunities.
- Collaborate with community-based organizations that provide culturally and linguistically appropriate services to students and families, particularly immigrant and refugee families, and help families access these services.



- Student-led conferences with teachers and family.

➤ **Out-of-School Time programs**

Out-of-School-Time (OST) programs (after-school programs) are extended learning time that are operated separately from the regular school day or year.

- Programs and activities must be aligned with academic content standards (Common Core State Standards).
- Academic activities must be aligned with individual student needs (one-on-one tutoring, homework help, targeted small group instruction).
- Provide ELLs with the homework support that their parents may not be able to give them.
- Provide ELLs the opportunity to practice their English in formal and informal classroom settings.
- Implementation of quality assessment tools.

How will Middle School Innovation Sites be phased in and managed?

- Approximately five Middle School Innovation Sites will be implemented in the 2012-13 school year.
- College and career readiness is a new component to the Middle School Innovation Sites.
 - Student-led conferences, advisories, and online college and career planning services will begin at approximately three innovation schools in 2012-13 (for all 6th – 8th graders) and will expand to approximately two additional innovation schools in the 2013-14 SY.
 - Case management for college and career readiness will begin in approximately five innovation sites in 2012-13, starting with 6th graders. Case management will roll up each year until all three middle school grades are being served (i.e., add 7th graders in 2013-14, 8th graders in 2014-15). It is anticipated that the same students may need to remain in the case management program all three years of middle school and possibly into high school.
- The Middle School Support Program Manager and middle school principals (or their designee) are primarily responsible for managing the implementation.

2. Middle School Linkage Sites

What is a Middle School Linkage Site?

- Middle School Linkage Sites can be any middle or K-8 school in the district.
- Through a competitive process, schools are given a block grant, in exchange for agreeing to achieve specific results. The amount of each block grant will depend on the level of need.
- Schools are required to develop intervention strategies that will serve a group of focus students who are performing below grade level.



- Funding is flexible, to allow schools to decide how to best meet the needs of their focus students, within the context of their particular school.
- Data is used at linkage sites on a daily or weekly basis to assess the success of the strategies.
- Systems must be in place to modify strategies when they are not successful.
- Schools may invest in one or more of the following key areas:
 - Extended in-school learning time
 - Social/emotional/behavioral support
 - College and career planning
 - Family involvement
 - Out-of-School Time programs

Why is this strategy important?

- Recognizes the importance of middle grades as a make-or-break time for academic achievement. Outcomes in these grades are highly correlated to high school graduation.
- Builds on success of this strategy in the current Levy. This strategy will continue by serving middle school students in non-innovation schools.
- Acknowledges that the content in middle school becomes more rigorous, and that students are now required to “read to learn,” making it more critical to meet the needs of English language learners.

What are key elements of a Middle School Linkage Site and what is the research that supports that practice?

- **Extended in-school learning time**
 - Students are provided with extra instructional time in math or literacy, with content and instruction aligned to their specific academic needs.
- **Addressing non-academic barriers to learning and school success (social/emotional, behavioral, health and attendance)**
- **Out-of-school time programs**
 - Academic activities aligned with individual student needs (tutoring, homework help, targeted small group instruction)
 - Enrichment activities aligned with Common Core Standards
 - Implementation of quality assessment tools

How will Middle School Linkage Sites be phased in and managed?

- Middle School Linkage Sites will be implemented in the 2012-13 school year, and may be shifted, depending on outcomes.
- There are no new elements to the Middle School Linkage Sites.
- The Middle School Support Program Manager and middle school/K-8 principals (or their designee) are primarily responsible for managing the implementation.



3. Summer Learning

What is Summer Learning?

- Summer Learning includes structured academic programs with the explicit purpose of building students' skills.
- Summer Learning should provide at least six weeks and/or 90 hours of extra learning time.
- Additional components, such as enrichment activities, service learning projects, or internships, may be paired with summer learning to provide a comprehensive program.

Why is this strategy important?

- Provides students with additional learning time to catch up with peers.
- Prevents summer learning loss, prevalent among low-income students.
- Provides students with a safe and structured place to go in the summer.
- Provides opportunity to inspiring learning in a different environment.

What are key elements of Summer Learning?

- Targeted recruitment, to ensure program is matched to student need
- Individualized instruction and smaller class sizes
- Maximizing student attendance
- Family involvement component
- Providing structures that support high-quality instruction
- Aligning summer content with school year curriculum
- Using data to track effectiveness
- Including content that goes beyond remediation
- Implementation of quality assessment tools

How will Summer Learning be phased in and managed?

- Summer Learning is a new component in the Middle School Investment.
- Summer learning may be awarded as part of a middle school RFI, either in combination with an RFQ approved partner organization or provided directly by the school. Summer learning may also be awarded directly to non-school partners through an RFI. Summer learning will be phased in over five school years, beginning with the 2012-13 school year.
- Programs will be phased in over a six-year period. In the first year (summer 2013), approximately 220 middle school students will be served by Summer Learning.
- Approximately 220 middle school students will be added each subsequent year, until the Levy is serving 1300 middle school students in Summer Learning programs.
- The focus of Summer Learning will depend on student need, determined from an ongoing analysis of the data. Some potential options include:
 - Focus on serving newly-arrived English language learners who are Level 1 or Level 2 on the State English Proficiency Exam
 - Focus on serving long-term English language learners (> five years in program)
 - Focus on helping student pass required state assessments in reading, math, science and/or writing



- Focus on students with very low math skills (Level 1 on MSP)
- Focus on students with very low literacy skills (Level 1 on MSP)

4. Supporting Middle School Strategies – Athletics and Transportation

Two strategies in the middle school investment will serve to support the achievement of middle school targets. These strategies include Middle School Athletics and Transportation.

What are Middle School Athletics?

- Athletic programs for middle school students provide partial funding for coaches in nine middle schools and ten K-8 schools.
- Sports include soccer, ultimate Frisbee, basketball, volleyball and track.

Why is this strategy important?

- Middle school athletics provide an additional opportunity to engage students in school and with school staff.
- Helps build school community and student engagement.
- Provides students the opportunity to engage in physical activity in a group setting.

How will Middle School Athletics be phased in and managed?

- Middle School Athletics will be implemented in all seven years of the Levy.
- This investment will be managed by the Parks Department.

What is Transportation?

- Provides transportation home for students participating in Levy-funded out-of-school time programs for all middle and K-8 students, including sports.

Why is this strategy important?

- Transportation is a critical component in allowing students to stay after school to participate in Levy-funded out-of-school time programs (academic, enrichment, and athletic).

How will Transportation be phased in and managed?

- Transportation for middle school out-of-school time programs will be provided in all seven years of the Levy.
- This investment will be managed by the Parks Department.

Ways in Which the Investment Builds on the Last Levy

- Adds summer learning programs to provide additional learning time and prevent summer slide.
- Adds academic advisories to provide students with both the information and support they need to get and stay on a post-secondary track and ensure each student is connected with an adult in their school.



- Adds case management services to achieve targets for students farthest behind in college and career readiness.
- Requires programs to have explicit strategies for English language learners
- Requires providers to use standards-based approaches to curriculum and assessment.
- Requires providers to monitor data on a daily/weekly basis, to monitor program effectiveness and make course corrections more frequently.
- Sets indicator targets for each school that will be monitored on a quarterly basis.
- Sets result targets for each school that will be monitored yearly.
- Implements quality assessments tools.

Alignment with Other City Resources

City General Fund Investments

- Multiple City departments are involved in providing out-of-school time activities wraparound support services for students for students. Such departments include Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs, Seattle Center, Human Services Department (HSD), Parks, and Seattle Public Library (SPL).
- Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative – Case management, behavior modification courses, service officers in schools, and a street outreach program.

Funding Assumptions

Specify program costs by major cost category.

- Middle School Innovation Sites (combined funds)
- Middle School Linkage Sites (combined funds)
- Summer Learning
- Middle School Athletics
- Transportation for out-of-school time programs

List of possible funding sources other than the Levy.

- Nesholm Family Foundation provides support for middle schools in three south end middle schools in the areas of literacy and mental health.
- Raikes Foundation provides support for the implementation of the Youth Program Quality Assessment (YPQA) for providers of out-of-school time (OST) programs.
- Multiple support service providers and community-based organizations
- Seattle Public Schools
 - Performance Management funds
 - Title I funds
 - Title III funds
 - Title IV funds
 - State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program Funding
 - Learning Assistance Program (LAP)



- Refugee Impact Grant
- State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program

What are the financial expectations of partners?

- Seattle Public Schools: We assume that schools that apply for investments will use the other funds available to them to maximize their overall school plan to achieve targets.
- Partner Organizations: We that expect Partner Organizations will braid Levy funding with other resources to provide a wider and deeper area of services than what could be supported by Levy funds alone.



RESEARCH

Extended Learning Time/Out-of-School Time/Summer Learning

Are Two Algebra Classes Better Than One? The Effects of Double-Dose Instruction Chicago. (August 2010). Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute. <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/Double%20Dose-7%20Final%20082610.pdf>

College Prep for All? What We've Learned from Chicago's Efforts. (August 2010). Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute. <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/College%20Prep%207x10-10-%20final%20082610.pdf>

Farbman, D. & Kaplan, C. (2005). *Time for a Change: The Promising of Extended-Time Schools for Promoting Student Achievement.* [www.mass2020.org/files/file/Time-for-a-change\(1\).pdf](http://www.mass2020.org/files/file/Time-for-a-change(1).pdf)

On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Use Time (January 2007). Education Sector. <http://www.educationsector.org/sites/default/files/publications/OntheClock.pdf>

Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement. NCEE 2009-012. U.S. Department of Education. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf

Academic Guidance and College Planning

Dynarski, M., Clarke, L., Cobb, B., Finn, J., Rumberger, R., and Smink, J. (2008). *Dropout Prevention: A Practice Guide* (NCEE 2008-4025). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc>.

Partners in Learning: Designing and Implementing an Effective Advisory. Program Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR). <http://www.esrnational.org/hs/reform/hsadvisory.htm>

Smaller Learning Communities Program. Northwest Education Regional Laboratory. <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sslc/>

Use of Leading Indicators

Allensworth, E. & Easton, J.Q. (July 2007). *What Matters for Staying On-Track and Graduating in Chicago Public Schools.* Chicago Consortium on School Research. <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/07%20What%20Matters%20Final.pdf>



Balfanz, R. (June, 2009). *Putting Middle Grade Students on the Graduation Path*. Everyone Graduates Center. Johns Hopkins University.

[http://www.nmsa.org/portals/0/pdf/research/Research from the Field/Policy Brief Balfanz.pdf](http://www.nmsa.org/portals/0/pdf/research/Research%20from%20the%20Field/Policy%20Brief%20Balfanz.pdf)

Balfanz, R., Herzog, L., & Mac Iver, D. (2007). Preventing student disengagement and keeping students on the graduation path in the urban middle grade schools: Early identification and effective interventions. *Educational Psychologist*, 42(4), 223–235.

Celio, Mary Beth M.B. (2007). Seattle Public Schools Class of 2006 Cohort Study

<http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/education/documents/MaryBethCelioReport2007.pdf>

Foly, E. et. al. (2010). *Beyond Test Scores: Leading Indicators for Education*. Annenberg Institute for School Reform. <http://www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/LeadingIndicators.pdf>

Musen, L. *Early Reading Proficiency* (May 2010). Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

http://www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/LeadingIndicator_Reading.pdf



2011 Families and Education Levy Implementation Plan High School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation Investment Area

What we will help achieve – High School Academic Achievement and College/Career Preparation Outcomes and Indicators

High School investments will contribute to the following District-wide outcomes:

- 9th graders promoting on time to 10th grade
- Students graduating on time
- Students graduating with HECB requirements for entry into college
- Students completing CTE course of study before graduation
- Students passing end-of-course math tests
- Graduates enrolling in post-secondary education
- Graduates taking fewer remedial courses in college
- Graduates continuously enrolled in post secondary education for one year

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English language learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- 9th grade students making annual typical growth on reading MAP
- 9th grade students making annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students in all grades passing all courses
- Students in all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

Strategies that will achieve results

There are two overarching strategies for achieving high school results: High School Innovation Sites and Summer Learning. This section describes each strategy and the rationale, specific elements that must be included in implementation, and cites the evidence-based research that supports this approach.

1. High School Innovation Sites (~5 schools)

What is a High School Innovation Site?

- High School Innovation Sites are schools that have large concentrations of incoming 9th graders who have multiple risk factors for academic failure.
- Through a competitive process, schools are given a block grant, in exchange for agreeing to achieve specific targets. The amount of each block grant will depend on the level of need.



- Schools are required to develop a tiered approach to intervention with 9th graders. This approach should be able to address multiple barriers students have to being successful in school, including academic, social/emotional/behavioral, and health barriers.
- Funding is flexible to allow schools to decide how to best meet the needs of their students, within the context of their particular school.
- Data is used at innovation sites on a daily or weekly basis to assess the success of the strategies.
- Systems must be in place to modify strategies when they are not successful.
- Innovation Sites develop a protocol for assessing and serving students who enter a school mid-year, a major risk factor.
- School must address five key areas:
 - Extended in-school learning time
 - Social/emotional/behavioral support
 - College and career planning
 - Family involvement
 - 8th to 9th grade transition

Why is this strategy important?

- The High School Innovation Strategy recognizes that 9th grade is a pivotal year in a student's life and success in 9th grade is highly correlated to high school graduation.
- Builds on the success of the current Levy, expanding from three high schools up to five high schools.
- Acknowledges that the content in high school becomes more rigorous and that students are now required to "read to learn," making it more critical to meet the needs of English language learners.
- Strategy also recognizes that it is necessary to ensure students meet the new Levy goal that students graduate college and career ready.
- Recognition that the bar for today's students is much higher and students need support to meet this bar.
- Adds a new college/career readiness component in order to get students to understand what is needed to prepare academically for their post-secondary plans.

What are key elements of a High School Innovation Site and what is the research that supports that practice?

➤ **Extended In-school Learning Time**

Extended in-school learning time provides students with additional focused instruction from a certified teacher for 30 minutes to two hours per day during the week or during school breaks. Extending in-school learning provides:

- More time mastering academic skills
- Greater depth and breadth of learning
- More time for enrichment and experiential learning



- Stronger relationships between teachers and students
- More time for planning and professional development for staff

Extending learning time can be effective in closing the achievement gap between poor and minority students and their more affluent peers. Schools with effective extended in-school learning do the following:

- Use standards-based instruction that provides students with the additional math or literacy learning opportunities aligned to their specific academic needs;
- Use appropriate assessments daily and weekly to track student learning and determine when modifications in instruction need to be made;
- Ensure that teachers have appropriate quality professional development; and
- Provide opportunities for small group learning.

Extended learning time is an effective strategy for English language learners (ELL). Characteristics of schools effectively serving ELLs include:

- All instructional staff (principal, teachers, and instructional aides) trained in language acquisition instructional strategies.
- A clearly articulated research-based instructional strategy for English language learners. This includes everything from sheltered-immersion programs to late-exit bilingual classes.
- Supplemental materials that fill in gaps in core curriculum programs for English language learners.
- Appropriate assessments that allow teachers to monitor gains in English proficiency and content knowledge in subjects like math and science.

➤ **Addressing Non-Academic Barriers to Learning and School Success** (social/emotional, behavioral, health and attendance)

By identifying and addressing the non-academic barriers to learning, schools provide support that students need as they transition from middle and throughout high school. It is well documented that these types of issues have significant impact on a student's ability to succeed in high school or not. Schools effectively addressing non-academic barriers to learning have been found to:

- Provide students encountering discipline issues with alternatives to suspension.
- Collaborate with nurses, school psychologists, counselors, levy-funded school-based health centers* and/or other providers to address physical and mental health issues
- Create intentional strategies to "connect" students to their school and a significant adult advocate.
- Provide support to students encountering drug- and/or alcohol-related issues.
- Develop multi-tiered strategies to address attendance issues of differing severity.
- Provide intensive case management for students encountering multiple or severe barriers to success.



- * The High School Health Investment is discussed in more depth in the Student Health Implementation Plan. Coordination of services with school-based health centers is required by all innovation schools.

➤ College and Career Planning

Over the past ten years it has become increasingly clear that high school graduation is no longer the goal. In order for the vast majority of young people to find living wage careers, they will need to obtain education beyond high school. This reality has driven the addition of the new “college and career planning” investment to the Levy.

College and career planning must be a collaborative process between educators, students, families and the community that allows for exploration of interests and aptitudes, goal setting, mapping out an educational plan and receiving the necessary information and support to achieve success. Innovation schools must implement the following components:

- A comprehensive guidance and counseling model that:
 - Provides students with (at least) monthly, curriculum-based meetings between advisor and advisees in accordance with best practices.
 - Provides for the administration and interpretation of career exploration and interest surveys, college-readiness assessments, etc. (ACT Plan & Explore, PSAT, COMPASS, etc.)
 - Includes “College knowledge” activities and information related to post-secondary options, college application and financial aid processes.
- Student-led conferences for all students at least once per year. Conferences may be phased in, beginning with a cohort of 9th grade students.
- Students identified as needing additional, intensive support will be assigned a college and career readiness case manager that will follow them from 9th grade through high school graduation.

➤ Family Involvement

- Family involvement must be integrated into the school’s overarching plan.
- Ensure families know how to access school attendance and performance data and information on their student (The Source).
- Provide internet access information for families without home computers.
- Provide families with information on what their student should be doing to succeed in school and to get ready for post-secondary opportunities.
- Provide families with information on graduation and college entrance requirements, customized school success strategies, and career exploration and college planning advice.



- Collaborate with community-based organizations that provide culturally and linguistically appropriate services to students and families, particularly immigrant and refugee families, and help families access these services.
 - Student-led conferences with teachers and family.
- **8th to 9th Grade Summer Bridge**
- Students are identified through collaborative efforts of middle and high school staff.
 - Students are provided with extra instructional time in math or literacy, with content and instruction aligned to their specific academic needs and state standards.
 - Special focus is placed on meeting the needs of English language learners.

How will High School Innovation Sites be phased in and managed?

- Approximately five High School Innovation Sites will be implemented in the 2012-13 school year. This number will remain constant for the duration of the Levy.
- College and career readiness is a new component to the High School investment.
 - Student-led conferences, advisories, and online college and career planning services will begin at up to five innovation schools in 2012-13.
 - Case management for college and career readiness will begin in up to five innovation sites in 2015-16, starting with 9th graders. Case management will roll up each year until all four high school grades are being served (i.e. add 10th graders in 2016-17, 11th graders in 2017-18, 12th graders in 2018-19).
 - It is anticipated that the same students who are enrolled in case management in middle school may need to remain in the case management program in high school.
 - Case management services are for students with the greatest number of barriers to accessing post-secondary education. Such barriers include poor attendance, failing grades, behavioral problems, very low scores on state standardized tests, and stagnant growth on the State English Proficiency Test.
 - College Readiness Assessment will be administered to all 10th or 11th graders, beginning in 2012-13, and will continue through the duration of the Levy.
- The High School Innovation Program Manager and high school principals (or their designee) will be primarily in charge of managing the implementation of this strategy.

2. Summer Learning

What is Summer Learning?

- Summer Learning includes structured academic programs with the explicit purpose of building students' skills.
- Summer Learning should provide at least six weeks and/or 90 hours of extra learning time.
- Additional components, such as enrichment activities, service learning projects, or internships, may be paired with Summer Learning to provide a comprehensive program.



Why is this strategy important?

- Provides students with additional learning time to catch up with peers.
- Prevents summer learning loss, prevalent among low-income students.
- Provides students with opportunities to make up missing credits, and remain on track for on-time graduation.
- Provides students with a safe and structured place to go in the summer.
- Provides opportunity to inspiring learning in a different environment.

What are key elements of Summer Learning?

- Targeted recruitment, to ensure program is matched to student need
- Individualized instruction and smaller class sizes
- Maximizing student attendance
- Family involvement component
- Providing structures that support high-quality instruction
- Aligning summer content with school-year curriculum
- Using data to track effectiveness
- Including content that goes beyond remediation
- Implementation of quality assessment tools

How will Summer Learning be phased in and managed?

- Summer Learning is a new component in the High School Investment.
- Summer learning may be awarded as part of a high school innovation site RFI, either in combination with an RFQ approved partner organization or provided directly by the school. Summer learning may also be awarded directly to non-school partners through an RFI. Summer learning is awarded beginning with the 2012-13 school year.
- Programs will begin in the first year of the Levy (summer 2013).
- Approximately 350 high school students will be served by Summer Learning each year of the Levy.
- The focus of Summer Learning will depend on student need, determined from an ongoing analysis of the data. Some potential options include:
 - Focus on serving newly arrived English language learners who are Level 1 or Level 2 on the State English Proficiency Exam
 - Focus on serving long-term English language learners (>5 years in program)
 - Focus on helping student pass required state assessments in reading and writing
 - Focus on helping student pass end-of-course exams in math and/or science
 - Focus on preparing students to take college entrance exams (e.g. COMPASS)
 - Focus on students with very low math or literacy skills (Level 1 on 8th grade MSP)
- The Office for Education will be in charge of managing this strategy.



Ways in Which the Investment Builds on the Last Levy

- Expands the High School innovation model from three to five schools.
- Adds summer learning programs for 9th–12th graders to provide additional learning time and prevent summer learning loss.
- Adds college readiness assessment to allow students to understand their level of college readiness and have opportunities to be better prepared.
- Adds academic advising to provide students with both the information and support they need to get and stay on a post-secondary track.
- Adds case management services to achieve targets for students farthest behind in college and career readiness.
- Requires programs to have explicit strategies for English language learners.
- Implements quality assessments tools.

Alignment with Other City Resources

City General Fund Investments

- Multiple City departments are involved in providing out-of-school time activities and wraparound support services for students. Such departments include Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs, Seattle Center, Human Services Department (HSD), Parks, and Seattle Public Library (SPL).
- Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative – Case Management, behavior modification courses, and a street outreach program.

Funding Assumptions

Specify program costs by major cost category.

- High School Innovation Sites (combined funds)
- Summer Learning

List of possible funding sources other than the Levy.

- Multiple support service providers and community-based organizations
- Seattle Public Schools
 - Federal Grant on Dropout Prevention (Cleveland, Rainier Beach, Chief Sealth, Ingraham, & Interagency)
 - Performance Management funds
 - Title III funds
 - Title IV funds
 - State Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program Funding
 - Learning Assistance Program (LAP)
 - Refugee Impact Grant



What are the financial expectations of partners?

- **Seattle Public Schools:** We assume that schools that apply for investments will use the other funds available to them to maximize their overall school plan to achieve targets.
- **Partner Organizations:** We expect that Partner Organizations will braid Levy funding with other resources to provide a wider and deeper area of services than what could be supported by Levy funds alone.



RESEARCH

Extended Learning Time/Out-of-School Time/Summer Learning

Are Two Algebra Classes Better Than One? The Effects of Double-Dose Instruction Chicago. (August 2010). Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute. <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/Double%20Dose-7%20Final%20082610.pdf>

College Prep for All? What We've Learned from Chicago's Efforts. (August 2010). Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago Urban Education Institute. <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/College%20Prep%207x10-10-%20final%20082610.pdf>

Farbman, D. & Kaplan, C. (2005). *Time for a Change: The Promising of Extended-Time Schools for Promoting Student Achievement.* [www.mass2020.org/files/file/Time-for-a-change\(1\).pdf](http://www.mass2020.org/files/file/Time-for-a-change(1).pdf)

On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Use Time (January 2007). Education Sector. <http://www.educationsector.org/sites/default/files/publications/OntheClock.pdf>

Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement. NCEE 2009-012. U.S. Department of Education. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/ost_pg_072109.pdf

Academic guidance and college planning

Dynarski, M., Clarke, L., Cobb, B., Finn, J., Rumberger, R., and Smink, J. (2008). *Dropout Prevention: A Practice Guide* (NCEE 2008-4025). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc>.

Partners in Learning: Designing and Implementing an Effective Advisory Program Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR). <http://www.esrnational.org/hs/reform/hsadvisory.htm>

Smaller Learning Communities Program. Northwest Education Regional Laboratory. <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sslc/>

Use of Leading Indicators

Allensworth, E. & Easton, J.Q. (July 2007). *What Matters for Staying On-Track and Graduating in Chicago Public Schools.* Chicago Consortium on School Research. <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/07%20What%20Matters%20Final.pdf>

Celio, Mary Beth, M.B. (2007). Seattle Public Schools Class of 2006 Cohort Study <http://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/education/documents/MaryBethCelioreport2007.pdf>

Foly, E. et. al. (2010). *Beyond Test Scores: Leading Indicators for Education.* Annenberg Institute for School Reform. <http://www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/LeadingIndicators.pdf>



2011 Families and Education Levy Implementation Plan Student Health Investment Area Kindergarten – 12th Grade

What we will help achieve – Student Health Outcomes and Indicators

Health investments will contribute to the following District-wide outcomes:

- Children meeting age level expectations on WaKIDS
- 3rd graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 4th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 5th graders meeting MSP science standard
- 6th graders meeting MSP reading standard
- 7th graders meeting MSP math standard
- 8th graders meeting MSP science standard
- Students graduating high school on time
- Students graduating with HECB requirements for entry into college
- Students completing CTE course of study before graduation
- Students passing end-of-course math tests
- 9th graders promoting on time to 10th grade

The following indicators will be used to track to results:

- English language learners in all grades making State English proficiency test gains
- Students in all grades making annual typical growth on reading MAP
- Students in all grades making annual typical growth on math MAP
- Students at all grades having fewer than 5 absences per semester

Strategies that will Achieve Results

There are five overarching strategies for achieving Student Health targets: School-Based Health Centers, Interagency Health Services, Elementary Strategy, Mental Health and Dental Enhancements, and School-Based Health Supports. This section describes each strategy and the rationale, lists specific elements that must be included in implementation, and cites the evidence-based research that supports this approach.

1. School-Based Health Centers

What are School-Based Health Centers?

- School-based health centers (SBHCs) are located in all comprehensive high schools, five middle schools, and the Seattle World School/Nova.



- SBHCs provide preventive, early screening, treatment, and referral services to keep students healthy and in school.
- SBHCs utilize evidence-based practices, exercise cultural and gender competency, and provide an accessible source of health care.
- Resources are focused on students at greatest risk of academic performance concerns.

Why is this strategy important?

- SBHCs are associated with decreased teen birth rates, more regular health maintenance visits, and higher receipt of vaccines.
- Recent investigation of Seattle Public Schools' SBHCs showed that SBHC use was associated with improved attendance and GPA.
- Most SBHC users in SPS are less likely to drop out of high school than similar students that did not use the SBHC.

What are key elements of School-Based Health Centers?

- Increased access and utilization of preventive care (family planning, well-child exams, immunizations).
- Primary and acute health care assessment, diagnosis, treatment and referral.
- Age-appropriate reproductive health care.
- STD screening and treatment.
- Mental health screening, counseling, case management and referral.
- Population-based health education and health promotion.
- Care coordination and referral for drug/alcohol and dental services.
- Information and assistance to eligible students' families about how to access and enroll in health insurance programs.
- Intensive interventions to support school success in high-risk students.
- Coordinate with schools on health and academic strategies and integrate with other levy strategies.
- The SWS site will implement family outreach strategies and provide health and support services to students' families.

How will School-Based Health Centers be phased in and managed?

- The City will directly contract with Public Health – Seattle King County (PHSKC) for SBHCs. More information about SBHC phase in is included in the Methodology and Timeline for Selecting Providers section below.

2. Interagency Health Services

What are Interagency Health Services?

- Provides school-based health services to high-risk middle and high school students enrolled in Interagency Programs.



- Comprehensive and more complex medical care will be provided in a central location and in community settings.
- Less complex medical care will be provided at the various Interagency sites.
- Mental health services will be provided at a central location, at Interagency sites, and in community settings.
- Will involve coordination with case managers from other systems, e.g. probation.

Why is this strategy important?

Interagency students experience very poor academic outcomes and lack access to the physical and mental health services available to students at other schools. During the 2009-2010 school year, almost 20% of Interagency students in grades 6 – 12 dropped out of school, compared to only 4% district-wide. In the class of 2010, 11% of Interagency students graduated and 67% dropped out, compared to 77% graduation and 15% dropout at regular high schools. In every subject, the proportion of Interagency students meeting state standards for the MSP and the HSPE is lower than the district-wide proportion. Interagency students are at the highest risk for academic challenges and stand to benefit from physical and mental health services.

What are key elements of Interagency Health Services?

- When possible, Interagency students will receive a physical health assessment and behavioral, social, and emotional health screening as part of the intake and enrollment process.
- Services include:
 - Ongoing preventative health care and management of chronic conditions
 - Family planning and reproductive health care
 - Other common adolescent health care services
 - Mental health services
- Utilizes a tiered approach to mental health services and supports that takes into account the varied needs of Interagency students and is informed by evidence-based practices.

How will Interagency Health Services be phased in and managed?

- Funding for this strategy begins in September 2013.
- In early 2013, a health organization partner(s) will be identified through the RFI process.
- This strategy will be managed by:
 - The principal of Interagency Programs
 - PHSKC Community and School-Based Health Partnerships Manager
 - Health organization partner(s) identified through the RFI.



3. Elementary Health

What is Elementary Health?

- Creates a partnership with community health systems and/or health systems that sponsor middle school SBHCs to provide health care services and resources to elementary schools.
- Implements school-based health care at elementary schools that include populations of students with low academic performance and inequities in health access/outcomes.
- As appropriate, links middle school SBHC programming with community-based care offered by the partner health system and other community health agencies.

Why is this strategy important?

- Health conditions identified during elementary school predict both short- and long-term academic outcomes, including test scores, grade retention, and high school graduation. These associations highlight the importance of early intervention.
- Addressing elementary students' mental and physical health improves attendance, their readiness to learn, and some academic measures. This makes students more available to benefit from other academically-focused interventions.

What are key elements of Elementary Health?

- Services include:
 - Site-based services and community referrals
 - Well-child care, management of chronic conditions, and minor acute care
 - Mental health individual counseling, case management, and preventive services
 - Teacher consultation and home visits to ensure supportive environment
 - Care coordination with family, medical home, and Medicaid access
 - Coordination with Levy investments in elementary innovation and family support
- Services are provided on-site at elementary schools, within community health settings, and at Middle School SBHCs as appropriate.
- As possible, care for students is coordinated during transitions from early learning settings to elementary school and from elementary school to middle school.

How will Elementary Health be phased in and managed?

- Programming in 4-5 schools will begin in September 2012.
- A second group of 4-5 of schools will be added in September 2013.
- Management for SBHC will include:



- Managers from community organizations that are selected to provide school-based health services.
- Principals and Building Leadership Teams of selected schools.
- PHSKC Community and School-Based Health Partnerships Manager.

4. Mental Health and Dental Enhancements

What are the Mental Health and Dental Enhancements?

- Mental health enhancement and integrated outcome and monitoring and feedback system (MFS) strategy will integrate objective psychosocial assessments and academic data to provide an innovative, empirically supported approach to improving the quality of mental health services provided in SBHCs.
- Dental enhancement builds on the school-based health investment by providing mobile and/or school-based dental services for students at schools with existing or future Families and Education Levy health investments.

Why are these strategies important?

- The implementation of evidence-based mental health care tools and practices will increase the likelihood that school-based mental health care meets individual student needs, improves social-emotional functioning, and promotes academic achievement and high school completion.
- Mental health and academic achievement are inexorably linked. Numerous studies have identified that youth who suffer from mental health problems, especially those who do not receive appropriate or timely intervention services, are at heightened risk for academic challenges. Moreover, those who receive effective school-based services can demonstrate measurable gains in academic performance.
- Schools have long been described as the “de facto” mental health service provision setting for youth, and national studies have documented that between 70 and 80 percent of youth mental health care is delivered in the education sector. For these reasons, there is consensus among researchers, practitioners, and policymakers about the importance of linking community provider organizations with school districts and locating mental health services in schools themselves.
- SBHCs become a “hub” for school-based mental health strategies. Partnerships between SBHCs, schools, and community providers increase access to mental health services as the SBHC itself cannot fully meet the mental health needs of all students.
- Oral health is an important part of overall health and affects children’s ability to succeed academically.
- Tooth decay is a common chronic childhood disease and is experienced more often by youth of color and youth in low-income families.
- Untreated oral disease can interfere with students’ learning.



- Providing dental care in schools improves students' oral health and is thus an opportunity to reduce barriers to learning.

What are key elements of the Mental Health and Dental Enhancements?

Mental Health

- Train mental health providers to support the use of standardized assessment tools to:
 - Screen for mental health issues
 - Build rapport and engagement
 - Enhance diagnostic clarity
 - Plan appropriate treatment
 - Monitor outcomes over time
 - Adjust treatment accordingly
- Develop a web-based monitoring and feedback system that will :
 - Track goal attainment and symptom improvement
 - Provide access to a wide array of screening and diagnostic instruments
 - Support systematic caseload management
 - Provide tools for patient engagement
 - Provide rich outcome data to support the ongoing evaluation of school-based mental health services

Dental

- Convene a group of key stakeholders and experts in school-based and oral health to further develop strategy and implementation plan.
- A specific plan for services and integration with existing SBHCs will be completed by February 2013.
- The Families and Education Levy Oversight Committee will review the plan prior to implementation.

How will these Enhancements be phased in and managed?

- Mental health enhancements will undergo a significant planning phase (funded by a Gates Foundation grant) prior to the beginning of the 2011 Levy allowing a timely initiation.
- Funding for dental enhancements starts in July 2013.
- The mental health enhancement will be managed by PHSKC Community and School-Based Health Partnerships Manager and Seattle Children's Hospital / University of Washington
- The dental health enhancement will be managed by PHSKC Community and School-Based Health Partnerships Manager and health organization partner(s) identified through the RFI process.



5. School District Health Services

What are School District Health Services?

The 2011 Levy will continue to support school district-employed school nurses or other appropriate staff at schools with a health center on premise. Although Levy funds support some of the state-mandated services to be provided in schools by registered nurses, the primary focus of Levy-funded nursing activities is to integrate with and complement the services of the health centers, contributing to intended results. The school district will explore alternative service delivery methods or staffing models to increase efficiencies.

Why is this strategy important?

School nurses are responsible for the health of all students and provide critical state-mandated services to ensure the health of the general student population. School nurses serve as an important triage and referral source that improves the efficiency and efficacy of SBHC providers.

What are key elements of School District Health Services?

- Screen students at academic risk for behavioral risk factors and provide appropriate interventions to support academic success; examples of interventions include supportive referrals, linkages, and family involvement.
- Provide coordinated support for management of chronic conditions.
- Increase compliance with state childhood immunization requirements by:
 - Assisting families to evaluate their school-age children's compliance with immunization requirements.
 - Providing referrals and follow-up with families as necessary.
 - Taking steps to assure that immunization compliance is tracked accurately and consistently across SPS immunization datasets.

How will School District Health Services be phased in and managed?

- School district leadership, including Pegi McEvoy, Assistant Superintendent for Operations; Jill Lewis, ARNP, who manages school nursing services.
- PHSKC Community and School-Based Health Partnerships Manager

Ways in Which the Investment Builds on the Last Levy

- Provides enhanced mental health and dental services, increases access to health care and other services for underserved populations, and promotes earlier identification and treatment of health-related barriers to learning.
- Includes an evidence-based approach to improve the quality of mental health services in the SBHCs. The provider training and the implementation of the outcomes and monitoring and feedback system will increase the likelihood that SBHC mental health



care meets individual student needs, improves social-emotional functioning, and promotes academic achievement and high school completion.

- The dental services enhancement acknowledges the importance of oral health to maintaining overall health and academic achievement. This enhancement is an opportunity to further reduce health-related barriers to learning by improving students' oral health through increased awareness about, and access to, oral health services.
- The Interagency strategy brings physical and mental health care to high-risk students enrolled in Interagency Programs.
- The SWS/Nova site increases access to health care and other services for newly-arrived refugee and immigrant students and their families.
- Extends school-based health services to elementary schools. This strategy supports earlier identification and treatment of health-related barriers to learning, thereby improving students' readiness to learn at an early age and setting the stage for continued health and academic success.
- Incorporates more intentional alignments with other Levy investments.
- SBHCs will collaborate with middle and high school staff to create and implement specific plans, focused on improving academic outcomes.

Primary Populations Served by the Investment

School-based health strategies will primarily serve low-income children and families of color who are historically under-represented in measures of academic achievement and positive health outcomes. However, school-based health services are a resource available to all students enrolled in a particular school in which programs are placed.

This investment area focuses on identifying students with health and academic concerns within the general population and targeting low-performing schools.

- (1) School-based primary care and school nursing services continue to be provided to students at all comprehensive high schools and at five middle schools:
 - Interventions are provided to individuals and other strategies are population-based, targeting particular student groups or school-wide enrollment.
 - Screening and referrals identify students experiencing school performance concerns and these students receive targeted interventions.
 - Services focus on students with risk behaviors that impact health-academic performance connections: sexual health concerns, management of chronic conditions, oral health, and interdisciplinary approaches to behavioral health concerns.



(2) Expand school-based health services to low-performing secondary schools:

- Provide health services to high-risk middle and high school students in Interagency Academy. Interagency students are some of the highest need students in SPS, often characterized by significant disciplinary concerns and/or high risk of dropping out.
- Mercer Middle School is the highest need SPS middle school that has not had a School-Based Health Center (SBHC). In the 2010-11 school year, Mercer enrolled the highest number of low-income (free/reduced lunch) students of all middle schools in the district.
- The SBHC at Seattle World School (SWS - formerly the Secondary Bilingual Orientation Center) will provide health services and other supports for newly-arrived immigrant and refugee students and their families. The SWS SBHC also serves Nova students.

(3) Expand school-based health services to low-performing elementary schools:

- Elementary schools that will receive primary health care and mental health services will be prioritized based on their status as an innovation site and/or the middle school feeder pattern in which they reside.

Elements Critical to the Partnership Between the City and the School District

What do you need from Seattle Public Schools to increase the chances of obtaining the desired results? What MOUs, data sharing agreements, and/or partnership agreements do you need?

School-based health strategies need access to Seattle Public Schools student data. In order to effectively communicate with students and families, identify students at risk of school performance concerns, and monitor program performance, health programs need more immediate access to data. The renewal of the SPS/City partnership and data-sharing agreements should seek to maximize the accessibility of SPS data for community partners selected to implement health strategies. Data-sharing agreements can also be implemented between the district and provider organizations and can build upon the "alignment agreements" that have successfully allowed school-based health partners to enter into rent-free lease agreements with SPS.

The health investments also require Seattle Public Schools' partnership and leadership in facility planning and development. As new SBHCs are developed at Mercer Middle School and SWS, and as health care facilities are required at elementary and Interagency sites, SPS will need to actively and efficiently participate in the identification of locations for programs in school buildings and partner with stakeholders in the pursuit of capital resources. Health investments also need SPS to continue the aforementioned alignment rent-free agreements and extend such to new school-based health programs.



SPS plays a critical role in the implementation of many of the Levy strategies outside of the health investment area. It will require the attention of district and building leadership to effectively align the various Levy programs and services in schools toward the common outcomes of student success. The school-based health investment and the health systems engaged in delivering services under this investment are accountable to academic outcomes. Schools will need to work with their partners in health to assure that students who are targeted for academic interventions are also supported by health strategies. It is optimal when the Levy-funded High School, Middle School, and Elementary investments include the school-based health programs and partners in their planning and implementation.

Alignment with Other City Resources

Other City General Fund Investments

- Community Health Centers – The City of Seattle invests \$6,284,074 in local safety net providers to serve low-income residents and underinsured/uninsured vulnerable populations. Community Health Centers are a key resource for school-based health programs to help families access a community-based health care home.
- Access/Outreach – The City of Seattle invests \$260,791 in PHSKC’s Access and Outreach program to assist low-income families and individuals in enrolling in and accessing publicly-funded health care and other essential benefits. School-based health programs rely upon Access and Outreach staff to assist adolescent and families in obtaining health care coverage and other supports.
- Youth Engagement Program (YEP) – City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) contracts with King County’s Department of Community and Human Services to enlist community-based substance abuse treatment organizations to provide outreach and engagement services to youth who require alcohol or drug treatment. YEP services target West Seattle and Franklin High Schools and subcontracted agencies are required to partner with SBHCs in these schools.
- Youth Mental Health Counseling – HSD investments in community mental health organizations to provide counseling service to at-risk youth. The \$585,105 investment can be aligned with Levy school-based health strategies that target middle and high school youth.

Community Partnerships and Leveraging Strategies

School-Based Health Sponsors

Currently, 16 school-based health centers are operated by the following local health care organizations:

- Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound
- Odessa Brown Children’s Clinic of Seattle Children’s Hospital
- Public Health – Seattle & King County
- Neighborcare Health



- Swedish Medical Center
- International Community Health Services

These sponsoring healthcare organizations have the expertise and the administrative capacity to operate school-based primary care services in selected schools and neighborhoods. Each sponsoring organization contributes a significant level of in-kind resources to its program, and some sponsors now hope to expand their scope to serve nearby elementary schools and neighborhoods. Continuing sponsors' involvement and commitment to school-based healthcare is crucial to the success of health investment strategies supported by the Families and Education Levy. Assuring sponsors' "buy-in" on new strategies is critical.

Other Partners

The Gates Foundation has generously funded a 12-month planning and development process for the mental health enhancement strategy leading up to Levy implementation. The process will include collaborative stakeholder meetings, gathering of feedback from practitioners and administrators, and incorporation of that feedback into development of the specifications for the system.

The University of Washington is a key collaborator in the development and maintenance of the quality agenda for adolescent mental health services. The University of Washington is a critical partner in creating the outcomes and monitoring feedback system for SBHC mental health. The UW has been a research partner in examining the link between school-based health and academic outcomes. And second-year fellows in the UW/Seattle Children's Hospital child and adolescent psychiatry fellows rotate to the SBHC providing consultation to staff.

The SBHCs receive a high level of community support, as evidenced by the operational, financial, and in-kind commitments from the six health care organizations involved. Motivation for sponsor commitment and involvement includes: philanthropic interests, community benefit, logical expansion and outgrowth of sponsors' community-based clinical practice into particular neighborhoods (sometimes a marketing agenda), and access to serving hard-to-reach adolescent populations through the schools. Each sponsor organization weighs the above motivating factors against the costs of doing business in relatively small and inefficient clinic sites and the considerable costs of providing uncompensated care for patients. In order to sustain sponsor's involvement, strategies and service sites can be aligned with each sponsor's organizational interests and mission as much as feasible.

Methodology and Timeline for Selecting Providers:

SBHCs

- The City will directly contract with Public Health – Seattle King County (PHSKC) for SBHCs.
- Prior to receiving Levy investments, operators of SBHCs will be required to submit to PHSKC detailed plans that illustrate:
 - Program enhancements and new strategies under their continuing partnership.
 - Collaboration with other Levy-funded strategies.



- Coordination with schools to identify and address the academic and health needs of the Levy's priority students (e.g. ELL, behind in credits, low tests scores).
- New academically-oriented performance targets (e.g. attendance).
- Failure to achieve Levy outcomes will result in competitive RFI processes to re-award Levy proceeds.

School District Health Services

- The City will directly contract with Public Health – Seattle King County (PHSKC) for School District Health Services.
- Prior to receiving Levy investments, SPS will submit to PHSKC a plan that:
 - Illustrates how the Levy investment:
 - Maximizes school district health service capacity.
 - Explores alternative service delivery methods or staffing models to increase efficiencies.
 - Demonstrates how district health services will collaborate with other Levy-funded investments.
 - Includes new academically-oriented performance targets (e.g. attendance).

Interagency Health Services

The City will directly contract with PHSKC for interagency health services. PHSKC will present an RFI process to the Levy Oversight Committee in the first quarter of 2013. Public Health – Seattle King County (PHSKC) will coordinate the RFI process in partnership with OFE and HSD.

Mental Health and Dental Enhancement

The City will directly contract with Public Health – Seattle King County (PHSKC) for Mental Health Enhancement. PHSKC will manage a technology implementation and quality improvement process in SBHC mental health services.

The City will directly contract with PHSKC for dental enhancement services. PHSKC will present an RFI process for dental enhancement to the Levy Oversight Committee in the first quarter of 2013. PHSKC will coordinate the RFI process in partnership with OFE and HSD.

Elementary Health

The City will directly contract with PHSKC for elementary health services. PHSKC will coordinate the RFI process for Elementary Health in partnership with OFE and HSD. . An RFI for Elementary Health investments beginning in the 2012-13 school year will be issued in early 2012. An RFI for additional investments starting in the 2013-14 school year will be issued in the first quarter of 2013.

Criteria for selection

- Previous experience providing similar services and achieving results.
- Demonstrated use of data to design, implement and modify programs.
- Demonstrated ability to jointly plan and implement strategies with schools and with community-based organizations to achieve results.



- Demonstrated willingness to implement innovative strategies.
- Demonstrated ability to leverage financial and in-kind resources to achieve results.

Quality Implementation and Management of Investment

Indicators and Outcomes to Manage Investment

In addition to the indicators identified for the Levy as a whole, health investments will use the following:

High School/Middle School

- Number of students screened for academic risk factors and health risk factors that may impact school performance.
- Number of students who have their primary care needs met at school, including physical and mental health.
- Number of students who receive assistance managing their chronic conditions, e.g., diabetes, asthma, depression, etc.
- Number of students receiving intensive interventions to support school success
- Number of medical and mental health visits / day / FTE.
- Number of students who are not in compliance with immunization requirements that are referred for vaccinations.

Elementary School

- Number of students screened for academic risk factors or health risk factors that may impact school performance.
- Number of students who have their primary care needs met at school, including physical and mental health.
- Number of students who receive assistance managing their chronic conditions, e.g., diabetes, asthma, depression, etc.
- Number of students receiving intensive interventions to support school success
- Number of medical and mental health visits / day / FTE.
- Number of students who are not in compliance with immunization requirements that are referred for vaccinations.
- Number of low income families linked to a health care home, Medicaid coverage, and/or other health care resources.

Health specific outcomes include:

High School/Middle School

- Trends in adolescent community health outcomes, including births to females 15-19 years and sexually transmitted disease rates.
- Number/proportion of fully immunized students in a student population.

Elementary School

- Number/proportion of fully immunized students in a student population.



In addition to measurable results, the quality of implementation will be assessed by:

- Site visits to observe programs and provide feedback.
- Evidence of systems in place to monitor data and program modification in response to such data.
- Training and emphasis on the elements of high quality program implementation.

Data reporting strategy:

On a monthly basis, organizations providing school-based health care under this investment will submit year-to-date detailed service reports. Service reports are extracted from electronic health records and care management systems. These reports include procedure and diagnosis data for individual health care visits/services and are linked to Seattle Public Schools (SPS) student ID or a unique identifier (e.g. family member). Public Health - Seattle & King County (PHSKC) collects these data and submits monthly program reports to the City Office for Education (OFE). The reports identify individuals who:

- Received primary care services (medical or mental health).
- Received intensive interventions to support school success.
- Are supported in management of chronic conditions.
- Are linked to a health care home, Medicaid coverage, and/or other health care resources.

SPS provides school nursing and student performance data directly to OFE through the negotiated data-sharing agreement between the district and the City. The SPS submittals to OFE include:

- Students screened for academic risk factors or health risk factors that may impact school performance.
- Students who are not in compliance with immunization requirements that are referred for vaccinations.
- Number/proportion of fully immunized students in a student population.
- Number of students meeting standard on Measurements of Student Progress (MSP) and High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) assessments (by subject area).
- Number of students making gains on the State English proficiency test.
- Number of 12th grade students that graduate from high school.

Funding Assumptions

Specify program costs by major cost category.

- School-based health centers
- Interagency health services
- Elementary health
- Mental health enhancement
- Dental enhancement
- School-based health support



List assumptions about fund sources other than the Levy

In addition to Levy resources, the City, Public Health, school district, and community partners will actively seek new sources of funding from a variety of public and private resources, and work to forge new financial relationships with major health payers, including State Medicaid.

What are the financial expectations of partners?

Sponsor organizations that operate school-based health centers make significant contributions to the cost of services through in-kind, community benefit funds, grants, patient-generated revenue and other contributions. Please note that many medical and mental health services provided in the schools are typically not reimbursable by outside payers. In the 2010-2011 academic year, five sponsors contributed approximately \$1.55 million to the high school and middle school services through financial subsidies and/or other in-kind support. This represented an estimated 34.7% of the total sponsor budgets.



APPENDIX A: RESEARCH

School-Based Health Centers

- Allison M.A., Crane L.A., Beaty B.L., Davidson A.J., Melinkovich P. & Kempe, A. (2007) *School-based health centers: improving access and quality of care for low-income adolescents.* Pediatrics. e887:94. Epub 2007 Sep 10. doi: 10.1542/peds.2006-2314
- Kerns, S.E.U., Pullmann, M.D, Walker, S.C., Lyon, A.R., Bruns, E.J. & Cosgrove, T.J. (2011). *Effect of adolescent use of school based health centers on high school dropout.* Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine. Published online. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2011.10
- Ricketts S.A. & Guernsey B.P. (2006) *School-based health centers and the decline in black teen fertility during the 1990s in Denver, Colorado.* Am J Public Health. 1588:92. Epub 2006 Jul 27.
- Walker, S.C., Kerns, S.E.U., Lyon, A.R., Bruns, E.J. & Cosgrove, T.J. (2009) *Impact of School-Based Health Center Use on Academic Outcomes.* Journal of Adolescent Health. 1:7.

Elementary Health Strategy

- Barbarese WJ, Katusic SK, Colligan RC, Weaver AL, Jacobsen SJ. Long-term school outcomes for children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a population-based perspective. J Dev Behav Pediatr. 2007 Aug;28(4):265-73.
- Barbarese WJ, Katusic SK, Colligan RC, Weaver AL, Jacobsen SJ. Modifiers of long-term school outcomes for children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: does treatment with stimulant medication make a difference? Results from a population-based study. J Dev Behav Pediatr. 2007 Aug;28(4):274-87.
- Barkley RA, Fischer M, Edelbrock CS, Smallish L. The adolescent outcome of hyperactive children diagnosed by research criteria: I. An 8-year prospective follow-up study. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 1990 Jul;29(4):546-57.
- Guzman MP, Jellinek M, George M, Hartley M, Squicciarini AM, Canenguez KM, Kuhlthau KA, Yucel R, White GW, Guzman J, Murphy JM. Mental health matters in elementary school: first-grade screening predicts fourth grade achievement test scores. Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2011 Jun 7. [Epub ahead of print]
- Scheffler RM, Brown TT, Fulton BD, Hinshaw SP, Levine P, Stone S. Positive association between attention-deficit/ hyperactivity disorder medication use and academic achievement during elementary school. Pediatrics. 2009 May;123(5):1273-9.



Webber MP, Caripiniello KE, Oruwariye T, Yungatai L, Burton WB, and Appel DK. Burden of asthma in elementary school children: Do SBHCs make a difference? *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 2003; 157: 125-129.

Wood JJ. Effect of anxiety reduction on children's school performance and social adjustment. *Dev Psychol.* 2006 Mar;42(2):345-9.

Mental Health and Dental Enhancements

Farmer, E. M., Burns, B. J., Phillips, S. D., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2003). Pathways into and through mental health services for children and adolescents. *Psychiatric Services*, 54, 60-66.

Gooch B.F., Griffin S.O., Gray S.K., Kohn W.G., Rozier, R.G., et al. (2009) *Preventing dental caries through school-based sealant programs: updated recommendations and reviews of evidence.* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. J Am Dent Assoc. 1356-65.

US Department of Health and Human Services (2000). *Oral Health in America: A Report of the Surgeon General-- Executive Summary.* Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health. Available at: <http://silk.nih.gov/public/hck1ocv.@www.surgeon.fullrpt.pdf>. Accessed on May 26, 2011.

Vander Stoep, A., Weiss, N. S., McKnight, B., Beresford, S. A. A., & Cohen, P. (2002). Which measure of adolescent psychiatric disorders-diagnosis, number of symptoms, or adaptive functioning-best predicts adverse youth adult outcomes? *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 56, 56-65.



**APPENDIX B:
 BASELINE DATA**

Teen Birthrates

Seattle has lower teen birth rates than King County, Washington State, and the United States. During 2007-2009 there were 13.3 births per 1,000 females ages 15 – 19 in Seattle.⁷ During 2009 there were 18.7 births per 1,000 females ages 15 – 19 in King County; this figure was 29.8 for Washington State and 39.1 for the United States.^{8,9,10}

Three-year averages for birth rates among 15 – 19 year-old females in Seattle show racial/ethnic disparities, as displayed in the table below.

Three-year average birth rates for females ages 15 – 19 in Seattle, 2007-2009	
Race/ethnicity (Hispanic/Latina individuals can be of any race and are included in the racial categories)	Births per 1,000 females ages 15 – 19¹¹
American Indian/Alaska Native alone	27.0
Asian alone	7.4
Black alone	29.3
Hispanic/Latina	47.4
Multiple race	20.0
Pacific Islander alone	25.6
White alone	9.4

Sexually Transmitted Diseases

Seattle has lower rates of Chlamydia and gonorrhea than King County, Washington State, and the United States.

During 2007 – 2009 the rate of Chlamydia infection among Seattle females ages 15 – 19 was 507.9 per 100,000.¹² The Seattle rate is lower than 2009 rates of Chlamydia infection in King County (2,373.2 per 100,000), Washington State (approximately 2,400 per 100,000), and the United States (3,329.3 per 100,000).^{13,14,15}

⁷ Public Health - Seattle & King County; Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit, 6/2011
⁸ Washington State Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics (October 2010). Available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/ehsph/chs/chs-data/birth/htmltables/a10.htm>. Accessed on June 14, 2011.
⁹ Washington State Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics (October 2010). Available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/ehsph/chs/chs-data/birth/htmltables/a10.htm>. Accessed on June 14, 2011.
¹⁰ Ventura S.J., Hamilton B.E. (2011). *U.S. teenage birth rate resumes decline*. NCHS data brief, no 58. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2011. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db58.htm#birth>. Accessed on June 14, 2011.
¹¹ Public Health - Seattle & King County; Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit, 6/2011.
¹² Public Health - Seattle & King County; Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit, 6/2011
¹³ Washington State Department of Health (May 2010). *Sexually Transmitted Disease Profile, King County 2009*. Olympia, WA. Available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/std/docs/ctyprofile09/KING09.pdf>. Accessed on April 22, 2011.
¹⁴ Washington State Department of Health (October 2010). *Washington State 2009 Sexually Transmitted Infections Annual Report*. Olympia, WA. Available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/STD/docs/morbidity/STI-09.pdf>. Accessed on April 22, 2011.



During 2007 – 2009, the rate of gonorrhea among 15 – 19 year-old females in Seattle was 89.4 per 100,000.¹⁶ This is lower than 2009 rates in King County (146.1 per 100,000), Washington State (124 per 100,000), and the United States (568.8 per 100,000).^{17,18,19}

Racial/ethnic disparities in Chlamydia and gonorrhea rates are evident in Seattle and Washington State, as shown in the table below.

Chlamydia and gonorrhea rates among females ages 15-19				
	Infections per 100,000 females ages 15 – 19			
	Seattle 2007 - 2009 ²⁰ Hispanic/Latina individuals can be of any race and are included in the racial categories		Washington State 2008 ²¹	
Race/ethnicity	Chlamydia	Gonorrhea	Chlamydia	Gonorrhea
American Indian/Alaska Native	1081.1	0.0	2848.3	289.0
Black/African American	1640.4	447.4	5838.7	1043.6
Asian/PI	272.0	41.8	1295.1	104.7
Multiple race	506.9	28.2	Not available	Not available
Hispanic	777.1	107.2	3049.1	149.8
White	198.7	19.1	1466.9	109.3

Immunizations

During the 2010-2011 school year, 21.3% of King County 6th graders were out of compliance with required immunizations; this is similar to the state rate of 20.8%.²² In August 2011 approximately 13.7% of students assigned to SPS middle and high schools with an SBHC were out of compliance with required immunizations.²³

¹⁵ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010). *Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2009*. Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats09/tables/10.htm>. Accessed on April 22, 2011.

¹⁶ Public Health - Seattle & King County; Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit, 6/2011

¹⁷ Washington State Department of Health (May 2010). *Sexually Transmitted Disease Profile, King County 2009*. Olympia, WA. Available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/std/docs/ctyprofile09/KING09.pdf>. Accessed on April 22, 2011.

¹⁸ Washington State Department of Health (October 2010). *Washington State 2009 Sexually Transmitted Infections Annual Report*. Olympia, WA. Available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/STD/docs/morbidity/STI-09.pdf>. Accessed on April 22, 2011.

¹⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010). *Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance 2009*. Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats09/tables/20.htm>. Accessed on April 22, 2011.

²⁰ Public Health - Seattle & King County; Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit, 6/2011

²¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (November 2009). *Sexually Transmitted Disease Morbidity for selected STDs by age, race/ethnicity and gender 1996-2008*. CDC WONDER On-line Database. Available at <http://wonder.cdc.gov/std-std-v2008-race-age.html>. Accessed on June 22, 2011.

²² WA DOH Immunization Program/CHILD Profile School and Childcare Assessment Database, 5/10. Available at: <http://www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/immunize/documents/6gradcov10-11.pdf>. Accessed on October 25, 2011.

²³ City of Seattle Office for Education. E-mail communication received October 5, 2011.



GLOSSARY

2011 Families and Education Levy Implementation Plans

Commonly used terms and acronyms:

CBO – Community-Based Organization

CBT - Child Behavior Traits is a tool used by the Parent-Child Home Program to assess a child's development across three domains. The assessment is given three times per year and measures the child's cooperation with adults, engagement in developmentally appropriate tasks, and attention to task.

CCCP – The Comprehensive Child Care Program is a City of Seattle program that helps low and moderate income working families pay for their child care costs. Providers contract with the City of Seattle to provide child care for the city's children.

CCER – The Community Center for Education Results is a local effort designed to double the number of students graduating from schools in south Seattle and south King County who go on to receive a post-secondary credential. CCER has been working with local school districts and stakeholders to develop specific goals and milestones to monitor progress toward the intended results.

CLASS – Classroom Assessment Scoring System is used by Seattle Early Education Collaborative (SEEC) programs to assess interactions between teachers and children. Three domains are measured: emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support. Results are used to inform professional development needs.

College Bound Scholarship – This Washington State scholarship is offered to low income 7th and 8th graders. Students who sign up pledge to do well in school, stay out of legal trouble, and graduate from high school. The scholarship covers tuition at the state public institution rate along with a book allowance.

CTE – Career and Technical Training programs are available in high schools to prepare students for post-secondary employment. Students can take a sequence of courses that build upon each other to strengthen their skills in particular career tracks.

ECEAP - The Early Childhood Education and Assistance Program (ECEAP), funded through the State of Washington's Department of Early Learning and the City of Seattle, offers free preschool services for eligible three- and four-year-olds and their families.

ECERS – Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale is designed to assess classrooms in group programs for pre-school children aged 2 through 5. The scale consists of 43 items in 7 domains, and is used by Seattle Early Education Collaborative (SEEC) programs to assess program quality and to set improvement goals.



ELL - English language learner is a national-origin-minority student who is limited-English-proficient. This term is often preferred over limited-English-proficient (LEP) as it highlights accomplishments rather than deficits.

EOC – End-of-Course Math Exams for high school debuted in spring 2011. The exams replaced the math HSPE and are given within the last three weeks of the school year. The end-of-course exams are available in algebra 1/integrated math 1 and geometry/integrated math 2. The EOC exams will be given to students in grades 7-12 who are taking those respective classes. The state is moving to end-of-course exams so students can be tested on the knowledge and skills they've gained from a specific course rather than on a comprehensive test like the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) that assesses overall knowledge.

FFN – Family, Friend & Neighbor Care is the most common type of child care for infants and toddlers, and for school-age children before and after school. Providers include grandparents, aunts and uncles, elders, older siblings, friends, neighbors, and others who help families take care of their kids on an informal basis. FFN providers are unlicensed and not regulated by the state, although some FFN providers can receive child care subsidies for the care they provide.

FRL - Free or Reduced Lunch status identifies whether or not a student is enrolled in the Free or Reduced Lunch program. This term is used as a proxy for determining students from low-income families.

HECB – The Higher Education Coordinating Board provides strategic planning, coordination, monitoring, and policy analysis for higher education in Washington, and administers state and federal financial aid and other education services. The Board establishes the minimum requirements necessary for admission into a Washington State four-year college.

HSPE – The High School Proficiency Exam is used as the state's high school exit exam and is administered beginning in the 10th grade. Students must pass this assessment or a state-approved alternative in reading and writing in order to be eligible to graduate.

Level I schools – Seattle Public Schools has adopted a performance measurement system that categorizes schools based on absolute performance and growth. There are five Levels with Level I identified as the lowest performing schools.

LOC – The Levy Oversight Committee is the 12-person committee reestablished in the 2004 Families and Education Levy to advise on the use of Levy funds and the implementation of specific programs.

LPC - The Levy Planning Committee was established by a City Council Resolution to help plan for the reauthorization of the FEL in 2011. The LPC includes the original 12-member LOC with 12 additional citizen members.



MAP - Measures of Academic Progress is an assessment system used by SPS to determine a student's progress during the year, and across years, in reading and math. MAP measures the student's growth from a fall baseline to winter and spring.

MSP – Measurements of Student Progress is used in Washington State in grades 3-8 to determine whether students are meeting grade level standards. These tests replace the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL).

OFE – The Office for Education was reestablished in the 2004 Families and Education Levy to manage and report on the use of Levy funds and outcomes achieved by Levy investments.

OSPI – Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction is the primary agency charged with overseeing K-12 public education in Washington State.

PACT- Parent and Child Together is a tool used by the Parent-Child Home Program to assess parent-child interactions and behavior. The assessment is given three times per year.

PPVT – The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test is one of the most commonly used assessments that measure verbal ability in standard American English vocabulary. It measures the receptive processing of examinees from 2 to over 90 years old.

RFI – Request for Investments are the method OFE uses to determine successful applicants for Levy funds. Schools or providers submit RFIs describing the specific results they expect to achieve, along with detailed descriptions of the targeted students, the means and methods used to achieve results, the key individuals involved and the process used to ensure quality implementation.

RFQ – Request for Qualifications are used by OFE to identify the organizations that meet OFE standards for providing Levy funded programs. Partnerships between schools and these qualified organizations will be given preference in awarding investments.

SEEC – The Seattle Early Education Collaborative (SEEC) is a community collaborative of stakeholders and partners working together to create a shared vision for early learning in Seattle to achieve greater gains for children. The stakeholders and partners include Step Ahead and ECEAP programs and Head Start grantees. SEEC has three working groups focusing on assessment and accountability, professional development and transitions.

SPS - Seattle Public Schools

SBHC – School-Based Health Centers are funded by the FEL in all ten comprehensive high schools and four middle schools to promote physical and mental health. Services provided by SBHCs include comprehensive primary health care, including both medical and mental health care, for adolescent students; screenings, health assessments, and interventions that focus on students who are academically at risk; integrating risk prevention strategies into primary health



care, emphasizing mental and behavioral health interventions; helping students manage chronic conditions; and addressing high-risk behaviors most common among adolescents.

Title.I Schools – These are schools with higher levels of poverty that are awarded federal funds to address the needs of low income students.

TSG - Teaching Strategies GOLD® is an observation-based assessment system for children from birth through kindergarten. The system may be implemented with any developmentally appropriate curriculum. It blends ongoing observational assessment for all areas of development and learning with performance tasks for selected predictors of school success in the areas of literacy and numeracy. TSG can be used to assess all children, including English-language learners, children with disabilities, and children who demonstrate competencies beyond typical developmental expectations. TSG will be used by SEEC members assessing children in Pre-K and will be used as part of the WaKIDS process.

WaKIDS – Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developmental Skills is a kindergarten transition process that allows families, kindergarten teachers and early learning professionals to share information about incoming kindergarteners. The information is gathered through:

- A teacher-family meeting where they discuss topics such as:
 - Languages spoken in the home
 - Members of the family
 - Child's likes and dislikes, strengths and worries
- An assessment of the child in four domains:
 - Social and emotional development
 - Cognition and general knowledge
 - Language, communication and literacy
 - Physical well-being, health and motor development
- Meetings between early learning professionals and teachers to share information about children.

WELPA – The Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment, adopted in 2011, is used to determine initial English language levels and student eligibility for ELL services. It is also used annually to determine whether students have gained sufficient proficiency to no longer need to continue ELL services.

Attachments

Attachment A: 2010-2011 Performance Data Seattle Public Schools



Sid Sidorowicz/dg
DON FEL Implementation and Evaluation FISC EXH ATT
December 30, 2011
Version #2

2010-2011

Performance Data

Seattle Public Schools

Prepared by:

City of Seattle, Office for Education

with OSPI and SPS data

December 2011




TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
District Level Data by Grade/School Level	1
MAP District Data	16
English Language Learner District Data.....	22
Middle School Feeder Patterns	28
Elementary Segmentation.....	33
Aki Kurose Feeder Pattern	36
Denny Feeder Pattern.....	41
Eckstein Feeder Pattern	46
Hamilton Feeder Pattern	51
Madison Feeder Pattern	56
McClure Feeder Pattern.....	61
Mercer Feeder Pattern.....	66
Washington Feeder Pattern	71
Whitman Feeder Pattern	76
K-8, Middle & High School Data	81




District Level Data

by


Grade/School Level




Seattle Public Schools 3rd Grade Reading MSP by Subgroups, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 4th Grade Math MSP by Subgroup, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 5th Grade Science MSP by Subgroups, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 6th Grade Reading MSP by Subgroup, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 7th Grade Math MSP by Subgroups, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 8th Grade Science MSP by Subgroups, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 10th Grade Reading HSPE by Subgroups, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 10th Grade Math EOC Year 1 by Subgroups, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 10th Grade Math EOC Year 2 by Subgroup, 2010-11




Seattle Public Schools 10th Grade Writing HSPE by Subgroups, 2010-11






Elementary School Number and Percentage of Student Absences by Subgroup, 2010-11




2019 goal of 90% of students with fewer than 10 absences



Middle Schools Number and Percentage of Student Absences by Subgroup, 2010-11




High School Number and Percentage of Student Absences by Subgroup, 2010-11




MAP District Data









Seattle Public Schools 4th Grade Math MAP Results by Subgroup, 2010-11








Seattle Public Schools
 7th Grade Math MAP Results by Subgroup, 2010-11








ELL District Data





Seattle Public Schools ELL Students Time in Program by School Level, 2010-11














Middle School Feeder Patterns



Combined Elementary School Data for Middle School Feeder Patterns 4th Grade Math MSP, 2010-11



Middle School Feeder Patterns Number and Percentage of Elementary School Students by Absences, 2010-11




2010-11 Elementary Segmentation





2010-11 School Segmentation



Absolute Score	→	Segment	Other Criteria	→	Segment
Low (0-30)	→	Level 1	High Growth	→	Level 3
Med-Low (30-59)	→	Level 2	High Growth	→	Level 3
Med-High (60-79)	→	Level 3			
High (80-100)	→	Level 4	FRL gap < 25%	→	Level 5



2010-11 School Segmentation Levels

Level 1 Schools

Bailey Gatzert ES
 Dunlap ES
 Emerson ES
 Hawthorne ES
 Highland Park ES
 Madrona K8
 Martin Luther King Jr ES

Level 2 Schools

B.F. Day ES
 Beacon Hill ES
 Broadview-Thomson K8
 Concord ES
 Gatewood ES
 Graham Hill ES
 John Muir ES
 Nova HS
 Rainier Beach HS
 Sanislo ES

Level 3 Schools

Adams ES
 Aki Kurose MS
 Alki ES
 Arbor Heights ES
 Chief Sealth HS
 Cleveland HS
 Dearborn Park ES
 Denny MS
 Franklin HS
 Greenwood ES
 Ingraham HS
 Jane Addams K8
 John Rogers ES
 Kimball ES
 Leschi ES
 Madison MS
 Northgate ES
 Olympic Hills ES
 Olympic View ES
 Orca K8
 Pathfinder K8
 Pinehurst K8
 Roxhill ES
 South Shore K8
 TOPS K8
 Van Asselt ES
 Washington MS
 West Seattle ES
 West Seattle HS
 Wing Luke ES

Level 4 Schools

Eckstein MS
 Frantz Coe ES
 Garfield HS
 Hamilton MS
 John Stanford ES
 Lafayette ES
 Laurelhurst ES
 Lawton ES
 Lowell ES
 Montlake ES
 Nathan Hale HS
 Roosevelt HS
 Sacajawea ES
 Stevens ES
 Thurgood Marshall ES
 View Ridge ES
 Whitman MS

Level 5 Schools

Ballard HS
 Bryant ES
 Catharine Blaine K8
 Daniel Bagley ES
 Green Lake ES
 John Hay ES
 Loyal Heights ES
 Maple ES
 McClure MS
 McGilvra ES
 Mercer MS
 North Beach ES
 Queen Anne ES
 Salmon Bay K8
 Schmitz Park ES
 The Center School HS
 Thornton Creek ES
 Wedgwood ES
 West Woodland ES
 Whittier ES

Not Segmented

Interagency Programs
 McDonald ES
 Middle College HS
 Sand Point ES
 Secondary BOC
 South Lake HS




Aki Feeder Pattern



Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas


Aki Kurose


APPROVED
 20091118
 MAP ID #027b




The names referenced on this map are not intended to reflect the official name of any school building. They are instead intended to ensure better public understanding of the map. This map was compiled by Seattle Public Schools staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. Seattle Public Schools makes no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a product. Seattle Public Schools shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost data.







Aki Kurose Feeder Pattern Schools Number and Percentage of Elementary Students by Absences, 2010-11




Denny Feeder Pattern




Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas

ADOPTED
 20091118
 MAP ID #028b


Denny




Denny Feeder Pattern Schools 3rd Grade Reading MSP, 2010-11



Denny Feeder Pattern Schools 4th Grade Math MSP, 2010-11



Denny Feeder Pattern Schools Number and Percentage of Elementary Students by Absences, 2010-11




Eckstein Feeder Pattern




Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas


Eckstein


APPROVED
 20091118
 MAP ID #023b



Eckstein Feeder Pattern Schools 3rd Grade Reading MSP, 2010-11








Hamilton Feeder Pattern




Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas


Hamilton Int'l School




Hamilton Feeder Pattern Schools 3rd Grade Reading MSP, 2010-11



Hamilton Feeder Pattern Schools 4th Grade Math MSP, 2010-11



Hamilton Feeder Pattern Number and Percentage of Elementary Students by Absences, 2010-11










Madison Feeder Pattern




Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas


Madison

APPROVED
 20091118
 MAP ID #020b


-  Attendance Area Elementary Schools
-  Attendance Area Middle Schools
-  Option Schools
-  Elementary School Attendance Areas
-  Middle School Attendance Area
-  Parks
-  Industrial Areas & UW




Madison Feeder Pattern Schools 3rd Grade Reading MSP, 2010-11



Madison Feeder Pattern Schools 4th Grade Math MSP, 2010-11



Madison Feeder Pattern Number and Percentage of Elementary Students by Absences, 2010-11




McClure Feeder Pattern

Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas


APPROVED
 20091118
 MAP ID #024b


McClure




- Attendance Area Elementary Schools
- Attendance Area Middle Schools
- Option Schools
- Elementary School Attendance Areas
- Middle School Attendance Area
- Parks
- Industrial Areas & UW
- Out of District

McClure Feeder Pattern Schools 3rd Grade Reading MSP, 2010-11








Mercer Feeder Pattern




Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas


Mercer




67
 The names referenced on this map are not intended to reflect the official name of any school building. They are instead intended to ensure better public understanding of the map. This map was prepared and compiled by Seattle Public Schools staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. Seattle Public Schools makes no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy, completeness, or timeliness of the information on this map or any product. Seattle Public Schools shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits.







Mercer Feeder Pattern Number and Percentage of Elementary Students by Absences, 2010-11




Washington Feeder Pattern




Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas

APPROVED
 20091118
 MAP ID #025b


Washington




- Attendance Area Elementary Schools
- Attendance Area Middle Schools
- Option Schools
- Elementary School Attendance Areas
- Middle School Attendance Area
- Parks
- Industrial Areas & UW
- Out of District



Washington Feeder Pattern Schools 4th Grade Math MSP, 2010-11





Whitman Feeder Pattern

~




Middle and Elementary School Attendance Areas

Whitman


APPROVED
 20091118
 MAP ID #022b

Legend


- Attendance Area Elementary Schools
- Attendance Area Middle Schools
- Option Schools
- Elementary School Attendance Areas
- Middle School Attendance Area
- Parks
- Industrial Areas & UW
- Out of District




Whitman Feeder Pattern Schools 3rd Grade Reading MSP, 2010-11



Whitman Feeder Pattern Schools 4th Grade Math MSP, 2010-11





Whitman Feeder Pattern Number and Percentage of Elementary Students by Absences, 2010-11





K-8, Middle & High School Data


























K-8 Schools - Elementary Grades Number and Percentage of Students by Absences, 2010-11




K-8 Schools Middle School Grades Number and Percentage of Students by Absences, 2010-11




Middle Schools Number and Percentage of Students by Absences, 2010-11




High School Number and Percentage of Students by Absences, 2010-11



Number and Percent of Graduates and Non-Graduates Class of 2010







City of Seattle
Office of the Mayor

January 17, 2012

Honorable Sally J. Clark
President
Seattle City Council
City Hall, 2nd Floor

Dear Council President Clark:

I am pleased to transmit the attached proposed Council Bill to approve The Families and Education Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan (the Plan) as required by Section 8 of Ordinance 123567. The Plan sets out the criteria, methodology, and required outcomes for investments of Levy proceeds. It identifies the key strategies that will be used to achieve better results for our students. Ordinance 123567 directs that Levy proceeds can be invested only in accordance with an approved Plan. Once approved, the Office for Education will be able to begin accepting Requests for Investments that will put in place programs for the 2012-2013 school year.

The Levy approved on November 8, 2011 is the fourth such measure supported by the City's voters. This is the boldest statement yet of our commitment to making sure all Seattle's students enter school ready to learn, achieve academically while in school, and graduate prepared for their futures as life-long learners. The Plan describes how new investments will be made that build upon the successes of previous Levies while addressing critical gaps identified by the Levy Planning Committee. With Council's approval, new approaches that strengthen services for many of our low-income, isolated families will be set into motion. Elementary schools will begin to build networks of support for their most struggling students. Summer loss of learning will be mitigated with the development of extended year learning opportunities. Existing programs, such as the school based health centers, will recommit to achieving the academic goals of the Levy.

I am confident that this Plan puts us on the path to ensuring every student in our city has access to a quality education, and every neighborhood enjoys a world class school. Thank you for your consideration of this legislation. Should you have questions, please contact Office for Education Director Holly Miller at 684-4508.

Sincerely,

Michael McGinn
Mayor of Seattle

cc: Honorable Members of the Seattle City Council

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

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

