

Families & Education Levy Annual Report 2005-06
Appendix A: Indicator Data

A. Early Learning Network Indicators

1. First Assessment Results

Table 1: Developmental Assessment Scoring Scale	
Range of Assessment Scores	Explanation of the Score
1.0 ----- 1.9	Forerunner – Children who show beginning evidence of reaching the initial level for typical preschool development.
2.0 ----- 2.9	Step 1 – Children who demonstrate the beginning level of typical preschool development.
3.0 ----- 3.8	Step 2 – Children who demonstrate intermediate levels in the sequence of development for each objective.
3.8 ----- 4.0	Step 3 – Children who demonstrate mastery in each objective.

Table 2: ELN Child Assessment Results¹², First Assessment, December 2005		
	2005 - 2006 School Year	
	Target	Actual
# and % of ELN students who are assessed at Forerunner/Score 1.0 – 1.9	N/A	13
# and % of ELN students who are assessed at Step 1/Score 2.0 – 2.9	182 / 65%	72
# and % of ELN students who are assessed at Steps 2 or 3/Score 3.0 – 4.0	N/A	19

Table 3: 1st Developmental Assessment Results - Fall 2005 by Race/Ethnicity				
	Average Score by Assessment Category			
	Social & Emotional Development	Cognitive	Physical	Language
Asian	2.23	2.33	2.37	2.36
African American	2.32	2.35	2.68	2.38
Hispanic	2.36	2.35	2.51	2.34
White	3.08	3.22	2.96	3.07
Other (includes Native American, unknown and other)	2.63	2.66	2.70	2.71
Total Average	2.42	2.46	2.42	2.41

¹ Average score across all four assessment categories

² 104 of 155 ELN children received a first assessment

Table 4: 1st Developmental Assessment Results – Fall 2005 by Income Average Score by Assessment Category*				
Income Level	Social & Emotional Development	Cognitive	Physical	Language
0 – 110% FPL				
110% FPL and above				

*Data not reported to OFE

Table 5: 1st Developmental Assessment Results - Fall 2005 by Provider Average Score by Assessment Category				
	Social & Emotional Development	Cognitive	Physical	Language
Jose Marti Child Development	2.41	2.51	2.48	2.43
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Main	2.19	2.44	2.29	2.29
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Wing Luke	2.40	2.29	2.38	2.35
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Emerson	2.75	2.04	2.47	2.67
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Bright Bellbirds	2.20	2.10	2.15	2.16
Total Tiny Tots	2.35	2.24	2.32	2.33
Seed of Life	3.44	3.94	3.42	3.42
Refugee Women's Alliance	1.99	1.88	1.85	1.86
Community Day School Assn	2.60	2.72	2.61	2.66
Other (9592)	2.00	1.85	1.82	1.93
Total average	2.42	2.46	2.42	2.41

Table 6: 1st Developmental Assessment Results - Fall 2005 by Race/Ethnicity Number of children assessed with scores above or below 2.0								
	Social & Emotional Development		Cognitive		Physical		Language	
	<2	> or = 2	<2	> or = 2	<2	> or = 2	<2	> or = 2
Asian	4	20	10	14	11	13	9	15
African American	3	21	1	23	3	21	3	21
Hispanic	4	31	3	32	4	31	5	30
White	1	10	2	9	1	10	1	10
Other (includes Native American, unknown and other)	0	10	1	9	0	10	0	10
Total	12	92	17	87	19	85	18	86

Table 7: Developmental Assessment Results - Fall 2005 by Provider Number of children assessed with scores above or below 2.0								
	Social & Emotional Development		Cognitive		Physical		Language	
	<2	> or = 2	<2	> or = 2	<2	> or = 2	<2	> or = 2
Jose Marti Child Development	3	38	1	40	2	39	3	38
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Main	1	5	0	6	1	5	0	6
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Wing Luke	3	13	2	14	2	14	1	15
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Emerson	0	4	3	1	1	3	0	4
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Bright Bellbirds	3	6	0	9	1	8	3	6
Total Tiny Tots	7	28	5	30	5	30	4	31
Seed of Life	0	9	0	9	0	9	0	9
Refugee Women's Alliance	2	11	9	4	10	3	10	3
Community Day School Assn	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4
Other (9592)	0	2	2	0	2	0	1	1
Total	12	92	17	87	19	85	18	86

2. Third Assessment Results

Table 8 ELN Child Assessment Results³⁴, Third Assessment, Spring 2006		
	2005 - 2006 School Year	
	Target	Actual
# and % of ELN students who are assessed at Forerunner/Score 1.0 – 1.9	N/A	4
# and % of ELN students who are assessed at Step 1/Score 2.0 – 2.9	N/A	30
# and % of ELN students who are assessed at Steps 2 or 3/Score 3.0 – 4.0	N/A	94

³ Average score across all four assessment categories

⁴ 128 of 155 ELN children received a third assessment

Table 9: 3rd Developmental Assessment Results - Spring 2006 by Race/Ethnicity				
	Average Score by Assessment Category			
	Social & Emotional Development	Cognitive	Physical	Language
Asian	3.31	3.04	3.39	3.41
African American	2.97	3.23	3.04	3.00
Hispanic	3.50	3.57	3.44	3.41
White	3.63	3.56	3.63	3.66
Other (includes Native American, unknown and other)	3.32	3.33	3.31	3.30
Total	3.33	3.32	3.28	3.24

Table 10: 3rd Developmental Assessment Results – Spring 2006 by Income*				
	Average Score by Assessment Category			
Income Level	Social & Emotional Development	Cognitive	Physical	Language
0 – 110% FPL				
110% FPL and above				

*Data not reported to OFE

Table 11: 3rd Developmental Assessment Results - Spring 2006 by Provider				
	Average Score by Assessment Category			
	Social & Emotional Development	Cognitive	Physical	Language
Jose Marti Child Development	3.65	3.76	3.65	3.56
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Main	2.74	3.18	3.27	2.97
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Wing Luke	3.24	3.15	3.13	3.15
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Emerson	3.37	3.13	3.21	3.25
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Bright Bellbirds	3.20	3.06	2.94	2.87
Total Tiny Tots	3.17	3.13	3.11	3.06
Seed of Life	3.91	3.99	3.98	3.98
Refugee Women's Alliance	3.05	2.96	2.88	2.87
Community Day School Association @ Sanislo	3.24	3.50	3.22	3.23
Community Day School Association @ Maple	2.89	2.58	2.91	2.89
Community Day School Association @ Highland Park	3.11	2.86	2.86	3.03
Total Community Day School Assn	3.02	2.81	2.92	2.99
Praxis Institute	3.04	4.00	3.41	3.46
Total Average	3.33	3.32	3.28	3.24

**Table 12:
3rd Developmental Assessment Results - Spring 2006 by Race/Ethnicity
Number of children assessed with scores above or below 3.0**

	Social & Emotional Development		Cognitive		Physical		Language	
	<3	> or = 3	<3	> or = 3	<3	> or = 3	<3	> or = 3
Asian	8	26	14	20	10	24	9	25
African American	13	12	8	17	11	14	15	10
Hispanic	7	28	5	30	7	28	7	28
White	2	11	4	9	2	11	2	11
Other (includes Native American, unknown and other)	7	14	3	18	4	17	4	17
Total	37	91	34	94	34	94		91

**Table 13:
3rd Developmental Assessment Results – Spring 2006 by Provider
Number of children assessed with scores above or below 3.0**

	Social & Emotional Development		Cognitive		Physical		Language	
	<3	> or = 3	<3	> or = 3	<3	> or = 3	<3	> or = 3
Jose Marti Child Development	5	34	1	38	3	36	4	35
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Main	3	2	2	3	1	4	3	2
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Wing Luke	6	10	3	13	5	11	4	12
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Emerson	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Bright Bellbirds	2	7	4	5	4	5	6	3
Total Tiny Tots	12	22	10	24	11	23	14	20
Seed of Life	0	10	0	10	0	10	0	10
Refugee Women's Alliance	11	14	13	12	13	12	12	13
Community Day School Assn @ Sanislo	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2
Community Day School Assn @ Maple	5	3	7	1	4	4	4	4
Community Day School Association @ Highland Park	2	6	3	5	3	5	3	5
Total Community Day School Assn	8	10	10	8	7	11	7	11
Praxis Institute	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2
Total Average	37	91	34	94	34	94	37	91

Table 14: 3rd Developmental Assessment Results - Spring 2006 by Race/Ethnicity Number of children assessed with scores above 3.0 in all four categories			
	Number of children with scores > 3.0	Children scoring > 3.0 as a percent of same race/ethnicity who were assessed	As a percent of all children with score of 3.0 or more
Asian	14	41%	21%
African American	7	28%	10%
Hispanic	24	69%	35%
White	9	69%	13%
Other (includes Native American, unknown and other)	14	67%	21%
Total	68	53%	100%

Table 15: 3rd Developmental Assessment Results - Spring 2006 by Provider Number of children assessed with scores above 3.0 in all four categories			
	Number of children >3.0 in all categories	Number of children assessed	Children scoring >3.0 as a percent of enrolled children who were assessed
Jose Marti Child Development	33	39	85%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Main	1	5	20%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Wing Luke	8	16	50%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Emerson	2	4	50%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Bright Bellbirds	2	9	22%
Total Tiny Tots	13	34	38%
Seed of Life	10	10	100%
Refugee Women's Alliance	6	25	24%
Community Day School Association @ Sanislo	1	2	50%
Community Day School Association @ Maple	0	8	0%
Community Day School Association @ Highland Park	4	8	50%
Total Community Day School Assn	5	18	28%
Praxis Institute	1	2	50%
Total Average	68	128	53%

Table 16: Assessment Results - Spring 2006 by Race/Ethnicity, Number of children improving by one level or more in each category from their baseline assessment to 3rd assessment⁵⁶				
	Number of children improving one level	Number of children assessed	Children improving one level as a percent of same race/ethnicity who were assessed	As a percent of all children improving one level
Asian	7	26	27%	20%
African American	4	25	16%	11%
Hispanic	15	34	44%	49%
White	5	12	42%	14%
Other (includes Native American, unknown and other)	2	17	12%	6%
Total	33	114	29%	100%

Table 17: Assessment Results - Spring 2006 by Provider, Number of children improving by one level or more in each category from their baseline assessment to 3rd assessment			
	Number of children improving by one level or more	Number of children assessed	Children improving as a percent of enrolled children who were assessed
Jose Marti Child Development	23	39	59%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Main		5	0%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Wing Luke	1	16	6%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Emerson		4	0%
Tiny Tots Development Center @ Bright Bellbirds	1	9	11%
Total Tiny Tots	2	34	6%
Seed of Life	2	10	20%
Refugee Women's Alliance	6	18	33%
Community Day School Association @ Sanislo		2	0%
Community Day School Association @ Maple		4	0%
Community Day School Association @ Highland Park		6	0%
Total Community Day School Assn		12	0%
Praxis Institute		1	0%
Total Average	33	114	29%

⁵ 28 children improved one level or more in each category from 1st to 3rd assessment; 2 who did not have a first assessment improved one or more level from the 2nd to 3rd assessment; 3 children scored at highest level at 3rd assessment whose first assessment was within one level of the highest score.

⁶ 93 children had a complete first and third assessment. 21 children who did not have a first assessment had complete second and third assessments.

B. Family Support and Family Involvement Indicators

1. Family Support

Table 18: Math and Reading WASL Results – Family Support Worker Focus Students, 2005 – 06 SY				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading & Math
Asian	56	4	18	24
African American	172	12	74	46
Hispanic	99	12	29	30
Native American	8	2	4	6
White	33	3	9	11
Non free/reduced lunch	23	2	11	14
Free/reduced lunch	345	31	123	103
Not LEP	215	17	94	85
Equal English proficiency	20	1	13	14
Limited English proficiency	133	15	27	18
All FSW focus students	368	33	134	117

Table 19: Developmental Reading Assessment Results – Family Support Worker Focus Students, 2005 – 06 SY		
	Did Not Meet Standard	Met Standard
Asian	22	40
African American	96	104
Hispanic	47	34
Native American	8	13
White	14	18
Non free/reduced lunch	17	18
Free/reduced lunch	170	191
Not LEP	123	140
Equal English proficiency	4	9
Limited English proficiency	60	60
All FSW focus students	187	209

Table 20: Developmental Reading Assessment Results – Family Support Worker Focus Students 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY				
	Did Not Meet Standard in '05 or '06	Met Standard in '05 But Not '06	Met Standard in '06 But Not '05	Met Standard Both Years
Asian	6	2	9	11
African American	32	2	25	39
Hispanic	23	2	11	7
Native American	3	0	4	3
White	5	1	8	4
Non free/reduced lunch	7	3	5	6
Free/reduced lunch	62	4	52	58
Not LEP	41	4	38	47
Equal English proficiency	3	0	1	3
Limited English proficiency	25	3	18	14
All FSW focus students	69	7	57	64

Table 21: Improve Attendance, Family Support Worker Focus Students 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
FSW Students with Attendance Goal	313	87.8 % ⁷	86.1%
All FSW Focus Students	1331	92.1% ⁸	91.5%
All Students K – 5 th Grade With An Attendance Measure Recorded		93.0%	93.2%

Table 22: Number Improving Attendance, Family Support Worker Focus Students 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
FSW Students With Attendance Goal and Attendance Measure Recorded in Both School Years	109	7	131

⁷ 248 of the students with an attendance goal in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year.

⁸ 1109 of the FSW focus students in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year.

Table 23: Reduce Disciplinary Action, Family Support Worker Focus Students, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY				
	Number of Students	Number of Students with Disciplinary Action in 2005-06 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2004 – 05 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2005 – 06 SY
FSW Students with Discipline Goal	164	37	1.42 ⁹	1.65
All FSW Focus Students	1331	84	1.54 ¹⁰	1.63
All Students K – 5 th Grade	22478	351	1.48	1.39

Table 24: Increased School Retention, Family Support Worker Focus Students, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY				
	Number of Students	Number of Students with Mobility Event¹¹ in 2005 - 06 SY	Mobility Events per Student, 2004 – 05 SY	Mobility Events per Student, 2005 – 06 SY
FSW Students with Mobility Goal	160	79	1.12 ¹²	1.22
All FSW Focus Students	1331	514	1.13 ¹³	1.12
All Students K – 5 th Grade	22478	7740	1.09	1.07

Table 25: Increased Family Involvement, All Students Receiving Family Support Worker Services, 1st vs. 2nd semester, 2005-06 SY				
	1st Semester		2nd Semester	
	Number of Families	Number of Activities	Number of Families	Number of Activities
Family Involvement Activities	1461	2244	1414	2219
Home Visits	534	708	526	704
Families Attending Parent/Teacher Conference	289	295	192	227
Families Attending Student Intervention Team Meeting	138	143	229	240
Unduplicated Number of Families Participating and Total Number of Activities	2142	3390	2105	3390

⁹ 24 of the students with a discipline goal in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

¹⁰ 54 of the FSW focus students in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

¹¹ Mobility events tracked include: Confirmed Transfer to a Private School in Seattle or Home-Based Instruction, Confirmed Transfer to a School Outside Seattle, Confirmed Transfer to another SPS school, Temporarily Unavailable for Schooling, Unknown or Unable to Locate, Withdrawn for Being Absent 20 Days (Consecutive).

¹² 49 of the students with a mobility goal in 2005-06 had mobility data the previous school year.

¹³ 222 of the FSW focus students in 2005-06 had mobility data the previous school year.

2. Family and Community Involvement¹⁴

Table 26: Math and Reading WASL Results –Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2005-06 SY				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Asian	23	2	12	11
African American	44	2	19	7
Hispanic	37	3	6	13
Native American and White**	4	1	5	2
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	4	1	2	3
Free/Reduced Lunch	104	7	40	30
Not LEP	49	1	20	17
Equal English Proficiency	2	0	10	3
Limited English Proficiency	57	7	12	13
All FIP Students	108	8	42	33

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 27: Developmental Reading Assessment Results –Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2005 -06 SY		
	Did Not Meet Standard	Met Standard
Asian, Native American, & White**	3	9
African American	12	21
Hispanic	7	4
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	**	**
Free/Reduced Lunch	**	**
Not LEP	14	26
Limited English or Equal English Proficiency	8	8
All FIP Students	22	34

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 28: Developmental Reading Assessment Results – Family Involvement Program Focus Students 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY**				
	Did Not Meet Standard in '05 or '06	Met Standard in '05 But Not '06	Met Standard in '06 But Not '05	Met Standard Both Years
All FIP students	11	1	12	7

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

¹⁴ Family and Community Involvement program indicators also include increased number of families attending parent/teacher conferences, attending School Intervention Team (SIT) meetings, or receiving home visits. Incomplete data provided to OFE to report changes during 2006-06 SY.

Table 29: Improve Attendance, Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2004 – 05 vs. 2005 – 06 SY			
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
All FIP Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	288	93.9% ¹⁵	93.4%
All Students In Family Involvement Schools With An Attendance Measure Recorded		94.7%	94.4%

Table 30: Number Improving Attendance, Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
FSW Students With Attendance Goal and Attendance Measure Recorded in Both School Years	119	22	109

Table 31: Reduce Disciplinary Action, Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students with Disciplinary Action in 2005-06 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2004 – 05 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2005 – 06 SY
FIP Focus Students	8	1.50 ¹⁶	1.13
All Students In Family Involvement Schools	91	1.74	1.45

Table 32: Increased School Retention, Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students with Mobility Event in 2005 - 06 SY	Mobility Events per Student, 2004 – 05 SY	Mobility Events per Student, 2005 – 06 SY
All FIP Focus Students	121	1.14 ¹⁷	1.12
All Students In Family Involvement Schools	1271	1.03	1.02

¹⁵ 250 of the FIP focus students in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year

¹⁶ 14 of the FIP focus students in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

¹⁷ 36 of the FIP focus students in 2005-06 had mobility data the previous school year.

3. Changes in WASL Results, FSW and FIP Focus Students

Table 33: Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, Family Support Worker and Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Math level improved	Math level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian	6	8	26	11	8	22
African American	15	25	69	29	25	55
Hispanic	17	9	39	16	12	37
White	5	4	7	0	2	14
Total	43	46	141	56	47	128

Table 34: Percent of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, Family Support Worker and Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Percent improving one level or more in math	Percent declining one level or more in math	Percent retaining same level in math	Percent improving one level or more in reading	Percent declining one level or more in reading	Percent retaining same level in reading
Asian	15%	20%	65%	27%	20%	54%
African American	14%	23%	63%	27%	23%	50%
Hispanic	26%	14%	60%	25%	18%	57%
White	31%	25%	44%	0%	13%	88%
Total	19%	20%	61%	24%	20%	55%

Table 35: Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, Family Support Worker and Family Involvement Program Focus Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Math score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same	Reading score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian	17	22	1	21	17	2
African American	45	57	2	50	50	3
Hispanic	32	30	0	30	32	1
White	8	7	0	6	9	0
Total	102	116	3	107	108	6

**Table 36:
Percent of students changing math and reading WASL scale score,
Family Support Worker and Family Involvement Program Focus Students,
2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY**

	Percent improving score in math	Percent declining score in math	Percent retaining same score in math	Percent improving score in reading	Percent declining score in reading	Percent retaining same score in reading
Asian	43%	55%	3%	53%	43%	5%
African American	43%	55%	2%	49%	49%	3%
Hispanic	52%	48%	0%	48%	51%	2%
White	53%	47%	0%	40%	60%	0%
Total	46%	52%	1%	48%	49%	3%

C. Elementary Community Learning Center Indicators¹⁸

**Table 37:
Math and Reading WASL Results – Students in Elementary CLC Programs,
2005 – 06 SY**

	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Asian	16	4	10	35
African American	20	1	22	7
Hispanic	31	2	12	10
Native American and White**	7	1	5	7
Non free/reduced lunch	9	1	7	22
Free/reduced lunch	65	7	42	37
Not LEP	34	3	31	23
Equal English proficiency	6	1	6	20
Limited English proficiency	34	4	12	16
All ECLC students	74	8	49	59

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

¹⁸ Elementary Community Learning Center staff proposed tracking “Changes in Developmental Reading Assessment Scores” and “Student Progressing on Time to Next Grade” as indicators. Too few students in the program have consecutive year DRA scores to track. In addition, all elementary students are identified as progressing to next grade. OFE recommends dropping these indicators. Finally, initial indicators included “Families participating in CLC events.” This data was not reported to OFE for the school year but will be included in 2006-07 in summary reports.

Table 38: Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, Elementary Community Learning Center Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Math level improved	Math level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian	4	4	14	9	5	8
African American	2	7	4	4	2	7
Hispanic, Native American, and White **	5	6	9	9	4	7
Total	11	17	27	22	11	22

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 39: Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, Elementary Community Learning Center Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Math score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same	Reading score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian	12	9	1	11	9	1
African American	4	9		8	5	
Hispanic, Native American, and White **	10	10		9	11	
Total	26	28	1	28	25	1

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 40: Developmental Reading Assessment Results – Students in Elementary CLC Programs, 2005 – 06 SY		
	Did Not Meet Standard	Met Standard
All ECLC Students**	5	17

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 41: Improve Attendance – Students in Elementary CLC Programs, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
All Students in Elementary CLC Programs	227	94.9% ¹⁹	95.1%
All Students in Schools with Elementary CLC Programs	1426	94.2%	93.9%

¹⁹ 207 of the ECLC students in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year

Table 42: Number Improving Attendance, Students in Elementary CLC Programs, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All ECLC Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	100	18	89

D. Middle School Support and Community Learning Center Indicators²⁰

1. All MSSP Students

Table 43: Math and Reading WASL Results – All MSSP Students, 2005-06 SY				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Asian	197	22	101	85
African American	388	10	168	50
Hispanic	117	5	62	42
Native American	23	3	6	1
White	85	9	49	43
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	214	21	132	98
Free/Reduced Lunch	596	28	254	123
Not LEP	552	33	281	140
Equal English Proficiency	117	12	72	70
Limited English Proficiency	141	4	33	11
All MSSP Students	810	49	386	221

²⁰ MSSP indicators also include number and percent of students improving DRA scores, Gates McGinitie (reading, vocabulary, and comprehension) scores, EduSoft math scores, and classroom based assessments. This data is not reported to OFE.

Table 44: Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, All MSSP Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY²¹						
	Math level improved	Math level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian	13	12	42	19	15	33
African American	16	27	122	46	28	91
Hispanic	17	13	30	22	24	24
Native American and White**	7	9	40	13	17	26
Total	53	61	234	100	84	174

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 45: Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, All MSSP Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY²²						
	Math score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same	Reading score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian	36	27	2	34	28	1
African American	79	63	4	88	61	2
Hispanic	32	26	0	34	21	2
Native American and White**	28	25	0	26	26	1
Total	175	141	6	182	136	6

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 46: Improve GPA²³, All MSSP Students 1st vs. 2nd Semester, 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Cumulative GPA, end of 1st semester, 2005 – 06 SY	Cumulative GPA, end of 2nd semester, 2005 – 06 SY
All Students in MSSP Programs	1551	2.52	2.54
All Students Grades 6-8		2.93	3.0

²¹ 348 MSSP students took the Math WASL test and 358 students took the Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and have data for test Levels.

²² 322 MSSP students took the Math WASL test and 324 students took the Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and had scale scores.

²³ The GPA indicator will not be used by the MSSP after the 2005-06 school year

Table 47: Improve Attendance, All MSSP Students 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
All Students in MSSP Programs	1633	93.4% ²⁴	91.4%
All Students Grades 6-8		94.5%	93.3%

Table 48: Number Improving Attendance, All MSSP Students 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All MSSP Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	548	56	956

Table 49: Reduce Disciplinary Action, All MSSP Students, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students with Disciplinary Action in 2005-06 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2004 – 05 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2005 – 06 SY
All MSSP Students	312	1.85 ²⁵	1.84
All Students Grades 6-8	1203	1.88	1.75

²⁴ 1566 of the MSSP students in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year

²⁵ 270 of the MSSP students in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

2. MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites²⁶²⁷

Table 50: Math and Reading WASL Results – MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites²⁸				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Asian	108	10	46	44
African American	212	3	105	35
Hispanic	67	3	30	23
Native American and White**	25	2	15	12
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	98	8	63	42
Free/Reduced Lunch	314	10	133	72
Not LEP	266	11	149	70
Equal English Proficiency	59	6	34	39
Limited English Proficiency	86	1	13	5
All MSSP Students Attending CLC Programs At Innovation Sites	412	18	196	114

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 51: Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY²⁹						
	Math level improved	Math level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian	4	4	18	5	8	13
African American	8	16	66	27	14	49
Hispanic	10	3	18	11	10	10
White	2	1	7	3	4	3
Total	24	24	109	46	36	75

²⁶ 788 students in the MSSP program attended the CLC programs at Denny, Aki Kurose, Mercer, and Madison Middle Schools.

²⁷ Middle School Support- CLC Program Indicators also include the number of students who participated in CLC programs twice per week or more who achieved their learning goals; the number of students with improved attitudes about school and their personal ability to succeed as measured by the Search Institute's Asset Development Survey; and increased number of families attending after school activities. These data are not reported to OFE.

²⁸ 739 students in the MSSP program attended the CLC programs at Denny, Aki Kurose, Mercer, and Madison Middle Schools, and took both the Math and Reading WASL tests.

²⁹ 157 MSSP students in CLCs took the Math and Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and have data for test Levels.

Table 52: Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY³⁰						
	Math score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same	Reading score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian	16	9	0	9	16	0
African American	40	45	1	51	34	1
Hispanic	19	10	0	15	14	0
White	5	5	0	4	6	0
Total	80	69	1	79	70	1

Table 53: Improve GPA, MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites, 1st vs. 2nd Semester, 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Cumulative GPA, end of 1st semester, 2005 – 06 SY	Cumulative GPA, end of 2nd semester, 2005 – 06 SY
MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites	780	2.60	2.57
All Students in MSSP Programs	1551	2.52	2.54
All Students Grades 6-8		2.93	3.0

Table 54: Improve Attendance, MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites, 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites	796	93.5% ³¹	91.2%
All Students in MSSP Programs	1633	93.4%	91.4%
All Students Grades 6-8		94.5%	93.3%

Table 55: Number Improving Attendance, MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites With Attendance Measure Recorded	259	22	480

³⁰ 150 MSSP students in CLCs took the Math and Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and had scale scores.

³¹ 761 of the MSSP students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year

Table 56: Reduce Disciplinary Action, MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students with Disciplinary Action in 2005-06 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2004 – 05 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2005 – 06 SY
MSSP Students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites	185	1.98 ³²	1.82
All MSSP Students	312	1.85 ³³	1.84
All Students Grades 6-8	1203	1.88	1.75

3. MSSP Students in All CLC Programs by Provider³⁴

Table 57: Math and Reading WASL Results – MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Asian	32	4	16	8
African American	66	0	40	10
Hispanic	38	3	15	14
Native American and White**	7	0	5	2
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	28	2	20	15
Free/Reduced Lunch	115	5	56	19
Not LEP	82	3	55	21
Equal English Proficiency	20	3	15	9
Limited English Proficiency	41	1	6	4
All MSSP Students Attending Parks CLC Programs	143	7	76	34

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

³² 147 of the MSSP students in CLC Programs at Innovation Sites in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

³³ 270 of the MSSP students in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

³⁴ 281 students in the MSSP program attended the Parks Department CLC programs at Denny, Mercer, and McClure Middle Schools. 640 students in the MSSP program attended YMCA CLC programs at Aki Kurose, Hamilton, Madison, Meany and Washington Middle Schools.

Table 58: Math and Reading WASL Results – MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Asian	82	9	31	40
African American	188	7	84	28
Hispanic	39	0	20	14
Native American and White**	23	4	17	13
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	80	11	53	35
Free/Reduced Lunch	252	9	99	60
Not LEP	228	15	119	58
Equal English Proficiency	47	5	23	34
Limited English Proficiency	56	0	10	3
All MSSP Students Attending YMCA CLC Programs	332	20	152	95

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 59: Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY³⁵						
	Math level improved	Math level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian & White**	1	0	7	2	3	3
African American	5	3	23	12	2	17
Hispanic	9	2	15	12	7	8
Total	15	5	45	26	12	28

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 60: Percent of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Percent improving one level or more in math	Percent declining one level or more in math	Percent retaining same level in math	Percent improving one level or more in reading	Percent declining one level or more in reading	Percent retaining same level in reading
Asian & White**	13%	0%	88%	25%	38%	38%
African American	16%	10%	74%	39%	6%	55%
Hispanic	35%	8%	58%	44%	26%	30%
Total	23%	8%	69%	39%	18%	42%

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

³⁵ 65 MSSP students in Parks CLCs took the Math and 66 took the Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and have data for test Levels.

**Table 61:
Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score,
MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs,
2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY³⁶**

	Math score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same	Reading score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian & White**	4	4	0	4	4	0
African American	19	11	1	24	7	0
Hispanic	17	8	0	14	10	0
Total	40	23	1	42	21	0

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

**Table 62:
Percent of students changing math and reading WASL scale score,
MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs,
2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY**

	Percent improving score in math	Percent declining score in math	Percent retaining same score in math	Percent improving score in reading	Percent declining score in reading	Percent retaining same score in reading
Asian & White**	50%	50%	0%	50%	50%	0%
African American	61%	35%	3%	77%	23%	0%
Hispanic	68%	32%	0%	58%	42%	0%
Total	63%	36%	2%	67%	33%	0%

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

**Table 63:
Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level,
MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs,
2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY³⁷**

	Math level improved	Math level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian	4	4	18	5	7	14
African American	4	13	54	19	13	39
Hispanic	3	1	7	3	3	5
White	2	2	8	2	5	5
Total	13	20	87	29	28	63

³⁶ 64 MSSP students in Parks CLCs took the Math and 63 took the Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and had scale scores.

³⁷ 120 MSSP students in YMCA CLCs took the Math and Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and have data for test Levels.

**Table 64:
Percent of students changing math and reading WASL performance level,
MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs,
2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY**

	Percent improving one level or more in math	Percent declining one level or more in math	Percent retaining same level in math	Percent improving one level or more in reading	Percent declining one level or more in reading	Percent retaining same level in reading
Asian	15%	15%	69%	19%	27%	54%
African American	6%	18%	76%	27%	18%	55%
Hispanic	27%	9%	64%	27%	27%	45%
White	17%	17%	67%	17%	42%	42%
Total	11%	17%	73%	24%	23%	53%

**Table 65:
Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score,
MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs,
2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY³⁸**

	Math score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same	Reading score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian	15	10	0	9	16	0
African American	28	37	2	36	30	1
Hispanic	6	4	0	6	5	0
White	5	7	0	3	9	0
Total	54	58	2	54	60	1

**Table 66:
Percent of students changing math and reading WASL scale score,
MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs,
2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY**

	Percent improving score in math	Percent declining score in math	Percent retaining same score in math	Percent improving score in reading	Percent declining score in reading	Percent retaining same score in reading
Asian	60%	40%	0%	36%	64%	0%
African American	42%	55%	3%	54%	45%	1%
Hispanic	60%	40%	0%	55%	45%	0%
White	42%	58%	0%	25%	75%	0%
Total	47%	51%	2%	47%	52%	1%

³⁸ 114 MSSP students in YMCA CLCs took the Math and 115 took the Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and had scale scores.

Table 67: MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs, 2005-06 SY Grade Point Average		
	Cumulative GPA, end of 1st semester, 2005 – 06 SY	Cumulative GPA, end of 2nd semester, 2005 – 06 SY
Asian	2.94	2.88
African American	2.43	2.46
Hispanic	2.58	2.57
Native American	2.79	2.77
White	2.77	2.69
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.83	2.81
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.52	2.52
Not LEP	2.49	2.51
Equal English Proficiency	2.87	2.88
Limited English Proficiency	2.72	2.60
All Parks CLC/MSSP Students	2.60	2.59

Table 68: MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs, 2005-06 SY Grade Point Average		
	Cumulative GPA, end of 1st semester, 2005 – 06 SY	Cumulative GPA, end of 2nd semester, 2005 – 06 SY
Asian	2.89	2.93
African American	2.25	2.34
Hispanic	2.38	2.45
Native American	1.93	2.13
White	2.57	2.61
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.65	2.74
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.38	2.45
Not LEP	2.36	2.43
Equal English Proficiency	2.81	2.89
Limited English Proficiency	2.52	2.60
All YMCA CLC/MSSP Students	2.46	2.54
All Students Grades 6-8	2.93	3.0

Table 69: Improve Attendance, MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs, 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs	281	93.3% ³⁹	91.4%
All Students Grades 6-8		94.5%	93.3%

³⁹ 273 of the MSSP students in Parks CLC Programs in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year

Table 70: Number Improving Attendance, MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs With Attendance Measure Recorded	102	10	161

Table 71: Improve Attendance, MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs, 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs	640	93.4% ⁴⁰	91.4%
All Students Grades 6-8		94.5%	93.3%

Table 72: Number Improving Attendance, MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs With Attendance Measure Recorded	205	16	389

Table 73: Reduce Disciplinary Action, MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students with Disciplinary Action in 2005-06 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2004 – 05 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2005 – 06 SY
MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs	61	2.08 ⁴¹	1.88
All Students Grades 6-8	1203	1.88	1.75

⁴⁰ 610 of the MSSP students in YMCA CLC Programs in 2005-06 had attendance data the previous school year

⁴¹ 64 of the MSSP students in Parks CLC Programs in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

Table 74: Reduce Disciplinary Action, MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students with Disciplinary Action in 2005-06 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2004 – 05 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2005 – 06 SY
MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs	146	1.82 ⁴²	1.78
All Students Grades 6-8	1203	1.88	1.75

Table 75: Participation for MSSP Students in Parks CLC Programs, 2005-06 SY		
	Number of Students	Average CLC Days Attended per Student
All MSSP Students Participating in Parks CLC	278	18
Number of MSSP students who participated in Parks CLC programs 2 times per week or more for 3 months or more	55	55

Table 76: Participation for MSSP Students in YMCA CLC Programs, 2005-06 SY		
	Number of Students	Average CLC Days Attended per Student
All MSSP Students Participating in YMCA CLC	595	29
Number of MSSP students who participated in YMCA CLC programs 2 times per week or more for 3 months or more	157	69

⁴² 110 of the MSSP students in YMCA CLC Programs in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

E. STFY Indicators⁴³

Table 77: Math and Reading WASL Results – STFY Students				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Middle School				
Asian	12	0	5	6
African American	24	0	3	0
Hispanic	23	0	4	1
Native American and White	12	0	4	0
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	7	0	3	2
Free/Reduced Lunch	64	0	13	5
Not LEP	41	0	8	3
Equal English Proficiency	8	0	6	4
Limited English Proficiency	22	0	2	0
All STFY Middle School Students	71	0	16	7
High School				
Asian	6	0	4	1
African American	19	0	8	1
Hispanic, Native American, and White**	9	0	7	1
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	9	0	7	1
Free/Reduced Lunch	25	0	12	0
Not LEP	27	0	14	2
Equal English Proficiency	5	0	4	1
Limited English Proficiency	2	0	1	0
All STFY High School Students	34	0	19	3

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

⁴³ STFY indicators also include number and percent of students making progress on Individual Service Plans, students reenrolling and staying in school for 90 days, number and percent of students completing a GED, and students staying in school. This data was not regularly reported to OFE during the 2005-06 school year.

Table 78: Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, STFY Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY⁴⁴						
	Math level improved	Math level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian	2	1	9	6	3	3
African American	1	0	12	3	4	5
Hispanic, Native American, and White**	4	2	11	9	4	4
Total	7	3	32	18	11	12

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 79: Percent of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, STFY Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Percent improving one level or more in math	Percent declining one level or more in math	Percent retaining same level in math	Percent improving one level or more in reading	Percent declining one level or more in reading	Percent retaining same level in reading
Asian	17%	8%	75%	50%	25%	25%
African American	8%	0%	82%	25%	33%	42%
Hispanic, Native American, and White**	23%	12%	65%	53%	23%	23%
Total	17%	7%	76%	44%	27%	29%

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 80: Number of students changing math WASL scale score, STFY Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY⁴⁵			
	Math score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same
Asian	5	5	0
African American	10	1	1
Hispanic, Native American, and White**	7	6	0
Total	22	12	1

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

⁴⁴ 42 STFY students took the Math and 41 took the Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and have data for test Levels.

⁴⁵ 35 STFY students took the Math WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and had scale scores.

Table 81: Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, STFY Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY⁴⁶			
	Reading score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian	7	4	0
African American, Hispanic, Native American, and White**	13	10	0
Total	20	14	0

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 82: Percent of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, STFY Students, 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Percent improving score in math	Percent declining score in math	Percent retaining same score in math	Percent improving score in reading	Percent declining score in reading	Percent retaining same score in reading
Total	63%	34%	3%	59%	41%	0%

Table 83: Average GPA, Students Receiving STFY Case Management, 2005 – 06 SY									
	Cumulative GPA, end of 1st semester				Cumulative GPA, end of 2nd semester				
	Middle School		High School		Middle School		High School		
	STFY ⁴⁷	General	STFY ⁴⁸	General	STFY ⁴⁹	General	STFY ⁵⁰	General	General
Asian	2.83	3.21	2.29	3.09	2.60	3.24	2.45	3.09	3.09
African American	1.58	2.37	1.96	2.48	1.62	2.50	2.10	2.52	2.52
Hispanic	1.80	2.67	2.02	2.71	1.85	2.70	2.28	2.73	2.73
Native American	1.81	2.46	1.82	2.62	1.27	2.54	2.39	2.67	2.67
White	1.62	3.20	1.86	3.11	1.50	3.26	2.24	3.12	3.12
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	1.70	3.22	2.11	3.06	1.96	3.28	2.10	3.06	3.06
Free/Reduced Lunch	1.95	2.57	1.99	2.66	1.90	2.65	2.28	2.69	2.69
Not LEP	1.62	2.91	1.97	2.91	1.65	3.01	2.17	2.93	2.93
Equal English Proficiency	2.53	3.12	2.06	3.02	2.35	3.14	2.33	3.02	3.02
Limited English Proficiency	2.16	2.68	2.19	2.81	2.06	2.75	2.42	2.83	2.83
All Students	1.91	2.93	2.02	2.91	1.90	3.00	2.23	2.93	2.93

⁴⁶ 34 STFY students took the Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and had scale scores.

⁴⁷ 91 students

⁴⁸ 194 students

⁴⁹ 91 students

⁵⁰ 183 students

Table 84: Students Participating in Seattle Team for Youth, 2005-06 Average Attendance				
	2004-05 School Year		2005-06 School Year	
	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage	Number of Students	Average Attendance Percentage
STFY Students – Attendance Measure Recorded	396	79.65	445	70.85
Asian	83	78.32	87	73.31
African American	145	80.66	168	71.56
Hispanic	106	81.37	116	73.36
Native American	27	73.90	35	59.43
White	35	77.85	39	65.13
Denny	28	89.37	32	81.65
Hamilton			12	76.50
Madison	10	90.28		
Mercer	23	87.73	19	77.92
All Other Middle Schools	38	82.18	50	76.10
Ballard	10	76.93		
Cleveland	28	73.02	32	69.57
Ed Service Center	22	66.73	27	58.92
Franklin	25	83.91	13	85.79
Garfield	58	85.36	49	71.77
Ingraham			15	60.43
Interagency	27	66.74	58	66.90
Rainier Beach	16	82.39	17	78.96
Sealth	41	78.88	39	68.26
South Lake	15	63.39	23	52.18
West Seattle	23	82.60	17	89.49
All Other High Schools	14	75.29	37	62.61
All Students 6 th –12 th Grade With An Attendance Measure Recorded		92.24		89.99

Table 85: Improve Attendance, Students Receiving STFY Case Management, 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
All STFY Students With Attendance Measure Recorded	226	2	288

Table 86: Reduce Disciplinary Action, STFY Students, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students with Disciplinary Action in 2005-06 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2004 – 05 SY	Average Disciplinary Actions Per Student 2005 – 06 SY
All STFY Students	123	2.21 ⁵¹	1.83

⁵¹ 140 of the STFY students in 2005-06 had discipline data the previous school year.

Table 87: Progress to the Next Grade Level or Improve Credits, Students Receiving STFY Case Management, 2005-06 SY				
	Progressed to the next grade level	Improved Credits	Average increase in HS credits, 1st to 2nd semester	Graduate
All STFY Students	196 ⁵²	125 ⁵³	2.23	23 ⁵⁴

F. Student Health Indicators

Table 88: Math and Reading WASL Results – Students Using School Based Health Clinic (SBHC) Services 2005-06 SY				
	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Middle School SBHC Users				
Asian	83	14	34	86
African American	152	5	68	37
Hispanic	67	3	26	26
Native American	12	1	5	5
White	49	7	47	129
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	85	12	67	204
Free/Reduced Lunch	278	18	113	79
Not LEP	246	19	137	233
Equal English Proficiency	47	6	35	45
Limited English Proficiency	70	5	8	3
All Middle School SBHC Users	363	30	180	283
High School SBHC Users				
Asian	24	3	55	83
African American	76	2	91	43
Hispanic	24	1	32	25
Native American	5	1	8	5
White	36	4	66	146
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	58	5	142	233
Free/Reduced Lunch	107	6	104	69
Not LEP	107	6	200	245
Equal English Proficiency	16	2	38	49
Limited English Proficiency	42	3	14	8
All High School SBHC Users	165	11	252	302

⁵² Of 300 STFY students with a grade level recorded both Sept. 2005 and Sept. 2006

⁵³ Of 236 STFY students with credits recorded for both 1st and 2nd semesters of 2005-06 SY

⁵⁴ Of 77 STFY students identified as 12th graders Sept. 2005

**Table 89:
Math and Reading WASL Results-
High-Risk Students Served by School-Based Health Centers
2005-06 SY**

	Met Neither Standard	Met Math Only	Met Reading Only	Met Reading and Math
Middle School High Risk Students				
Asian	23	1	6	5
African American	40	0	10	8
Hispanic	20	0	8	2
Native American*				
White	10	0	12	12
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	18	0	8	14
Free/Reduced Lunch	75	1	28	13
Not LEP	60	0	25	20
Equal English Proficiency	15	1	10	6
Limited English Proficiency	18	0	1	1
All Middle School SBHC High Risk Students	93	1	36	27
High School High Risk Students				
Asian	9	0	13	11
African American	21	1	22	6
Hispanic	4	0	6	1
Native American*				
White	7	0	15	13
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	16	0	34	20
Free/Reduced Lunch	25	1	22	11
Not LEP	31	0	46	26
Equal English Proficiency	1	1	7	5
Limited English Proficiency	9	0	3	0
All High School SBHC High Risk Students	41	1	56	31

**Fewer than ten students in category*

Table 90: Number of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, Students Using SBHC Services 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY⁵⁵						
	Math Level improved	Math Level declined	Math level stayed the same	Reading level improved	Reading level declined	Reading level stayed the same
Asian	15	19	55	20	17	52
African American	13	24	76	34	15	64
Hispanic	8	8	32	12	13	23
Native American	2	2	6	3	3	4
White	6	21	73	21	29	50
Total	44	74	242	90	77	193

Table 91: Percent of students changing math and reading WASL performance level, Students Using SBHC Services 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Percent Improving one level or more in math	Percent declining one level or more in math	Percent retaining same level in math	Percent improving one level or more in reading	Percent declining one level or more in reading	Percent retaining same level in reading
Asian	17%	21%	62%	22%	19%	58%
African American	12%	21%	67%	30%	13%	57%
Hispanic	17%	17%	67%	25%	27%	48%
Native American	20%	20%	60%	30%	30%	40%
White	6%	21%	73%	21%	29%	50%
Total	12%	21%	67%	25%	21%	54%

⁵⁵ 360 middle and high school students took the Math and Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and have data for test Levels.

Table 92: Number of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, Students Using SBHC Services 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY⁵⁶						
	Math Score improved	Math score declined	Math score stayed the same	Reading Score improved	Reading score declined	Reading score stayed the same
Asian	53	32	1	46	38	2
African American	54	47	0	63	37	1
Hispanic and Native American*	27	24	1	26	25	1
White	36	59	1	44	52	0
Total	170	162	3	179	152	4

** Too few students to disaggregate by category

Table 93: Percent of students changing math and reading WASL scale score, Students Using SBHC Services 2004 -05 SY vs. 2005 – 06 SY						
	Percent improving score in math	Percent Declining Score in math	Percent retaining same score in math	Percent improving score in reading	Percent declining score in reading	Percent retaining same score in reading
Asian	62%	37%	1%	53%	44%	2%
African American	53%	47%	0%	62%	37%	1%
Hispanic	51%	47%	2%	49%	49%	2%
Native American	56%	44%	0%	56%	44%	0%
White	38%	61%	1%	46%	54%	0%
Total	51%	48%	1%	53%	45%	1%

⁵⁶ 335 middle and high school students took the Math and Reading WASL test in both the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years and have data for test scale scores.

Table 94: GPA – Middle School Students Using School Based Health Centers, 2005-06 SY		
	Cumulative GPA, end of 1st semester	Cumulative GPA, end of 2nd semester
Asian	2.91	2.84
African American	2.28	2.33
Hispanic	2.34	2.21
Native American	2.11	1.96
White	2.86	2.87
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.99	3.01
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.34	2.28
Not LEP	2.59	2.58
Equal English Proficiency	2.62	2.65
Limited English Proficiency	2.58	2.43

Table 95: GPA – High School Students Using School Based Health Centers, 2005-06 SY		
	Cumulative GPA, end of 1st semester	Cumulative GPA, end of 2nd semester
Asian	2.92	2.82
African American	2.39	2.36
Hispanic	2.56	2.49
Native American	2.62	2.48
White	2.89	2.88
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	2.85	2.79
Free/Reduced Lunch	2.51	2.48
Not LEP	2.68	2.65
Equal English Proficiency	2.85	2.73
Limited English Proficiency	2.65	2.63

Table 96: Progress On-Time to Next Grade Level*, Students Using SBHC Services, 2005-06 to 2006-07 SY		
	Number of Students**	Percentage progressing on-time
Students Using School-Based Health Centers	3,399	89.6%
High-Risk Students Using School-Based Health Centers	640	83%
All 6 th through 12 th Grade Students in Schools with SBHCs	11,197	92.6%

*Measured as the number of students with different grade in June and Sept. 2006

**Students with a grade in SPS files both June and Sept. 2006

Table 97: Improve Attendance, Students Using SBHC Services, 2004-05 vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students*	Average Attendance Percentage 2004 – 05 SY	Average Attendance Percentage 2005 – 06 SY
Students Using School-Based Health Centers With Attendance Measure Recorded	4,700	91% ⁵⁷	87.9%
High-Risk Students Using School-Based Health Centers With Attendance Measure Recorded	846	88.8% ⁵⁸	82.9%
All 6 th through 12 th Grade Students in Schools Supported by the 2004 Levy	11,717	91.8%	90.3%

* Students who fall in one of the categories above during the 2005-06 school year who had an attendance measure in the 2004-05 school year.

Table 98: Number Improving Attendance, Students Using SBHC Services, 2004-05 SY vs. 2005-06 SY			
	Number of Students		
	Attendance Improved	No Change	Attendance Declined
Students Using School-Based Health Centers With Attendance Measure Recorded	1482	122	2666
High-Risk Students Using School-Based Health Centers With Attendance Measure Recorded	238	18	535

Table 99: Transfers to Alternative School Settings – Students Using SBHC Services, 2005-06 SY*	
	2005 – 06 SY
Asian	34
African American	69
Hispanic	22
Native American	7
White	44
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	66
Free/Reduced Lunch	110
Not LEP	148
Equal English Proficiency	22
Limited English Proficiency	6

* Students shown as attending a regular and an alternative school between Sept. 2005 and Sept. 2006.

⁵⁷ 4,266 SBHC users in the 2005-06 SY had attendance data the previous year.

⁵⁸ 786 High risk SBHC users in the 2005-06 SY had attendance data the previous year.

Table 100: Immunization Results 2005-06 SY		
	Not in Compliance Sept. 2005⁵⁹	In Compliance June 2006⁶⁰
Asian	1906	1112
African American	2411	1102
Hispanic	1247	606
Native American	201	103
White	3021	1857
Non Free/Reduced Lunch	5641	2750
Free/Reduced Lunch	3145	2030
Not LEP	6604	3585
Equal English Proficiency	410	327
Limited English Proficiency	1772	868
All Students	8786	4780

⁵⁹ 8990 students were out of compliance for immunizations in Sept. 2005. Demographic data is available for only 8786.

⁶⁰ 4918 students were brought into compliance for immunizations by June 2006. Demographic data is available for only 4780.