

March 27, 2019

MEMORANDUM

To: Gender Equity, Safe Communities, New Americans, and Education Committee
From: Brian Goodnight and Aly Pennucci, Council Central Staff
Subject: Council Bill 119480: Families, Education, Preschool, and Promise Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan

At its March 13 meeting, the Gender Equity, Safe Communities, New Americans, and Education (GESCNA-Ed) Committee received a presentation from the Department of Education and Early Learning (DEEL) on the Families, Education, Preschool, and Promise (FEPP) Levy Implementation and Evaluation Plan (I&E Plan). This memorandum provides background information, evaluates consistency between the proposed I&E Plan and the policy direction provided by the Council, and identifies potential issues and options for Council consideration as they relate to the FEPP Levy I&E Plan. This information will be discussed at the GESCNA-Ed Committee on March 27.

Background

In June 2018, the Council approved [Ordinance 125604](#) submitting a proposition to voters to fund education services with a property tax levy generating approximately \$619.6 million over a seven-year period. The proposition was subsequently approved in November 2018 with support from almost 69 percent of the voters. Section 7 of the ordinance states that levy proceeds may only be spent in accordance with an I&E Plan approved by ordinance, and it specifies that the I&E Plan shall include: priority criteria and outcomes for levy-funded strategies, the process and schedule for contracting with partners, and the evaluation methodology to measure individual investments and overall impacts. The Council also adopted a companion resolution, [Resolution 31821](#), requesting that the Executive address specific policies and priorities in the I&E Plan and providing funding guidance for a variety of programs.

[Council Bill 119480](#), transmitted by the Executive on March 5, proposes an I&E Plan intended to meet the requirements established in Ordinance 125604 and address the Council's requests in Resolution 31821. The proposed I&E Plan maintains the broad investment areas and spending levels from the approved levy ordinance, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: FEPP Levy Investment Areas

Investment Area	Amount
Preschool and Early Learning	\$ 341.8 m
K-12 School and Community-Based	\$ 188.1 m
K-12 School Health	\$ 67.3 m
Seattle Promise	\$ 40.7 m
	<u>\$ 637.8 m¹</u>

In addition, Council Bill 119480 would amend the 2019 Adopted Budget to authorize DEEL to accept and then remit the Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) family tuition payments. During the development of the 2019 Budget, DEEL was intending to implement a policy shift whereby preschool providers would directly collect tuition payments from families. DEEL has decided against this policy shift, and DEEL therefore requests appropriation authority to recognize additional City revenues from tuition and to enable the distribution of family tuition payments to providers. The budget amendment would increase appropriation authority within the Early Learning budget summary level by \$860,000, which matches the projections for increased tuition revenue coming to the City.

Consistency with Resolution 31821

Resolution 31821 provided guidance to the Executive for developing the I&E Plan to address the Council’s policy priorities. The proposed I&E Plan, on page 115, includes a reference table that lists the priorities identified in Resolution 31821 and indicates where the priority is addressed in the proposed I&E Plan. An updated version of the table is provided as Attachment 1 to this memo, reflecting corrections to several page number references. At the GESCNA-Ed Committee meeting on April 18, Councilmembers may want to offer an amendment to correct the references in this table and to fix other drafting errors identified by Central Staff.

The proposed I&E Plan includes implementation strategies that address the direction the Council provided in the resolution, with a few exceptions. Specifically, direction related to prioritizing investments in certain groups, expectations for the funding of family support services, and prioritizing resources are not fully addressed. A more detailed discussion and potential amendment options are provided in the issue identification section below under items 1, 4, and 5.

¹ The \$18.2 million difference between the proposed spending plan and the property tax amount is a result of utilizing underspend from the 2011 Families and Education Levy and accounting for interest earnings from the FEPP Levy proceeds.

Although not specifically addressed in the proposed I&E Plan, the Executive has taken some steps towards implementing three other priorities identified in the resolution:

- (1) developing a unified application process for families seeking preschool services from the City;
- (2) researching the concept of using a cross-subsidization tuition methodology to increase the number of children served by SPP; and
- (3) exploring opportunities to gain efficiencies in SPP through better coordination with the state's preschool program.

DEEL has added a question on the SPP application to identify families that may be eligible for the Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP). Though this does not fully realize a unified application process, it is a step towards streamlining the process for families that may be eligible for both SPP and CCAP. DEEL staff indicate that they intend to continue to pursue opportunities to introduce additional efficiencies in their applications. DEEL has explored but chosen not to pursue a cross-subsidized program for SPP due to concern that increasing tuition for higher-income families will deter participation in the program. DEEL continues to look for opportunities with the state and the Office of Intergovernmental Relations to address improvements to childcare and preschool programs.

In addition to identifying priorities related to FEPP Levy investments for inclusion in the I&E Plan, the resolution included direction to the Executive on policy areas that are related to, but not directly addressed by, the FEPP Levy. This includes ensuring that the Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP) will be fully funded with Sweetened Beverage Tax (SBT) proceeds, exploring modifications to CCAP, and encouraging the state to provide additional funding for its child care program. PCHP is currently fully funded with SBT revenue. DEEL is pursuing modifications to CCAP, and the City continues to support efforts to enhance assistance for child care programs.

Identified Issues

1. Levy Goals and Outcomes

The proposed I&E Plan contains a goal and an outcome for the FEPP Levy that may need to be expanded to appropriately recognize levy activities and prioritized groups.

For each of the four levy investment areas, the proposed I&E Plan contains one goal and multiple outcomes that are intended to guide the City's investments and be useful in aligning programs and strategies. The I&E Plan also contains one goal and one outcome for the overall levy. The complete list of goals and outcomes can be found in Table 2, on page 10, of the proposed I&E Plan. Two of the items in this section, the overall levy outcome and the K-12 School and Community-Based goal, are discussed in more detail below.

FEPP Levy Outcome:

Section 2 of the levy ordinance approved in 2018 lists four funding priorities and eight implementation principles. As shown in the excerpts below, the list of groups to prioritize includes aspects of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, English proficiency, familial situations, housing status, and sexual orientation.

Priority 1: Invest in Seattle children, students, families, and communities that have been historically-underserved to increase access to educational opportunities across the education continuum.

Implementation Principle 1: Prioritize investments to ensure educational equity for historically-underserved groups including African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Pacific Islanders, underserved Asian populations, other students of color, refugee and immigrant, homeless, English language learners, and LGBTQ students.

The proposed outcome for the overall levy contains an abbreviated version of the prioritized groups from Implementation Principle 1; and it does not include refugee and immigrant, homeless, English language learners, and LGBTQ students.

Proposed Levy Outcome: African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Pacific Islander, underserved Asian populations, and other students of color achieve academically across the preschool to post-secondary continuum

This abbreviated list occurs in other sections of the proposed I&E Plan as well, including sections related to the intended recipients of K-12 investments and the prioritization process for Seattle Promise tuition funds.

K-12 School and Community-Based Goal:

The proposed I&E Plan, on page 55, describes K-12 investments as follows: “K-12 School and Community Investments will direct services towards students with the greatest need and fund evidence-based and promising practices targeting academic preparation and social, emotional, and behavioral skill building that lead to high school graduation and college and career readiness.” Similarly, the levy ordinance approved in 2018 describes a variety of activities to increase student achievement of educational milestones.

As currently drafted, the proposed K-12 School and Community-Based goal focuses more narrowly on college and job readiness experiences.

Proposed K-12 School and Community-Based Goal: Seattle students have access to and utilize college and job readiness experiences that promote high school graduation.

In addition, the proposed strategies to be pursued within the K-12 investment area include activities and supports that appear to expand beyond the scope of college and job readiness experiences. Some examples are: increased instructional time, academic preparation, social-emotional skill development, and family support services.

Options:

- a. Accept the proposed outcomes and goals as they are currently drafted.
- b. FEPP Levy Outcome: Modify the overall outcome and/or the other references as appropriate in the I&E Plan to include “refugee and immigrant, homeless, English language learners, and LGBTQ students” in the list of prioritized groups.
- c. K-12 School and Community-Based Goal: Modify the goal to include elements that would be more broadly applicable to levy activities and younger K-12 students, such as increased instructional time, academic preparation, and social-emotional skill development.

2. Policy Changes and Reporting Requirements

The proposed I&E Plan contains language that would allow DEEL to modify program elements without Council approval during the seven-year term of the levy, including resource allocations and eligibility criteria.

As described in the background section above, Section 7 of the FEPP Levy ordinance states that levy proceeds may only be spent in accordance with an I&E Plan approved by ordinance. The section also specifies that the I&E Plan may be amended by ordinance. Examples of the types of modification authority included in the proposal are:

K-12 Wraparound Services: DEEL has the authority to reallocate resources over the life of the Levy as determined by program outcomes, student need, local funding opportunities, demographic changes, and district and state policy shifts. (I&E Plan, page 77)

Seattle Promise: DEEL has authority to modify eligibility criteria for tuition as implementation of the Seattle Promise program matures and performance is monitored. ... DEEL will seek the recommendation of the [Levy Oversight Committee] to implement new eligibility criteria and notify Council 30 days before new policies take effect. (I&E Plan, pages 103-104)

This type of modification authority is currently scattered throughout the proposed I&E Plan in approximately 17 sections. The Council may be comfortable with delegating some of the authority contained with the proposed I&E Plan, such as the ability to issue additional competitive funding processes. For other areas, Council may wish to retain greater control.

One model for how to handle I&E Plan modifications can be found in the SPP Implementation Plan that was approved by Council in April 2015 ([Ordinance 124749](#)). The

SPP Implementation Plan included language in the overview section of the document listing the circumstances where modifications to the Implementation Plan required Council approval via ordinance, and those that required written notification.

In addition to approval requirements or written notification, Council may also wish to specify certain topics or programs for regular reporting by DEEL. The FEPP Levy ordinance approved in 2018 only requires that annual reports be presented to the Levy Oversight Committee, although the companion resolution that was approved at the same time does request that DEEL submit annual progress reports to the Mayor and Council. As a component of this annual progress report, or on a more frequent basis, the Council could request reporting on specific levy policies, programs, or modifications where authority for changes was delegated.

Options:

- a. Accept the proposed modification authority language as currently drafted.
- b. Create a new section or appendix specifying which modifications require Council approval and/or those that require Council notification.
- c. Create a new section or appendix specifying reporting requirements.

3. Preschool and Early Learning: Seattle Preschool Program Tuition Scale

The proposed SPP tuition scale would increase subsidies for families at the higher end of the income spectrum relative to the current tuition scale.

When the Council adopted the SPP Implementation Plan in 2015, it included a sliding tuition scale that charged families with household incomes greater than 300 percent of the federal poverty level a percentage of the tuition cost. Federal poverty level takes into account both household size and income, and the tuition scale was designed such that within any given household size, families with higher incomes pay a progressively higher share of the tuition cost.

The SPP tuition scale was also designed to provide at least some level of subsidy for all participating families. In practice, the tuition scale increased up to a maximum federal poverty level of 760 percent for families, at which point those families were receiving a tuition subsidy of approximately \$535. The tuition subsidy amount is determined by comparing the tuition charged to families relative to the average amount the City pays to providers for direct services, which is referred to as the base slot cost.

The proposed I&E Plan makes a few changes to the tuition scale for SPP. First, the I&E Plan proposes to increase the “free tuition” threshold from 300 percent to 350 percent of the federal poverty level. In 2019, a family of four at 300 percent would earn \$77,250, whereas a family at 350 percent would earn \$90,125. Second, the proposed tuition scale simplifies the administrative complexity of the scale by reducing the number of steps that the scale

contains. This change is intended to allow City staff and families to more accurately estimate tuition charges prior to formal application to the program and to make program administration easier.

Third, the proposed tuition scale caps the maximum family tuition amount at \$10,000, due to the belief that this is effectively the maximum amount that can be charged without encouraging families to seek preschool services outside of SPP. When compared to the base slot cost of \$11,000, families at the top of the proposed tuition scale would receive a \$1,000 tuition subsidy. In addition, the proposed tuition scale reaches this maximum tuition amount at 711 percent of the federal poverty level, and any income increases beyond this point would not result in additional tuition increases. These tuition scale design decisions would result in increasing the tuition subsidy for higher income families relative to the current program design.

Options:

- a. Accept the proposed SPP tuition scale as currently drafted.
- b. Modify the proposed SPP tuition scale to increase the maximum annual tuition amount for families at the highest income levels. This could be achieved by increasing the maximum tuition amount, and it could include revising the number of steps and/or the family income level where tuition reaches its maximum.

4. K-12 School and Community-Based: Family Support Services

It is unclear how the FEPP Levy's investment in family support services will be utilized after the first year due to the Seattle School District's (District) effort to develop a coordinated care plan.

During the 2011 Families and Education Levy period, which is concluding with the 2018-19 school year, the City has funded family support services in two different ways: through an agreement with Public Health – Seattle and King County (Public Health), and through Elementary Innovation School investments. Public Health administers the portion of funds that are directed to the District's centralized Family Support Program. The central program allows the District to locate staff at schools based on the level of students in need, and in the 2018-19 school year the City funded five family support workers and two administrative positions in the program. The family support services provided with Innovation funds are for those schools receiving school-based investments that have chosen to fund a family support worker as a strategy in achieving their levy outcomes. In the 2018-19 school year, six schools have chosen to fund a family support worker with Innovation funds.

For the FEPP Levy, DEEL is proposing to contract directly with the District for the provision of family support services. The proposed I&E Plan states that DEEL and the District will collaborate to identify which schools will receive family support services, and allocations will be directed toward schools with high concentrations of students not meeting grade

level standards, not scoring highly or making gains on state assessments, experiencing homelessness, receiving free/reduced priced lunch support, or having chronic absenteeism.

In considering the FEPP Levy last year, the Council increased funding for family support services by \$3.6 million, for a total of \$14.5 million over the seven-year levy period, to provide resources sufficient to fund the equivalent of 15 family support workers and their associated costs. According to DEEL, the District has requested flexibility to develop a coordinated care plan for family supports in order to maximize the number of students served, and one aspect of this plan may involve utilizing different job classifications to provide services. The District is intending to develop this plan over the next year in partnership with the staff that currently provide direct services.

While this plan is being developed during the 2019-20 school year, DEEL intends to provide funding to the District to support family support workers at the elementary schools that have previously used Innovation funds for those positions, with the remainder of the funding being directed to the centralized family support worker program. Beyond the first year of the FEPP Levy, it is currently unclear how many District staff will provide family support services within schools or how those positions will be classified.

Options:

- a. Accept the proposed funding process as currently drafted.
- b. Request that DEEL provide periodic status reports to the Council during the District's development of the coordinated care plan and in advance of entering into a project agreement for the 2020-21 school year regarding how family support services will be provided.

5. Seattle Promise: Equity Across Financial Support Strategies

The proposed allocations for the Seattle Promise financial support strategies may need to be reallocated over time to ensure equity for prioritized students.

Two of the three Seattle Promise strategies described in the proposed I&E Plan provide financial support to participants to assist with the cost of attending college. The Tuition strategy is a last-dollar scholarship covering all tuition costs after federal and state supports and individual student scholarships are applied. The Equity Scholarship strategy would provide funding for non-tuition related expenses such as books, childcare, transportation, and housing for students with the highest financial need.

The companion resolution adopted in 2018 alongside the FEPP Levy ordinance requested the I&E Plan to "provide an equitable methodology for prioritizing resources to students with the greatest needs, if necessary." Page 102 of the proposed I&E Plan describes a prioritization process for the Tuition strategy if demand for tuition supports exceeds supply, as follows: "...tuition funds will be prioritized for low-income, first-generation (i.e. students

who are first in their family to attend college), and/or African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Pacific Islander, underserved Asian populations, and other students of color.”

There may be a broader equity issue, however, with the funding split between the Tuition strategy and the Equity Scholarship strategy. In general, the lowest-income students will receive sufficient federal or state tuition support to attend Seattle Colleges without requiring tuition support from the Seattle Promise program. These are the students that would be eligible for the type of financial support offered by the Equity Scholarship strategy. For students with higher incomes, they might not receive enough, or any, federal or state tuition support, and would therefore receive tuition support from the Seattle Promise program. These students would not be eligible to receive additional funding through the Equity Scholarship strategy.

This program design creates a situation where, most likely, Seattle Promise students would only be receiving financial support through one of the two strategies. The proposed I&E Plan allocates almost \$16 million over the seven-year levy period to the Tuition strategy, and a little more than \$3.6 million to the Equity Scholarship strategy. Depending on the interest in the program and the demographics of the students that participate, these allocations may be sufficient or may need to be reallocated over time to meet student need.

Options:

- a. Accept the proposed funding allocations as currently drafted.
- b. Request that DEEL provide detailed reporting to the Council during the first few years of the program, including demographic information of participants and expenditures by strategy, to ensure that the funding allocations are adequately serving prioritized groups of students.

6. Seattle Promise: Part-Time Enrollment

The proposed design of the Seattle Promise program is targeted toward students who are able to attend college on a full-time basis, thereby excluding part-time students that could benefit from the program’s support.

The Seattle Promise program is proposed to operate under a cohort model, meaning that students enroll in college the fall immediately after high school graduation and attend full-time for two years, or up to 90 credits. Full-time enrollment is defined as a minimum of 12 credits per quarter in the Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters; attendance during Summer quarter is optional. As described on page 107 of the proposed I&E Plan: “Cohort models for higher education have proven to be successful in supporting students through program completion and building a sense of peer support, family, and belonging.”

According to data from the National Center for Education Statistics, located within the U.S. Department of Education, 38 percent of all students that enrolled in degree-granting post-secondary institutions in 2016 attended part-time. When refined to only consider enrollment in two-year institutions, the part-time attendance number grows to 62 percent. Seattle Colleges is experiencing similar enrollment attendance rates this year: 36 percent of students are enrolled full-time, and 64 percent are enrolled part-time.

The Seattle Promise program is targeted toward students enrolling in college for the first-time directly after high school graduation. Of the total Seattle Colleges enrollment of almost 25,000 students, only about 1,100 are students that are recent high school graduates. Part-time enrollment for this population is 43 percent.

Given that a large percentage of students enrolling in two-year institutions, and in Seattle Colleges specifically, attend part-time, the program as currently proposed may fail to serve a significant number of students that could benefit from the program's support.

One avenue for serving part-time students would be to allow students within the Seattle Promise program to attend part-time on a temporary basis if necessary. According to Seattle Colleges, Seattle Promise students may appeal to enroll less than full-time on a quarterly basis, so long as they maintain Satisfactory Academic Progress (see item 7 below for a description of Satisfactory Academic Progress). As currently drafted, the proposed I&E Plan does not adequately describe this flexibility for program enrollment.

The second avenue for serving part-time students would be to open up Seattle Promise to students that want, or need, to attend college exclusively part-time. Developing the policies and requirements for exclusive part-time attendance would require a collaborative effort between the City and Seattle Colleges to ensure that a part-time program was designed to encourage completion of a credential, certificate, degree, or transfer to a four-year institution. This effort may align with the Racial Equity Toolkit process that DEEL is proposing to complete in early 2021 related to expanding access to Opportunity Youth and public charter school students, for phase-in with the class of 2022.

Options:

- a. Accept the proposed cohort model as currently drafted.
- b. Amend the enrollment description to clarify that part-time enrollment is available through a quarterly appeals process.
- c. Amend the description of potential program expansion to Opportunity Youth and public charter school students to include part-time students.

7. Seattle Promise: Satisfactory Academic Progress

At the March 13 GESCNA-Ed Committee meeting, Councilmembers requested additional information on the Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) eligibility milestone for the Seattle Promise program.

Students participating in Seattle Promise must meet a variety of milestones to remain eligible for the program. The complete list of eligibility milestones can be found on page 103 of the proposed I&E Plan; one of the milestones is maintaining SAP as determined by the Seattle College campus that the student attends. In general, SAP requirements are determined by individual colleges and are applicable to all students that are not covering their education costs independently (i.e. without federal or state aid).

There are three central elements to SAP requirements:

- Maintaining a minimum cumulative grade point average (2.00)
- Earning a minimum percentage of credits relative to the number of credits attempted (50–67 percent)
- Making sufficient progress toward completion of the degree or credential (125–150 percent of the normal program duration)
 - For instance, a student pursuing a degree that requires 90 credits would need to complete the degree within 135 attempted credits.

Student performance is reviewed both annually, prior to the awarding of financial aid, and quarterly, after grades are posted. Depending on their current status, students not meeting SAP requirements are either placed into a warning status, where they remain eligible for financial aid but need to demonstrate improvement in subsequent quarters, or become ineligible for financial aid. Students may appeal their ineligibility status and, if successful, are placed into a probationary status.

Options:

- a. Accept the eligibility milestones as currently drafted.
- b. Amend the proposed I&E Plan to include in the Racial Equity Toolkit process for Seattle Promise an evaluation of whether Satisfactory Academic Progress requirements are disproportionately affecting certain groups of students, which may suggest that adjustments are needed to program supports.

8. Seattle Promise: Connecting Students to Resources

The proposed I&E Plan may not contain sufficient detail with respect to the types of programs and services to which students should be referred and connected by college advisors.

At the March 13 GESCNA-Ed Committee meeting, Councilmembers expressed interest in ensuring that Seattle Promise students would be informed about, and connected to, complementary services or assistance programs for which they may be eligible. This referral and connection would be especially important for those students that are eligible for the Equity Scholarship. As currently described in the proposed I&E Plan, one of Seattle Promise's implementation strategies is to provide advising support to students beginning in high school and continuing throughout their 13th and 14th years.

During their time at Seattle Colleges, students would be required to meet with an advisor at least quarterly. In addition to providing program and course registration guidance, the advisor would be responsible for supporting students in completing annual financial aid files and referring and connecting students to proper campus supports. The proposed I&E Plan also states, on page 108, that "Seattle Promise students will have access to non-FEPP-funded supports to promote preparation for life beyond college."

These descriptions imply that students would be connected to at least some assistance programs for which they may be eligible, but the proposed I&E Plan does not explicitly describe the range of programs and services that may be applicable to students eligible for the Equity Scholarship. Council may wish to provide additional specificity with regard to the types of programs and services to which students should be referred.

Options:

- a. Accept the student advising and support description as currently drafted.
- b. Amend the proposed I&E Plan to provide additional direction regarding the types of referral and connection services that should be provided by Seattle College advisors.
- c. Request that DEEL include in its annual reporting to Council the referral rates of Seattle Colleges advisors and successful student connections to applicable assistance programs.

Attachments:

1. Updated Priorities Reference Table – Page 115 of FEPP Levy I&E Plan

cc: Kirstan Arestad, Central Staff Director
Dan Eder, Central Staff Deputy Director

V.II Resolution 31821 Policy Guide

Table 30. Guide to Locate Content detailed by Council in Resolution 31821		
Council Priorities	Section	Page(s)
Underspend	Quality Implementation and Management of Investments	22 <u>21</u>
Outcomes-based accountability	Quality Implementation and Management of Investments	25 <u>21</u>
Annual progress reports	Quality Implementation and Management of Investments	25 <u>21</u>
Child care mentorship program	Preschool and Early Learning (See: Strategy #7: Family Child Care Mentorship and Quality Supports)	55 <u>49</u>
Homeless child care program	Preschool and Early Learning (See: Strategy #6: Homeless Child Care Program)	53 <u>47</u>
Seattle Preschool Program (SPP) Expansion	Preschool and Early Learning (See: Strategy #1: Preschool Services and Tuition, How will Preschool Services and Tuition be managed and phased in?)	40 <u>34</u>
10-hour per day preschool model	Preschool and Early Learning (See: Strategy #5: SPP Child Care Subsidies, What are SPP Child Care Subsidies?)	52 <u>47</u>
Parent-Child Home Program (PCHP)	Preschool and Early Learning (See: Alignment with City Resources)	36 <u>30</u>
Child Care Assistance Program modifications (CCAP)	Preschool and Early Learning (See: Alignment with City Resources)	36 <u>30</u>
School-Based Investments	K-12 School and Community-Based (See: Spending Plan)	63 <u>56</u>
Family support programs	K-12 School and Community-Based (See: Strategy #3: Wraparound Services, Family Support Services)	77 <u>70</u>
Opportunity & Access	K-12 School and Community-Based, (See: Spending Plan)	63 <u>57</u>
Student homelessness	K-12 School and Community-Based (See: Strategy #3: Wraparound Services, Homelessness/Housing Support Services)	77
Investment in technical skill and pre-apprenticeship programs	K-12 School and Community-Based (See: What are the key elements of School-Based Investments/Opportunity & Access? <i>Expanded Learning and Academic Support</i> and <i>College and Career Readiness</i>)	67 <u>64</u> ; 74 <u>70</u>
Nova High School SBHC	K-12 School Health (See: Strategy #1: School Based Health Centers, How will School Based Health Center investments be managed and phased in?)	99 <u>91</u>
Seattle Promise equity focus	Seattle Promise (See: Alignment with RSJI)	110 <u>101</u>
Partnership	Seattle Promise (See: Spending Plan)	110 <u>100</u>