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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE PUBLIC EDUCATION ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

Fourteen school programs are currently being funded through PEEF resources. The goals of each program and key findings is described as follows:

**S.L.A.M.**

- Athletics: To provide athletic opportunities to students at all SFUSD middle and high schools. Since inception of the fund, a total of at least 6,000 middle and high school students were served annually.

- Physical Education: To promote K-12 physical education curriculum for every child. Since full inception of the fund, 21 new physical education teachers were hired and taught at least 20,000 students of all school levels annually.

- Libraries: To provide teacher librarians that create school library programs at all school sites. Since inception of the fund, the number of certified teacher librarian increased from 5 to 55 in 4 years and the number of students served from 3750 to 14700 of all school levels.

- Visual and Performing Arts: To provide access and equity in arts education for every SFUSD student during the curricular day. Since inception of the fund, full time arts teachers increased from 13 to 43 and the number of students increased 11,328 to 21,102.

**Third-Third**

- Academic Coaching: To provide teacher coaches at non-STAR school sites to support math and language arts teacher instruction. Since inception of the fund, overall professional development to teachers increased 99% (from 14,167 to 28,210) and served 705 teachers.

- Career Technical Education (CTE): To improve instructional programs within career academies and pathways model. Since inception of the fund, a CTE teacher was hired that was instrumental in 55% increase in the number of students enrolled in career academy and CTE programs from 737 to 1140.

- Custodial Services: To provide a cleaning crew for Children’s Centers and increased staffing at schools with additional needs. Since inception of the fund, all 37 Children Centers had deep cleaning and elementary school custodial staff increased by .5 full-time equivalent (FTE) to 14 school sites.

- Formative Assessments: To provide multiple performance measures and tools for all teachers to inform instruction. Since inception of the fund, 13,413 students has taken a 4th, 7th, and 9th grade writing assessment as well as 23,000 students taken math assessments.
• General Infrastructure: To build and provide capacity in evaluation and coordination of all PEEF programs. Since inception of the fund, the program coordinator developed a PEEF website with an abundant PEEF-related resources and coordinated completion of the spending plans for each program. The program evaluator has created surveys, filmed PEEF programs in action, and built capacity for evaluation with each program manager.

• Human Resources Recruitment: To recruit a diverse, highly qualified teacher workforce. Since inception of the fund, number of classes being served by Teacher Academy teacher aides increased 41% from 850 to 1200.

• Peer Resources: To empower students to be leaders in their own lives, in their schools, and in their communities. Since inception of the fund, the number of students served in direct service programs and activities increased 932 to 2690 in 2 years.

• Student Support Professionals: To provide site based services to improve the social and emotional learning of students. Since inception of the fund, the ratio of Student Support Professionals to elementary school students increased from 1:1207 to 2:680 and 0:10881 to 2:1447 for middle school students.

• Translation and Interpretation: To provide all Limited English Proficiency (LEP) parents with equal access to information and services with translation and interpretation services at school sites and central office. Since inception of the fund, the number of translated pages in Chinese and Spanish increased over 200% from 1489 to 4750 pages.

• Violence Prevention: To create school environments that demonstrates a high degree of caring relationships, high expectations and youth involvement. Since inception of the fund, the number of students receiving conflict resolution increased 173% from 234 to 640.

• Wellness Centers: To improve the health, well-being, and educational outcomes of high school students. Since inception of the fund, the remaining 4 high schools without Wellness Centers gained a wellness staff, which includes a Wellness Coordinator, a nurse, and community health outreach workers. The number of students accessing Wellness services at the 4 high school sites increased 15% from 1041 to 1200 in 2008 while none were served before 2007.

**Key Recommendations**

• Departmental monitoring of PEEF resources that are managed by the school sites is crucial for accountability of how the funds are being used as well as assessing their impact.

• Creating an evaluation welcoming culture that is collaborative between program managers and program evaluator that builds capacity for an evaluation infrastructure that is specific to each unique program.

• Monitoring each outcome measures on an annual basis to provide reliable and accurate reportable data.
**PROGRAM DESIGN**

**PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

In March 2004, voters of San Francisco approved the Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF), formerly known as Proposition H., which created a City funding stream from 2005 through 2015 to increase funding for SFUSD. The City and County of San Francisco fund is divided into three funding streams each receiving one third of the total funds: 1) Preschools, 2) Sports, libraries, art & music (S.L.A.M.), and 3) Other educational supports (The Third-Third) including in-kind services provided by the City such as the Department of Children Youth and Families services, City light, heat and power resources, and Department of Public Health services comprise the top in-kind supports. The first third is allocated to the First Five Commission of San Francisco, while the other two-thirds are allocated to San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD).

The Charter funding requirements by fiscal year are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005-06</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006-07</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007-08</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>$45 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-2015</td>
<td>Annual contributions grow from $60 million by the rate of change in discretionary revenues*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**

The following are the program goals developed by the program managers:

- **Athletics**: To provide accessible, well coached, safe, and well supported athletic opportunities to students at all SFUSD middle and high schools.

- **Physical Education**: To promote a quality K-12 physical education curriculum for every child through participation in a comprehensive, sequential physical education system that promotes physical, mental, emotional, and social well-being.

- **Libraries**: To provide highly-skilled and effective teacher librarians that create school library programs at all school sites in which all students engage and increase accountability.

- **Visual and Performing Arts**: To provide access and equity in arts education (both arts as a discrete discipline taught by certificated teachers and arts infused academics) using San Francisco as the campus for every SFUSD student, at every school, during the curricular day.

---

* Discretionary revenue refers to the unrestricted funds that the City & County of San Francisco has flexibility in allocating to various programs, services, or other agencies in the city.
• Academic Coaching: To provide highly skilled and effective teacher coaches at non-STAR school sites to support students' access to grade level content from teachers who deliver instruction that engages students in active learning.

• Career Technical Education: To improve instructional programs within career academies and pathways model, improve and expand career academies and pathways programs to underserved SFUSD students, and improved enrollment, attendance, and completion of post-secondary programs of Career Technical Education (CTE) students.

• Custodial Services: To provide a general cleaning crew for Children's Centers and increased staffing at schools with additional needs.

• Formative Assessments: To provide multiple performance measures and tools for all teachers to inform instruction and for all learners to demonstrate understanding and to reflect on their own learning.

• General Infrastructure: To build and provide capacity in evaluation and coordination of all PEEF programs.

• Human Resources Recruitment: To recruit a diverse, highly qualified workforce; to train, support and retain talented employees such as high school students as Math/Algebra teachers aides to teacher leaders and to provide efficient, responsible, quality customer service.

• Peer Resources: To empower students to be leaders in their own lives, in their schools, and in their communities. Students trained as Peer Leaders gain the skills and knowledge necessary to look critically at their schools and communities and take action to improve them.

• Student Support Professionals: To provide site based services to improve the social and emotional learning of students as a crucial part to improving academic performance.

• Translation and Interpretation: To provide all Limited English Proficiency (LEP) parents with equal access to information and services by maintaining and expanding translation and interpretation services at school sites and central office.

• Violence Prevention: To create school environments that demonstrate a high degree of caring relationships, high expectations and youth involvement so that students demonstrate high levels of engagement, self-efficacy, participatory and inclusive learning for all groups of students.

• Wellness Centers: To improve the health, well-being, and educational outcomes of high school students through the provision of coordinated prevention and early intervention services including health education, behavioral and physical health services, and related support services at the school site.

**Program Activities, Resources, and Impact**

The following describes a summary of what each program provided, how the monies were used, and the eventual impact of the monetary resource:
S.L.A.M.

- **Athletics** began receiving PEEF funds in 2005. This program involves extracurricular individual and team sports in middle and high schools. The funds were used for coaches salaries, medical supplies for sports injuries, athletic equipment, rental of athletic facilities, athletic trainers, field referees, security, transportation, professional development and athlete tutorials, and school site athletic program expenditures. Since inception of the fund, a total of at least 6,000 middle and high school students served annually.

- **Physical Education** began receiving PEEF funds in 2006. This program provides a state mandated physical fitness curriculum during the school day for elementary, middle, and high school students. The funds were used for new elementary and secondary level physical education equipment, professional development, site coordinators, departmental and site staffing, and intramural funding. Since full inception of the fund, 21 new physical education teachers were hired and taught at least 20,000 students of all school levels annually.

- **Libraries** began receiving PEEF funds in 2005. This program manages the school libraries for elementary, middle, and high schools. The funds hired full-time teacher librarians, supplied library books, materials, and supplies as well as online subscription resources, computers, departmental staffing, and professional development. Since inception of the fund, the number of certified teacher librarian increased from 5 to 55 in 4 years and the number of students served from 3750 to 14700 of all school levels.

- **Visual and Performing Arts** began receiving PEEF funds in 2005. This program heads the arts education in all school levels. The funds provided arts teachers and specialists, departmental staffing, site based art coordinators, professional development, and support for a yearly citywide event called Young at Art Festival showcasing student art work in various art mediums. Since inception of the fund, full time arts teachers increased from 13 to 43 and the number of students increased 11,328 to 21,102.

**Third-Third**

- **Academic Coaching** began receiving PEEF funds in 2007. This program has been providing instructional support from teacher coaches that help teachers at non-STAR school sites to deliver instruction that engages students in active learning. Funding supports staffing of math and language arts coaches. Since inception of the fund, overall professional development to teachers increased 99% (from 14,167 to 28,210) and served 705 teachers.

- **Career Technical Education (CTE)** began receiving PEEF funds in 2007. The CTE program handles the career academy and pathways instruction geared toward the underserved SFUSD high school students. Specifically, technology education and City College of San Francisco dual enrollment opportunities are provided to offer career-relevant skills and education after graduation. The funds provided a full-time CTE instructional specialist to support, educate, and manage the CTE program at various school sites. Since inception of the fund, a CTE teacher was hired that was instrumental
in 55% increase in the number of students enrolled in career academy and CTE programs from 737 to 1140.

- **Custodial Services** began receiving PEEF funds in 2007. This program performs deep cleaning for child development centers and continual custodial staffing at elementary schools to provide a clean and safe environment. Since inception of the fund, all 37 Children Centers had deep cleaning and elementary school custodial staff increased by .5 full-time equivalent (FTE) to 14 school sites.

- **Formative Assessments** began receiving PEEF funds in 2008. This branch of assessments manages and creates the district-wide formative assessments program that provides consistent informative feedback in instruction for teachers and performance for students. Funding supports staffing, administrative costs, and maintenance of the Online Assessment and Reporting System (OARS) for site administrators. Since inception of the fund, 13,413 students has taken a 4th, 7th, and 9th grade writing assessment as well as 23,000 students taken math assessments.

- **General Infrastructure** began full force in 2008 with both coordinator and evaluator building the capacity of the program managers, the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), and the funding source as a whole. Since inception of the fund, the program coordinator developed a PEEF website with an abundant PEEF-related resources and coordinated completion of the spending plans for each program. The program evaluator has created surveys, filmed PEEF programs in action, and built capacity for evaluation with each program manager.

- **Human Resources Recruitment** began receiving PEEF funds in 2007. This program within the Human Resources department focuses on recruiting a diverse, highly qualified workforce as well as training and supporting and retain talented employees. Funding supports high school students working as teacher aides, training and professional development for Master Teachers as well as recruitment staffing costs. Since inception of the fund, number of classes being served by Teacher Academy teacher aides increased 41% (from 850 to 1200).

- **Peer Resources** began receiving PEEF funds in 2006. This program provides middle and high school courses that serves to empower students to be leaders in their own lives, schools, and communities. Along with the San Francisco Education Fund, funding supports 8 full-time Peer Resources teachers. Since inception of the fund, the number of students served in direct service programs and activities increased 932 to 2690 in 2 years.

- **Student Support Professionals** began receiving PEEF funds in 2005. This program provides the mental health services in all school levels in varying capacities. Funding supports hiring onsite social workers or nurses as well as staff professional development, administrative costs, and an external evaluator. Since inception of the fund, the ratio of Student Support Professionals to elementary school students increased from 1:1207 to 2:680 and 0:10881 to 2:1447 for middle school students.
• **Translation and Interpretation** began receiving PEEF funds in 2007. This department provides translators and interpreters in Chinese and Spanish for the monolingual families in SFUSD at various types of meetings within the district. Funding supports staffing, interpretation equipment and supplies for translation, and external language services for certain languages not covered by the departmental staff (Tagalog, Russian, Vietnamese, Arabic and Samoan). Since inception of the fund, the number of translated pages in Chinese and Spanish increased over 200% from 1489 to 4750 pages.

• **Violence Prevention** began receiving PEEF funds in 2007. This site specific program intends to create a school environment free from violence that demonstrate a high degree of caring relationships, high expectations, and youth involvement that affect engagement, self-efficacy, and learning for all groups of students. Site-based fund allocations aided in programs that promotes the health and well being of students and teachers such as various violence reduction clubs or groups, workshops, development, and programming. Since inception of the fund, the number of students receiving conflict resolution increased 173% from 234 to 640.

• **Wellness Centers** began receiving PEEF funds in 2007. These centers are the wellness hub of high schools that provide health services and health education to students. The funds supported four high schools (Washington, Wallenberg, June Jordan, and Newcomer) providing wellness coordinators, nurses, and community health outreach workers as well as funding for an external evaluator, supplies and materials, and other administrative costs. Since inception of the fund, the remaining 4 high schools without Wellness Centers gained a wellness staff, which includes a Wellness Coordinator, a nurse, and community health outreach workers. The number of students accessing Wellness services at the 4 high school sites increased 15% from 1041 to 1200 in 2008 while none were served before 2007.

Figure 1 displays the PEEF funding breakdown into two pie graphs. The first graph shows the funding divisions within S.L.A.M. and the second graph shows the funding divisions within the Third-Third programs also known as other educational uses.

Chart 1 describes the interconnected stakeholders of the City and County of San Francisco and SFUSD. The arrows represent the direction of communication and rectangles and ovals represent the different stakeholders and governing officials.
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EVALUATION DESIGN

Table 1 details the evaluation design with 6 guiding evaluation questions. In this model, each goal is program specific and unique. Although each program has unique goals, the methodological approaches are relatively similar in order to make valid comparisons across programs. A mixed method design is crucial to extract breadth and depth of impact in every program.

STAGES OF EVALUATION

Four stages of evaluation were framed to provide an evaluation plan that is adaptive to fit the needs of each unique PEEF program. Given that each PEEF program possess differing capacities and capabilities of program evaluation and that program evaluation is most effective when it is collaborative and participatory with program management, the Program Evaluator sought fit that each program would be placed in a different level of program evaluation based on what outcome measures needed to be devised, the staffing resources of each program, and the time availability of the General Infrastructure team which consists of program evaluation and development staff.

Categorizing each program within four stages of the continuum of evaluation capacity building allows the General Infrastructure team to be more accountable and provide appropriate monitoring of program evaluation across all programs. The continuum of the 4 stages of evaluation means that each evaluation stage is built upon the prior stage, so the first stage represents the most basis evaluation plan while the fourth stage represents the most comprehensive plan.

STAGE I-LOGIC MODEL

Since each school area covers a unique aspect of the school experience, each program manager of each respective program in collaboration with the program evaluator were asked to developed a logic model detailing their monetary inputs, service outputs, and performance measure outcomes, which were guided by their program goal (See Appendix – Figure 4). The main purpose of developing this pragmatic approach was to understanding each PEEF funded program in two folds: 1) Program understanding-to provide each program manager an infrastructure that could be uniformly quantified, measureable, and compared across all PEEF funded programs, and 2) Program improvement-to aid program mangers in visually grounding their unique goal, activities, and eventual impact of their services which informs each program their function and purpose of all activities performed and possibly making modifications on priorities. Logic models are intended to be the roadmap for each program to set a foundation of understanding and accountability to guide programs in reaching their intended goal.

STAGE II- PERFORMANCE MEASURES CHART

In addition to the visual diagram of a logic model, a series of performance measures tailored specifically to the program goal of each area. This chart provides a yearly longitudinal snapshot of program performance in regards to how their monetary resources translate into quantifiable and concrete activities performed. The performance measure chart (PMC) functions as an accountability system across all PEEF programs that archives the actual, targeted, and projected figures of their performance measures (See Appendix – Table 5). The chart has three sections that matches the components in the logic model: 1) Inputs are only monetary figures listing all the expenditures of each line item specified, 2) Outputs are the program activities defined in quantifiable terms, and 3)
Table 1 - Evaluation Design Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Instruments/ Sources</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Report/Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has PEEF funding been spent consistently with PEEF directives?</td>
<td>1. Program logic model: Inputs, Outputs, and Outcomes</td>
<td>1. Qualitative methodology:</td>
<td>1. Existing district data files: on archival network (Student Information System)</td>
<td>1. Compare student standardized testing scores longitudinally.</td>
<td>1. Promote a data driven strategic plan by referencing the usefulness of the new funds for PEEF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How efficient and cost effective have PEEF expenditures been?</td>
<td>2. Classroom observations and videotaping data</td>
<td>2. Classroom observation</td>
<td>2. District-created instruments</td>
<td>2. Compare students’ attitude and well being (joyful learning) throughout PEEF implementation.</td>
<td>2. Promote an analytical dialogue from all PEEF stakeholders that will encourage more effective collaboration in areas of program improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the longitudinal annual impact of inputs, outputs, and outcomes of each PEEF program?</td>
<td>3. Performance Measure Chart</td>
<td>3. Videotape classroom activities</td>
<td>3. Standardized instruments</td>
<td>3. Examine the relationship of how PEEF programs affect effort optimism, student engagement, academic achievement, accountability, and equity.</td>
<td>3. Establish database and software application protocols in regard to tracking the funds that benefit students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do the PEEF program impacts align with the Balanced Score Card, the strategic plan of SFUSD?</td>
<td>4. Program logic model: Impact</td>
<td>4. Semi-structured interviews of key informants (e.g., teachers, students, &amp; parents)</td>
<td>4. Video camcorder for documentation of PEEF program impact</td>
<td>4. Summarize and examine professional development evaluation data for quality and relevance to improving instructional practices of PEEF programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the barriers to meeting each PEEF program goals?</td>
<td>5. Program Manager dialogue; program logic model: External factors</td>
<td>5. PEEF program tracking data (e.g., number of students in athletic teams or how many nurses are hired for the current fiscal year) as well as budget officers who provide financial figures for the performance measures.</td>
<td>5. PEEF program tracking data (e.g., number of students in athletic teams or how many nurses are hired for the current fiscal year) as well as budget officers who provide financial figures for the performance measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What are the assumptions of each PEEF program that allow the goals to be met?</td>
<td>6. Program Manager dialogue; program logic model: Assumptions</td>
<td>6. Research findings local, state, and national.</td>
<td>6. Research findings local, state, and national.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes are the impact measures usually based from qualitative or quantitative data. Although each program may have varying numbers and types of performance measures within each section, it was crucial to uniform certain measures for comparisons across programs. These uniform measures include number of students served by the program, number of professional development attended paid by PEEF, and number of staff funded by PEEF. Each program manager updates this chart annually.

**STAGE III-OUTCOME MEASURES DEVELOPMENT**

The third section of the PMC is devoted to outcome measures that illustrate through quantitative or qualitative data the impact of the program on the entire school community paying particular attention to students. Some programs have developed their own outcome measures and have been collecting outcome data through primarily surveys, however some programs have none. The role of the program evaluator is to collaborate with the program manager to develop the outcome measures that examine how impactful their services were for all the stakeholders in the school community (students, family, school staff, and administrators). This overarching goal of this kind of participatory approach is to develop valid, reliable, and relevant outcome measures specific to each program goal.

**STAGE IV-SUSTAINABILITY**

The last stage of evaluation is the continual up keeping of all three evaluation tools: the logic model, PMC, and outcome measures. This refers to updating each evaluation component annually to maintain program effectiveness. Ideally, program staff will refer to their logic model, PMC, and outcome measures to guide them in program improvement and examining the longitudinal impact their program has had on the school community. As with many educational programs, statistical effects of a program are not evident until a program is well-grounded and well-established, thus it is vital to have sustainability in evaluation to illuminate those effects when they occur.
EVALUATION FINDINGS

STAGES OF EVALUATION

Currently, all PEEF programs have reached stages I and II. The programs developed logic models and performance measure data has been compiled as of 2008-09. The programs were asked to complete 2009-10 PMC data as targets, which are defined as the intended numbers they set to reach that fiscal year. Eight programs have fully reached stage III which includes: Physical Education, Custodial Services, Wellness Centers, Peer Resources, Human Resources Recruitment, Translation & Interpretation, Student Support Professionals, and Academic Coaching. These eight programs are approaching sustainability (stage IV) with all their evaluation tools as well. The other 6 programs have yet to work with the program evaluator to develop appropriate outcome measures.

IMPACT OF PEEF-QUALITATIVE

From April to June 2009, 25 focus groups were conducted reaching approximately 300 participants in 25 various school sites around San Francisco to inform the school sites about PEEF and to gather student, family, school staff, and administrator perspectives on the impact of PEEF as well as their top priorities of school areas that help create successfully achieving students. The focus group protocol material was translated in Chinese and Spanish. Table 2 illustrates the impact of PEEF as the number of occurrences a PEEF program was transcribed when asked what programs funded through PEEF made an impact at the school site. The priorities of school areas were based on asking the focus group participants to write down on Post-Its their top 5 school areas that contribute best for students to succeed. A total of 1260 Post-Its were tabulated and categorized into school areas. The results are presented in Figure 2.

Table 2 Qualitative Finding on PEEF Impacts Ranked in Ascending Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank ordered</th>
<th>IMPACT code</th>
<th>Code occurrence counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Computers in library</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Learning Support Professional</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Wellness Centers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>P.E. equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Peer Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Violence Prevention</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Sports uniform</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Athletic injury treatment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Weight room</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Academic Coaches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>After school program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Athletic transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Computer software in library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Learning disability support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Music equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>School facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Teacher academy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Technological resources in library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 - PEEF Categorized Priorities

PEEF Community Conversations Priorities

- Technology: 9%
- Health and Well Being: 9%
- School Food: 7%
- School Resources: 5%
- Teacher: 13%
- Extracurricular: 5%
- School class/curriculum: 17%
- College and career: 6%
- School environment: 3%
- Family/parents: 3%
- School scheduling: 2%
- After school: 2%
- Community: 1%
- Assessments and evaluation: 1%
- Miscellaneous: 1%
- Student: 7%
**IMPACT OF PEEF-QUANTITATIVE**

An online survey that has been administered asked about how much PEEF impact their school community. A total of 169 respondents completed the online survey through Google Form. The following preliminary findings are divided into two parts: 1) Demographics and 2) Impact. Most of the online respondents comprised of school staff (48%) and family (46%), who were associated with the elementary level, and non-Hispanic Caucasian (69%). The most impactful PEEF programs (the most of the responses were “Much impact”) include: libraries (68%), peer resources (59%), arts education (57%), health and mental health services (46%), physical education (45%), and athletics (38%). The programs that the respondents did not have any knowledge were academic coaching (51%), custodial services (42%), formative assessments (43%), and safer school environment (33%). Here is the summary of responses from the survey:

**Part 1-Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your role?</th>
<th>What is your school level?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator (6) – 4%</td>
<td>Elementary (73) – 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff (77) – 48%</td>
<td>Middle (37) – 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family (74) – 46%</td>
<td>High (41) – 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (1) - .1%</td>
<td>Other (1) – 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (2) – 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are you Hispanic or Latino?**

- No (144) – 91%
- Yes (15) – 9%

**What is your race/ethnicity?**

- African American (5) – 3%
- Caucasian (109) – 69%
- American Indian or Alaskan Native (1) – 1%
- Chinese (5) – 3%
- Filipino (2) – 1%
- Other Asian (4) – 3%
- Native Hawaiian (1) – 1%
- Samoan (0) – 0%
- Other Pacific Islander (0) – 0%
- Multiracial (12) – 8%
- Decline to state (12) – 8%
- Others not mentioned (8) – 5%

---

1 Google Form is a feature within Google Docs which allows free survey creation that could be emailed or published online.
### LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

The most apparent limitation of the data collected was the extremely low sample size of both the qualitative and quantitative samples. Despite having approximately less than 1% of the entire school community participate, the goals of the data collection was to examine the depth of impact rather than the breadth of impact given the limited staff capacity and limited available resources. In other words, the purpose of the data collection was to gain understanding in how to help students become successful. Reflected in the quantitative survey, some programs are only known by certain stakeholders (e.g., administrators). This lack of program knowledge limits the validity of addressing the impact of each program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEEF Programs</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Little impact</th>
<th>Some impact</th>
<th>Much impact</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Coaching</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>6% (9)</td>
<td>19% (31)</td>
<td>14% (23)</td>
<td>51% (81)</td>
<td>5% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>6% (9)</td>
<td>20% (32)</td>
<td>57% (91)</td>
<td>14% (22)</td>
<td>3% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>7% (11)</td>
<td>19% (30)</td>
<td>38% (61)</td>
<td>23% (36)</td>
<td>9% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer schools</td>
<td>3% (5)</td>
<td>11% (17)</td>
<td>21% (34)</td>
<td>28% (44)</td>
<td>33% (53)</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>5% (8)</td>
<td>11% (18)</td>
<td>16% (25)</td>
<td>23% (36)</td>
<td>42% (66)</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>4% (6)</td>
<td>16% (25)</td>
<td>16% (26)</td>
<td>14% (23)</td>
<td>43% (69)</td>
<td>6% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
<td>16% (26)</td>
<td>68% (108)</td>
<td>11% (18)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>6% (10)</td>
<td>7% (11)</td>
<td>21% (33)</td>
<td>45% (72)</td>
<td>16% (26)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Mental health</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
<td>8% (12)</td>
<td>20% (32)</td>
<td>46% (73)</td>
<td>25% (40)</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Resources</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>9% (3)</td>
<td>59% (20)</td>
<td>18% (6)</td>
<td>12% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Recruitment</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>7% (11)</td>
<td>18% (29)</td>
<td>65% (104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career pathways/academies</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>1% (2)</td>
<td>7% (11)</td>
<td>14% (22)</td>
<td>8% (12)</td>
<td>68% (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness Centers</td>
<td>2% (3)</td>
<td>3% (4)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>19% (30)</td>
<td>4% (7)</td>
<td>68% (108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUES TO CONSIDER FOR CONTINUAL IMPROVEMENT

Process Recommendations

- Departmental monitoring of PEEF resources that are managed by the school sites is crucial for accountability of how the funds are being used as well as assessing their impact.
- Ensure that accurate expenditures of PEEF is recorded and accounted in the PMC monetary input boxes.

Evaluation Recommendations

- Creating an evaluation welcoming culture that is collaborative between program managers and program evaluator that builds capacity for an evaluation infrastructure that is specific to each unique program.
- Devising new evaluation tools that compare programs to one another in a standardized format such as a quantitative survey asking about the kinds of impact resulted in PEEF resources.

Outcome Recommendations

- Refining outcome measurements that align with the program goal as well as providing valid, objective, quantifiable, and consistently collected data that addresses each program meeting its goal.
- Monitoring each outcome measures on an annual basis to provide reliable and accurate reportable data.
### APPENDIX

Table 3 – PEEF Impact Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Impact of PEEF</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Much Impact</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic coaching support for math and English Language Arts teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Arts education (includes music, visual arts, dance, theater, creative writing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Athletics (includes extracurricular individual and team sports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical education (includes all physical activities during the school day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Custodial services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Formative assessments (includes writing, algebra, and other benchmark assessments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. School library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Health and mental health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Translation and interpretation services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Peer resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Violence prevention programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>High schools only:</strong> Teacher recruitment and teacher academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>High schools only:</strong> Career pathways and career academies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>High schools only:</strong> Wellness centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4 – Logic Model Template

- **Inputs**
  - What we invest?
  - What are the measurable deliverables (products) your program offer?
  - Number of FTE staff
  - Number of students served
  - Number of professional development attended by teachers
  - Total minutes of instruction

- **Outputs**
  - What do we do? What are the measurable deliverables (products) your program offer?
  - Number of FTE staff
  - Number of students served
  - Number of professional development attended by teachers
  - Total minutes of instruction

- **Outcomes**
  - What are the results of delivering these outputs? What measurable effects do you want to see as a result of what is provided by an output?
  - Increased academic achievement
  - Increased parent involvement
  - Increase student engagement and joyful learners

- **External Factors**
  - Funding cuts
  - Teacher attrition
  - Declining student enrollment
  - Community/school’s adversaries

- **Assumptions**
  - The beliefs we have about the program, the people involved, and the context and the way we think the program will work.
  - Student engagement, parent/family engagement, pertinence
  - Stakeholder cooperation

- **Program Goal(s)**
  - Balanced Score Card:
    - Access & Equity
    - Academic Achievement
    - Accountability

- **Priorities to Consider:**
  - PEEF funding leveraged:
    - Partnerships

- **Results of**
  - Measurements of outcomes (self-made instruments, current instruments, archival means, data extraction, observational methods or other means):
    - Survey
    - Archival (number of parents participate in school meetings)
    - Classroom observations

- **Impact**
  - Diminish the predictive power of all demographic data on high and equitable student achievement by increasing the achievement of all groups of students (achievement gap) (1.1)
  - Provide authentic learning for every student (2.1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEEF Program</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for staff</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for professional development</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for supplies and materials</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PEEF funding</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FTE staff (archival)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students served (archival)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of professional development attended by staff (archival)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased academic achievement (survey)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased parent involvement (number of parent participation in school meetings)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased student engagement and joyful learning (classroom observations)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>