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Executive Summary

In March of 2004, San Francisco voters, with approval of over 70% of the electorate, passed the ballot initiative Proposition H. The passage of Proposition H established the Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF) as law within the City Charter, Section 16.123.1-10 (Appendix A). The passage of Proposition H came at a time when district resources had significantly diminished due to state and federal funding.

PEEF provides funding to improve the quality of education for the youth of San Francisco and is shared by both First 5 San Francisco and SFUSD. One-third of the total PEEF fund is allocated to First 5 San Francisco for preschool support; one-third supports SFUSD sports, libraries, the arts and music (SLAM); and the final third funds other general SFUSD programs such as Learning Support Professionals, Wellness Centers, Peer Resources, Restorative Justice, Formative Assessment, Translation Services, and Custodial Services.

This report presents an evaluation of the PEEF initiative using data through the 2010–11 school year.

Given the complexity of the programs supported by the PEEF initiative, the PEEF Office consulted with SRI International (SRI), for guidance on the assessment and communication processes. The specific work with SRI focused on streamlining and aligning current data collection activities so that the data collected is organized in a way that can be effectively analyzed and communicated to PEEF stakeholders. The overarching goal of this report is to link the investment of PEEF funding to student outcomes which ultimately show how those outcomes impact school sites and student achievement.

SRI recommended using a district-wide logic model approach that considers the PEEF initiative as a district-wide portfolio rather than 14 distinct and separate programs. The PEEF district-wide logic model provides the comprehensive coordination to link (1) the funding; (2) the program activities designed to promote access and equity; (3) immediate outcomes, such as creating a positive school climate and increasing student engagement; and (4) the long-term outcomes such as student achievement and post-graduation success. This model provides a conceptual roadmap for understanding how PEEF activities relate to outcomes, and a way to analyze data to assess PEEF’s impact on students.

The recommendations from SRI entail significant changes from the way that PEEF evaluation data has been presented and considered in the past. The overarching recommendation from SRI entails a shift in evaluation from considering programs as single and distinct entities to viewing the district-wide PEEF initiative in a comprehensive and holistic manner. To provide the rationale for this new direction in the PEEF initiative evaluation, SRI’s description of and justification for the logic model as it was presented in the final SRI report received on December 9, 2011 is included below.

Recommendations from SRI report:

Achieving the PEEF evaluation goal of measuring the impact of PEEF as a district-wide investment initiative requires an evaluation design that can measure the synergistic effect within the district of the 14 PEEF-funded programs as a whole. As an appropriate and feasible alternative to creating comparison groups through random assignment or propensity scoring, SRI recommends that PEEF use a logic model.
PEEF is a district-wide investment in a diverse yet strategic portfolio of SFUSD programs that has generated improvements in student achievement and success. The evaluation of PEEF and this report was guided by the PEEF district-wide logic model, which depicts a chain of reasoning of “if... then” statements that explain how each of the components in the model (inputs, outputs, immediate outcomes and long-term outcomes) are connected and sequential. Findings related to each of the logic model components were organized by PEEF’s goals of improving professional and instructional capacity and quality, school climate, school engagement, student physical and mental health, and ultimately, student academic achievement. Below is a summary of PEEF outputs, outcomes, and impact.

**PEEF Outputs**

PEEF-funded programs increased access and equity by increasing levels of offerings and participation related to the following areas:

1. Professional and instructional capacity and quality (e.g., qualified staff, number of physical education and arts classes offered to students, student access to libraries, and professional development for staff)
2. School climate (e.g., security at athletic events, Restorative Practices implementation at middle schools, additional custodians at elementary schools)
3. School engagement (e.g., arts instruction for elementary students, students receiving mentoring, interpretation for ELL parents)
4. Student physical and mental health (e.g., students participating in athletic teams, students served at Wellness Centers, student access to Student Support Professionals)
5. Academic achievement (e.g., students tutored by peers, City College courses offered to SFUSD students, teachers aides)

As presented in the outputs section of the report, 50 measures out of 59 measures (85%) show a positive trend, indicating that PEEF has contributed to increasing access and equity in SFUSD.
PEEF Immediate Outcomes

With these increased outputs, immediate outcomes are expected to improve. As evidenced by the data included in this report, positive trends were manifested in the following areas:

1. Professional and instructional capacity and quality (e.g., highly qualified teachers hired in SFUSD, diversity in new hires)
2. School climate (decrease in expulsion rates, decrease in suspension rates for middle school students, increase in students’ experience of a positive school climate)
3. School engagement (improved attendance rates)
4. Student physical and mental health (e.g., aerobic capacity of students)

This report presents data for 75 immediate outcome measures, 29 of which show change over time, 16 of which compare participants with nonparticipants, and 30 of which show 2010–11 data snapshots. Of the measures showing change over time, 22 out of 29 (76%) display a positive trend, indicating that PEEF has contributed to improving professional and instructional capacity and quality, improving school climate, increasing school engagement, and improving student physical and mental health.

PEEF Long-Term Outcomes

With the progress made toward these immediate outcomes it is reasonable to expect increases in student achievement. When student achievement was examined, it was found that GPA and CST ELA and CST math scores improved district-wide. This report presents data for 20 long-term outcome measures, 14 of which show change over time, 2 of which compare participants with nonparticipants, and 4 of which show 2010–11 data snapshots. Of the 14 measures showing change over time, 13 (93%) display a positive trend.

A considerable majority of the PEEF outcomes (81%) show a positive trend. District-wide data indicates that SFUSD is moving in the right direction; over the course of the PEEF years most of the key district-wide indicators of student success have improved. Since PEEF funding was initiated in 2004–05, attendance rates have increased; GPAs have increased; CST ELA and math scores have improved for all school levels. Data and anecdotal feedback indicate that activities conducted as a result of PEEF funding have contributed to this positive trend.

This pattern of positive increases in both outputs and immediate outcomes indicate that the PEEF initiative has made significant progress in improving long-term outcomes for students in SFUSD. PEEF funding has been paramount to SFUSD during a time period of state budget cuts and decreases in funding. The fact that key indicators in SFUSD have increased during a time of major funding cuts is impressive, and data indicates that PEEF contributed to this trend.

This report is a first step in an effort to follow a logic model approach to evaluating the PEEF initiative. To test the pathways in the PEEF logic model, the PEEF Office will continue to collect and report relevant and meaningful measures of outputs and outcomes. The PEEF Office has started this process by following recommendations from SRI on how to enhance PEEF data. In particular, the PEEF Office will continue to focus on collecting data to show the changes from pre-PEEF to the current year, and, when student level data is available, examine the differences between students served by PEEF and those not
served by PEEF. In addition, the PEEF Office will work with PEEF program managers to strengthen program capacity to collect high-quality data, as well as develop a PEEF data management system.
Report Overview

This report presents an evaluation of the Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF) initiative using data through the 2010–11 school year.

Given the complexity of the programs supported by the PEEF initiative, the PEEF Office consulted with SRI International (SRI), for guidance on the assessment and communication processes. The specific work with SRI focused on streamlining and aligning current data collection activities so that the data collected is organized in a way that can be effectively analyzed and communicated to PEEF stakeholders. The overarching goal of this report is to link the investment of PEEF funding to student outcomes which ultimately show how those outcomes impact school sites and student achievement.

SRI recommended using a district-wide logic model approach that considers the PEEF initiative as a district-wide portfolio rather than 14 distinct and separate programs. The PEEF district-wide logic model provides the comprehensive coordination to link (1) the funding; (2) the program activities designed to promote access and equity; (3) immediate outcomes, such as creating a positive school climate and increasing student engagement; and (4) the long-term outcomes such as student achievement and post-graduation success. This model provides a conceptual roadmap for understanding how PEEF activities relate to outcomes, and a way to analyze data to assess PEEF’s impact on students.

Public Education Enrichment Fund Background

In March of 2004, San Francisco voters, with approval of over 70% of the electorate, passed the ballot initiative Proposition H. The passage of Proposition H established the Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF) as law within the City Charter, Section 16.123.1-10 (Appendix A). The passage of Proposition H came at a time when district resources had significantly diminished due to state and federal funding. The preamble of SEC. 16.123-1 includes the rationale for creating PEEF:

(a) The people of the City and County of San Francisco find and declare that:

1. Quality public education is highly correlated with higher earnings potential, reduced crime, lower rates of teen pregnancy and substance abuse, and greater self-esteem;

2. Urban public schools have the greatest need for comprehensive educational programs-including preschool programs, arts and music programs, sports activities, and after school programs-but often have the fewest resources to provide them;

PEEF provides funding to improve the quality of education for the youth of San Francisco (figure 1) and is shared by both First 5 San Francisco and SFUSD. One-third of the total PEEF fund is allocated to First 5 San Francisco for preschool support; one-third supports SFUSD sports, libraries, the arts and music (SLAM); and the final third funds other general SFUSD programs such as Learning Support Professionals, Wellness Centers, Peer Resources, Restorative Justice, Formative Assessment, Translation Services, and Custodial Services.
Figure 1: PEEF Initiative Funding Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year(s)</th>
<th>First 5 (Pre-K)</th>
<th>SFUSD SLAM</th>
<th>SFUSD Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Amount Received by SFUSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006–07</td>
<td>$6,666,667</td>
<td>$6,666,667</td>
<td>$6,666,667</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td>$13,333,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–08</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–09</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$45 million</td>
<td>$22,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–10</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–11</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
<td>$29,100,000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–15</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amount refers to financial support plus the cash value of any in-kind support services.

**Amount reflects submitted budget (April 20, 2010)

Note. 2008–09, 2009–10, and 2010–11 allocations reduced 25% due to City’s $100 million or more budgetary shortfall. Contributions in years 2010–11 through 2014–15 are adjusted based on the estimated percentage increase or decrease in the City’s discretionary General Fund revenues in each year.
SRI International Recommendations

In the fall of 2011, SFUSD contracted with SRI International (SRI) to provide technical assistance in reviewing current PEEF data collection activities. SRI provided direct assistance in refining and streamlining current data collection activities in order to effectively communicate PEEF activities and results. SFUSD received SRI’s final report, San Francisco Unified School District’s Public Education Enrichment Fund: Evaluation Technical Assistance Report on December 9, 2011. The report provided recommendations based on current PEEF performance measures and data, program materials, data collection tools, and information gathered through meetings and interviews with the PEEF program administrators and managers. The most significant recommendation adopted was to use a district-wide logic model approach to assess and evaluate the success of this initiative.

This report presents the PEEF initiative logic model, the arguments for using it, and available data. The next planned steps in the PEEF evaluation process is outlined in the final section of this report.

The recommendations from SRI entail significant changes from the way that PEEF evaluation data has been presented and considered in the past. The overarching recommendation from SRI entails a shift in evaluation from considering programs as single and distinct entities to viewing the district-wide PEEF initiative as an interconnected system. To provide the rationale for this new direction in the PEEF evaluation, SRI’s description of and justification for the logic model as it was presented in the final SRI report received on December 9, 2011 is included below.

SRI Report Overview

The Logic Model Approach

“Stakeholders in investment programs such as PEEF frequently want to know, “Did our investments cause improvements in outcomes of participants in the programs we fund?” To make a causal statement, one must rule out all other possible explanations for a change in outcomes, which requires rigorous and often expensive research approaches. The gold standard for measuring causality is a randomized control trial (RCT) in which service recipients are randomly assigned to intervention and nonintervention groups. This approach generates comparison groups that are similar on all other factors except their participation in the intervention being evaluated. Although an RCT is the most scientifically rigorous design for ruling out alternative explanations for impacts observed (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002), it is expensive, complex, difficult to implement, and most importantly, not feasible for evaluating complex initiatives like PEEF for multiple reasons:

- As an investment portfolio, PEEF has no clearly-defined, separately funded “intervention” to which changes in outcomes can be linked, a requirement of a RCT. PEEF funds mingle with funds from other sources to support a set of widely diverse programs that are intended to work together collectively to

improve a wide range of student and staff outcomes district-wide.

- PEEF-funded services often are voluntary and sometimes are mandatory (e.g., physical education), so participants cannot be randomly assigned to receive or not receive PEEF-funded services. The motivations for participants to self-select into a PEEF-funded program make them inherently different from nonparticipants, introducing possible explanations for differences in outcomes other than program participation.

- PEEF explicitly intends to have impacts that spread from individual program participants to others in their schools and district. For example, certain PEEF investments intend to improve overall school climate by providing specific students with peer supports or through training specific teachers in restorative practices. This intended spread of impacts beyond individual participants means that an uncontaminated comparison group whose members are not impacted by any PEEF-funded programs cannot be identified.

A statistical analysis approach that can simulate analyses of data derived from an RCT, propensity scoring, adjusts for differences in program participants and nonparticipants and estimates effects that approximate what might be obtained in an RCT (Cepeda, Boston, Farrar, & Strom, 2003; Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983, 1985). To use propensity scoring methods, programs need to collect individual, unduplicated data for participants. Currently, only a few PEEF-funded programs (e.g., athletics and the wellness initiative) identify individual program participants. Further, although propensity scoring reduces the bias resulting from self-selection of participants, it may not eliminate it completely, especially when factors such as the spread of effects from program participants to others in a school confounds the differences between participants and nonparticipants. Therefore, propensity scoring also cannot capture overall impact of PEEF investments. This type of analysis was conducted on the effects of participation in athletics, but was not considered appropriate for any other PEEF program at this time. Fundamentally, standard program evaluation designs cannot meet the needs of a PEEF evaluation because it is not a program, but an investment portfolio.

Achieving the PEEF evaluation goal of measuring the impact of PEEF as a district-wide investment initiative requires an evaluation design that can measure the synergistic effect within the district of the 14 PEEF-funded programs as a whole. As an appropriate and feasible alternative to creating comparison groups through random assignment or propensity scoring, SRI recommends that PEEF use a logic model approach to assess the results of the overall initiative and the programs its funding helps to support and to examine the relationship of program outcomes to activities and investments.

The evaluation field promotes a logic model approach for evaluating complex, multifaceted school- or community-wide initiatives because it not only produces useful and credible evaluation results, but also a valuable program or initiative planning tool that is a foundation for monitoring implementation. In fact, PEEF program managers found that the newly-created district-wide logic model helped clarify what the investment initiative intends to
accomplish and the model encouraged them to reflect on how the initiative can be strengthened.

A logic model depicts the ways in which various aspects of an initiative connect to one another and how they can be expected to produce the desired outcomes. The recommended approach to constructing a logic model is to first reach agreement with stakeholders as to the outcomes an initiative is expected to achieve and how they can be measured. “Backward mapping” is then used to identify what has to happen—what activities must occur (e.g., a specific program is funded, staff are trained to deliver it, students participate)—if the outcomes can reasonably be expected to occur. Continuing to backup from these “outputs,” the resources, or “inputs” needed to produce the outputs are identified. With these three components identified—resources needed to support activities, which must occur for outcomes to be achieved, and the outcomes desired—stakeholders can monitor both the implementation and outcomes of initiative and their relationship to each other.

Although the logic model approach cannot eliminate all alternative explanations for the outcomes measured in an evaluation, tracking data on each of the logic model components provides credible evidence regarding the actual resources committed, the level of implementation achieved, and results attained. The logic model approach for establishing impact “draws on tried and true scientific traditions of testing hypotheses about cause and effect relationships, including methods used in physical, biological, and other social sciences” (Connell & Kubisch, 1998, p. 34). Logic models have been used by many other programs and evaluations, including the U.S. Department of Education’s Promise Neighborhood’s effort, Ready Schools Miami, Kellogg Youth Initiative Partnerships, Devolution, ENLACE (Engaging Latino communities for Education), the Native American Higher Education Initiative, and the Build Initiative (Chen & Rossie, 1992; Connell & Kubisch, 1995; Golan et al., 2011; Julian, 1997; Lambur & Mayeske, 2000; Scheirer, 1999; Smith, 2011; W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2001; Weiss, 1995; Westmoreland, Lopez, & Rosenberg, 2009; Yampolskaya, Nesman, Hernandez, & Koch, 2004). In fact, as part of its effort to improve educational outcomes, the U.S. Department of Education requires successful applicants for many of its grant-making efforts to include a logic model in their proposals and funds the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy to provide technical assistance to applicants in support of logic-model development (http://www.tadnet.org/model_and_performance).

**PEEF District-Wide Logic Model**

Key PEEF-initiative components and the relationships among them is graphically represented in the PEEF logic model (Figure 2). Because PEEF is a district-wide initiative, this model measures the synergistic effect on the district of the 14 PEEF-funded programs as a whole rather than focusing on each program separately.

The PEEF logic model describes a chain of reasoning or “If... then...” statements that explain how PEEF-funded programs and activities are linked to SFUSD school and student outcomes. There are five components in the model (inputs, outputs, immediate outcomes, and two long-term outcomes), each of which is connected to the next component and is dependent on the component before it occurring.
Beginning at the left of the logic model, the PEEF logic model depicts the 14 PEEF-funded programs (inputs)—the 4 SLAM programs and the 10 Third-Third programs. If these program inputs are funded, then we would expect increases in access and equity to be produced as outputs of what those programs do—their offerings and activities, including for example, the number and types of services, events, and professional development trainings; and the numbers and types of course offerings and equipment provided; and the number and types of program participants (students, parents, and staff).

If outputs are provided and students and staff participate in them, then a set of immediate outcomes would be expected to improve. The four types of immediate outcomes specified in the logic model include: 1) increased professional and instructional capacity and quality (e.g., staff qualifications, skills, and knowledge); 2) improved school climate (e.g., greater safety and cleanliness, reduced behavioral incidents); 3) increased school engagement (e.g., increased student attendance, motivation, joy in learning, and leadership skills, and greater parent participation); and 4) improved student health (e.g., self-confidence, self-efficacy, level of stress, fitness and health knowledge and behavior).

If progress is made toward these Immediate outcomes—schools deliver higher quality instruction and have more highly qualified staff, more students feel safe in clean, orderly, and well-maintained schools, more students and parents are engaged and connected to schools, and more students are in good physical and mental health—then it is reasonable to expect that student academic achievement will improve. Extensive research has demonstrated significant links between these four types of immediate outcomes and increased academic achievement. For example, increased teacher qualifications and professional capacity have been related in multiple studies to improved student reading and math achievement levels, higher scores on high school graduation tests, and reduced gaps in student learning frequently associated with differences in household income and race/ethnicity (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb, Rockoff, & Wyckoff, 2008; Heck, 2007; Powers, 2003; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Siegrist, Weeks, Pate, & Monetti, 2009). Aspects of school climate, including students’ feeling safe at school, fewer school-wide behavioral incidents, and overall cleanliness have been associated with increased achievement, including higher grades, lower absenteeism, stronger performance on standardized achievement tests, and high school completion rates (Brand et al., 2008; Brand, Felnor, Shim, Seitsinger, & Dumas, 2003; Duran-Narucki, 2008; McEvoy & Welker, 2000; Mendel & Heath, 2004; Samdal, Nutbeam, Wold, & Kannas, 1998). Students’ school engagement, school connectedness, and motivation toward school also have been demonstrated to have significant impacts on academic achievement, particularly for at-risk urban students (Bond et al., 2007; Fenzel & O’Brennan, 2007; Malecki & Demaray, 2006; Samdal, et al., 1998). Improved student social-emotional and physical health and fitness have been found to be positively related to academic outcomes, including grade performance and high school persistence (Efrat, 2011; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Murray-Harvey, 2010).

Finally, if increases in academic achievement are attained, then we can expect that students are well on their way to becoming successful adults, ready for college and careers, and equipped with the skills, capacities, and dispositions necessary for 21st century
success—SFUSD’s Vision for Student Success. The combination of “if-then” relationships and measures presented in the PEEF logic model collectively provides strong and compelling evidence about the success of PEEF. If positive changes in immediate outcomes and academic achievement are documented and these improvements are shown to coincide with increases (or in some cases maintenance in the face of budget cuts from other funding sources) in the number and types of PEEF-funded activities and students and staff served, then it is reasonable to conclude that PEEF played an important role in that impact.”
Figure 2. Public Education Enrichment Fund (PEEF) Initiative Logic Model

**Inputs**
- **SLAM**
  - Athletics
  - Physical Education
  - Libraries
  - Visual and Performing Arts
- **Third-Third**
  - Student Support Services
  - Peer Resources
  - Wellness
  - Restorative Justice
  - Career Technical Education
  - Teacher Academy
  - Formative Assessment
  - Translation and Interpretation
  - Custodial Services
  - Teacher Recruitment

**Outputs**
- **Increased Access and Equity**
  - Offerings/Activities (e.g., number/percent/type of course offerings, course availability, services, events, equipment, professional development activities)
  - Participation (e.g., number/percent of students, teachers, staff, schools participating in offerings and activities)

**Immediate Outcomes**
- **Increased Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality**
  - (e.g., staff qualifications, staff knowledge and skills)
- **Improved School Climate**
  - (e.g., sense of safety and cleanliness, reduced behavioral incidents)
- **Increased School Engagement**
  - (e.g., student attendance at school, motivation, joy in learning, leadership skills, school connectedness, parent participation)
- **Improved Physical and Mental Health**
  - (e.g., social-emotional learning, level of stress, sense of self-efficacy, self-confidence, fitness, health knowledge and behavior)

**Long-Term Outcomes**
- **Increased Academic Achievement**
  - (e.g., graduation/dropout rates, GPA, standardized test scores, college and career preparedness)
- **Successful Adults**
  - Ready for college and careers and equipped with the skills, capacities, and dispositions necessary for 21st-century success.
Methods
The following sections of the report analyze a broad range of data related to PEEF’s activities and effects, organized by the logic model developed by SRI. The logic model provides a framework for understanding how PEEF can lead to better student outcomes. The analysis summarizes trends over time across each of the major categories in the model to provide a picture of how PEEF funds have been allocated to the district (inputs), how the funds have been used to increase access to, and equitable distribution of programs (outputs), intermediate student outcomes, and long-term student outcomes. Taken together, these trends describe the pattern of implementation and student outcomes that have actually occurred, and thus portray the extent to which PEEF is having, or not having, the intended positive effects on students, as anticipated in the design of the initiative.

In addition to the presentation of trend data, this report includes a propensity score matching study of the effects of participation in athletics, which uses a statistical matching approach to compare attendance, grades, and suspension rates of athletes with matched non-athletes. Although as explained previously, this method is not feasible for assessing the whole initiative, athletics data, which identifies individual program participants, provides an opportunity to rigorously test this program’s effects, and also suggests the kinds of effects that PEEF-funded enrichment programs can have on students.

The outcomes sections of this report also include qualitative data. The PEEF Community Advisory Committee invited students, teachers, and principals from all PEEF-funded programs to public community meetings to share their experiences and stories about how the programs are affecting students. Relevant quotes from students, teachers, and principals who attended the meetings are presented in the outcomes sections of the report.

The PEEF Office and PEEF program managers gathered the most complete data available for measures included in this report from the year before PEEF (2004–05) through the last complete year (2010–11). In all, 154 measures are included in this analysis. In addition, when a large number of measures related to the same program had similar content, only a few representative measures were included in this report. Detailed information about the data included in this report (e.g., data sources and trends for additional years) can be found in Appendix C.
Inputs: What does the PEEF initiative provide?

The first box in the PEEF district-wide logic model depicts the funds received by the PEEF program, which is considered inputs. The PEEF initiative budget for the 2010–11 school year was $29,100,000 (budget submission to the City, April 20, 2010). Included in that amount was:

- $14,550,000 for sports, libraries, the arts and music (SLAM) and $14,550,000 for Other General Uses (the Third-Third). The Other General Uses funding included: $7,526,814 for Ongoing Programs in the areas of Learning Support Services (Student Support Professionals, Wellness Initiative, Restorative Practices, and Peer Resources), Academic Support (Career Technical Education, Teacher Academy, and Formative Assessment System), Family Support (Translation and Interpretation Services), Safe and Clean Schools (Custodial Services), and PEEF Infrastructure (Teacher Recruitment and General Infrastructure). The budgets for these ongoing programs have remained consistent with 2010–11 levels.
- $4,765,511 for Reserve Funds: Allocations to the SFUSD General Operating fund (weighted student formula) to address the State budget shortfall.
- $2,257,675 for In-Kind Services (this amount is 7.75% of the total SFUSD allocation which is consistent with previous years): services received from the Department of Children, Youth and their Families; Department of the Environment; and the Public Utilities Commission.

Appendix B contains a narrative description of the 14 PEEF–funded programs as well as a description of PEEF-funded activities. Tables 1 and 2 display the amount of PEEF funding budgeted for each program in 2010–11.
# Table 1: Sports, Libraries, Arts and Music Budget 2010–11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Education Enrichment Fund</th>
<th>SFUSD 2010-2011 Detailed Budget</th>
<th>Uses - Sports, Libraries, Arts and Music</th>
<th>Budget Revision 4-20-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Physical Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.0 FTE: 15.0 FTE ES PE Specialists to provide instruction at 30 elementary schools, 2.0 FTE Elementary Implementation Specialists, 1.0 FTE Middle School Content Specialist to support 22 middle schools, 1.0 FTE High School Content Specialist to support 19 high schools, 1.0 FTE Program Administrator, and 1.0 FTE Clerk</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School PE Site Coordinators 30 coordinator stipends for 30 sites</td>
<td>$30,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations for secondary sites: $17.83 per student for 22 middle and 19 high schools</td>
<td>$506,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations for secondary Charter and County Community sites: $17.83 per student for 10 sites</td>
<td>$40,706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supplies for 30 elementary school sites</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development provided for staff and teachers administering the State mandated physical fitness test</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletics Office Allocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches Pay / Benefits - 150 coaches at $28.89/hr. + benefits</td>
<td>$752,909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Supplies</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants: Medical Personnel, Security, Officials - including 5 Athletic Trainers for high schools, 4 Emergency Medical Technicians and 11 doctors for football games, 1-4 officials per contest, approx. 400 private security guards and 140 SFPD Police Officers (from 1-5 guards and/or officers at each of event)</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Transportation for athletes - approx. 1200 trips to 500 athletic contests &amp; Playoff Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Athletic Facility Repair/Maintenance/Construction</td>
<td>$636,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-School Site Facilities Rental</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Equipment including scoreboards, track equipment, and football equipment</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development for approximately 100 coaches</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Based Allocations for 22 middle and 12 high schools</td>
<td>$450,261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,825,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Total</strong></td>
<td>$5,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBRARIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 FTE (43.5 FTE K - 8 Librarians assigned to all elementary and middle schools (86 sites) 2-3 days per week, 1.0 FTE Program Administrator, 0.5 FTE Libraries Supervisor, 1.0 FTE Teacher Librarian on Special Assignment, and 1.0 FTE Library Technician)</td>
<td>$4,020,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All schools K-12 Allocations of $5 per student for library materials, technology, or other library related resources</td>
<td>$269,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large high school partial staffing support of $25,000 per site for 12 high schools (approx. 3.2 FTEs total)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE Librarian to support 5 county, small, and alternative high schools</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations for 10 Charter Schools (funded at same rate as non charter schools) books, materials, supplies, or FTEs; at the discretion of sites</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Subscription Resources: Library research and reference databases for k-12 schools including Netrekker, Ferguson’s Careers, and Teaching Books</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology upgrade - approx. 20 computers at 20 schools, 4 printers at 4 schools, 4 LCD projectors for 8 schools</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development for 65 librarians</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,850,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBRARIES Total</strong></td>
<td>$5,250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARTS AND MUSIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.4 FTE Middle School Arts Teachers (.4 to County/Community/Court Schools) 2-5 days per site for 22 sites</td>
<td>$1,602,072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 FTE High School Arts Teachers (.6 to County/Community/Court) 1-3 days for 19 sites</td>
<td>$503,744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE Arts Teacher for County/Community/Court schools</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 FTE Arts Teachers for Charter Schools based on student enrollment 1-2 days for 10 schools</td>
<td>$198,194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4 FTE Arts Teachers serving 72 elementary schools - 2 FTE for each elementary site</td>
<td>$1,049,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations for 72 ES, 14 ML, 19 HS and 10 County Community &amp; Charter Schools for arts supplies/materials, field trips, artists-in-residence and/or credentialed arts specialists ($5.00 for E.S., $10.00 for M.S. and $10.00 for H.S.)</td>
<td>$428,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Materials/Equipment for Generalist Arts Program to support 72 elementary sites</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Education Master Plan (AEMP) Implementation Manager</td>
<td>$105,074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 FTE Visual and Performing Arts (.6 Teacher on Special Assignment &amp; 1.0 Program Administration)</td>
<td>$199,597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Elementary, Middle, and High School Arts Coordinators stipends ($750/Coordinator; includes benefits)</td>
<td>$73,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE Clerical staff to support the Visual and Performing Arts Department</td>
<td>$73,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE District-Wide Piano Technician</td>
<td>$82,109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-Wide Music Instrument Repair &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development for all principals, Arts Coordinators, and Arts and Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts Implementation Support - Consultants, Content Specialist Extended Hours</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAPA/Parent Outreach and Assessment costs</td>
<td>$6,255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young At Art (K-12) festival production</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Music Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLAM Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 2: Other General Uses Budget 2010–11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FTE/Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Professionals</td>
<td>36.5 FTE Learning Support Professionals and School District Nurses</td>
<td>$3,294,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 FTE Program Administrator and .5 FTE Administrative Support</td>
<td>$142,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,436,867</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Resources</td>
<td>Approximately 6.0 FTE Peer Resource Teachers</td>
<td><strong>$467,471</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness Centers</td>
<td>Funding for 3 Wellness Centers and 6 Newcomer Pathway Sites</td>
<td><strong>$670,552</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stipends for Youth Outreach Coordinator and Youth Outreach Workers (Leadership and youth development at 3 sites)</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Supervision for counseling interns to be placed at 6 Newcomer Pathway Sites</td>
<td><strong>$37,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$725,552</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice (Incorporates Violence Prevention)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$664,763</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Technical Education</td>
<td>- 1.0 FTE</td>
<td><strong>$100,019</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment System</td>
<td>- Data Director Database and 1.0 FTE Researcher</td>
<td><strong>$284,750</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation and Interpretation Services</td>
<td>- 4.5 FTE</td>
<td><strong>$604,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe and Clean Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Services</td>
<td>- 9.5 FTE (8.5 Custodians &amp; 1.0 Assistant Supervisor)</td>
<td><strong>$695,773</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEEF Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Academy</td>
<td>Stipends for 50 students working as teaching aides and early field work course</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended hours for six Teacher Academy Teachers</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School Outreach</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conferences and travel</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Recruitment</td>
<td>- 1.2 FTE (Approx. 0.8 FTE Recruitment Analyst + Approx. 0.4 FTE Education Credential Technician)</td>
<td><strong>$109,238</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 FTE Program Administrator</td>
<td>$116,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 FTE Program Evaluator</td>
<td>$105,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grants Writer - Contract Position</td>
<td>$143,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Advisory Committee Support</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$373,381</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,526,814</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserve Funds</strong></td>
<td>Funds in Reserve for Weighted Student Formula to Address State Budget Shortfall</td>
<td><strong>$4,765,511</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Uses Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$12,292,325</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Kind Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,550,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In kind Services Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEEF Grand Total**
Outputs: What are the levels of Access and Equity related to the PEEF initiative?

Outputs are what PEEF-funded programs “do”—their offerings and activities, including for example, the number and types of services, events, and professional development trainings; the numbers and types of course offerings and equipment provided; and the number and types of program participants (students, parents, and staff) served. The second box in the PEEF district-wide logic model depicts PEEF outputs. If PEEF programs are funded (as described in the inputs section), then increases would be expected in access and equity to be produced as outputs of what those programs do.

PEEF outputs are organized by their primary outcome theme from the logic model, including the four immediate outcomes: (1) increased professional and instructional capacity and quality; (2) improved school climate; (3) increased school engagement; and (4) improved student physical and mental health, as well as the long-term outcome of increased academic achievement. Although these outputs are presented by their primary theme, readers should be aware that many outputs are related to multiple outcomes. Research has demonstrated significant links between the four types of immediate outcomes and the long-term outcome of academic achievement.

Outputs 1: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality

What are the levels of offerings and participation related to professional and instructional capacity and quality, and what is their distribution?

Table 3 displays the data relating to how PEEF is impacting the levels of offerings, participation, and distribution that concern professional and instructional capacity and quality. As presented in this section, of the 18 outputs, all have increased over time, showing that PEEF has increased student access to quality programming and services in SFUSD. Table 3 and subsequent tables include arrows to indicate either a desired or undesired data trend. Data marked with an upward pointing blue arrow indicates a desired trend while a downward pointing orange arrow indicates an undesired trend (e.g., if suspension rate data decreases over time an upward pointing blue arrow is used to indicate a desired trend).

The measures show how PEEF funding has increased the number of qualified staff in SFUSD, e.g., number of certified arts teachers, teacher librarians, and physical education specialists, and thereby increased student access to quality instruction. For example, in 2004–05, the year before PEEF funding was initiated, 39% of students in SFUSD had access to a functioning library staffed with a certified teacher librarian. Through PEEF-funded facility improvements and hiring of 47 highly qualified personnel, 98% of schools had a functioning, staffed library, and 99% of students had access to a library staffed with a certified teacher librarian in 2010–11.
### Table 3: PEEF Initiative Outputs Related to Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality: Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/relevant data Number Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Number of PEEF-funded elementary school PE specialist FTEs</td>
<td>2004-05* 0 0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Number and percent of elementary/K-8 schools receiving PEEF-funded Program Support Option 1</td>
<td>2004-05* 0 0%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Number and percent of elementary school students at schools that receive PE instruction from PEEF-funded PE specialists</td>
<td>2004-05* 0 0%</td>
<td>11,478</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Number of PD trainings offered to elementary school classroom teachers</td>
<td>2004-05* 0 0%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of professional development trainings for PE specialists and PE teachers district-wide</td>
<td>2004-05* 0 0%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Number of athletic coaches reimbursed for at least one professional development training (PEEF-funded)</td>
<td>2004-05* 0 0%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Number of PEEF-funded certified teacher librarians FTEs in SFUSD</td>
<td>2004-05* 0 0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Number and percent of schools with a teacher librarian</td>
<td>2004-05* 20.3 17%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Number and percent of students with access to a library at their school site that is staffed with a teacher librarian</td>
<td>2004-05* 22,316 39%</td>
<td>52,297</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Number of professional development trainings provided to K-12 teacher librarians</td>
<td>2004-05* 4 39%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality</td>
<td>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/ relevant data</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Number of PEEF funded FTE arts teachers at school sites (all grade levels)</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Number and percent of schools with arts coordinators (all PEEF-funded)</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Number of arts classes offered to ES students through the PEEF funded Visual and Performing Arts Generalist program</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Number of Visual and Performing Arts classes offered to MS students</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Number of Visual and Performing Arts classes offered to HS students</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>877</td>
<td></td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Number of professional development workshops provided for PEEF funded arts teachers</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Number of Restorative Practices professional development trainings offered district wide</td>
<td>2009-10†</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Number of school site and centralized staff receiving introductory or advanced training in restorative practices as alternative methods of discipline (duplicated count)</td>
<td>2009-10†</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
†PEEF funding of program initiated in 2010-11.
Some other examples of increased student access to quality instruction are in Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA), where the PEEF-funded VAPA Generalist program in 2010–11 offered 379 arts classes to 9,371 elementary students, and in Physical Education where 15 PEEF-funded physical education specialists have been added to the staff, serving 35 schools in 2010–11, and providing 11,478 students with access to high-quality physical education instruction.

In addition to increasing quality of instruction and professional capacity in SFUSD by funding the hiring of highly qualified staff, PEEF also is funding professional development trainings for staff. For example, in 2010–11 the Restorative Justice program offered 31 trainings for staff; the Physical Education program offered 99 trainings to elementary classroom teachers and 54 trainings to physical education specialists and secondary physical education teachers; the library department offered 30 trainings to teacher librarians, and 104 athletic coaches were reimbursed for trainings.

To summarize, all measures show that PEEF has had a positive impact on the offerings and participation related to professional and instructional capacity and quality. To show the distribution of quality instruction and professional capacity, subsequent reports will include an analysis of how PEEF-funded personnel is distributed among schools and areas/zones in SFUSD.

**Outputs 2: School Climate**

*What are the levels of offerings and participation related to school climate, and what is their distribution?*

Table 4 displays the data relating to how PEEF is impacting the offerings, participation, and distribution related to school climate. Of the measures that have been categorized as relevant to school climate, six out of seven are showing a positive trend, demonstrating that PEEF has contributed to increasing access to programming and services that affect school climate.

For instance, the number of athletics events covered by security has almost quadrupled over the course of 4 years, increasing the safety at such events. Due to PEEF funding, three SFUSD schools are going through full school implementation of Restorative Justice through the Institute for Restorative Practices, and six middle schools are going through extensive Restorative Practices implementation through Educators for Social Responsibility and SFUSD’s Restorative Practices to improve school climate, and reduce suspensions and expulsions. Because of PEEF funding, the 37 Early Education Department Centers in SFUSD are receiving annual deep cleanings, and 11 elementary schools receive a 0.5 FTE custodian, keeping the schools they serve open for an additional 4 hours daily, and thereby ensuring increased cleanliness and safety at these schools. One measure shows a negative trend; number of students participating in conflict mediation through Peer Resources. This is due primarily to a reduction in funding for both PEEF and other sources.
Table 4: PEEF Initiative Outputs Related to School Climate: Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs: School Climate</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/relevant data</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Number of athletic events covered by private security guards and SFPD resources officers (100% PEEF funded)</td>
<td>2006-07*</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Number of students participating in conflict mediation</td>
<td>2006-07*</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Number of SFUSD schools going through a 2 year program of full school implementation of restorative practices (run by the International Institute for Restorative Practices, IIRP)</td>
<td>2009-10†</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Number of SFUSD middle schools implementing restorative practices through Educators for Social Responsibility and SFUSD’s Restorative Practices program</td>
<td>2009-10†</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of elementary schools receiving an additional 0.5 FTE PEEF funded custodian</td>
<td>2006-07‡</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Number and percent of SFUSD Early Education Department centers receiving deep cleaning at least once a year</td>
<td>2006-07‡</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Total number of hours daily elementary schools are open after the school day as a result of PEEF funding</td>
<td>2006-07‡</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First year of available data. PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
†PEEF funding of program initiated in 2010-11.
‡PEEF funding of program initiated in 2007-08.
**Outputs 3: School Engagement**

*What are the levels of offerings and participation related to school engagement, and what is their distribution?*

Table 5 displays the data relating to how PEEF is impacting the offerings, participation, and distribution related to school engagement. Of the 12 measures, seven show a positive increase, four show a negative trend, and one measure shows a flat trend. PEEF is affecting offerings, participation, and distribution relating to school engagement in several ways. One example is the Visual and Performing Arts program. Since PEEF started funding the program, student participation in arts classes has increased across all school levels, with larger increases at the elementary and middle school levels. Through the PEEF-funded Visual and Performing Arts Generalist program initiated in 2008–09, elementary students have been given access to quality arts programming, and in 2010–11, 9,371 elementary students were instructed by PEEF-funded certified arts teachers. At the middle school level, the percent of students enrolled in arts classes has increased from 50% in 2004–05 to 62% in 2010–11.

Because of PEEF funding, the Translation and Interpretation Unit has been able to increase the number of documents translated from 177 in 2006–07 to 456 in 2010–11 (an increase of 158%) and the number of school and district-wide events interpreted from 34 in 2006–07 to 610 (an increase of 1,694%) in 2010–11. Through the increase in documents translated and events interpreted, English Language Learner parents are given increased access to participate and engage in their children's education.

Some other examples of how PEEF is affecting offerings related to school engagement are the mentoring program offered through the Student Support Professional program which started in 2007–08, and now has 750 mentees, and the increase in number of bus trips offered to student athletes which impacts the safety of the students and increases instructional time.

The negative trends for the Peer Resources measures can be linked to funding reductions for both PEEF and other sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs: Student Engagement</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/ relevant data</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Number and percent of bus trips for athletic teams funded by PEEF</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Number of ES students receiving arts instruction through the PEEF funded Visual and Performing Arts Generalist program</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Number and percent of middle school students enrolled in Visual and Performing Arts classes</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>6,313</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Number and percent of high school students enrolled in Visual and Performing Arts classes</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>8,476</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of students participating in mentoring programs at school sites through Student Support Professionals</td>
<td>2006-07†</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Number of students who are peer mentors/peer leaders</td>
<td>2006-07‡</td>
<td>857</td>
<td></td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Number of SFUSD middle schools with a Peer Resources program</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Number of SFUSD high schools with a Peer Resources program</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Number of students who participate in support groups through Peer Resources</td>
<td>2006-07‡</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Number of students participating in site-based workshops, peer education, and special projects through Peer Resources</td>
<td>2006-07‡</td>
<td>26,101</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Number of school and district-wide events that were interpreted by the SFUSD's Translation and Interpretation Unit</td>
<td>2006-07§</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Number of translation requests from school sites and central office fulfilled by SFUSD's Translation and Interpretation Unit</td>
<td>2006-07§</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
†Mentoring program initiated in 2007-08. PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
‡First year of available data. PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
§PEEF funding of program initiated in 2007-08.
Outputs 4: Student Physical and Mental Health

*What are the levels of offerings and participation related to student physical and mental health, and what is their distribution?*

Table 6 presents the data relating to how PEEF is impacting the levels of offerings, participation, and distribution that concern student physical and mental health. Of the 17 measures, 14 have increased over time, demonstrating that PEEF has increased student access to mental and physical health services and offerings. PEEF is contributing to increasing access for students to health services and professionals in several ways. Through increasing allocations to the Student Support Professional program over the years, the number of students per Student Support Professional (School District Nurses and Learning Support Professionals) has decreased for K-5, K-8 and middle school students, increasing student access to health care professionals. However, a recent decline in PEEF funding has impacted the number of students receiving services from student support professionals.

PEEF provides funding for Wellness Centers at four high schools in SFUSD. In 2010–11, these four PEEF funded Wellness Centers provided 10,173 service hours to students at the four school sites; 1,382 students received at least one in-depth session at these four centers; and 450 students received five or more in-depth sessions. The services provided at the PEEF-funded Wellness Centers are contributing to a rise in total number of students served at Wellness Centers in SFUSD.

Through the athletics program, PEEF funded 269 coaches in 2010–11, increasing the total number of coaches in SFUSD above pre-PEEF levels. The percentage of students who participate in athletics has remained fairly stable, with an increase of 1% for high school and a decrease of 2% for middle school. To increase athlete access to injury treatment and prevention, the number of athletic trainers serving high school teams has been increased from zero in 2004–05 to five in 2010–11, providing direct services to 17% of all high school athletes in 2010–11.
Table 6: PEEF Initiative Outputs Related to Student Physical and Mental Health: Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs: Student Physical and Mental Health</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/relevant data Number Percent Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent Number Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Percent of middle school students participating in athletic teams</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Percent of high school students participating in athletic teams</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Number of middle school and high school athletic coaches funded by PEEF over total number of athletic coaches (PEEF funded athletic coaches/Total athletic coaches)</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0/464</td>
<td>269/599</td>
<td>269/135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Number of athletic trainers serving high school athletic teams</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number and percent of high school athletes receiving preventative or injury treatment from an athletic trainer</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Number of athletic facility improvements supported by PEEF funds (cumulative)</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Number of fully officiated athletic contests (games, matches, meets, and tournaments) supported by PEEF funds</td>
<td>2006-07†</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Number of students per PEEF funded Student Support Professional in ES and K-8</td>
<td>2005-06†</td>
<td>1,207/1</td>
<td>950/1</td>
<td>257/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Number of students per PEEF funded Student Support Professional in MS</td>
<td>2005-06†</td>
<td>10,881/0</td>
<td>1,343/1</td>
<td>1/1,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Number and percent of ES and K-8 students receiving individual and/or group health and mental health services through Student Support Professionals</td>
<td>2007-08†</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs: Student Physical and Mental Health</td>
<td>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/relevant data</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Student Support Professionals that are PEEF funded</td>
<td>2007-08†</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number of classroom presentations made by Student Support Professionals related to health and mental health promotion | 2007-08† | 734 |  | 716 | -18 |  |  | ↓
| Number of parent presentations offered by Student Support Professionals | 2007-08† | 58 |  | 88 | 30 |  |  | ↑
| Number of direct services hours provided to students at the PEEF funded Wellness centers | 2006-07‡ | 0 |  | 10,173 | 10,173 |  |  | ↑
| Average number of direct services hours per student who attends the PEEF Wellness centers | 2006-07‡ | 0 |  | 7.4 | 7.4 |  |  | ↑
| Number of students served at the Wellness centers and at the Wellness centers overall (receiving at least 1 counseling session) (students served at PEEF funded Wellness centers/Total students served at Wellness centers) | 2006-07‡ | 0/4,825 | 1,382/5,666 | 1,382/841 |  |  |  | ↑
| Number of students receiving 5 or more counseling sessions at the PEEF funded Wellness centers and at the Wellness centers overall (students served at PEEF funded Wellness centers/Total students served at Wellness centers) | 2006-07‡ | 0/1,144 | 450/1,414 | 450/270 |  |  |  | ↑

*PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
†First year of available data. PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
‡PEEF funding of program initiated in 2007-08.
Outputs 5: Academic Achievement

What are the levels of offerings and participation related to academic achievement, and what is their distribution?

Table 7 presents the data relating to how PEEF is impacting the levels of offerings, participation, and distribution that concern academic achievement. All of the measures presented in table 7 show positive change over time, providing evidence that PEEF is offering SFUSD students increased access to opportunities that can enhance academic achievement.

Since 2007–08, PEEF has funded a 1.0 FTE Teacher on Special Assignment through Career Technical Education (CTE) whose main task has been to facilitate collaboration between City College of San Francisco and SFUSD and internship opportunities for CTE students. Since 2006–07 (pre-PEEF), the number of city college courses offered to 11th and 12th grade students has increased from 2 to 67, and the number of students completing internships through CTE has increased by 45%.

Since 2007–08, the number of students with access to teaching opportunities through the Teacher Academy program has increased by 45%, while the number of students receiving tutoring by these students has increased by 65%. The number of students receiving tutoring from peer leaders has increased from 150 to 891 between 2006–07 and 2010–11.
### Table 7: PEEF Initiative Outputs Relevant to Academic Achievement: Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs: Academic Achievement</th>
<th>1st year of available/ relevant data</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Number of students participating in peer tutoring through the Peer Resources program</td>
<td>2006-07*</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Number of city college of SF course offering for 11th and 12th grade students organized by Career Technical Education</td>
<td>2006-07†</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Number of students completing an internship through Career Technical Education</td>
<td>2006-07†</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Number of Teacher Academy Aides</td>
<td>2007-08‡</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of students tutored by Teacher Academy aides</td>
<td>2007-08‡</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First year of available data. PEEF funding of program initiated in 2005-06.
†PEEF funding of program initiated in 2007-08.
‡First year of available data. PEEF funding of program initiated in 2007-08.
Outcomes: What are the outcomes associated with the PEEF initiative?

The third and fourth boxes in the PEEF district-wide logic model depict immediate and long-term outcomes. If the outputs described in the prior section are provided and students and staff participate in them, then a set of immediate outcomes would be expected to improve. If progress is made toward these immediate outcomes—schools deliver higher quality instruction and have more highly qualified staff, more students feel safe in clean, orderly, and well-maintained schools, more students and parents are engaged and connected to schools, and more students are in good physical and mental health—then it is reasonable to expect that student academic achievement will improve.

This section begins with a description of PEEF-initiative immediate outcomes, presented by the four theme areas of professional and instructional capacity and quality, school climate, school engagement, and student physical and mental health, followed by outcomes directly related to academic achievement.

Immediate Outcomes 1: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality

Has professional and instructional capacity and quality increased since the advent of PEEF?

Table 8 displays data relevant to the question of whether professional and instructional capacity and quality has increased since the advent of PEEF. The data in table 8 shows positive trends for all of the eight measures. Table 9 provides 2010–11 snapshots of student, teacher, principal, and parents’ satisfaction with PEEF programming.

PEEF is impacting professional and instructional capacity and quality in SFUSD in a number of ways. For example, since 2007–08, PEEF has funded the Teacher Recruitment program in SFUSD, which is responsible for recruiting, selecting, and placing new teachers. Since then, the quality of newly hired teachers has increased: in 2007–08, 90% of new hires met the No Child Left Behind standards; in 2010–11, 98% of new hires met the standards. At the same time, the number of classroom teacher positions filled on the first day of school has increased from 98.55% to 99.94%. The diversity of newly hired teachers has improved: since 2007–08, the percentage of new hires who were African Americans has increased from 3% to 5%, and the portion of new hires who were Latinos has increased from 6% to 17%.

Table 9 shows the level of student, teacher, principal, and parent satisfaction with PEEF programming in regards to professional and instructional capacity and quality.
Since the advent of PEEF, the Visual and Performing Arts program has focused on increasing student access to highly qualified arts teachers, with a particular focus on middle school. In a principal survey conducted by the PEEF Office in fall 2011, 89% (n = 11) of middle school principals agreed or strongly agreed that PEEF funds have increased the quality of PEEF arts instruction.

With a focus on improving student access to quality Physical Education in elementary schools, the Physical Education Department has, since the advent of PEEF, allocated physical education specialists and equipment, and provided professional development to school sites. In the fall 2011 PEEF Principal Survey, 88% of respondents at schools that received Physical Education Option 1 Support (includes a physical education specialist) agreed or strongly agreed that PEEF funds have helped build their school’s capacity in Physical Education. In a spring 2011 survey administered by the physical education department, 81% of the elementary classroom teachers at schools receiving physical education specialist support agreed or strongly agreed that the professional development provided by the site-based physical education specialist had helped them become better teachers of Physical Education.

With PEEF funding, the library department has increased the number of teacher librarians at all grade levels in SFUSD, and also the number of professional development trainings offered to teacher librarians. In a survey of teacher librarians in spring 2011, 95% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the professional development trainings offered by library services had helped them become a more effective librarian. In the fall 2011 PEEF Principal Survey, 63% of elementary school principals, 73% of middle school principals, and 88% of high school principals agreed or strongly agreed that PEEF libraries had helped them improve the quality of instruction at their school through partnership between teacher librarians and classroom teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Number and percent of teachers using at least one of the district's common assessments to assess student achievement</td>
<td>2006-07*</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and percent of teachers using at least one of the district's common assessments to assess student achievement</td>
<td>2006-07*</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Number of students participating in common assessments</td>
<td>2006-07*</td>
<td>16,432</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Number of teachers, principals, school site and central office staff with at least 1 log-in to Data Director/OARS</td>
<td>2007-08†</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>2976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Average number of Data Director log-ins per teacher/principal/school site staff/central office staff</td>
<td>2009-10†</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Percent of newly hired teachers who are highly qualified according to the No Child Left Behind standards</td>
<td>2007-08†</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Percent of newly hired teachers who are Hispanic</td>
<td>2007-08†</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Percent of newly hired teachers who are African American</td>
<td>2007-08†</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Percent of classroom teacher positions filled on the first day of school</td>
<td>2007-08†</td>
<td>98.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PEEF funding of program initiated in 2007-08.
†First year of available data. PEEF funding initiated in 2007-08.
### Table 9: PEEF Initiative Outcomes Related to Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality: Snapshots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcomes: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality - 2010-11 Snapshots</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Percent of SFUSD principals who agree or strongly agree that PEEF Physical Education has helped build their school's capacity in PE by providing curriculum, professional development and equipment to improve instructional quality | ES overall: 65%  
ES option 1 PE support: 88%  
MS: 91%  
HS: 67% |
| 2 | Percent of ES teachers at schools with option 1 Physical Education support who agree or strongly agree that “the professional development provided by a site-based PE specialist has helped me become a better teacher of physical education” | 81% |
| 3 | Percent of SFUSD principals who strongly agree or agree that PEEF Libraries has helped improve the quality of instruction at their school through partnership between teacher librarians and classroom teachers | ES: 63%  
MS: 73%  
HS: 83% |
| 4 | Percent of Teacher Librarians who strongly agree or agree that professional development trainings offered by Library Services helped them become a more effective librarian. | 95% |
| 5 | Percent of SFUSD principals who agree or strongly agree that PEEF funds have increased the quality of arts instruction | ES: 70%  
MS: 89%  
HS: 50% |
| 6 | Percent of teachers who strongly agree or agree that they know how to access Common Learning Assessment (CLA) results on Data Director and to make meaning out of the results | 78% |
| 7 | Percent of teachers who strongly agree or agree that they are using Common Learning Assessment (CLA) results to inform instruction and planning | 45% |
| 8 | Percent of SFUSD principals who were satisfied with the quality of the human capital workshop sponsored by the Teacher Recruitment department. | 100% |
| 9 | Percent of SFUSD principals who were satisfied with the overall customer services provided by their Human Capital Specialist | 94% |
| 10 | Percent of SFUSD parents who think that the sports, library, arts and music programs at their child's school is a very important part of their child's school life | 91% |
Immediate Outcomes 2: School Climate

Has school climate improved since the advent of PEEF?

Table 10 shows the data relating to the question of whether school climate has improved since the advent of PEEF. Of the nine measures in table 10, six display a desirable trend.

A review of SFUSD suspension data from the year prior to the implementation of PEEF funding through 2010–11, shows an overall stable trend across the district in the percent of students who are suspended (3.1% in both 2004–05 and 2010–11). The suspension rate for elementary students has increased from 0.7% to 1.1%, while the rate for high school student has increased slightly (4.4% to 4.5%). The rates for middle school students have improved considerably with a decrease from 6.1% in 2004–05 (pre-PEEF) to 5.6% in 2010–11, a reduction of 0.5%. Another indicator of school climate, expulsion rate, shows a decrease of 43% from 2004–05 (pre-PEEF) to 2010–11.

One widely used indicator of school climate in California is the School Connectedness Index from the California Healthy Kids Survey. The index is made up of questions for students regarding (1) caring adults at school, (2) high expectations by teachers and others, and (3) meaningful participation at school.

Student scores are divided into three main categories; high, moderate, and low. The survey is administered to 5th, 7th, 9th, and 11th grade students in SFUSD. Comparing the 2004–05 (pre-PEEF) results to the 2010–11 results, there is an improvement in percent of students scoring high in School Connectedness across all grade levels; the percent of 5th grade students scoring high increased from 49% to 58%, among 7th grade students from 28% to 51%, among 9th grade students from 19% to 44%, and among 11th grade students from 25% to 39%.

Since 2005–06, PEEF has funded programs that contribute to improving school climate. The positive trends in indicators of school climate included in this report (e.g., drop in number of district-wide expulsions, drop in elementary and middle school suspension rates and increases in students’ sense of school connectedness) provide evidence of PEEF’s contribution to the improvement in school climate.

Table 11 includes 2010–11 snapshots of additional data for Student Support Professionals, Wellness Initiative, and Custodial Services related to School Climate. Various programs and district-wide surveys address school climate. In 2010–11, students who participated in a mentoring program though the Student Support Professional program had a slightly higher than district average percent scoring high on the school connectedness index (58% vs. middle school average of 51% and elementary school average
of 58%). Among students who received services through the Wellness Centers, a higher percent scored high on the school connectedness index than the district average, 46% among Wellness clients versus 39% high school average. Among students who were Youth Outreach Workers (through the Wellness Initiative), a higher percent scored high on the school connectedness index than the district average, 73% among Youth Outreach Workers versus 39% high school average.

In 2010–11, 100% of principals at sites who received an additional 0.5 custodian through PEEF funding were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall cleanliness at their school site. In the annual SFUSD satisfaction survey, 87% of parents reported that they think that their child’s school is a safe place to be from early in the morning until late at night.
### Table 10: PEEF Initiative Outcomes Related to School Climate: Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: School Climate</th>
<th>1st year of available/ relevant data</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Percent of students suspended district wide</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Percent of SFUSD ES students suspended</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Percent of SFUSD MS students suspended</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Percent of SFUSD HS students suspended</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of SFUSD students expelled</td>
<td>2005-06†</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Percent of SFUSD 5th grade students who score high on the school connectedness index</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Percent of SFUSD 7th grade students who score high on the school connectedness index</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Percent of SFUSD 9th grade students who score high on the school connectedness index</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Percent of SFUSD 11th grade students who score high on the school connectedness index</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pre-PEEF, PEEF funding cycle initiated in 2005-06.
†First year of available data.
Table 11: PEEF Initiative Outcomes Related to School Climate: Snapshots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: School Climate - 2010-11 Snapshots</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   Percent of students mentored through the Student Support Professionals program who score high on the school connectedness index</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   Percent of Wellness students who score high on the school connectedness index</td>
<td>46%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   Percent of Youth Outreach Workers (YOWs) who score high on the school connectedness index</td>
<td>73%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   Percent of ES principals receiving additional PEEF funded custodians who are satisfied or very satisfied with overall cleanliness of school site</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5   Percent of SFUSD parents who think that their child's school is a safe place to be from early in the morning until late at night</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Wellness surveys are administered biennially. 2009-10 is the most recent year of data collection.
Immediate Outcomes 3: School Engagement

*Has school engagement increased?*

Table 12 shows data relating to the question of whether school engagement has improved since the advent of PEEF. Four out of the five measures presented in table 12 show a positive trend, while one trend is flat. A strong indicator of student engagement is attendance rates. Since the advent of PEEF, the district-wide attendance rate has increased from 92% to 93%. The rate for middle school has remained stable at 94%, while the elementary attendance rate has increased from 95% to 96%, and high school attendance rate from 86% to 87%.

Table 13 includes 2010–11 snapshots from program and district surveys related to school engagement. Survey results show a high level of school engagement for students, parents, and principals; 69% of elementary school students feel more motivated to go to school on the days that have Physical Education; 89% of middle school principals agreed or strongly agreed that PEEF Visual and Performing Arts has helped increase student engagement in arts in their school; and 71% of Peer Leaders report increased school engagement after participating in Peer Resources. In the 2010–11 SFUSD Satisfaction Survey, 93% of parents agreed or strongly agreed that their child’s school provides a caring, inclusive, and engaging environment for learning.

What principals, teachers, and students are saying about PEEF programs related to School Engagement...

“The Wellness Center at my school is the foundation for students to be succeeding in classes and wanting to go to college, because without them being there to support us mentally, physically and emotionally, students would not be coming to school.”
—High school student

“Without [the counselor at the Wellness Center] I wouldn’t have gotten through the years—I wouldn’t have been attending high school, because the work over there is difficult.”—High school student

“Thursday when I wake up, I feel happy because I get to dance with Miss Jackie.”
—Elementary school student

“Before I got into the band, I was coming to school with no motivation...music opened my eyes to a new world [and] showed me a side of me I never knew.”—Middle school student
Table 12: PEEF Initiative Outcomes Related to School Engagement: Change Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: School Engagement</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/relevant data</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of students exhibiting and/or performing at Young at Art festival</td>
<td>(2006-07^*)</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>11,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>District wide attendance rate</td>
<td>(2004-05^†)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ES attendance rate</td>
<td>(2004-05^†)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MS attendance rate</td>
<td>(2004-05^†)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HS attendance rate</td>
<td>(2004-05^†)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First year of available data. PEEF funding for program initiated in 2005-06.
†Pre-PEEF. PEEF funding cycle initiated in 2005-06.
### Table 13: PEEF Initiative Outcomes Related to School Engagement: Snapshots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: School Engagement - 2010-11 Snapshots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percent of ES students who strongly agree or agree that they feel more motivated to go to school on the days when they have Physical Education class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Percent of SFUSD principals who agree or strongly agree that the PEEF Visual and Performing Arts program has helped increase student engagement in Visual and Performing Arts at their school | ES: 74%  
MS: 89%  
HS: 50% |
| 3. Percent of peer leaders/mentors who, after participating in peer resources, report increased school engagement (commitment to learning composite score) | 71%* |
| 4. Percent of SFUSD parents who think that their child's school provides a caring, inclusive, and engaging environment for learning | 93% |

*2009-10 data. Item removed from 2010-11 survey.
Immediate Outcomes 4: Student Physical and Mental Health

Has student physical and mental health improved?

Table 14 shows data relating to the question of whether student physical and mental health has improved since the advent of PEEF. Of the seven measures in table 14, three show a positive trend.

As shown in the physical and mental health output section of this report, PEEF is increasing student access to a variety of services and offerings that promote physical and mental health (e.g., Physical Education, Athletics, Student Support Professionals and the Wellness Centers).

Through the funding of the Physical Education program, beginning in 2005–06, PEEF has increased students’ access to quality Physical Education instruction. The California Physical Fitness Test is comprised of six different tests: Aerobic Capacity, Body Composition, Abdominal Strength and Endurance, Trunk Extensor Strength and Flexibility, Flexibility, and Upper Body Strength and Endurance. To pass the California Fitness Test, a student must score in the Healthy Fitness Zone in five out of six tests.

The percentage of 9th graders who have passed the California Physical Fitness Test has increased since 2004–05 (from 53% in 2004–05 to 58% in 2010–11). The percent of students who scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone for Aerobic Capacity has increased from 2004–05 for 7th and 9th grade students: 7th grade students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone increased by 1% (from 66% to 67%); 9th grade students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone increased by 15% (from 49% to 64%), while 5th grade students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone was at the same level in 2010–11 as in 2004–05 (64%).

Table 15 shows snapshots of data from 2010–11. Through a number of different surveys, students and principals have expressed how PEEF funded programs have had an effect on student health.

Of students receiving five or more counseling sessions at the Wellness Centers, 88% report that they have learned information about how to improve their health; 79% that they have learned ways to reduce stress in their lives after receiving services at the Wellness Center; 76% that they are better able to cope when things go wrong; 81% that they have learned new information about the effects of alcohol, tobacco and drugs; and 74% are more satisfied with their
What principals, teachers, and students are saying about PEEF programs related to Physical and Mental Health...

“There was at a time when I thought I was lost, when I was in a dark corner, someone reached out a hand to me, and they said ‘Are you OK?’ That’s what the Wellness Center means to me. Because it is some place I can be myself and be accepted for who I am.”—High school student

“There is enough PE equipment so that all kids actually have access to equipment. So instead of it just being one kid just kicking the ball and everybody else sits around, everybody has got a basketball, and is playing a game where they are learning how to dribble and how to shoot.”—Middle school principal

“The fitness lab has really changed me. My teacher used to let me come through during my lunch periods just to work out. I’ve recently lost 103 pounds. I used to be 285 pounds. Without this room I don’t think I would be able to do it. And really, without my teachers, I don’t think any of this would be possible.”—High school student

lives after receiving services from the Wellness Center at their school. Peer Leaders were surveyed on a self-efficacy index which measures students’ belief in their own competence and feeling that they have the power to make a difference. After participating in Peer Resources, 45% of Peer Leaders report increased self-efficacy (change in score from pre to post-test).

In the PEEF Principal Survey, 77% of elementary principals, and 95% of middle school principals agreed or strongly agreed that the Student Support Professional program has helped improve the emotional and social learning of students in their school. In an elementary school Physical Education Survey, 74% of elementary students agreed or strongly agreed that their Physical Education class has helped improve their physical skills, and in the PEEF Principal Survey, 88% of elementary principals at schools receiving Option 1 Physical Education support, 82% of middle school principals, and 67% of high school principals agreed or strongly agreed that PEEF Physical Education helped improve the activity level and physical fitness of students at their school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Student Physical and Mental Health</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Percent of 5th grade students who pass the CA Physical Fitness Test (pass 5/6 or 6/6 fitness standards)</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Percent of 7th grade students who pass the CA Physical Fitness Test (pass 5/6 or 6/6 fitness standards)</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Percent of 9th grade students who pass the CA Physical Fitness Test (pass 5/6 or 6/6 fitness standards)</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Percent of 5th grade students meeting Aerobic Endurance Standard</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Percent of 7th grade students meeting Aerobic Endurance Standard</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Percent of 9th grade students meeting Aerobic Endurance Standard</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Percent of ES students who report exercising, dancing, or playing sports at least 3 times a week (CHKS)</td>
<td>2006-07†</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PEEF funding of PE initiated in 2005-06.
†First year of available data
### Table 15: PEEF Initiative Outcomes Related to Student Physical and Mental Health: Snapshots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcomes: Student Physical and Mental Health - 2010-11 Snapshots</th>
<th>ES Overall: 65%</th>
<th>ES option 1 PE support: 88.2%</th>
<th>MS: 82%</th>
<th>HS: 67%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD principals who strongly agree or agree that PEEF Physical Education has helped increase the physical activity level and physical fitness of students at their school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD principals who strongly agree or agree that the PEEF Student Support Professional program has helped their school improve the social and emotional learning of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percent of ES students who strongly agree or agree that their PE class has helped them improve their physical skills, such as kicking, swinging, running, throwing, and catching</td>
<td>ES: 77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percent of students who, after participating in Peer Resources, report increased Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percent of Wellness clients (students who received 5 or more counseling sessions) who agree or strongly agree that they learned information about how to improve their health and well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Among the Wellness clients who reported learning information about how to improve their health and well-being, percent who planned to take steps to improve their health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Percent of Wellness clients (students who receive 5 or more counseling sessions) who agree or strongly agree that they learned ways to reduce stress in their life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Percent of Wellness clients (students who receive 5 or more counseling sessions) who agree or strongly agree that they are better able to cope when things go wrong since receiving services form the Wellness center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Percent of Wellness clients (students who receive 5 or more counseling sessions) who agree or strongly agree that they learned information about the effects of using tobacco, alcohol and other drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Of the students who learned information, percent of students who reported learning new ways to reduce their use of tobacco, alcohol and other drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Percent of students who report being more satisfied with their lives after receiving direct services from the Wellness center at their school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Wellness surveys are administered biennially. 2009-10 is the most recent year of data collection.*
Long-Term Outcomes: Academic Achievement

Has academic achievement increased?

Table 16 shows data relating to the question of whether academic achievement has improved since the advent of PEEF. Of the 14 measures included in table 16, 13 show a positive trend. As described in this report, and supported by the research literature, each of the four immediate outcomes presented in the previous section (instructional quality, school climate, school engagement, and student health) has been shown to increase academic achievement in students. Following the logic of the PEEF district-wide logic model, if increases are seen in the immediate outcomes, it is expected that increases will be seen in students’ academic achievement. A majority of the immediate outcome measures presented in this report show a positive trend. Since PEEF started funding libraries in 2005–06, book circulation in SFUSD has increased, from 6.5 books per student 2004–05 (pre-PEEF), to 15.3 books per student in 2010–11. This is an indication that students are reading more, and student reading has been shown to correlate with academic achievement.2

Since the advent of PEEF, indicators of academic achievement have improved district-wide. The average district-wide GPA has increased from 2.6 to 2.8. District-wide, the percentage of students (grades 2-11) scoring at or above proficiency level in CST English Language Arts (ELA) has increased from 46% in 2004–05 to 57% in 2010–11. For CST mathematics, the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency level has increased from 48% to 56%. When analyzing the trend of CST scores by school level, the same trend emerges across all school levels; increasing CST ELA and math scores for elementary, middle, and high school students.

Table 17 includes 2010–11 snapshots from program and district surveys related to academic achievement. The survey results indicate that PEEF has great impact on academic achievement. For example, 74% of elementary principals, 64% of middle school principals, and 83% of high school principals agreed or strongly

---

agreed that PEEF funding for libraries has helped increase reading among students at their school. Elementary school principals (77%) and middle school principals (91%) agreed or strongly agreed that the PEEF funded Student Support Professionals program at their school helps improve student attendance, achievement, and pro-social learning. Of Wellness students receiving five or more counseling sessions at the Wellness Centers, 69% agreed or strongly agreed that they are doing better in school after receiving services through the wellness center.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Academic Achievement</th>
<th>Prior to PEEF funding or since implementation of PEEF data collection</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st year of available/relevant data</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall book/student circulation ratio in SFUSD</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Book/student circulation ratio in elementary school</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Book/student circulation ratio in K-8</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Book/student circulation ratio in middle school</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Book/student circulation ratio in high school</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>District wide GPA</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD students (grades 2-11) scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST English Language Arts test</td>
<td>2005-06†</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD students (grades 2-11) scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST math test</td>
<td>2005-06†</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD elementary school students scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST English Language Arts test</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD middle school students scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST English Language Arts test</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD high school students scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST English Language Arts test</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD elementary school students scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST math test</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD middle school students scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST math test</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Percent of SFUSD high school students scoring at or above proficiency level on the CST math test</td>
<td>2004-05*</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*First year of currently available data.
†First year of PEEF funding for programs was 2005-06.
Table 17: PEEF Initiative Outcomes Related to Academic Achievement: Snapshots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: Academic Achievement: 2010-11 Snapshots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Percent of SFUSD principals who agree or strongly agree that PEEF Libraries has helped increase reading among students at their school | ES: 74%  
MS: 64%  
HS: 83% |
| 2. Percent of SFUSD principals who agree or strongly agree that the PEEF Student Support Professionals program at their school helps improve student attendance, achievement, and pro-social learning | ES: 77%  
MS: 91% |
| 3. Percent of students who, after participating in Peer Resources, report increased confidence in likelihood of enrollment in college/post-high school graduation (change score, pre-post survey) | 21%* |
| 4. Number and percent of Wellness clients (students who receive 5 or more counseling sessions) who agree or strongly agree that they are doing better in school after receiving services through the wellness center | 69%† |

*2009-10 data. Item removed from 2010-11 survey.
†The Wellness surveys are administered biennially. 2009-10 is the most recent year of data collection.
Propensity Score Matching Study: Effects of Middle School and High School Athletics on Attendance, GPA and Suspension

In subsequent reports, PEEF will pursue student level data linked to academic achievement. Using available student level data for Athletics, this section of the report displays the type of analysis that can be conducted when programs have access to student level data.

The ideal way to measure the effects of a program or treatment is to randomly assign participants to either a treatment or control condition. The difference in outcomes for the two groups will then be the result of the treatment. However, when looking at participants that engage in a program through their own choice or through their involvement in a school, there is no fully equivalent way to look at the effects of a treatment.

Matching creates a comparison group, in this case composed of non-athletes, that closely resembles the athletes on a large number of demographic, academic, and school participation characteristics. For high school, students were matched based on their 8th grade characteristics of ethnicity, poverty (free or reduced-price lunch), gender, special education, GATE, CELDT scores, ELA CST score, math CST score, attendance, GPA, number of suspensions, and days suspended. Such matching means that students in both groups were quite similar before entering high school, thus allowing for a more accurate estimate of the effects of involvement in athletics than just comparing results based on one or two demographic characteristics (such as gender and race). The analysis looked at high school athletes and their matched comparisons in 2008–09, 2009–10, and 2010–11.

Table 18 shows the results of a comparison of high school athletes versus matched non-athletes regarding attendance, GPA, and suspensions. Results for athletes were overall better than matched non-athletes at a statistically significant level for all measures except for suspensions for African American athletes. Overall, athletes had a 3.7% higher attendance rate than matched non-athletes, which translate to attending, on average, 6.7 more days over the course of a school year. The average GPA for athletes was 0.2 higher than non-athletes, which means that, for every five courses taken, the athlete would have one grade higher on the fifth course (e.g., getting a B rather than a C). Suspensions were slightly lower for athletes than non-athletes overall, but the difference was very small.
For two groups of traditionally underserved students, African Americans and Latinos, the gaps between athletes and non-athletes were substantially larger than were seen for the district as a whole on both attendance and GPA. African American athletes had attendance rates that were 12.2% higher than matched non-athletes, which translate to about 21.9 more days at school over the course of the year. On GPA, African American athletes averaged 0.4 higher than matched non-athletes which means that, for every five courses taken, the athlete would have a grade higher on two of the courses (e.g., getting two Bs rather than two Cs). Latino athletes had a 5.5% higher attendance rate than Latino non-athletes, which translates to attending about 9.8 days more per school year. Latino athletes had 0.3 higher GPAs than Latino non-athletes, meaning that for every three courses taken, if two had equal grades, the Latino athlete would have one grade higher in the third course (e.g., getting a B rather than a C).

A similar analysis was run matching middle school athletes with matched non-athletes based on their characteristics in 5th grade. Table 19 shows the results of a comparison of middle school athletes versus matched non-athletes regarding attendance, GPA, and suspensions. The same factors that were used to match high school athletes were also used for middle school athletes except for GPA, which is not available for elementary students in the district’s administrative database for elementary students. There was a statistically significant difference between the groups on each of the measures, in every case favoring the athletes as compared with the matched non-athletes. The differences between middle school athletes and non-athletes tended to be smaller than was found for high school, but the differences were still meaningful.

African American middle school athletes again had the largest differences from their matched non-athletes in attendance, GPA, and lower number of suspensions per student. Middle school Latino athletes also had better results than matched non-athletes on attendance, GPA, and the number of suspensions per student, but the differences were smaller than those found for African Americans.
This analysis provides strong evidence that participation in middle school and high school athletics helps improve student engagement and achievement, and lowers suspension rates. Athletes had positive results across these areas compared with non-athletes who closely resembled them before beginning high school and middle school, thus participation in athletics is the main factor that can explain these different results. Overall, middle school athletes tended to have better attendance, GPAs, and lower number of suspensions per student than matching non-athletes, and these differences were largest for African Americans. The effects of participation in athletics appear to be even larger in high school where athletes tended to have much higher attendance, substantially higher grades, and somewhat lower number of suspensions than non-athletes. The analysis indicates that participation in high school athletics helps increase student engagement and achievement.

For traditionally underserved (African American and Latino) students, the differences between athletes and matched non-athletes were very large. Athletics seems to play a significant role in improving student engagement and achievement for high school athletes from these groups. Those who resembled the athletes in 8th grade across a variety of measures, however, averaged low attendance and GPAs. It may be worth considering if there are any ways to engage these students in high school in a way similar to how athletes were engaged, using activities that befit their interests and abilities.

### Conclusion

PEEF is a district-wide investment in a diverse yet strategic portfolio of SFUSD programs that has generated improvements in student achievement and success. The evaluation of PEEF and this report was guided by the PEEF district-wide logic model, which depicts a chain of reasoning of “if... then” statements that explain how each of the components in the model (inputs, outputs, immediate outcomes and long-term outcomes) are connected and sequential. Findings related to each of the logic model components were organized by PEEF’s goals of improving professional and instructional capacity and quality, school climate, school engagement, student physical and mental health, and ultimately, student academic achievement. Below is a summary of PEEF outputs, outcomes, and impact.
PEEF Outputs

PEEF-funded programs increased access and equity by increasing levels of offerings and participation related to the following areas:

1. Professional and instructional capacity and quality (e.g., qualified staff, number of physical education and arts classes offered to students, student access to libraries, and professional development for staff)
2. School climate (e.g., security at athletic events, Restorative Practices implementation at middle schools, additional custodians at elementary schools)
3. School engagement (e.g., arts instruction for elementary students, students receiving mentoring, interpretation for ELL parents)
4. Student health (e.g., students participating in athletic teams, students served at Wellness Centers, student access to Student Support Professionals)
5. Academic achievement (e.g., students tutored by peers, City College courses offered to SFUSD students, teachers aides)

As presented in the outputs section of the report, 50 measures out of 59 measures (85%) show a positive trend, indicating that PEEF has contributed to increasing access and equity in SFUSD.

PEEF Immediate Outcomes

With these increased outputs, immediate outcomes are expected to improve. As evidenced by the data included in this report, positive trends were manifested in the following areas:

1. Professional and instructional capacity and quality (e.g., highly qualified teachers hired in SFUSD, diversity in new hires)
2. School climate (decrease in expulsion rates, decrease in suspension rates for middle school students, increase in students’ experience of a positive school climate)
3. School engagement (improved attendance rates)
4. Student physical and mental health (e.g., aerobic capacity of students)

This report has presented data for 75 immediate outcome measures, 29 of which show change over time, 16 of which compare participants with non-participants, and 30 of which show 2010–11 data snapshots. Of the measures showing change over time, 22 out of 29 (76%) display a positive trend, indicating that PEEF has contributed to improving professional and instructional capacity and quality, improving school climate, increasing school engagement, and improving student physical and mental health.

PEEF Long-Term Outcomes

With the progress made toward these immediate outcomes it is reasonable to expect increases in student achievement. When student achievement was examined, it was found that GPA and CST ELA and CST math scores improved district-wide. This report has presented data for 20 long-term outcome measures, 14 of which show change over time, 2 of which compare participants with non-participants, and 4 of which show 2010–11 data snapshots. Of the 14 measures showing change over time, 13 (93%) display a positive trend.
A considerable majority of the PEEF outcomes (81%) show a positive trend. District-wide data indicates that SFUSD is making gains; over the course of the PEEF years many of the key district-wide indicators of student success have improved. Since PEEF funding was initiated in 2004–05, attendance rates have increased, GPAs have increased, and CST ELA and math scores have improved for all school levels. Data and anecdotal feedback indicate that activities conducted as a result of PEEF funding have made a contribution to this trend.

This pattern of positive increases in both outputs and immediate outcomes indicate that the PEEF has contributed to the improvement of long-term outcomes for students in SFUSD. PEEF funding has been vital during a period of state budget cuts and decreases in other funding and data suggests that PEEF has contributed to this trend.

**Future Steps**

This report is a first step in an effort to follow a logic model approach to evaluating the PEEF initiative. To test the pathways in the PEEF logic model, the PEEF Office will continue to collect and report relevant and meaningful measures of outputs and outcomes. The PEEF Office has started this process by following recommendations from SRI on how to enhance PEEF data. In particular, the PEEF Office will continue to focus on collecting data to show the changes from pre-PEEF to the current year, and, when student level data is available, examine the differences between students served by PEEF and those not served by PEEF. Future measures will better allow PEEF to disaggregate outputs and outcomes by student and school characteristics, such as student’s race/ethnicity, gender, ELL status, school level (e.g., elementary, middle, high school), school area/zone, to better address equity issues. In addition, the PEEF Office will work with PEEF program managers to strengthen program capacity to collect high-quality data, as well as develop a PEEF data management system.
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SEC. 16.123-1. PREAMBLE.

(a) The people of the City and County of San Francisco find and declare that:

1. Quality public education is highly correlated with higher earnings potential, reduced crime, lower rates of teen pregnancy and substance abuse, and greater self-esteem;

2. Urban public schools have the greatest need for comprehensive educational programs-including preschool programs, arts and music programs, sports activities, and after school programs-but often have the fewest resources to provide them;

3. While California once led the nation in public school spending and performance, investments have greatly declined. Despite its high cost of living, San Francisco per pupil spending ranks 34th among 43 comparable central City U.S. public school districts of similar size. As of 2001, adjusted for cost-of-living, teacher salaries for the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) ranked 99th of 100 metropolitan areas;

4. SFUSD enrollment has dropped in recent years as families have left San Francisco in search of affordable neighborhoods with high-quality public schools;

5. The choices businesses make about where to locate include the quality of public services the City provides, including public safety, transportation and education;

6. Since 2000, the SFUSD has made strong improvements in achievement measures and financial management; and

7. As the economy begins to recover, now is the time to invest in our children’s future, before further declines begin to erode the progress the SFUSD has made.

(b) This measure may be referred to as "The Arts, Music, Sports, and Pre-School for Every Child Amendment of 2003."

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-2. PUBLIC EDUCATION ENRICHMENT FUND.

(a) Creating the Fund. There shall be a Public Education Enrichment Fund. The City shall each year appropriate monies to the Public Education Enrichment Fund according to subsections (b), (c), and (d), below. In determining whether the City has met its annual obligation to the Fund, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors may consider both direct financial support and the cash value of any in-kind support services, as described in Section 16.123-5, provided by the City to the San Francisco Unified School District and the Children and Families First Commission (hereinafter the "First Five Commission") or any successor agency, provided that at least two-thirds of the City's contribution...
to the Fund each year shall be comprised of direct financial support necessary to meet the requirements of Sections 16.123-3 and 16.123-4 of this measure.

(b) Baseline Appropriations. The Fund shall be used exclusively to increase the aggregate City appropriations to and expenditures for the San Francisco Unified School District. To this end, the City shall not reduce the amount of such City appropriations (not including appropriations from the Fund and exclusive of expenditures mandated by state or federal law) in any of the eleven years during which funds are required to be set aside under this Section below the amount so appropriated for the fiscal year 2002-2003 ("the base year"). These baseline appropriations shall be separate from the City’s annual contributions to the Public Education Enrichment Fund under subsection (c), and shall be appropriated by the City to the School District each year during the term of this measure for the same purposes and in the same relative proportions among those purposes as in the base year, as certified by the Controller.

The amount of the City's baseline appropriations to the School District shall be adjusted for each year after the base year by the Controller based on calculations consistent from year to year by the percentage increase or decrease in City and County discretionary General Fund revenues. In determining City and County discretionary General Fund revenues, the Controller shall only include revenues received by the City and County that are unrestricted and may be used at the option of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors for any lawful City purpose. Errors in the Controller's estimate of discretionary revenues for a fiscal year shall be corrected by an adjustment in the next year's estimate. Using audited financial results for the prior fiscal year, the Controller shall calculate and publish the actual amount of City appropriations that would have been required under this baseline for the School District.

(c) Annual Contributions to the Fund--FY 2005-2006 through FY 2009-2010. In addition to the annual baseline appropriation provided above, the City shall, for years two through six of this measure, contribute the following amounts to the Public Education Enrichment Fund:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$45 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$60 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Annual Contributions to the Fund--FY 2010–11 through FY 2014–15. For Fiscal Years 2010–11 through FY 2014–15, the City’s annual contribution to the Public Education Enrichment Fund shall equal its total contribution for the prior year, beginning with Fiscal Year 2009–2010, adjusted for the estimated increase or decrease in discretionary General Fund revenues for the year.

(e) Audit Requirements. All disbursements from the Fund and from the baseline appropriations shall be subject to periodic audit by the Controller. The San Francisco Unified School District and
the First Five Commission shall agree to such audits as a condition of receiving disbursements from the Fund.

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-3. ARTS, MUSIC, SPORTS, AND LIBRARY PROGRAMS.

Each year during the term of this measure, the City shall appropriate one-third of the money in the Public Education Enrichment Fund to the San Francisco Unified School District for arts, music, sports, and library programs in the schools.

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-4. UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO PRESCHOOL.

(a) Universal Access to Preschool. It shall be the policy of the City and County of San Francisco to provide all four-year-old children who are City residents the opportunity to attend preschool, and it shall be the goal of the people in adopting this measure to do so no later than September 1, 2009.

(b) Planning Process. No later than September 1, 2004, the First Five Commission, in consultation with the San Francisco Childcare Planning and Advisory Council, the San Francisco Unified School District, the San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, and community stakeholders, shall submit to the Board of Supervisors a proposal for a universal preschool program for San Francisco. The Board of Supervisors shall approve the plan by resolution; if the Board does not approve the plan, it may refer the plan back to the First Five Commission for revision.

In preparing the plan, the First Five Commission shall develop universal preschool funding guidelines consistent with the Childcare Planning and Advisory Council’s San Francisco Childcare Needs Assessment, including guidelines designed to meet neighborhood-specific needs, such as subsidies, new facility development, and provider support for both family childcare homes and childcare centers. Such funding guidelines also shall address the unmet need for universal preschool and childcare slots in specific City neighborhoods.

(c) Annual Disbursements. Each year during the term of this measure, the City shall appropriate one-third of the money in the Public Education Enrichment Fund to the First Five Commission for universal preschool programs administered by the Commission.

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-5. OTHER CITY SUPPORT FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

(a) In-Kind Support. Not later than one year after the effective date of this measure, the City and the School District shall identify areas of potential in-kind support that the City could provide to the
School District free of charge or at substantially reduced rates. In-kind support, for these purposes, may include, but is not limited to:

Learning support services, including health, counseling, social work, and nutrition services;

Financial support services;

Telecommunication and information services;

Construction management services;

Utility services;

Transportation services;

Legal services; and

Public safety services.

(b) Planning Process. No later than six months after the effective date of this measure, the School District shall submit to the Board of Supervisors proposals for in-kind services that could be provided by the City to the District to further the educational goals and operations of the District. The Board shall distribute those proposals to all City departments having expertise in providing or capability to provide such in-kind services, and no later than nine months after the effective date of this measure, the departments will respond to the Board with proposals to provide such in-kind services to the District. The School District may use any direct financial support provided under this Section to hire consultants to help identify possible in-kind services. The Board of Supervisors may, by ordinance, provide for continuation of this planning process during the subsequent term of the measure.

(c) Annual Disbursements. Each year during the term of this measure, the City shall provide direct financial assistance from the Public Education Enrichment Fund to the San Francisco Unified School District, in an amount equal to one-third of the money in the Fund, or in-kind support services of equal value.

(d) Permissible Uses. The San Francisco Unified School District may expend funds provided as direct financial support under this Section for any educational or support purpose provided under law, including, but not limited to, gifted and talented programs, magnet programs, literacy programs, dual-language immersion programs, special education, employee compensation, career and college centers at high schools, teacher mentoring or master teacher programs, or other instructional purposes. The City recognizes that in providing such programs and services, a well-run school district requires both certificated and classified staff, and urges the San Francisco Unified School District to hire both certificated and classified staff to carry out the purposes of this measure.

(e) Within one year of the effective date of this measure, the School District, with the assistance of the City’s Department of Public Health, Department of Human Services, and Department of
Children, Youth, and Their Families, shall conduct an assessment of health, counseling, social work, and nutritional needs of pupils in the District, including problems related to asthma and other chronic diseases. The City may appropriate a specific portion of the disbursement under this Section through its annual appropriation process for these purposes, pursuant to recommendations from the School District.

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-6. EXPENDITURE PLANS.

(a) No later than February 1 of each year during the term of this measure, the San Francisco Unified School District and the First Five Commission shall each submit an expenditure plan for funding to be received from the Public Education Enrichment Fund for the upcoming fiscal year. The proposed expenditure plans must include prior year total budgeted and expended appropriations and Fund budgeted and expended appropriations by category, as well as average daily attendance information for the prior year and anticipated average daily attendance information for the plan year, to facilitate multi-year comparison.

(b) The Controller shall review the plans and transmit them, with his or her comments, to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors for their review and comment.

(c) The plans shall include a budget for the expenditures, performance goals, target populations, hiring and recruitment plans for personnel, plans for matching or other additional funding, operating reserves, and any other matters that the District and Commission deem appropriate or the Mayor or the Board requests.

(d) The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors may request further explanation of items included in the plans, and the District and the Commission shall respond in a timely manner to such inquiries. The Board may place appropriations provided for under this measure on reserve until it has received adequate responses to its inquiries.

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-7. STRUCTURAL SAVINGS TO THE CITY'S BUDGET.

(a) Controller's and Budget Analyst's Recommendations. Not later than October 1 of each fiscal year from Fiscal Year 2005–06 through 2009–10, the Controller and the Board of Supervisors' Budget Analyst shall prepare and submit recommended cuts or other structural changes to reduce, on an ongoing basis, spending on City departmental operations, or identify new revenues, in an amount sufficient to meet each year's required funding for the Public Education Enrichment Fund.

(b) Board of Supervisors' Proposals. Not later than December 15 of each fiscal year from Fiscal Year 2005–06 through Fiscal Year 2009–10, the Board of Supervisors shall hold hearings on the
recommendations made by the Controller and the Budget Analyst and shall forward its proposals to the Mayor.

(c) Budget Requirements. In his/her annual budget submission to the Board of Supervisors for each fiscal year from Fiscal Year 2005–06 through Fiscal Year 2009–10, the Mayor shall incorporate the Board of Supervisors' proposals, or identify alternative revenue or expenditure savings sufficient to appropriate funds to the Public Education Enrichment Fund according to the schedule set forth in Section 16.123-2 of this measure.

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-8. ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) In any year of this measure, if the joint budget report as prepared by the Controller, the Mayor's Budget Director and the Board of Supervisors' Budget Analyst projects a budgetary shortfall of $100 million dollars or more, the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors may reduce the City's contribution to the Public Education Enrichment Fund under Section 16.123-2, and its disbursements under Sections 16.123-3, 16.123-4, or 16.123-5, by up to 25 percent; provided, however, that the City must pay back the amount deferred within the period from June 30, 2015, the last day of the term of this measure, and June 30, 2018, a date three years later, unless the voters extend this measure beyond July 1, 2015 or authorize a substantially similar measure at that time.

(b) Audit Recommendations. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors may suspend the City's disbursements from the baseline appropriations or the Public Education Enrichment Fund under Sections 16.123-3, 16.123-4, or 16.123-5 in whole or in part for any year where the Controller certifies that the San Francisco Unified School District or the First Five Commission has failed to adopt audit recommendations made by the Controller.

As part of the audit function, the Controller shall review performance and cost benchmarks developed by the School District and the First Five Commission in consultation with the Controller for programs funded under this measure. The Commission's performance and cost benchmarks shall be based on the same performance and cost benchmarks as are required for other City departments, and on comparisons with other cities, counties, and public agencies performing similar functions. The School District's performance and cost benchmarks shall be based on similar standards.

In particular, the Controller shall assess:

1. Measures of workload addressing the level of service being provided or providing an assessment of need for a service;

2. Measures of efficiency including cost per unit of service provided, cost per unit of output, or the units of service provided per full time equivalent position; and
(3) Measures of effectiveness including the quality of service provided, citizen perceptions of quality, and the extent a service meets the needs for which it was created.

The Controller’s audits may address the extent to which the School District and the First Five Commission have met their respective performance and cost benchmarks.

(c) Reserve Policies. The Mayor and the Board of Supervisors may suspend the City's disbursements from the baseline appropriations or the Public Education Enrichment Fund under Sections 16.123-2, 16.123-4, or 16.123-5 in whole or in part for any year where the Controller certifies that the San Francisco Unified School District or the First Five Commission has failed to adopt reserve policies recommended by the Controller.

(d) Transfer and Use of Suspended Distributions. If the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors suspend City distributions from the baseline appropriations or the Public Education Enrichment Fund under subsections (b) or (c), the City shall transfer the amount that would otherwise be distributed from the baseline appropriations or the Public Education Enrichment Fund for that year to the Children’s Fund established in Charter Section 16.108, for the provision of substantially equivalent services and programs.

(e) New Local Revenues. The Board of Supervisors may, by ordinance, proportionally reduce the contribution to the Public Education Enrichment Fund and the disbursements to the San Francisco Unified School District and the First Five Commission required by this measure if the voters of San Francisco adopt new, dedicated revenue sources for the School District or the Commission, and the offsetting reduction in disbursements is specifically authorized by the local revenue measure.

(f) New State Revenues. The Board of Supervisors may, by ordinance, proportionally reduce the contribution to the Public Education Enrichment Fund and the disbursements to the San Francisco Unified School District required by this measure if the percentage increase in per-pupil Revenue Limit funding provided by the State of California to the San Francisco Unified School District in any fiscal year exceeds the percentage increase in the City's cost of living during the previous fiscal year.

The Board of Supervisors may, by ordinance, proportionally reduce the contribution to the Public Education Enrichment Fund and the disbursements to the First Five Commission if the State of California provides funding to the City for universal preschool, provided that such disbursements are not required to match state and/or other funding.

(g) Eighteen months prior to the expiration of this measure, the Controller shall conduct a complete analysis of the outcomes of the programs funded through the Public Education Enrichment Fund. The Controller’s study shall also address changes in the levels of state and federal funding for local schools, per-pupil spending in the San Francisco Unified School District compared to urban school districts of similar size. The Controller shall present the results of this analysis to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors no later than nine months prior to the expiration of the measure.

(Added March 2004)

(a) The people of the City and County of San Francisco find and declare that major urban school districts, such as San Francisco, serve an ethnically and economically diverse student population that requires more resources than currently provided under state guidelines. In adopting this measure, the people of San Francisco choose to provide additional City resources to complement, and not supplant, state funding for the San Francisco Unified School District.

(b) Consistent with subsection (a), the people of the City and County of San Francisco specifically find that their contributions to and disbursements from the baseline appropriations and the Public Education Enrichment Fund are discretionary expenditures by the City for the direct benefit of the children of San Francisco, their families, and the community at large. In the event that the State attempts, directly or indirectly, to redistribute these expenditures to other jurisdictions or to offset or reduce State funding to the School District because of these expenditures, the City shall transfer said monies that would otherwise be distributed to the School District each year to the City’s Children’s Fund established in Charter Section 16.108, for the provision of substantially equivalent services and programs.

(Added March 2004)

SEC. 16.123-10. SUNSET.

The provisions of this measure shall expire in eleven years, at the end of Fiscal Year 2014-15, unless extended by the voters.

(Added March 2004)
Appendix B: PEEF Initiative Budget Information and Narrative Description of Programs – 2010–11 PEEF Expenditure Plan Narrative

The following section of the report includes parts of the narrative portion of the 2010–11 PEEF Expenditure Plan which includes the descriptions of the 14 PEEF-funded programs and program activities.

Physical Education

On May 18, 2009 the San Francisco Unified School Board unanimously approved the Physical Education Master Plan. The goal of the Physical Education program and the Physical Education Master Plan is to provide quality K-12 physical education for every child through participation in a comprehensive, sequential physical education system that promotes physical, mental, emotional, and social well-being. Physical Education is allocated $2,425,000 of the $4,850,000 Sports allocation for 2010–2011. Physical Education’s Spending Proposal includes support for:

- 15.0 FTE Elementary School Physical Education Teachers to provide direct instruction to approximately 10,100 elementary students at approximately 30 sites, supporting approximately 500 elementary classroom teachers. Elementary Physical Education Specialists work closely with the classroom teacher to implement the district adopted physical education curriculum to all students.
- 2.0 FTE Elementary Physical Education Implementation Specialists to provide support to Elementary Physical Education Specialists, classroom teachers, and all elementary school sites.
- 2.0 FTE Physical Education Secondary Content Specialists to support all secondary school sites and approximately 140 physical education teachers.
- 1.0 FTE Physical Education Program Administrator and 1.0 FTE Physical Education Clerk to implement programming, support teachers at K-12 school sites, and to ensure alignment with standards and the district’s PE Master Plan.
- 30 stipends for elementary school teachers to serve as physical education site coordinators at 30 sites to support teachers and staff in implementation of PE requirements.
- Replenish broken or damaged instructional equipment for 30 sites currently in PE Program Support.
- 51 secondary site allocations of $17.83 per student to purchase instructional materials to support implementation of district-adopted curriculum, includes 10 charter, and county community secondary sites (approximately 30,700 students).
- Professional development for staff and teachers who administer mandated physical fitness testing.

Athletics

The goal of the Athletic program is to provide accessible, well coached, safe, and well supported athletic opportunities to students at all SFUSD middle and high schools. PEEF funding provides student athletes opportunities to not only increase physical activity, but also develop skills and abilities in the following:
Team building, leadership development, overcoming adversity and pressure, setting and achieving goals, and winning and losing with honor.

Athletics is allocated $2,425,000 of the $4,850,000 Sports allocation for 2010–2011. The Athletics Department’s Spending Proposal includes recommendations for:

- Funding for approximately 150 coaches: PEEF funding will enable SFUSD to maintain the current number of coaches and athletic directors at all 22 middle schools and 12 high schools and will allow continued support for student athletes in both sports and academics.
- Medical Supplies: to maintain sufficient training room medical supplies at all high schools and purchase of automatic external defibrillators for each high school’s athletic facility.
- Consultants for medical personnel, security personnel, and contest officials: 5 Athletic Trainers for high schools; 4 Emergency Medical Technicians for FS Football games; 11 doctors for varsity football games, 400 private security guards, and 140 San Francisco Police Officers (from 1-5 guards and/or officers at each of the events); officials for football, volleyball, wrestling, baseball, and softball games and matches (contests require 1-4 officials per event depending on the sport).
- Bus transportation for athletes to and from high school and middle school athletic competitions within San Francisco and throughout the Bay Area. Transportation provides approximately 1200 athletic team trips for an estimated 500 contests at an estimated average cost of $300 per trip for both middle and high school athletic teams.
- Hotel accommodations for high school athletes and coaches traveling to participate in CIF Nor-Cal and State playoff events.
- School Athletic Facility Repair/Maintenance/Construction includes construction and repair of athletic field and track areas at SFUSD High School sites. For 2010–2011, funding will be earmarked to renovate the deteriorating south field located at Washington High School and the natural grass softball field located at Burton High School.
- Non-School Site Facilities Rental for SFUSD athletic events.
- Athletic Equipment: includes equipment replacements and repairs to address conditions that limit student participation in athletics, including scoreboards, batting cages, football padding and helmets, golf driving cages, volleyball standards, and basketball backboards.
- Professional development stipends to provide leadership development opportunities to coaches (mandated by the California Interscholastic Federation) to create better mentors and leaders for our students. Additionally, CPR and First Aid certification trainings will be provided for all paid coaches, and some veteran and volunteer coaches.
- Site allocations for 34 middle and high schools to purchase athletic equipment, uniforms, and stipends for athletic event personnel uniforms. Each allocation is based on each site’s plan to establish teams and the approximate costs required per team.

Libraries
The spending plan includes $4,850,000 in funding recommendations for Library Services. The goal of Library Services is to provide high quality, effective library services that enhance the education and
instruction for all students. In 2010–11, PEEF funded sites will receive teacher librarians, technology upgrades, and updated library collections that are current, relevant, engaging, and accessible to students.

Library Services’ Spending Proposal includes recommendations for:

- 43.5 FTE Teacher Librarians assigned to 86 elementary and middle school sites, each receiving 2, 2.5 or 3 days of support, depending on school size.
- 1.0 FTE Program Administrator and 1.0 FTE Teacher Librarian on Special Assignment for program coordination and to provide centralized support.
- 1.0 FTE Teacher Librarian assigned to 5 small high schools and allocations of $25,000 each to 12 large high schools to support additional librarian staffing.
- Allocations for high schools of $10.00 per student for additional Teacher Librarian FTE, classified support, materials, technology, or other library-related resources.
- Allocations for all elementary and middle schools (86 sites) of $5.00 per student for library books, materials, and supplies.
- Allocations for 10 charter schools (funded at same rate as non-charter schools) books, materials, supplies, or FTEs (allocation is at the discretion of these sites).
- Online subscription resources, library research and reference databases for K-12 schools including Netrekker, Ferguson’s Careers, and Teaching Books.
- Continue replacement cycle of library computers and printers for book circulation, support circulation software, presentation equipment; includes 35 computers at 35 schools, 4 printers at 4 schools, and 4 LCD projectors for 8 schools.
- Professional development for 65 librarians including stipends for conferences, workshops on design and development of new research units.

**Arts and Music**

The spending plan includes $4,850,000 million in funding recommendations for Music and Arts. The goal of the Visual & Performing Arts program is to provide access & equity in arts education (both as a discrete discipline taught by certificated teachers and as arts embedded academics using San Francisco as the campus) for every SFUSD student, at every school, during the curricular day. Proposed spending for arts and music follow the Arts Education Master Plan and were approved by the Arts Education Master Plan Advisory Committee. All areas of funding support the Master Plan’s six areas of focus: administrative leadership, professional development, resources and staffing, curriculum and instruction, partnerships and collaborations, and assessment.

The Visual & Performing Arts Department’s Spending Proposal includes recommendations for:

- 19.6 FTE middle school arts teachers (.4 to County Community) for 2-5 days per site for 22 sites.
- 7.4 FTE high school arts teachers (.6 to County Community) for 1-3 days for 19 sites.
- 1.0 FTE arts teacher for county community middle and high schools.
- 2.4 FTE charter school based on student enrollment. Approximately 1-2 days for ten charter schools.
- 14.4 FTE certificated generalist arts teachers (dance, drama, visual art, and music) serving 72 elementary schools at .2 FTE for each elementary site.
- Per pupil allocations for 72 elementary schools, 22 middle schools, 19 high schools and 10 county community and charter schools for supplies, materials, field trips, artists-in-residence and/or credentialed arts specialists ($5.00 for elementary schools, $10.00 for M.S., and $10.00 for H.S.).
- Supplies, materials, and equipment for 72 elementary sites to support Generalist Visual & Performing Arts teachers of dance, drama, visual art, and music, and Visual & Performing Arts STAR teachers of music and visual art.
- 1.0 FTE Arts Education Master Plan Implementation Manager.
- 2.5 FTE – includes 1.5 Visual and Performing Arts Teachers on Special Assignment to provide support for the Young at Art Festival, assessment, and curriculum and 1.0 Visual & Performing Arts Program Administration.
- 98 Elementary, Middle and High School Arts Coordinators stipends ($2,000 each) for 98 sites.
- 1.0 FTE Clerical staff.
- 1.0 FTE districtwide piano technician.
- Districtwide musical instrument repair and supplies.
- Professional Development for Arts Coordinators, principals and Arts and classroom teachers.
- Visual and Performing Arts Implementation Support - consultants, content specialist extended hours to support sites, teachers, and program implementation.
- VAPA parent outreach and assessment costs.
- Young at Art (K-12) festival production to support a districtwide week-long event held at the de Young Museum connecting student and teacher achievement in the arts.

**Student Support Professionals**

Student Support Professionals are Learning Support Professionals and School District Nurses who provide site based services to improve the health, and social/emotional learning of students, a critical component of academic achievement. Working with teachers and other designated school site staff, the essential function of the LSP is to provide support for students’ mental health needs. School District Nurses focus on prevention, early detection, and management of health and behavioral concerns. Support services provided by Support Professionals and School District Nurses include:

- Individual counseling, support groups, and classroom behavior support.
- Assessment and identification of student needs and appropriate interventions.
- Crisis assistance and prevention planning.
- Health education and personal social skill development.
- Community referral and resource development for linking students and families to services.
- Family outreach to support home involvement in schooling.
The Student Support Professionals program is allocated $3,436,867. Recommendations include support for:

- 36.5 FTE Learning Support Professionals and School District Nurses.
- 1.0 FTE Program Administrator and 0.5 FTE Clerk for central office support.

**Peer Resources**

The goal of Peer Resources is to empower students to be leaders in their own lives, in their schools, and in their communities. Students receive training to become Peer leaders and gain the skills and knowledge necessary to look critically at their schools and communities to take action to improve them.

Peer Resources is committed to developing young leaders in San Francisco with the use of fun, creative, and interactive strategies that build safety, confidence, and skills. Core student-run delivery services includes conflict mediation, peer mentoring, peer tutoring, and peer education programs that focus on improving schools and schools communities, particularly for vulnerable student populations.

The Peer Resources program is allocated $467,471. Recommendations include support for 6.0 FTE Peer Resources Teachers assigned to 5 middle schools and 7 high schools. Sites provide matching funds to increase FTEs.

**Student Wellness**

The Wellness Programs provide school-based resources in high schools, ensuring support for all high school students (including newcomer students). The goal of each Wellness Program is to improve the health, well-being and educational outcomes of high school students through the provision of coordinated prevention and early intervention services. These include health education, behavioral and physical health services, and related support services at the school site, dedicated to improving the health, well-being and educational outcomes of all students. PEEF funding supports wellness centers at four high schools (June Jordan, Wallenberg, Newcomer, and Washington).

The Wellness program is allocated $725,552. Recommendations for funding supports:

- 4.0 FTE Wellness Coordinators, 3.2 Community Health Outreach Workers, and 1.3 District Nurses
- Youth Outreach Stipends and Youth Outreach Workers
- Site Supplies and Contacts for Services

**Restorative Justice**

Restorative Justice is a new program proposed for 2010–2011 which incorporates the formerly PEEF funded program, Violence Prevention. Allocations will be centrally allocated to support the implementation of the District’s Restorative Justice Plan. The plan includes professional development and training for all middle schools in programs that address school climate and the affective domain. Currently, four sites are piloting the program, “Alternatives to Suspension”. If the program yields promising results, it will be implemented in the remaining 10 sites. Alternative programs may include
“Capturing Kids Hearts” and Caring Schools Communities. In addition to the aforementioned programs, we will continue to train middle school sites on “Tribes” curriculum. This training began during 2009–2010 with four sites trained on Tribes curriculum.

The Restorative Justice program is allocated $664,763. Recommendations include support for

- 1.0 FTE Consultant includes travel, training days, materials, and supplies
- Allocations for 10 middle schools for substitutes or stipends to train staff

Career Technical Education

The Career Technical Education program provides a Career Technical Education Instructional Specialist, responsible for expanding the program consistent with the Career Technical Education Strategic Plan. The goal of the program is to improve instructional programs within the career academies and pathways model, improve and expand career academies and pathways programs to underserved SFUSD students, and ensure that Career-Tech-Education students will demonstrate improved enrollment and attendance, and completion of post-secondary programs.

The Career Technical Education program is allocated $100,019. Recommendations include support for a 1.0 FTE Career Technical Education Instructional Specialist who develops and improves technology and enhancement of all career academies/pathways programs in the eight high schools funded by the Career Technical Education Department.

Formative Assessment System

The goal of the districtwide assessment system is to provide multiple performance measures and tools for all teachers to inform instruction and to provide students with the means to demonstrate understanding and to reflect upon their learning.

The Formative Assessments System is allocated $284,750. Recommendations include support for a 1.0 FTE Researcher and database software.

Translation and Interpretation Services

The Translation and Interpretation Unit’s primary goal is to provide translation and interpretation services to Limited English Proficiency parents with equal access to information and services by maintaining and expanding translation interpretation services at school sites and at the central office.

Translation and Interpretations Services is allocated $604,000. Recommendations include support for:

- 2.0 FTE Chinese language translators/interpreters
- 2.0 FTE Spanish language translators/interpreters
- 0.5 FTE Assistant Manager
**Custodial Services**

Custodial Services supports a year-round crew for the Child Development Program to perform deep cleanings and additional FTE custodians assigned to approximately 11 understaffed elementary schools.

Custodial Services is allocated $695,773. Recommendations include support for:

- 8.5 FTE custodians
- 1.0 FTE custodian assistant supervisor

**Teacher Academy**

Teacher Academy to Paraprofessional Pathway is a San Francisco Unified School District “grow your own” teacher initiative that taps the local talent among our Teacher Academy High School students by providing them with paid internships as Algebra/Mathematics tutors serving in San Francisco Unified School District Middle School Math intervention classrooms. The Teacher Academy to Paraprofessional Pathway program addresses the San Francisco Unified School District goals of providing opportunities for our students to demonstrate their focus on higher achievement specifically in Algebra and Mathematics. By supporting their community, students demonstrate the district’s goal of “democratic responsibility”. The district’s Human Resources commitment to increase the diversity of our teaching pool in future years is also addressed.

Teacher Academy is allocated $65,000. Recommendations include support for:

- Stipends for 50 students working as teaching aides and early field work course
- Extended hours for six Teacher Academy Teachers
- Middle School Outreach
- Conferences and travel

**Teacher Recruitment**

High performing, properly credentialed teachers are directly linked to student achievement. Recruiting and retaining diverse, quality teachers to the San Francisco Unified School District is critical to our students’ success, particularly in lower performing schools. The program aims to improve the District’s ability to engage students and increase student achievement by recruiting and selecting high quality teachers, and providing incoming and current teachers with credential advisement.

Teacher Recruitment is allocated $109,238. Recommendations include support for:

- Approximately 0.8 FTE Recruitment Analyst
- Approximately 0.4 FTE Education Credential Technician
Appendix C: PEEF Initiative Data Charts

This appendix includes data charts for every measure presented in the body of this report. To provide a baseline for pre-PEEF funding, trend data in this appendix are presented beginning with the year prior to a program initially receiving PEEF funding. For example, six programs first received funding in the 2005–06 school year. The first year of data included in the charts for those programs is for the 2004–05 school year. In addition to this trend data, the outcomes section of this appendix also includes data from several surveys. Data from these surveys are reported for the most recent survey administration. The survey dates are included with the charts depicting this type of data.

Outputs 1: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality

Charts with light blue bars report data as numbers, while those with dark blue bars report data as percentages.

Six of the programs that are currently funded by PEEF started receiving PEEF funding in 2005–06: Physical Education, Athletics, Libraries, Arts and Music, Student Support Professionals, and Peer Resources. In 2007–08, seven additional programs that are currently receiving PEEF funding were included in the PEEF investment portfolio: Wellness Initiative, Career Technical Education, Formative Assessment, Translation and Interpretation, Custodial Services, Teacher Recruitment, and Teacher Academy. In 2010–11, PEEF funding was extended to the Restorative Practices program.

The California Healthy Kids Survey was administered bi-annually in the even year. Charts based on that survey include data for every other school year.

---

3 Charts with light blue bars report data as numbers, while those with dark blue bars report data as percentages.

4 Six of the programs that are currently funded by PEEF started receiving PEEF funding in 2005–06: Physical Education, Athletics, Libraries, Arts and Music, Student Support Professionals, and Peer Resources. In 2007–08, seven additional programs that are currently receiving PEEF funding were included in the PEEF investment portfolio: Wellness Initiative, Career Technical Education, Formative Assessment, Translation and Interpretation, Custodial Services, Teacher Recruitment, and Teacher Academy. In 2010–11, PEEF funding was extended to the Restorative Practices program.

5 The California Healthy Kids Survey was administered bi-annually in the even year. Charts based on that survey include data for every other school year.
Number of PD trainings for PE specialists and PE teachers (Physical Education Department records)

Number of athletic coaches reimbursed for at least one PD training (PEEF-funded) (Athletics Department records)

Number of PEEF-funded certified teacher librarian FTEs (Library Services records)

Number of schools with a teacher librarian (Library Services records)
Number of PEEF-funded arts teachers at school sites (all grade levels)
(Visual and Performing Arts records)

Number of schools with arts coordinators (all PEEF-funded)
(Visual and Performing Arts records)

Percent of schools with arts coordinators (all PEEF-funded)
(Visual and Performing Arts records)

Number of arts classes offered to elementary school students through the PEEF-funded VAPA Generalist program
(Visual and Performing Arts records)
Number of school site and centralized staff receiving training in Restorative Practices as alternative methods of discipline (duplicated count) (Restorative Practices records)
Outputs 2: School Climate

- **Number of athletic events covered by security guards and SFPD resources officers** (100% PEEF-funded) (Athletics Department records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Number of students participating in conflict mediation through Peer Resources** (Peer Resources records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Number of SFUSD schools going through a 2-year program of full implementation of Restorative Practices** (International Institute for Restorative Practices) (Restorative Practices records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Number of middle schools implementing Restorative Practices through Educators for Social Responsibility and SFUSD’s RP program** (Restorative Practices records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outputs 3: School Engagement

Number of bus trips for athletic teams funded by PEEF
(Athletics Department records)

Percent of bus trips for athletic teams funded by PEEF
(Athletics Department records)

Number of elementary school students receiving arts instruction through the PEEF-funded VAPA Generalist program
(Visual and Performing Arts records)

Number of middle school students enrolled in one or more arts course
(Data Director)
Percent of middle school students enrolled in one or more arts course (Data Director)

Number of high school students enrolled in one or more arts course (Data Director)

Percent of high school students enrolled in one or more arts course (Data Director)

Number of students participating in mentoring programs at school sites through Student Support Professionals (Student Support Professionals records)
Number of students participating in site-based workshops, peer education, and special projects through Peer Resources (Peer Resources records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26,101</td>
<td>20,444</td>
<td>19,310</td>
<td>16,126</td>
<td>13,825</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of school and district-wide events interpreted (Translation and Interpretation records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of translation requests from school sites and central office fulfilled (Translation and Interpretation records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outputs 4: Student Physical and Mental Health

**Percent of middle school students participating in athletic teams**
(Athletics Department records and Data Director)

- 2004-05: 25%
- 2005-06: 21%
- 2006-07: 21%
- 2007-08: 21%
- 2008-09: 22%
- 2009-10: 23%
- 2010-11: 23%

**Percent of high school students participating in athletic teams**
(Athletics Department records and Data Director)

- 2004-05: 20%
- 2005-06: 20%
- 2006-07: 20%
- 2007-08: 20%
- 2008-09: 20%
- 2009-10: 21%
- 2010-11: 21%

**Number of coaches funded by PEEF (blue) and non-PEEF (red)**
(Athletics Department records)

- 2004-05: 464 (PEEF), 0 (non-PEEF)
- 2005-06: 459 (PEEF), 0 (non-PEEF)
- 2006-07: 428 (PEEF), 20 (non-PEEF)
- 2007-08: 418 (PEEF), 75 (non-PEEF)
- 2008-09: 376 (PEEF), 199 (non-PEEF)
- 2009-10: 381 (PEEF), 216 (non-PEEF)
- 2010-11: 330 (PEEF), 269 (non-PEEF)

**Number of athletic trainers serving high school athletic teams**
(Athletics Department records)

- 2004-05: 0
- 2005-06: 1
- 2006-07: 3
- 2007-08: 4
- 2008-09: 4
- 2009-10: 4
- 2010-11: 5
Number of high school student athletes receiving preventative or injury treatment from an athletic trainer (Athletics Department records)

Percent of high school student athletes receiving preventative or injury treatment from an athletic trainer (Athletics Department records)

Cumulative total of athletic facility improvements funded by PEEF (Athletics Department records)

Number of fully officiated athletic contests (games, matches etc.) supported by PEEF funds (Athletics Department records)
Number of Student Support Professional FTEs funded by PEEF and non-PEEF
(Student Support Professionals records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PEEF LSP</th>
<th>PEEF Nurse</th>
<th>Non-PEEF LSP</th>
<th>Non-PEEF Nurse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of classroom presentations made by Student Support Professionals related to health and mental health promotion
(Student Support Professionals records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of parent presentations offered by Student Support Professionals
(Student Support Professionals records)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of direct services hours provided to students at the PEEF-funded Wellness Centers (Wellness Initiative records)

Average number of direct services hours per student who attends the PEEF Wellness Centers (Wellness Initiative records)

Number of students served at Wellness Centers funded by PEEF (blue) and non-PEEF (red) (Wellness Initiative Records)

Number of students served five or more times at Wellness Centers funded by PEEF (blue) and non-PEEF (red) (Wellness Initiative records)
Outputs 5: Academic Achievement

Number of City College of SF course offerings for 11th and 12th grade students (Career Technical Education records)

Number of students participating in peer tutoring through the Peer Resources program (Peer Resources records)

Number of students completing an internship through Career Technical Education (Career Technical Education records)

Number of Teacher Academy Aides (Teacher Academy records)
Number of students tutored by Teacher Academy Aides (Teacher Academy records)

- 2006-07: N/A
- 2007-08: 850
- 2008-09: 1,200
- 2009-10: 1,520
- 2010-11: 1,400
Outcomes 1: Professional and Instructional Capacity and Quality

Number of students participating in the District's common assessments
(Data Director)

Number of teachers using at least one of the district's common assessments for ELA or math to assess student achievement
(Data Director)

Number of teachers, principals, district and school site personnel with at least one log-in to OARS/Data Director
(Data Director)

Average number of Data Director log-ins per teacher/principal/school site and central office staff
(Data Director)
Percent of all elementary school principals who believe that PEEF PE has helped build their school’s capacity in PE by providing curriculum, PD, and equipment to improve quality (n = 32) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

65%

Percent of all middle school principals who believe that PEEF PE has helped build their school’s capacity in PE by providing curriculum, PD, and equipment to improve quality (n = 11) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

91%

Percent of all high school principals who believe that PEEF PE has helped build their school’s capacity in PE by providing curriculum, PD, and equipment to improve quality (n = 6) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

67%

Percent of elementary school teachers at PE Option 1 schools agreeing that PE specialists have helped them become better teachers of PE (n = 309) (Annual PE Survey spring 2011)

81%
Percent of elementary school principals who believe that PEEF libraries have helped improve the quality of instruction at their school through partnership between teacher librarians and classroom teachers (n = 32) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

63%

Percent of middle school principals who believe that PEEF libraries have helped improve the quality of instruction at their school through partnership between teacher librarians and classroom teachers (n = 11) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

73%

Percent of high school principals who believe that PEEF libraries have helped improve the quality of instruction at their school through partnership between teacher librarians and classroom teachers (n = 6) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

83%

Percent of teacher librarians who strongly agree or agree that the PD offered by Library Services helped them become a more effective teacher librarian (Annual Teacher Librarian Survey spring 2011)

95%
Percent of elementary school principals who agree or strongly agree that PEEF funds have increased the quality of arts instruction (n = 32) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

70%

Percent of middle school principals who agree or strongly agree that PEEF funds have increased the quality of arts instruction (n = 11) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

89%

Percent of high school principals who agree or strongly agree that PEEF funds have increased the quality of arts instruction (n = 32) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

50%

Percent of teachers surveyed reporting that they know how to access MAP results on Data Director and make meaning of the results (n = 343) (SFUSD MAP Assessment Feedback Survey spring 2011)

78%
Percent of teachers surveyed who report using the MAP assessments results to inform instruction and planning (n = 343) (SFUSD MAP Assessment Feedback Survey spring 2011)

Percent of SFUSD principals who were satisfied with the quality of the human capital workshop sponsored by the Teacher Recruitment department (n = 114) (Teacher Recruitment Satisfaction Survey fall 2010)

Percent of SFUSD principals who were satisfied with the overall customer services provided by their human capital specialist (n = 64) (Teacher Recruitment Satisfaction Survey fall 2010)

Percent of SFUSD parents who think that the sports, library, arts, and music programs at their child’s school are a very important part of their child’s school life (Annual SFUSD Satisfaction Survey fall 2011)
Outcomes 2: School Climate

Percent of K-12 students suspended once or more (Data Director)

Percent of elementary school students suspended once or more (Data Director)

Percent of middle school students suspended once or more (Data Director)

Percent of high school students suspended once or more (Data Director)
Number of expulsions in SFUSD
(Pupil Services, SFUSD)

Percent of grade 5 students scoring "high" on school connectedness
(California Healthy Kids Survey, WestEd)

Percent of grade 7 students scoring "high" on school connectedness
(California Healthy Kids Survey, WestEd)

Percent of grade 9 students scoring "high" on school connectedness
(California Healthy Kids Survey, WestEd)
Percent of Grade 11 students scoring "high" on school connectedness (California Healthy Kids Survey, WestEd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of students mentored through the Student Support Professionals program who score high on the school connectedness index (Student Support Professional Surveyspring 2011, ETR)

- 2004-05: 25%
- 2006-07: N/A
- 2008-09: 38%
- 2010-11: 39%

Percent of Wellness clients who score high on the school connectedness index (Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)

- 2004-05: 25%
- 2006-07: N/A
- 2008-09: 38%
- 2010-11: 39%

Percent of Youth Outreach Workers in high schools who score high on the school connectedness index (Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)

- 2004-05: 25%
- 2006-07: N/A
- 2008-09: 38%
- 2010-11: 39%
Percent of elementary school principals receiving additional PEEF-funded custodians who are satisfied or very satisfied with overall cleanliness at their school site (n = 11)  
(Custodial Services Survey spring 2011)

100%

Percent of SFUSD parents who agree or strongly agree that their child’s school is a safe place to be from early in the morning until late at night  
(SFUSD Family Satisfaction Survey spring 2011)

86.5%
Outcomes 3: School Engagement

Number of students performing and/or exhibiting at the Young at Arts Festival
(Visual and Performing Arts records)

SFUSD average K-12 attendance, by year
(Data Director)

Attendance rates of elementary school students
(Data Director)

Attendance rates of middle school students
(Data Director)
Attendance rates of high school students (Data Director)

Percent of elementary school students who report feeling more motivated to go to school on the days when they have PE class (schools with Option 1 PE support, n = 1,177) (Annual PE Survey spring 2011)

- 86% 85% 85% 85% 87% 87% 87%
- 0%
- 20%
- 40%
- 60%
- 80%
- 100%
- 69%

Percent of elementary school students who report feeling more motivated to go to school on the days when they have PE class (schools with Option 1 PE support, n = 1,177) (Annual PE Survey spring 2011)

- 74%

Percent of middle school principals who believe that PEEF Visual and Performing Arts has increased student engagement in arts at their school (n = 11) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

- 89%

Percent of elementary school principals who believe that PEEF Visual and Performing Arts has increased student engagement in arts at their school (n = 32) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)
Percent of high school principals who believe that PEEF Visual and Performing Arts has increased student engagement in arts at their school (n = 6) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

50%

Percent of peer leaders who, after participating in Peer Resources, report increased school engagement (Peer Resources Survey Pre-Survey fall 2010; Post-Survey spring 2011)

71%

Percent of SFUSD parents who think that their child’s school provides a caring, inclusive, and engaging environment for learning (n = 11,680) (SFUSD Satisfaction Survey spring 2011)

93%
Outcomes 4: Student Physical and Mental Health

Percent of SFUSD 5th grade students who passed CA Physical Fitness Test
(California Department of Education)

Percent of SFUSD 7th grade students who passed CA Physical Fitness Test
(California Department of Education)

Percent of SFUSD 9th grade students who passed CA Physical Fitness Test
(California Department of Education)

Percent of 5th grade students meeting Aerobic Endurance Standard
(California Department of Education)
Percent of 7th grade students meeting Aerobic Endurance Standard (California Department of Education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of 9th grade students meeting Aerobic Endurance Standard (California Department of Education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of elementary students reporting they exercise, dance, or play sports three or more times per week (California Healthy Kids Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of elementary school principals who believe that PEEF PE has helped increase physical activity level and fitness of students at their school (n = 32) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

- 65%
Percent of middle school principals who believe that PEEF PE has helped increase physical activity level and fitness of students at their school (n = 11)
(PEEF Principal Surveyfall 2011)
82%

Percent of high school principals who believe that PEEF PE has helped increase physical activity level and fitness of students at their school (n = 6)
(PEEF Principal Surveyfall 2011)
67%

Percent of elementary school principals who believe the PEEF Student Support Professional program has helped improve the social and emotional learning of students at their school (n = 32)
(PEEF Principal Surveyfall 2011)
77%

Percent of middle school principals who believe the PEEF Student Support Professional program has helped improve the social and emotional learning of students at their school (n = 11)
(PEEF Principal Surveyfall 2011)
95%
Percent of elementary school students who agree or strongly agree that their PE class has helped them improve their physical skills, such as kicking, swinging, etc. (Students at PE Option 1 schools only)
(Annual PE Survey spring 2011)

Percent of students who, after participating in Peer Resources, report increased self-efficacy (change score comparing pre- and posttest)
(Peer Resources Pre-Survey fall 2010; Post-Survey spring 2011)

Percent of Wellness clients (students receiving five or more counseling sessions) who agree or strongly agree that they learned information about how to improve their health and well-being (n = 581)
(Wellness Clients Survey spring 2011, ETR)

Among the Wellness clients who reported learning ways to improve their health and well-being, percent who planned to take steps to improve their health (n = 581)
(Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)
Percent of Wellness clients who agree or strongly agree that they learned ways to reduce stress in their life (n = 581)
(Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)
79%

Percent of Wellness clients who agree or strongly agree that they are better able to cope when things go wrong since receiving services from the Wellness Center (n = 581)
(Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)
76%

Percent of Wellness clients who agree or strongly agree that they learned information about the effects of using tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs (n = 581)
(Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)
81%

Of the students who learned information, percent who reported learning new ways to reduce their use of tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs (n = 581)
(Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)
92%
Percent of Wellness clients who report being more satisfied with their lives after receiving direct services from the Wellness Center at their school (n = 581)
(Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)
Outcomes 5: Academic Achievement

**Book circulation in SFUSD (books/student)**
(Destiny data base)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>K-8</th>
<th>SFUSD average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average SFUSD GPA (gr6-gr12)**
(Data Director)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CST English Language Arts (grades 2-11)**
(Trend for proficient and above)
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CST Math (grades 2-11)
Trend for proficient and above
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)

CST English Language Arts (grades 2-5)
Trend for proficient and above
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)

CST English Language Arts (grades 6-8)
Trend for proficient and above
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)

CST English Language Arts (grades 9-11)
Trend for proficient and above
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)
CST Math (grades 2-5)  
Trend for proficient and above  
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)

CST Math (grades 6-8)  
Trend for proficient and above  
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)

CST Math (grades 9-11)  
Trend for proficient and above  
(Research, Planning, and Accountability, SFUSD)

Percent of elementary school principals who believe that PEEF libraries have helped increase reading among students at their school (n = 32)  
(PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)
Percent of middle school principals who believe that PEEF libraries have helped increase reading among students at their school (n = 11) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

Percent of high school principals who believe that PEEF libraries have helped increase reading among students at their school (n = 6) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

Percent of elementary school principals who believe that the PEEF Student Support Professional program at their school helps improve attendance, achievement, and pro-social learning (n = 32) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)

Percent of middle school principals who believe that the PEEF Student Support Professional program at their school helps improve attendance, achievement, and pro-social learning (n = 11) (PEEF Principal Survey fall 2011)
Percent of students who, after participating in Peer Resources, report increased confidence in likelihood of enrollment in college/post-high school graduation
(Peer Resources Pre-Survey fall 2010; Post-Survey spring 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Wellness clients who agree or strongly agree that they are doing better in school after receiving services through the Wellness Center (n = 581)
(Wellness Client Survey spring 2011, ETR)

69%
Effects of Middle School and High School Athletics on Attendance, GPA and Suspension

Attendance for high school athletes (blue) and matched non-athletes (red)
(Data Director)

GPA for high school athletes (blue) and matched non-athletes (red)
(Data Director)

Number of suspensions per student for high school athletes (blue) and matched non-athletes (red)
(Data Director)

Attendance rates for middle school athletes (blue) and matched non-athletes (red)
(Data Director)
GPA for middle school athletes (blue) and matched non-athletes (red)
(Data Director)

Number of suspensions per student for middle school athletes (blue) and non-athletes (red)
(Data Director)