



**Puget Sound Taxpayer Accountability Account**

# **Funding Level Options Report**

**A report to the King County Council**

**Ken Thompson Consulting  
March 2019**

# Puget Sound Taxpayer Accountability Account

## Funding Level Options Report

A report to the King County Council

**Prepared by:**

Ken Thompson, Ken Thompson Consulting

Ken Thompson Consulting

March 2019

**ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION:** King County Council Motion 15029 directs County staff to prepare a report, in consultation with Councilmembers and the executive branch, that assesses strategies for how King County can best use proceeds from the Puget Sound Taxpayer Accountability Account (PSTAA). In June of 2018, King County hired Ken Thompson Consulting to create three reports, of which this is the final one, as part of the effort by the County to understand options for use of the PSTAA funds. The consultant worked under the direction of the King County Council Initiatives Director to craft this report; however, the content and assessments contained herein is solely the work of the consultant.

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	4
Introduction	
Background .....	7
Purpose of This Report .....	7
Underserved Students .....	8
The Nine Strategy Areas & Three Education Domains .....	9
Notes on Estimates .....	10
Funding Level Options By Education Domain	
Early Learning .....	11
K-12 .....	14
Postsecondary .....	18
References .....	21
Appendices:	
A: King County Council Motion 15029 (PSTAA) .....	22
B: Expected Annual King County PSTAA Funds .....	25

# Executive Summary

## Background

The Puget Sound Taxpayer Accountability Account (PSTAA) was created as an amendment to the 2015 State of Washington Transportation Revenue Package by the Washington State Legislature, and directs that the funds be used to improve educational outcomes in early learning, K-12, and post-secondary education. Approximately \$315 million is expected to become available to King County between 2019 and 2034 through PSTAA.

Goals and principles for the use of PSTAA funds in King County, Washington were approved by the King County Council on December 11, 2017 as [Motion 15029](#). The Council's motion identified specific populations that PSTAA might support<sup>1</sup>, and put forth other goals and objectives for the use of the funds.

This report is meant to be one source of information that can aid King County in making decisions about potential uses of PSTAA funding in the future. It builds on the PSTAA [Needs Assessment Report](#) and the [Strategy Assessment Report](#), both completed in October 2018<sup>2</sup>.

The Needs Assessment Report calculated total numbers of different groups of underserved students. The Strategy Assessment Report, while it contained information on costs and audiences that might be served by nine potential strategy areas identified by the County<sup>3</sup>, did not attempt to calculate how many students might be served by which strategy area, based on potential allocations of PSTAA funding. **Producing estimates of numbers of students that could be served by PSTAA strategy areas in three different funding scenarios is the main purpose of this report.**

The County instructed the consultant to assess how many students would be served by strategy areas at the following total funding amounts (over the 15 year period of PSTAA):

- **50%** of all King County PSTAA funds: **\$150,000,000**
- **33%** of all King County PSTAA funds: **\$100,000,000**
- **25%** of all King County PSTAA funds: **\$75,000,000**

Rather than look at each of the nine strategy areas independently, it was decided that **this report would look at one example strategy area in each of the three education system domains: early learning, K-12 and postsecondary.**

As explained further in subsequent chapters, the calculations of potential numbers served in each domain is specific to the following strategic approach within each domain:

- **Early Learning:** this report produces estimates of children that can be served by **early learning facilities**, per the plan developed by the Early Learning Facilities Stakeholders Group.
- **K-12:** this report produces original estimates of students that can be served by **community-based programs focused on underserved students.**
- **Postsecondary:** this report produces estimates of students that can be served by the “services” component of a **King County Promise** plan (a “college promise”-type plan), as developed by the Puget Sound Coalition for College and Career Readiness.

---

<sup>1</sup> This report calculates impacts on low-income students and students of color. The Council's motion also identifies other specific underserved populations. This report refers to all of these groups together as “underserved students.” See page 8 of this report for further definition of this term and the reasons for limiting estimations to just two groups.

<sup>2</sup> Both of these reports are currently available on King County's website at <https://kingcounty.gov/council/issues/education.aspx>

<sup>3</sup> See page 9 of this report for a list of the nine strategy areas.

## Compilation of Estimates of Numbers Served

This table compiles the estimates produced in the three main chapters of this report. See those chapters for additional explanation and context on the numbers presented here.

**Table 1: Education Domain Comparisons of Numbers Served by Funding Level**

PSTAA Funding Level Options	# Low income served 2019-34	# Low income served 2019-50	# Students of color served 2019-34	Serves non-underserved students also	Matching funds requirement	# Low income served 2019-34 w/ match
<b>Early Learning (Facilities)</b>						
<b>50% (\$150M)</b>	15,300	41,581	Unavailable	Yes	Not Requested	No change
<b>33.3% (\$100M)</b>	12,748	34,256	Unavailable	Yes	Not Requested	No change
<b>25% (\$75M)</b>	9,354	24,892	Unavailable	Yes	Not Requested	No change
<b>K-12 (Underserved Students Supports)</b>						
<b>50% (\$150M)</b>	17,647	No change	17,647	No	Not Requested	No change
<b>33.3% (\$100M)</b>	11,765	No change	11,765	No	Not Requested	No change
<b>25% (\$75M)</b>	8,824	No change	8,824	No	Not Requested	No change
<b>Postsecondary (College Navigation &amp; Supports)</b>						
<b>50% (\$150M)</b>	60,313	No change	40,410	No	Requested	120,616
<b>33.3% (\$100M)</b>	40,205	No change	26,937	No	Requested	80,410
<b>25% (\$75M)</b>	30,157	No change	20,205	No	Requested	60,314

Notes on calculation methods for each domain are given in the following chapters of this report.

### Definitions of Terms Used:

- **# Low Income Served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the unique number of low income students who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.
- **# Low Income Served 2019-2050:** this number reflects the number of unique low income students who would be served during the PSTAA period, and beyond it as well, should the strategy have an impact beyond the core PSTAA funding period.
- **# Students of color served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the number of unique students of color who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.
- **Serves Non-underserved Students Also:** Indicates whether students who are not specifically named in the County's PSTAA motion (see definition of 'underserved students' on page 8) would be served as a part of the strategy.
- **Matching Funds Requirement:** Indicates whether stakeholders would encourage the County to require matched funding from other sources. Such matching would potentially increase the number of students served due to the County's investment.

- **# Low-Income Served 2019-34 With Match:** This figure calculates the total unique students served if the effort attains a 1:1 funding match from non-PSTAA sources as a part of its strategy, based on whether it stated that it desired to have a matching funds requirement (above).

## Notes on Calculations of Numbers Served

The table above shows how the basic numbers of students to be served could be calculated differently, based on variables in strategy design and implementation.

Some programs may serve more students beyond the PSTAA funding window, increasing their impact. Some programs may be amenable to constructing a required funding match, effectively leveraging existing PSTAA funding further to serve more students. Some programs may by design also require services be provided to non-underserved students, which extends PSTAA funds in one way, but also could be seen to dilute the impact of PSTAA funds if PSTAA funds were to be spent on non-underserved students.

These numbers are rough estimates. Any number of external conditions or refinements offered by the County or stakeholder groups could impact implementation plans and thus the numbers of students served. As such, these numbers should be taken as directional, not absolute.

Although this report attempts to use for calculation purposes the cost of *high quality* services (which should attain significant education outcomes for students), the total numbers served should always be considered in tandem with the impact on student progress one might get from such investments. While this report does not address 'cost per impact,' it's recommended that readers review the appropriate sections of the Strategy Assessment Report to understand the kinds of student-level impacts that might be attained through investments in particular strategies.

# Introduction

## PSTAA Background

The Puget Sound Taxpayer Accountability Account (PSTAA) was created as an amendment to the 2015 State of Washington Transportation Revenue Package by the Washington State Legislature. The Legislature created PSTAA to direct certain funds into a protected account that is to be paid to the counties in the Sound Transit taxing district, and directs that the funds be used to improve educational outcomes in early learning, K-12, and post-secondary education. PSTAA is described in [RCW 43.79.520](#).

Goals and principles for the use of PSTAA funds in King County, Washington were approved by the King County Council on December 11, 2017 as [Motion 15029](#) (see Appendix A for the full text of the motion). The Council's motion identified specific populations that PSTAA might support, and put forth other goals and objectives for the use of the funds. As of the date of this report, approximately \$315 million is expected to become available to King County between 2019 and 2034 through PSTAA (see Appendix B for allocation of funds by year).

In early 2018, the County identified nine strategy areas for potential PSTAA funding (the list of strategy areas is given on page 9 of this report). In June of 2018, King County hired a consultant to compile information about education needs in the County and the potential impact of the nine strategy areas they had identified and three reports were commissioned.

The consultant created the following two reports in October 2018:

- [Needs Assessment Report](#): a summary of numbers of underserved students in the County, and a compilation and review of existing education-related needs assessments done recently in King County.
- [Strategy Assessment Report](#): an examination of the potential impact of, need for, cost, and implementation feasibility of each of the nine strategy areas.

This Funding Level Options Report is the third report commissioned by the County. Further information on King County's PSTAA work, and these three reports can be found on the County's website at: <https://kingcounty.gov/council/issues/education.aspx>

## Purpose of The Funding Level Options Report

This report is meant to be one source of information that can aid King County in making decisions about potential uses of PSTAA funding in the future. As noted, it builds on prior PSTAA reports.

The Needs Assessment Report calculated total numbers of different groups of underserved students. The Strategy Assessment Report, while it contained information on costs and audiences that might be served by nine potential strategy areas identified by the County, did not attempt to calculate how many students might be served by which strategy area, based on potential allocations of PSTAA funding. **Producing estimates of numbers of students that could be served by PSTAA strategy areas in three different funding scenarios is the main purpose of this report.**

The County instructed the consultant to assess how many students would be served by strategy areas at the following total funding amounts (over the 15 year period of PSTAA):

- **50%** of all King County PSTAA funds: **\$150,000,000**
- **33%** of all King County PSTAA funds: **\$100,000,000**
- **25%** of all King County PSTAA funds: **\$75,000,000**

Rather than look at each of the nine strategy areas independently, it was decided that **this report would look at one example strategy area in each of the three education system domains: early learning, K-12 and postsecondary.**

As explained further in the full report, the calculations of potential numbers served in each domain is specific to the following strategic approach within each domain:

- **Early Learning:** this report produces estimates of children that can be served by **early learning facilities**, per the plan developed by the Early Learning Facilities Stakeholders Group.
- **K-12:** this report produces original estimates of students that can be served by **community-based programs focused on underserved students.**
- **Postsecondary:** this report produces estimates of students that can be served by the “services” component of a **King County Promise** plan (a “college promise”-type plan), as developed by the Puget Sound Coalition for College and Career Readiness.

This report looks at several variables that could impact the total numbers served over time at the various funding levels as well. Those include:

- Continued impacts on populations beyond the 2034 end of PSTAA funding
- Whether non-underserved populations would also be served by the strategy
- Whether County funds could be matched by other funding sources, therefore increasing the effective impact of County funding

## Underserved Students

The County’s motion identifies several different student populations to focus PSTAA funds on. It specifically calls out closing opportunity gaps for low income students and students of color. Low income students are defined for the purpose of this report loosely as those in households under 200% of the Federal Poverty Level; or the rough equivalent according to other metrics of assessing household income. Students of color are defined as all students except those who are non-Hispanic whites. Time and resource constraints and availability of information prevented doing more detailed analyses by different income levels and by different racial and ethnic groups.

The County’s motion also states that it seeks to improve educational outcomes for “children and youth who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system or otherwise vulnerable.” This report refers to all of these groups together, along with low income and students of color, as “underserved students.” (The word ‘students’ is used here as a general shorthand for children, youth and young adults who are or could be connected to education, recognizing that some pre-Kindergarten children, as well as some older youth disconnected from education that PSTAA may serve are not technically ‘students;’ the term ‘underserved students’ is meant to include them, however.)

Because of challenges in gathering data on all the separately named groups of underserved students across the strategies addressed, this report mainly focuses on the numbers of low income students and students of color. Insufficient data was available to the author to calculate numbers of other kinds of underserved students which the specific strategies discussed here might serve at different funding levels. (However, the Needs Assessment Report does provide some estimates of the total numbers of these students across King County, as that information was available.)

Additionally, it’s likely that “children and youth who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system” significantly overlap with the universe of underserved students who are low-income and/or students of color. To be clear, though, that does not mean that any given strategy area discussed in this report necessarily would also well serve these other named groups of underserved students. As the County considers plans for how to implement its chosen PSTAA strategies, it will have an opportunity to decide whether and what extent to focus funding on

services to specific groups of underserved students. To maximize its focus on equity, during implementation planning the county should do further calculations of to more completely understand potential impacts on all of the underserved student groups, including disaggregation further by race/ethnicity.

## The Nine PSTAA Strategy Areas Restructured into Three Education Domains

The original nine PSTAA Strategy Areas developed by King County are:

1. **College Promise Programs:** Increasing access and success in postsecondary, via a “promise scholarship” program with a focus on:
  - a. Supportive services in high school to help students prepare for and persist in college;
  - b. Advisory support, completion coaching, or other necessary services at community or technical colleges;
  - c. Scholarships that target the highest-need students and programs serving low-income youth, youth of color, youth aging out of foster care, or homeless youth; and
  - d. Re-engaging youth who have dropped out of high school in education and employment.
2. **Career Academies:** Supporting career-connected education in K-12 schools, including through expansion of career academy models at the middle or high-school level to combine academic and career content from industries like technology or health care.
3. **Project-Based Learning:** Support elementary and middle schools in planning and launching innovative teaching methods that emphasize problem-based learning and connect classroom learning to careers;
4. **Early Learning Facilities:** Constructing, maintaining and renovating facilities to support early learning programs;
5. **Collocated Early Learning Facilities:** Collocating early learning centers with affordable housing, including flexible, mixed-use space to meet the multiple needs of children and youth with limited access to services;
6. **Underserved Youth:** Programming or facilities to support children and youth who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system or otherwise vulnerable or underserved;
7. **Children’s Savings Accounts:** Supporting asset-building strategies for youth, including children’s educational savings accounts;
8. **Youth Empowerment:** Identifying innovative strategies to empower students to be change agents in their schools and communities, who can identify and address social and racial injustice through advocacy and organizing; and
9. **Equity Education:** Training educators in the effects that economic status and institutional racism have on educational outcomes and economic mobility.<sup>4</sup>

To simplify reporting on potential numbers served, it was decided, instead of addressing all nine strategy areas separately and calculating three different numbers (one per funding level) for each (resulting in 27 estimates!), to cluster the strategy areas by services focused on early learning outcomes, K12 outcomes, and postsecondary outcomes, and report on generalized numbers served at three funding levels, for each of the three domains (resulting in a more manageable list of 9 estimates).

To do this, we associated strategy areas to the education domain where our Strategy Assessment Report appeared to indicate the strategy area would have the largest impact on student outcomes, as such:

- **Early Learning:** Strategy areas 4 and 5
- **K-12:** Strategy areas 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9
- **Postsecondary:** Strategy areas 1 and 7

---

<sup>4</sup> King County. RFP for PSTAA consultant. Strategy area ‘titles’ (in bold) per Strategy Assessment Report.

Readers will note that some strategies overlap education domains or could impact multiple domains. Please see the chapters related to each domain for more information on the rationale for choices of which strategy areas we produce estimates for, and detail on methods used to estimate populations that could be served at different funding levels. We also note that the numbers and variety of strategy areas in the K-12 domain prompted the use of a different methodology for estimating numbers served; versus the approach taken for Early Learning and Postsecondary. Again, more information on estimation methods and approach is given in each chapter.

## **Notes on the Estimates of Numbers that Could be Served**

All numbers should be considered rough estimates. As noted in the Strategy Assessment Report, costs of strategies and cost per student served in each strategy can vary greatly, depending on numerous implementation choices the County has yet to make. In most cases, more precise estimates will not be useful until programmatic level decisions are made by the County.

This report uses estimated typical costs of serving students that reflect what is known from the impact assessment literature (as summarized in the Strategy Assessment Report) related to the costs of high quality interventions that should secure maximum positive student outcomes. Some readers may think “I’ve heard of a program that costs half as much” to serve students. Such programs may well exist, but this report’s estimates generally hew to the literature about the cost of well-evaluated, quality programs that produce lasting education-related impacts, in particular for historically underserved student populations. Deciding to spend less per student, therefore, could result in fewer, to no, education impacts.

As the County makes decisions on which strategy areas it will fund at what levels, and makes implementation design choices within each strategy area, it will need to refine cost estimates further. These rough estimates are intended to be used only at this specific stage of the County’s decision-making process. These numbers should be taken as directional, not absolute.

Specific estimation methods used are discussed in each chapter of this report.

# Early Learning

## Background

Of the County's nine PSTAA strategy areas, two are focused on early learning facilities. None are specifically focused on funding early learning programming or other needs in early learning. Accordingly, the estimates produced here are specific to estimating potential numbers of children served by investing in early learning *facilities*.

Strategy areas 4 (early learning facilities) and 5 (collocated early learning facilities) both address early learning facilities but are listed as separate strategy areas. In the Strategy Assessment Report we combined analysis of these two strategy areas, as we considered strategy area 5 (collocation) to be an implementation option within strategy area 4, and that the underlying impacts, needs, and costs assessed under strategy 4 would be fairly similar to that found under strategy 5. This report focuses on strategy area 4, for similar reasons, as we would not expect strategy area 5 to produce significantly different numbers of early learners served than strategy area 4. (It should be noted that collocated facilities could have impacts beyond early learners, however the estimates in this report do not consider those impacts.) For detailed information on early learning facilities in general, and their potential impacts in King County, please see pages 43-56 of the Strategy Assessment Report.

A coalition formed in 2017 to advocate for PSTAA investment in early learning facilities – the Early Learning Facilities Stakeholders Group (ELFS) – has done extensive modeling to assess costs, impacts and other variables that would affect different approaches to creating new early learning facilities in King County. They have produced several reports which they have shared with King County staff, including their December 20, 2018 *Early Learning Facilities Development Proposal*<sup>5</sup>, written by their consultants Third Sector Intelligence (3SI). That report, in addition to responses to additional questions sent to ELFS' consultant Elty Consulting in January and February 2019, form the basis for the estimates reported here.

The ELFS numbers used in this Funding Levels Options Report utilize modeling that include specific assumptions. King County may choose to make different implementation choices, however the author of this report feels that the extensive work done by the ELFS group is likely the most accurate assessment of a likely EL facilities implementation plan currently available to King County decision-makers at this time. While this author was not privy to the exact methods used to develop the estimates that ELFS provided, he was able to discuss the model, and what it includes and doesn't include, with both 3SI and Elty Consulting representatives, and judges from the available information that the estimation methods are sound and high quality.

Please note that ELFS did not provide all the numbers that the author of this report requested, and he has, as noted in the following section and in the footnotes, made as needed his own estimates (based on information provided by ELFS, but not generated by or approved by ELFS).

---

<sup>5</sup> This report is available at [https://childcare.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Early%20Learning%20Facilities%20Development%20Proposal\(1\).pdf](https://childcare.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Early%20Learning%20Facilities%20Development%20Proposal(1).pdf)

**Table 2: Early Learning (Facilities) Numbers Served by Funding Level Option**

PSTAA Funding Level Options	# Low income served 2019-34 <sup>6</sup>	# Low income served 2019-50	# Students of color served 2019-34	Serves non-underserved students also	Matching funds requirement	# Low income served 2019-34 w/ match
<b>50% (\$150M)</b>	15,300	41,581	Un-available	Yes	Not Requested	No change
<b>33.3% (\$100M)</b>	12,748	34,256	Un-available	Yes	Not Requested	No change
<b>25% (\$75M)</b>	9,354	24,892	Un-available	Yes	Not Requested	No change

**Discussion of Data Presented**

**# Low Income Served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the unique number of low income children who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.

*Discussion: This number was calculated as described in the footnote. It is likely a small overestimate. Because of the ramp up period needed to construct and/or renovate new facilities, most facilities will not be open until further into the PSTAA funding period. Therefore total numbers of children served increases more slowly in the initial years of this project, and then accelerates faster in later years as new children use the same facilities in subsequent years. Because these are facilities investments, new children will continue to be served by PSTAA beyond the 2034 PSTAA end date (see below).*

**# Low Income Served 2019-2050:** this number reflects the number of unique low income children who would be served during the PSTAA period, and beyond it as well, should the strategy have an impact beyond the core PSTAA funding period.

*Discussion: These figures were provided by ELFS. As noted above, because these are investments in facilities that will continue to serve children beyond the PSTAA funding that ends in 2034, the County’s investment in this approach would continue to serve children long after PSTAA ends. 2050 was offered by ELFS as a long term date by which to judge total potential numbers served.*

*ELFS also provided estimates for numbers of children who would be served from 2019-2040: at 50%: 21,549 children; at 33%: 17,955 children; at 25%: 13,174 children.*

**# Students of Color served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the number of unique children of color who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.

*Discussion: This number cannot be calculated at this stage given the range of implementation decisions that have not been made that could increase or decrease these numbers.*

**Serves Non-underserved Students Also:** Indicates whether children who are not specifically named in the County’s PSTAA motion (see definition of ‘underserved students’ on page 8) would be served as a part of the strategy.

<sup>6</sup> The numbers in this column were estimated by the author of this report, based on other figures provided by ELFS. Due to the method used, they likely somewhat overestimate the number to be served by 2034. 2019-2040 (a 21 year period) “total served” numbers were multiplied by .71 to estimate numbers served from 2019-2034 (a 15 year period).

*Discussion: The ELFS model assumes that some children over 200% of the Federal Poverty Level will be served by the PSTAA funded early learning facilities. In short, the reason for this is that the EL providers that will occupy PSTAA funded facilities are highly likely to serve both subsidized and non-subsidized children as a necessary function of the business (financial) model of most early learning facilities. Therefore, some portion of PSTAA funding would go to support children who do not receive state or federal subsidies. ELFS estimates that the total number of children served will be more than 40% higher when accounting for the non-low income population that the facilities would also serve.*

**Matching Funds Requirement:** Indicates whether stakeholders would encourage the County to require matched funding from other sources. Such matching would potentially increase the number of children served due to the County's investment.

*Discussion: ELFS has stated that it prefers that there not be a match requirement placed by the County on PSTAA funds.*

**# Low-Income Students Served 2019-34 With Match:** This figure calculates the total unique children served if the effort attains a 1:1 funding match from non-PSTAA sources as a part of its strategy, based on whether it stated that it desired to have a matching funds requirement (above).

*Discussion: As a matching requirement is not preferred, there is no change in the potential number of children who might be served.*

## **Additional Context and Notes**

**Potential Impact of Early Learning Facilities:** We encourage readers to consider not just the costs and the potential numbers served by any PSTAA investment, but to also consider the potential impacts on those child and student populations – particularly low-income and student of color populations that the County has prioritized for PSTAA funding. An extensive discussion of the impacts of high quality early learning programs can be found in the Strategy Assessment Report starting on page 46. That report found a wide range of potential positive education impacts, from Kindergarten readiness through K12 and into postsecondary and beyond – with the condition that the programs housed within PSTAA-funded early learning facilities meeting the definitions of high quality EL programming.

It should also be noted that, as described under Strategy Area 5 (Collocated Early Learning Facilities) the funding of such facilities might have other positive benefits outside of young children, with the facilities providing benefits to older children and youth and other groups as well.

**Cost per student calculations:** Because of the complex modeling that generated the estimates of children served, including differentiation between costs of building brand new facilities vs. costs of renovating existing facilities (and numbers served in those different circumstances), it is not recommended that readers divide total numbers served by total PSTAA investment in order to attain 'cost per child' estimates.

**Administrative and support costs:** The calculations here are for "fully loaded" costs of all aspects of the project. The ELFS estimates are inclusive of administrative and other necessary costs to conduct such a project in addition to facilities construction and/or renovation costs.

# K-12

## Background

Of the County's nine PSTAA strategy areas, five are focused fairly specifically on K-12 related projects. (And it should be noted that all nine strategy areas might have some plausible impact on K-12 related outcomes).

This report will focus its cost estimates, and calculations of potential numbers of students served using a method that focuses on services provided by community partners; as such it is most applicable to strategy areas 6 (underserved youth), 8 (youth empowerment) and 9 (equity education), as well as partially applicable to strategy areas 1 (college promise), 2 (career academies) and 3 (project-based learning) to the extent that these strategy areas would engage community partners to fulfill elements of those strategies using approaches described here. The community-based partner components for strategy area 1 (college promise) are addressed in the Postsecondary section of this report, and it should be noted that the plan assessed there is likely to have impacts on high school graduation as well as postsecondary outcomes. For detailed information on the K-12 related strategy areas, and their potential impacts in King County, please see the Strategy Assessment Report. For more information on K-12 related needs, broken down by sub-groups of underserved students, please see the Needs Assessment Report.

Because this approach ranges across a number potential strategy areas and different approaches to serving K-12 aged youth, the author engaged 22 people from King County familiar with services for underserved youth, representing 19 different organizations, during 5 group interviews. 14 of these organizations were direct service providers who focus on services to low income youth, youth of color and other underserved student populations, including youth experiencing homelessness and foster youth. About half of the interviewees were people of color. The direct service providers were typically larger to mid-sized organizations, but smaller service providers were also included. Participants were told that their estimates and other comments would be reported in aggregate/summary form, rather than identified by person or organization. 6 of the interviewees reviewed a draft of the information summarized in this chapter prior to publication and provided feedback.

The author collected information from interviewees, including the kinds of services provided and average costs per student per year for services and the average number of years of service that students typically required, as well as the feasibility of the County requiring matching funds to receive PSTAA funding.

The focus of the group interviews, and cost and time estimates, was on programmatic approaches that could have a noticeable impact on education outcomes for underserved students (including low income students, students of color, and children and youth who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system or otherwise vulnerable); acknowledging that these students have multiple challenges in their lives that impact educational progress, and that many of these are challenges outside of the education system itself. As such, the conversation, and thus the estimates provided here, tended to focus on "case management" type approaches to working with youth (rather than less intensive approaches such as drop-in programs, or large group activities). The research on youth programs supports the idea that longer term, more intensive approaches are more likely to produce significant education outcomes; for more on this research see pages 57-61 of the Strategy Assessment Report.

The conversations focused on the needs of underserved students, and a wide range of potential interventions were discussed in terms of service numbers and costs. Interviewees noted that each student's needs were unique and also variable over time, as their personal situations change frequently, which could change the level of intervention and cost over time. Interviewees also noted that in most cases these community-provided services were happening in addition to education services already being provided by the public school system.

The estimates from interviewees varied greatly in terms of both cost and typical duration. On cost, the range was from \$1250 to \$10,000 per student per year, with most in the \$2000 to \$5000 range. Typical (non-outlier) program durations mentioned ranged from 1 year to 5 years. Based on the research literature, these ranges are within typical bounds reported nationally. More on the exact calculations of numbers of unique individuals that could be served are given in the notes below.

**Table 3: K-12 (Underserved Students Supports) Numbers Served by Funding Level Option**

PSTAA Funding Level Options	# Low income served 2019-34	# Low income served 2019-50	# students of color served 2019-34	Serves non-underserved students also	Matching funds requirement	# Low income served 2019-34 w/ match
<b>50% (\$150M)</b>	17,647	No change	17,647	No	Not Requested	No change
<b>33.3% (\$100M)</b>	11,765	No change	11,765	No	Not Requested	No change
<b>25% (\$75M)</b>	8,824	No change	8,824	No	Not Requested	No change

## Discussion of Data Presented

**# Low Income Served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the unique number of low income students who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.

*Discussion: The estimates are based on interviews (described above) and research presented in the Strategy Assessment Report. \$4250/student/year is the rounded average of interviewee responses; it also matches well what research on quality out of school programs tells us such programs cost. To arrive at a count of unique individuals who could be served, we assumed a two year intervention period. The research would support this as a minimum period to attain meaningful education outcomes. Two years was also the modal response given by interviewees, with an average of 2.7 years given (for a ‘typical’ service period).*

**# Low Income Students Served 2019-2050:** this number reflects the number of unique low income students who would be served during the PSTAA period, and beyond it as well, should the strategy have an impact beyond the core PSTAA funding period.

*Discussion: Given the approach described here, focused on supporting community organizations which would deliver services and expend PSTAA funds during the PSTAA funding period, no additional students would be expected to be served beyond 2034 by PSTAA funds.*

**# Students of color served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the number of unique students of color who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.

*Discussion: A PSTAA funding approach that focuses on providing funds to community organizations would be able to focus 100% of its funding on target populations, including students of color; it’s therefore possible, if the County directs its funding as such, that 100% of those served could be students of color.*

**Serves Non-underserved Students Also:** Indicates whether students who are not specifically named in the County’s PSTAA motion (see definition of ‘underserved students’ on page 8) would be served as a part of the strategy.

*Discussion: A PSTAA funding approach that focuses on providing funds to community organizations would be able to focus 100% of its funding on target populations; therefore no non-underserved groups would necessarily need to be supported by PSTAA funds.*

**Matching Funds Requirement:** Indicates whether stakeholders would encourage the County to require matched funding from other sources. Such matching would potentially increasing the number of students served due to the County's investment.

*Discussion: Those interviewed for this report were nearly unanimous in their opinion that the County should not require a funding match for community organizations to receive PSTAA funds. Primary reasons for this opinion given were: requiring a match will disadvantage smaller organizations, likely particularly race- and ethnic-specific organizations, thereby defeating the County's own equity-related goals for PSTAA; a requirement for matching funds creates additional unhelpful competition amongst providers for eligible matching funds; raising match adds significant time and uncompensated cost to organizational administrative functions, which may be better spent supporting students.*

**# Low-Income Students Served 2019-34 With Match:** This figure calculates the total unique students served if the effort attains a 1:1 funding match from non-PSTAA sources as a part of its strategy, based on whether it stated that it desired to have a matching funds requirement (above).

*Discussion: As a matching requirement is not preferred, there is no change in the potential number of students who might be served.*

## **Additional Context and Notes**

**Potential impact of K-12 underserved student support programs:** We encourage readers to consider not just the costs and the potential numbers served by any PSTAA investment, but to also consider the potential impacts on underserved student populations. Discussion of the impacts of various K-12 programs can be found in the Strategy Assessment Report. These can vary widely by program intent and design, and can include everything from test score increases in math and reading, social emotional development, grade point average increases, high school completion, and postsecondary readiness and enrollment.

**Administrative and support costs:** The calculations here are for 'fully loaded' costs of serving underserved students by community organizations. That is to say, the costs here include the associated administrative costs for an organization, in addition to the programmatic costs of delivering client services.

**Other feedback from interviews:** In the process of interviewing youth program service providers and intermediary organizations, other feedback and advice, not already covered elsewhere in this report, was offered for consideration of County decision makers. This included:

- A call for more of a 'system level' response, not simply funding more programmatic services: It was noted that this report's method of calculating costs exclusively emphasizes the costs of serving students, and the County might also consider working with school districts or other systems on systems-level solutions for underserved youth.
- Youth program facilities needs: it was noted that the methods used here focused on program services, and that for some youth organizations, facilities are a different important need.
- Focus on specific populations: The County should consider implementation plans that include programs designed for specific underserved populations named in the County's motion (children and youth who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system or otherwise vulnerable), rather than more 'universal' program services designs. It was also noted that even services targeted at, for example, low-income students may not be sufficient to meet the specific needs of these specific named populations. This concern was noted related to Early Learning and Postsecondary investments, not just in K-12. (For a

discussion of why this report only calculates numbers for low-income and students of color, see page 8.)

- Holistic student services can include family members: it was noted that the calculations of numbers served focused only on students; some programs also focus on serving family members concurrently as a part of program design, and those numbers and outcomes are also important products of this service delivery approach.

**Other K-12 approaches not covered by this estimation method:** A limitation of this report is that it does not provide cost and students served estimates for K-12 improvements conducted by school districts themselves, which are referenced by several of the strategy areas. Rough cost estimates for such programs are stated in the Strategy Assessment Report. For several of these strategy areas (such as “project based learning”) it was difficult to assess both the likely impact on student outcomes as well as generating numbers of students served, given such a systemic-change type intervention. A few of the strategy areas (such as “career academies”) could lend themselves to calculations of numbers of students served. Estimates of costs per academy created, as well as typical numbers of students served by Academies, can be found in the Strategy Assessment Report.

# Postsecondary

## Background

Of the County's nine PSTAA strategy areas, two are focused specifically on potential postsecondary impacts, strategy areas 1 (college promise) and 7 (children's savings accounts).

This report focuses on strategy area 1 (college promise) exclusively, as the assessment of children's savings accounts (in the Strategy Assessment Report) found that *postsecondary* impacts have not yet been reported in evaluations of this strategy area. For detailed information on college promise programs and their potential impacts in King County, please see pages 10-22 of the Strategy Assessment Report.

In 2008, the Puget Sound Coalition for College & Career Readiness (PSCCCR) formed, including regional K-12 and higher education leaders dedicated to addressing inequities in postsecondary access and success. In 2017, PSCCCR began a design effort to develop a model for more comprehensive support systems to increase postsecondary enrollment and completion for students of color and low income students in the region. The planning process resulted in the development of the King County Promise, a proposed college scholarship and supports program for King County guided by the PSCCCR. PSCCCR is staffed by the Puget Sound College & Career Network, a program of the Puget Sound Educational Service District.

PSCCCR has done modeling to assess costs, impacts and other variables that would affect such a college promise scholarship and supports system for King County. They have produced several reports and presentations which they have shared with King County staff. Those documents, in addition to responses to additional questions sent to PSCCCR in January and February 2019, form the basis for the estimates reported here.<sup>7</sup>

The PSCCCR numbers used in this Funding Levels Options report are specific to a set of implementation choices that PSCCCR is recommending. King County may choose to make different implementation choices, however the author of this report feels that the extensive work done by PSCCCR is likely the most accurate assessment of costs and numbers served in a likely college promise implementation plan currently available to King County decision-makers. While this author was not privy to the exact methods and decisions used to develop the estimates that were provided by PSCCCR, he was able to discuss the model, and what it includes and doesn't include, with PSCCCR representatives, and judges from the available information that the estimation methods are sound and of good quality.

Please note that PSCCCR was not able to provide all the numbers that the author of this report requested, and he has, as noted in the following section, made as needed his own estimates (based on information provided by PSCCCR, but not necessarily generated by or approved by PSCCCR).

It should be noted that the total King County Promise plan described by PSCCCR includes substantial supports that begin in high school, and the numbers reported here include both programs focused on helping high school students complete K-12 and access higher education, and also programs focused on helping college students succeed. The complete range of programmatic approaches of the King County Promise plan include both scholarships (direct aid to students), and student supports such as navigation and advising. This report assumes, and calculates numbers only for, the navigation/student supports services portion of the King County Promise (it does not address the scholarships components). The supports considered includes advising and navigation for both current high school and college students; it also supports reengagement of youth who have left high school before graduation, helping them to complete both high school and college. This 'services' portion of the King County Promise assessed in this report exclusively focuses on low income students.

---

<sup>7</sup> More information on the King County Promise can be found here: <http://psccon.org/king-county-promise/>

**Table 4: Postsecondary (College Navigation & Supports) Numbers Served by Funding Level Option**

PSTAA Funding Level Options	# Low income served 2019-34	# Low income served 2019-50	# Students of color served 2019-34	Serves non-underserved students also	Matching funds requirement	# Low income served 2019-34 w/ match
<b>50% (\$150M)</b>	60,313	No change	40,410	No	Requested	120,616
<b>33.3% (\$100M)</b>	40,205	No change	26,937	No	Requested	80,410
<b>25% (\$75M)</b>	30,157	No change	20,205	No	Requested	60,314

**Discussion of Data Presented**

**# Low Income Served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the unique number of low income students who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.

*Discussion: These numbers are derived based on PSCCCR’s estimated cost per student per year of \$835 for supportive services; this is a mix of averaged costs between CBO-provided services and services provided by public education institutions. The potential range for number of years is 1 to 5 for such services; to calculate unique numbers of students that could be served, three years was assumed as an average. Three years is a typical number of years to serve students in a college access program (two years in high school plus the first year of college); three years is also a typical time frame to serve a reengaged high school student through their first year of college.*

**# Low Income Students Served 2019-2050:** this number reflects the number of unique low income students who would be served during the PSTAA period, and beyond it as well, should the strategy have an impact beyond the core PSTAA funding period.

*Discussion: No additional students are expected to be served by PSTAA funds beyond 2034, as in this approach they would all be expended during the 2019-34 funding availability window. PSCCCR does expect the King County Promise program to continue well beyond the PSTAA 2034 end date, however.*

**# Students of Color served 2019-2034:** this number reflects the number of unique students of color who would be served during the specific period that PSTAA funding is available.

*Discussion: PSCCCR estimated that one third of students in the support services would be non-Hispanic whites.*

**Serves Non-underserved Students Also:** Indicates whether students who are not specifically named in the County’s PSTAA motion (see definition of ‘underserved students’ on page 8) would be served as a part of the strategy.

*Discussion: Given the focus of PSTAA funds specifically on support services of the King County Promise, it’s not expected that any non-underserved students would also be served, as those PSTAA funded services could be specifically dedicated to underserved students.*

**Matching Funds Requirement:** Indicates whether stakeholders would encourage the County to require matched funding from other sources. Such matching would potentially increase the number of students served due to the County's investment.

*Discussion: The King County Promise plan is built on the expectation of and need for over \$300M in total to be raised, over several decades, to support the complete Promise plan (scholarships and support services). PSCCCR has said that it would welcome King County requiring a match for PSTAA funds, as doing such would create additional leverage from which to raise other private and public funding to support the King County Promise plan.*

**# Low-Income Students Served 2019-34 With Match:** This figure calculates the total unique students served if the effort attains a 1:1 funding match from non-PSTAA sources as a part of its strategy, based on whether it stated that it desired to have a matching funds requirement (above).

*Discussion: As PSCCCR has indicated interest in a matching requirement, the numbers presented here are a simple doubling of the numbers that would be supported by PSTAA funds alone. PSTAA funds in effect 'leverage' other funders to double the number of student who could be served "because" of the PSTAA investment.*

## **Additional Context and Notes**

**Potential Impact of College Promise programs:** We encourage readers to consider not just the costs and the potential numbers served by any PSTAA investment, but to also consider the potential impacts on those student populations – particularly the underserved students that the County has prioritized for PSTAA funding. College Promise programs are relatively new interventions, and impact can vary widely due to the design choices made by such programs; they can include increased college attendance and completion in some cases. High school college access supports can increase high school completion and college entry. An extensive discussion of the impacts of college promise programs can be found in the Strategy Assessment Report starting on page 10.

**Cost per student calculations:** As noted, we relied on the PSCCCR provided number of an average Promise program support-focused intervention of \$835 per student per year. Because very large numbers of students would be supported in the high school and college advising supports parts of this project via 'school wide' interventions serving large numbers of students, it is reasonable to assume that some students would receive more specialized supports costing significantly more than \$835/year on average. Thus not all students who would be served by the King County Promise would receive equal amounts of supports.

**Administrative and support costs:** The calculations here are for 'fully loaded' costs of the project, including administrative costs that would be needed to execute the services portion of a King County Promise program as currently designed by PSCCCR.

## References

Puget Sound Taxpayer Accountability Account. King County. (website) <https://kingcounty.gov/council/issues/education.aspx>

*PSTAA Needs Assessment Report*. Ken Thompson Consulting. October 2018. [https://kingcounty.gov/~media/Council/documents/2018/PSTAA\\_Needs\\_Assessment\\_Report\\_10-2018.ashx](https://kingcounty.gov/~media/Council/documents/2018/PSTAA_Needs_Assessment_Report_10-2018.ashx)

*PSTAA Strategy Assessment Report*. Ken Thompson Consulting. October 2018. [https://kingcounty.gov/~media/Council/documents/2018/PSTAA\\_Strategy\\_Assessment\\_Report\\_10-2018.ashx](https://kingcounty.gov/~media/Council/documents/2018/PSTAA_Strategy_Assessment_Report_10-2018.ashx)

*Early Learning Facilities Development Proposal*. Third Sector Intelligence, Inc. Submitted by Early Learning Facilities Stakeholders Group. December 2018. [https://childcare.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Early%20Learning%20Facilities%20Development%20Proposal\(1\).pdf](https://childcare.org/ckfinder/userfiles/files/Early%20Learning%20Facilities%20Development%20Proposal(1).pdf)

King County Promise. Puget Sound College and Career Network. (website) <http://psccn.org/king-county-promise/>

## Appendix A: Full Text of King County Council Motion 15029

A MOTION stating the King County council's intent to develop an implementation plan to invest proceeds from the Puget Sound taxpayers' accountability account to improve educational outcomes in King County through investments in early learning programs; college and career training programs; and in programs that serve children and youth from low-income families or communities of color, or who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system or otherwise vulnerable.

"WHEREAS, the Washington state Legislature amended chapter 81.112 RCW via Second Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5987 in 2015 to create the Puget Sound taxpayer accountability account, and

WHEREAS, the Puget Sound taxpayer accountability account is to be funded by a sales and use tax offset fee of three and twenty-five one-hundredths percent of the total payments made by a regional transit authority to construction contractors on construction projects that are:

1. For new projects identified in the system plan funded by any proposition approved by voters after January 1, 2015; and
2. Excluded from the definition of retail sales under RCW 82.04.050(10), and

WHEREAS, on July 26, 2017, the King County council's committee of the whole held a special meeting in the city of Kent to discuss the account to hear from the public on this topic, and

WHEREAS, the King County council adopted Motion 14923 directed legislative department staff to prepare a report, in consultation with all councilmembers and the executive branch that provides strategies for how King County can engage stakeholders in a public process to determine how to use proceeds from Sound Transit 3 in the Puget Sound taxpayer accountability account, and

WHEREAS, between 2018 and 2035, King County is projected to receive approximately three hundred fifteen million dollars, and

WHEREAS, the proceeds are required by RCW 43.79.520 "for educational services to improve educational outcomes in early learning, K-12, and higher education including, but not limited to, for youths that are low-income, homeless, or in foster care, or other vulnerable populations," and

WHEREAS, to the greatest extent practicable, the expenditures of the county must follow the requirements of the Sound Transit subarea equity policy, and

WHEREAS, the proceeds may only be spent after the Washington state Legislature appropriates them, and

WHEREAS, meaningful funding from the account will be available starting in 2019, and

WHEREAS, the Youth Action Plan defines youth as people from ages sixteen to twenty-five, and

WHEREAS, economic status and race are predictors educational outcomes and economic mobility, and

WHEREAS, King County has traditionally not been involved in providing direct educational services to children or youth, and

WHEREAS, King County is fortunate to be home to dozens of organizations that work to improve educational outcomes for students and youth in all parts of the county;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

A. King County will utilize moneys from the Puget Sound taxpayers' accountability account to meet the following goals:

1. Ensure every child in King County is ready for kindergarten;
2. Improve educational outcomes for children and youth who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system or otherwise vulnerable;

3. Close the opportunity gap for children and youth of color and low-income children and youth;
4. End the school to prison pipeline and reduce youth involvement in the criminal justice system;
5. Embody the King County equity and social justice goal;
6. Ensure all youth in King County are prepared to fill the jobs of the future; and
7. Build a legacy for King County that lasts beyond the duration of the funding.

B. In order to meet the goals stated in section A. of this motion, King County will use the following principles:

1. Maximize the impact of the funding by focusing on no more than three areas for investment;
2. Invest in programs and projects consistent with the limited duration of the funding as much as possible, such as facility or pilot projects;
3. Prioritize programs that are evidence based or promising practices and have measurable outcomes, while also investing in innovative approaches;
4. Include funding for direct services provided in and by the community being served; and
5. Leverage existing initiatives, organizations, programs and funding sources,

such as the Youth Action Plan, , the Children and Youth Advisory Board, the Best Starts for Kids Levy, and the Veterans, Seniors and Human Services Levy, as well as related investments by cities, the state of Washington, schools employers and private foundations.

C. Puget Sound taxpayers' accountability account funding will be directed to the following priority areas:

1. Early learning;
2. K-12 education for vulnerable and underserved children and youth; and
3. College, career, and technical education.

D. The council initiative's director will lead the development of the implementation plan and will coordinate with the appropriate legislative branch and executive branch staff. The council initiatives director should provide an oral update on the progress of developing the implementation plan to the council's committee of the whole each quarter.

E. The King County council will engage a consultant to help facilitate community outreach and prepare an implementation plan, for the life of the account, guided by the goals and principles stated in section A and B of this motion, targeting the priority areas in section C of this motion, and in accordance with section F of this motion. The consultant shall meet with stakeholders and subject-matter experts when drafting the implementation plan.

F. When conducting the community outreach to develop the implementation plan, the consultant will explore a variety of strategies including, but not limited to:

1. Increasing access and success in postsecondary or career connected education, including advisory support or other necessary services at community or technical colleges via a "promise scholarship" program, or programs targeting low-income youth, youth of color or homeless youth.;
2. Constructing, maintaining and renovating facilities to support early learning programs;
3. Collocating early learning centers with affordable housing, including flexible, mixed-use space to meet the multiple needs of children and youth with limited access to services;
4. Programing or facilities to support children and youth who are homeless, in the foster care system, in the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system or otherwise vulnerable or underserved;
5. Supporting asset building strategies for youth including children's educational savings accounts;

6. Identifying innovative strategies to empower students to be change agents in their schools and communities who can identify and address social and racial injustice through advocacy and organizing; and

7. Training educators in the effects that economic status and institutional racism have on educational outcomes and economic mobility.

G. The King County council intends to engage the public directly through at least two town hall meetings of the committee of the whole. The King County council also intends to establish an advisory committee to review and provide comments on the consultant's draft report and will establish this advisory committee in a future motion.

H. The implementation plan is due to the council by September 1, 2018, and will be used to inform the development of the 2019-2020 biennial budget.

Motion 15029 was introduced on 11/27/2017 and passed as amended by the Metropolitan King County Council on 12/11/2017, by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Dunn, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Upthegrove, Ms. Kohl-Welles and Ms. Balducci

No: 0

Excused: 2 - Mr. Gossett and Ms. Lambert

# Appendix B: Expected Annual King County PSTAA Funds

2017 projected payout of PSTAA funding (as of March 2019):

<b>2020</b>	\$5,519,000
<b>2021</b>	\$8,556,000
<b>2022</b>	\$7,638,000
<b>2023</b>	\$9,351,000
<b>2024</b>	\$15,561,000
<b>2025</b>	\$17,105,000
<b>2026</b>	\$13,302,000
<b>2027</b>	\$26,202,000
<b>2028</b>	\$37,429,000
<b>2029</b>	\$36,398,000
<b>2030</b>	\$25,711,000
<b>2031</b>	\$29,325,000
<b>2032</b>	\$29,799,000
<b>2033</b>	\$31,662,000
<b>2034</b>	\$17,625,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$315,719,000</b>