

Final Report

**Review of the At-Risk Adjustment to the
Wyoming Cost-based Block Grant
Education Funding Model**

November 1, 2002

A Report Prepared by Ruth Sommers
for the

Wyoming Department of Education
Judy Catchpole
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Hathaway Building, Second Floor
2300 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Summary

Review of the At-Risk Adjustment to the Wyoming Cost-based Block Grant Education Funding Model November 1, 2002

A Report Prepared by Ruth Sommers for the Wyoming Department of Education

History

Management Analysis & Planning (MAP) last year presented to the Wyoming State Legislature extensive discussion of the issues surrounding the identification and funding of services to students at risk of failure. Based on their recommendations, the Legislature modified the adjustment then in use. The identification of students was changed to a system which did not allow counting the same student twice for reimbursement purposes (one who could be both limited English proficient, or LEP, *and* participate in free or reduced lunch.) The reimbursement itself was adjusted from a per capita amount to one that compensated districts based on their concentration of at-risk students. The legislature adopted the use of a weighted adjustment to funding provided in the Cost-based Block Grant model. Finally, dollars were not directed to districts unless they had schools within their jurisdiction that served more at-risk students than the statewide average of the same.

The 56th Legislature directed the Wyoming Department of Education to review the current at-risk adjustment in order to answer two primary questions. Is the use of limited English speaking (LEP) and free and/or reduced price lunch counts (referred to as the unduplicated count) inclusive, appropriate and accurate as a proxy for identifying the number of at-risk students for the purposes of financial compensation, and additionally, is the adjustment adequate?

Approach

Two survey instruments were distributed to districts. The spring 2002 survey was sent to a randomly selected elementary and secondary school in each district and asked them, among other things, to identify the number of at-risk students they were serving, to provide an estimated cost for interventions, and to describe the programs they were using. Fifteen individual schools were visited on-site, essentially discussing the survey in person. An additional questionnaire was sent to all districts in August, 2002 requesting information on summer school programs offered throughout the state.

Responses to these surveys, though not verified, constitute a large portion of this report. This information was supplemented with demographic and statistical data gathered by

the Wyoming Department of Education (the Department) to draw conclusions concerning the state's identification of and reimbursement to schools for their at-risk student population.

FINDINGS ON THE PROXY

Short of establishing a system of individual student identification, accompanied with improvement/intervention plans, documentation of services delivered, etc., use of a proxy can be an effective way to predict a school's general level of academically vulnerable children. The use of socioeconomic measures to predict the level of need for additional resources, although controversial, remains one of the most accurate predictors of educational failure. Socioeconomic indicators are used by the majority of states within the nation, and by the federal government itself. And, in Wyoming, there is a direct and noticeable correlation between test scores and socioeconomic status (as measured by students participating in free/reduced lunch.)

The numbers of at-risk students reported by Wyoming schools as receiving at-risk interventions were compared to the number of students identified in those same schools by the at-risk adjustment's unduplicated count. Statewide, K through 12, these two counts differed by only 6 percent, and were reasonably correlated. However, when the counts are segregated into grade spans and re-examined, different results are made evident.

In the elementary span, the unduplicated count and the number of students identified by schools are very correlated, and the two differ by only 4.6 percent. But, at the secondary level, differences between the current proxy and the actual experience reported by schools begin to surface. Interestingly, the findings tend to dispute one another, thus are somewhat masked when examining the entire K-12 system. At the middle/ junior high level, the unduplicated count in the model *under represented (by 16 percent)* the number of students schools reported to be serving; and at the high school level, the unduplicated count *over represented (by 16 percent)* the number reported as being served by schools.

Table 2: Comparison of Unduplicated Count and At-risk Students Reported by Schools, K-12

	Enrollment	Undup Count	Percent Enrollment	# ID'd by School	% Enroll Identified	Variance with Undup Count
Sub-Total Elem:	9301	3515	37.79%	3676	39.52%	4.58%
Sub-Total JH/Middle:	3566	1221	34.24%	1417	39.74%	16.05%
Sub Tot High, w/o Alt Highs:	6592	1282	19.45%	1065	16.16%	-16.93%
Sub-Total, Alternative Highs:	526	269	51.14%	507	96.39%	88.48%
TOT K-12 w 100% Schools:	19985	6287	31.46%	6665	33.35%	6.01%

An incidental finding which surfaced while analyzing counts submitted by schools and those generated by the unduplicated count is that alternative schools are probably not well represented by using only the unduplicated count. Like other high schools, alternative schools typically will not have a large participating in the free/reduced lunch program, yet 100 percent of their students are, by the mere fact of attending an alternative school, considered to be at risk of failure. Although these schools generally qualify for the small school adjustment, this adjustment varies greatly among them, from an additional estimated FY03 small school supplement of \$475/ADM at Triumph High School to \$55,749/ADM at Shoshone Learning Center.

Fine Tuning the Proxy, Recommendation

In analyzing various school demographics with WyCAS scores in order to determine what other characteristics unique to Wyoming could be used to predict academic performance, mobility was found to have a significant impact on test scores at the secondary level. Mobility of students is a fact of life schools have no control over, but one to which they must respond. It is recognized nationally in the No Child Left Behind legislation that mobility affects student performance, to the point schools are not required to report for accountability purposes the scores of students new to their building the first year. Thus, **it is recommended the proxy in the current model for at-risk student identification be adjusted, either directly or indirectly, at the secondary level to account for incidence of mobility** within individual schools. A coincidental benefit of modifying the unduplicated count to accommodate mobility is that it directs additional funds to alternative schools which typically have the highest levels of new students within their buildings.

Other Findings, Comments, and Recommendations

A very high percentage of *special education students* were included in at-risk numbers received from schools (27.98 percent K-12.) Some schools were able to clearly identify which services were required by a student's Individual Education Plan and which were at-risk interventions. Others could not articulate this differentiation as well. **It is recommended the Department further identify distinctions between these two student populations (if necessary) then train schools on how to clearly separate the supports provided by these two programs** so that counts are not polluted and reimbursement for services not duplicated.

Data gathered indicate the possibility that schools may be *under serving at-risk students at the high school level*. Even accounting for pupils who drop out of school, the decrease in number of students reported as being served from junior high/middle school to high school cannot be explained by dropout numbers alone. **It is recommended compensatory programs offered throughout districts be reviewed for effectiveness and efficiency** over a two-year interim period to determine if intervention and/or remediation programs for students are adequate.

Only part of the decline in numbers of students served in middle/junior high versus high school is unfortunately explained by *student dropout and completion rates*. The 2000-01 dropout event rate (for one year) was 6.119 percent; the completion rate was 77.346 percent. Completion rates look at a 4-year cohort of students, and are a fairly accurate representation of how many 9th graders complete their high school education. Looked at beyond the one-year event rate, 23 percent of Wyoming's students in a particular class are dropping out. **It is recommended policy makers focus much more attention on dropout rates**, recognizing they are one of the primary indicators of the health of the state's educational system.

It appears there currently is *no commonly shared vision* of what an at-risk student is, or how to effectively serve that child. The fact that individual districts use from 20th to 75th percentile test scores as cutoff points for intervention reflects a very wide disparity of achievement expectations. The absence of a commonly shared vision is also evident in the significant variation among schools between the students they identify at-risk and those identified by the unduplicated count. For example, at the high school level, some schools reported serving up to three times as many students as the unduplicated count, while other serve as few as 12 percent of the students identified by the unduplicated count. **It is recommended policy makers define adequate and inadequate student performance, and that the Department provide technical assistance and support for the use of effective intervention and remediation strategies.**

FINDINGS ON THE ISSUE OF ADEQUACY

As stated in the above paragraph, there currently is no shared vision within the state on what satisfactory student performance is. Before the issue of adequacy can be addressed seriously, policy makers need to identify adequate and inadequate student performance. Compensatory education is becoming more and more critical in light of the implementation of higher standards and strict new federal mandates; thus we find ourselves in need of identifying when and how interventions should occur with students so they remain engaged and successful in the educational process.

The larger report explains in detail how the current model works in compensating districts for at-risk students. MAP maintains the prototype schools in the Cost-based Block Grant model were developed assuming a statewide average concentration of at-risk students. Thus, their adjustment does not provide funds until after the statewide concentration is exceeded. MAP also recognizes the prototype does not fund services delivered to students before or after school, or in other extended settings, like summer school. They maintain the weighted adjustment is intended for these purposes, in addition to being able to compensate schools for interventions occurring "within school day" for numbers of students beyond the statewide average.

Until more research is done to cost out specific programs and strategies that have been *proven effective* within Wyoming schools, it is difficult to argue with MAP's assertion that

an average concentration of at-risk students can be adequately served within the parameters of the current funding model (the prototype.)

We do have information on how the adjustment itself reimburses districts. Except for summer school expenditures, we *do not* have accurate information from districts on what their interventions cost or whether or not those interventions are effective. Again, without definition of adequate student performance and identification of effective intervention and remediation strategies, it is difficult to anticipate what these programs *should* cost. Additionally, even being able to capture cost of programs *currently in place* in schools would take two interim legislative sessions. One year would be needed to systematically prepare districts and gather school level cost data throughout the full school year. Reporting back to the legislature would occur the session following that school year.

One Wyoming district was able to provide cost data on the intervention strategies they currently have in place. Caution is urged in drawing hard conclusions from this limited anecdotal evidence, but this information does give us a direction to pursue in answering whether the adjustment is at least reimbursing districts for what they *currently do* (whether or not it is *adequate*.) It was found the adjustment alone did not fully fund this district's expenditures associated with at-risk students. Some additional costs are covered in the prototype itself, but it is difficult to isolate an exact figure for these additional costs.

However, we do know the prototype is not intended to reimburse districts for extended day programs, and the adjustment currently in place did not cover the costs of interventions in place for the district in question. Thus, **it is recommended that the legislature provide a limited reimbursement to districts for costs associated with their summer school intervention and remedial programs.** Summer school reimbursement should be operated as a grant initiative separate from the education block grant, with application procedures and program requirements developed by the Department in association with district personnel.

Summer school programs and costs were collected at the district level through a questionnaire distributed to districts in August, 2002. Although costs per student vary drastically across district lines, it is felt this information is more accurate than school-level data requested in the spring survey. Detail is provided in the body of this report on summer school academic and other offerings, percentage of students participating, costs of programs, etc. Information is also provided to policy makers on what successful summer school policies are considered to be in light of today's compensatory education demands.

**Review of the At-Risk Adjustment to the
Wyoming Cost-based Block Grant
Education Funding Model
November 1, 2002**

A Report Prepared by Ruth Sommers for the Wyoming Department of Education

INTRODUCTION

The 56th Legislature directed the Wyoming Department of Education (the Department) to review the at-risk adjustment provided through the current public education funding model to answer two primary questions. Is the use of limited English speaking and free/reduced-price lunch counts (referred to as the unduplicated count) inclusive, appropriate and accurate as a proxy for identifying the number of at-risk students for the purposes of financial compensation, and additionally, is the adjustment adequate?

In its report to the Wyoming State Legislature last year, Management Analysis and Planning, Inc. (MAP) presented extensive discussion of a number of issues surrounding the complex subject of identifying and funding services for students at risk of failure.¹ MAP spoke to the Wyoming Supreme Court's ruling on funding programs for at-risk youth, and what problems they perceived the Court found with the then current funding model. They presented a lengthy explanation of what characteristics defined at-risk students, related extensive research findings on educational practices and funding programs for these students, explained where Wyoming's specific demographics placed it in a national context relative to these issues, and how the funding prototype or mechanisms currently in place effectively dealt with researched-based resource allocation strategies (such as generally small class and/or school sizes, early reading intervention, professional development, etc.) These issues and discussions will not be reiterated in this report. Rather, it will deal primarily with specific Wyoming data and experience in an attempt to mold a funding mechanism unique to this state, its needs, and its demographics.

To gather data to begin to resolve the specific questions raised by the legislative mandate, surveys (Attachment 1) were distributed in May, 2002 to an elementary and secondary school in each district asking for: 1.) their definition of at-risk students; 2.) their count of students identified and served; 3.) estimated costs of "within day" and "outside of day" interventions; 4.) types of programs utilized by schools for these children; 5.) the success of the programs, and how it is measured; and, 6.) ideas and suggestions they may have concerning proven interventions for at-risk students. Fifteen schools were visited on-site, essentially reviewing in person the survey mailed to other schools.

¹ Seder, R., L. Picus, and J. Smith. Wyoming Education Finance: Estimating the Costs of Services for "At Risk" Students. Davis, CA: Management Analysis and Planning, Inc. 2002.

Surveys were returned with only five schools not responding. Responses from three additional schools were rejected because of incomplete or questionable information (Attachment 2.) One school could provide no numbers because of definition changes within their district, and two schools identified 100 percent of their students at risk and currently being served. Although these latter two schools did not have high WyCAS scores in the proficient or above categories, they also did not experience scores typical of alternative schools, which, by definition, exclusively serve populations of at-risk students and thus are considered to legitimately claim 100 percent of their students at risk. Unfortunately, all three surveys rejected were from middle/junior high schools.

Information gathered in these surveys gives a broad overview of what schools are doing to intervene on the behalf of students needing additional supports to succeed academically. These survey findings are included as Attachment 3 to this report, "At-Risk Student Survey, Program Offerings."

THE PROXY ISSUE

In determining the incidence of students at risk of failure, essentially only two methods can be used: identify each student individually at the school level; or use a proxy measure to predict a school's or a district's general level of academically vulnerable children. The first method would of necessity look very much like the state's current system of identifying and funding services to children in special education. It would require a very specific common definition of an "at-risk" student, development of an educational improvement or intervention plan, documentation of services delivered, enumeration of results, etc. In visiting with schools around the state, the consultant found schools interviewed would prefer not to delve into this level of detail in dealing with their at-risk population. First, many more children are, at one point or another, considered to be at risk of failure than are served as special education students. Additionally, students move in and out of at-risk services with a great deal of frequency. This kind of system could be extensively burdensome.

The use of a proxy measure is not without its problems. It is not perfect or exact; but at the same time, it is not inexact to the point of being useless and actually poses a number of advantages. Since students are not individually identified when using a proxy, they are not labeled as being problem or needy children. A proxy does not reward failure as is feared might occur if each student were specifically counted as requiring interventions. All states within the nation provide some sort of additional funding for compensatory education for children who are in need of it. Most of them use some sort of proxy, usually a socioeconomic one, to determine where to direct funds. And, of course, the nation's largest compensatory program, Title 1, distributes funds based on the number of children living in poverty within each school district.

National Practice

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) has compiled an extensive collection of state school finance synopses, identifying by each state their tax mechanism for educa-

tion, their basic foundation funding, support for special education, transportation, teacher pay/benefits, litigation, compensatory programs, etc.² In this data base, 33 states specifically defined their mechanism for identifying and funding their at-risk student populations. Of these 33 states, 23 (70 percent) used a socioeconomic indicator as the basis of their supplement. Most often this indicator was free and reduced lunch count, but states also utilized Title 1, AFDC/TANF, food stamp numbers, and sometimes a combination of one or more. Of the ten remaining states, five used a combination of economic and academic performance as indicators, and five defined at-risk students using only academic performance. Additionally, districts or schools with higher concentration levels of poverty were acknowledged by many states as needing higher levels of financial support than those without the same degree of socioeconomic pressure, and their funding supplements were adjusted accordingly, similar to the current at-risk adjustment.

Although the use of socioeconomic measures to predict levels of need for additional resources is controversial in some circles, even recently published reports still strongly emphasize the impact of poverty, especially when it is concentrated. A student's performance "...depends not only on his own characteristics and family background, but also on the characteristics and backgrounds of the students in his class...a student's performance declines as the share of classmates from poor households increases. This finding translates into a statement about educational cost."³ An environment characterized by high poverty is considered a harsh one and results in higher costs to obtain a given performance level than are incurred in an environment not characterized by poverty.

The State View as a Whole

Is there a relationship in Wyoming between socioeconomic status and academic achievement? Actually, there is, and it is noticeable. When looking at school level WyCAS test scores in relationship to students taking the test who were also participating in free or reduced lunch programs, significant correlations can be seen between the two at all three grade levels (See Table 1.)

These negative correlations essentially say that as free/reduced lunch counts increase, WyCAS scores tend to decrease. Please note these correlations are at the school rather than the individual student level. At the individual level, John Doe, who is receiving free and reduced lunch, may be a high achieving student, while Jane Smith, who is struggling with learning, is not receiving a free or reduced lunch. However, at the school level, these two would cancel out each other under a block grant model, as funds directed by the formula to John Doe could be redirected by the school or the district to Jane Smith.

² National Conference of State Legislatures. Education Finance Database. 2002. From the NCSL Web site at www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/ed.

³ Duncombe, W. and J. Yinger, Financing Higher Standards in Public Education: The Importance of Accounting for Educational Costs. Syracuse, NY: Center for Policy Research, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University. 1998.

Table 1: School level correlations between WyCAS test scores and free/reduced lunch participation of students:

Grade	School Demographic	WyCAS Mean Scores		
		Reading	Writing	Math
4	F&R Lunch	-0.442**	-0.497**	-0.298**
8	F&R Lunch	-0.362**	-0.425**	-0.274**
11	F&R Lunch	-0.630**	-0.564**	-0.693**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)
 Excludes schools reporting 0% F&R Lunch
 Based on 3-year data

Information from Wyoming Schools

One of the primary goals of the at-risk survey sent to schools was to ascertain whether or not schools were serving at or near the number of students counted as being at-risk by the current funding model's unduplicated count of free/reduced lunch and limited English speaking students. Based on the results of these surveys, when looking at the K-12 system as a whole, the proxy appears adequate and reasonable.

At the K-12 level, the unduplicated count used in the current funding mechanism identified 6,287 students among the schools surveyed as being limited English speaking and/or participating in free/reduced lunch programs (Table 2, below.) The schools themselves reported 6,665, a difference statewide of 6.01 percent.

Table 2: Comparison of Unduplicated Count and At-risk Students Reported by Schools, K-12
 (Specific schools shown in Tables 3 and 4.)

	Enrollment	Undup Count	Percent Enrollment	# ID'd by School	% Enroll Identified	Variance with Undup Count
Sub-Total Elem:	9301	3515	37.79%	3676	39.52%	4.58%
Sub-Total JH/Middle:	3566	1221	34.24%	1417	39.74%	16.05%
Sub Tot High, w/o Alt Highs:	6592	1282	19.45%	1065	16.16%	-16.93%
Sub-Total, Alternative Highs:	526	269	51.14%	507	96.39%	88.48%
TOT K-12 w 100% Schools:	19985	6287	31.46%	6665	33.35%	6.01%

Table 3: Correlation between Unduplicated Count Percentage and Percentage of At-Risk Students Reported by Schools, K-12			
<u>Grade</u>		<u>100% Schools OUT</u>	<u>100% Schools IN</u>
K-12	Undup Count	0.494**	0.568**

**Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

The correlation between the two reporting systems (unduplicated count and what the schools reported, Table 3) varied between 0.494 and 0.568, depending on whether or not schools identifying 100 percent of their students as at risk are included. These so-called “100 percent schools” are either reservation schools, which have at or near 100 percent of their students identified as limited English speaking, or alternative schools, which generally target academically struggling students. In the former case, because the current funding mechanism also counts limited English speaking children, the correlation with reservation schools is very high. But, alternative schools look like other non-reservation high schools. They do not typically have high numbers of either limited English speaking or free/reduced lunch participation, and thus the unduplicated count is not highly representative of the number of students they would identify. Nevertheless, when the 100 percent schools surveyed for this study are included in the totals, the correlation *increases* (Table 3.)

At the elementary grade span, the unduplicated count found 3,515 children, and schools identified 3,676, a difference of 4.58 percent (Attachment 4.) The correlations between the two sets of figures are both good, and varied between 0.427 with 100 percent schools out, and 0.711, with the 100 percent schools in. At the elementary level, the 100 percent schools are all reservation schools; thus the correlation is increased when they are added, again due to the fact that the current model already identifies limited English speaking children in its methodology.

At the secondary level, middle/junior high and high school, differences between the current proxy and experience reported by schools begin to surface. Interestingly, the findings at one level tend to negate findings at the other. In junior high/middle school, the unduplicated count in the model *under represented* the number of students schools were actually serving (Attachment 5.) The model identified 1,221 children in the schools selected, while the schools themselves reported 1,417, a difference of 16.05 percent. The correlation without the 100 percent schools is weak, at 0.272; however, when the 100 percent schools are included, the correlation increases to 0.559. Nevertheless, because the percentage difference of student counts between the two measurements is high (16.05 percent,) identification of at-risk students in junior high/middle school is one area that perhaps needs some adjustment.

At the high school level, when alternative schools are excluded, the current identification method *over represented* the number of students the surveyed schools reported they served (Attachment 5.) This raises the questions of whether or not schools could be under serving high school at-risk pupils. Without the 100 percent schools, the current model counted 1,282

students in the surveyed schools, while the schools themselves counted 1,065, a difference of -16.93 percent. This negative difference is misleadingly alleviated when alternative schools are included, as the model only recognizes their unduplicated count, while the schools recognize 100 percent of their students.

MAP recognized that using free and reduced lunch counts could under represent the number of economically disadvantaged youth at the secondary level. To help alleviate this possibility, they proposed using *eligibility* for the supplemental food program (rather than participation) as the count for at-risk students within each school⁴. However, in real practice, this could not be implemented as planned, further supporting the need for adjustment at the secondary level.

Fine Tuning the Proxy

Analyses were made comparing multiple school characteristics with WyCAS scores in order to determine if test results could be predicted using other measurements unique to Wyoming. The Wyoming Department of Education gathers a multitude of data, some of which will be used in the state's new report card system, Every Child Counts. Some of the items analyzed relative to WyCAS scores were number of students per certified staff, teacher experience levels, teacher attainment of master's degrees, student attendance, and mobility. Significant correlations with test results were evident with two of these elements – mobility and attendance (all significant correlations are shown in Attachment 6.)

It is probably not surprising to most that attendance would be highly correlated with successful test performance. It is interesting that, according to analysis results, attendance is a much more critical factor in secondary schools, particularly in middle/junior highs, than in elementary. Because the school funding model is based on average daily membership, attendance is already a significant and direct contributor to a school's funding level. Many schools did mention in their survey responses that they would like to lend more resources and attention to truancy. They expressed frustration over the fact parents are not held liable for attendance of their children at school, and that our laws allow young people to leave school at the age of 16. Indeed, the sophomore year is exactly where dropout numbers double from the prior year. Regardless of truancy problems, attendance is something schools can address and have some control over; thus using it as an additional measurement of a school's at-risk climate could be counter productive and perhaps even redundant.

The other element that showed a high correlation with test results was mobility. Like attendance, mobility (defined in WyCAS as a student new to the building) showed a much greater effect at the secondary level than at elementary (Table 4.) Mobility and free/reduced lunch counts are highly correlated; thus the larger effect of mobility on test scores at the secondary level (rather than the elementary level) may somewhat be the result of the drop in free/reduced lunch counts in secondary, particularly in high school.

⁴Seder, R., L. Picus, and J. Smith. Wyoming Education Finance: Estimating the Costs of Services for "At Risk" Students. Davis, CA: Management Analysis and Planning, Inc., 2002, page 23.

Table 4: School level correlations between WyCAS test scores and mobility of students:

Grade	School Demographic	WyCAS Mean Scores		
		Reading	Writing	Math
4	New to Bldg	-0.087	-0.140	-0.152*
8	New to Bldg	-0.528**	-0.551**	-0.550**
11	New to Bldg	-0.550**	-0.509**	-0.626**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed.)

Excludes schools reporting 0% F&R Lunch

Based on 3-year data

Mobility of students is a fact of life schools have no control over, but one to which they must respond. It is recognized nationally in the No Child Left Behind legislation that mobility affects student performance to the point that schools are not required to report for accountability purposes the scores of students new to their building during the testing year. Analyzing data specific to Wyoming tends to prove this national assumption true within the experience of our own state.

However, this finding needs more research before it can be accurately applied to the adjustment for at-risk students. This analysis relied on demographic data reported by schools for the WyCAS. At this point in time, mobility data is gathered only at the WyCAS years, in fourth, eighth, and eleventh grades, and may not be detailed or accurate enough to extrapolate to other grades. The Department will need to gather more accurate mobility data, and/or perhaps explore the possibility of extending, then modifying elementary unduplicated counts to secondary grades (the “feeder school” concept in Title 1.) After examining how these numbers could be used to supplement or weight the unduplicated count, further decisions can be made as to whether or not it satisfactorily targets secondary schools.

The goal of this adjustment is to account for and lend resources to schools for needed interventions of new students, especially at high concentration levels. It is important this reimbursement be based on individual schools, as targeting funds in this way seems to particularly resolve some of the issues of directing funds to at-risk students in alternative schools. Although these schools generally qualify for the small school adjustment, like all small schools, this adjustment varies greatly among them, from an additional estimated FY03 supplement of \$475/ADM at Triumph High School to \$55,749 per ADM at Shoshone Learning Center.⁵ Following is a list of secondary schools, ranked from highest to lowest percentage of new students, as reported through WyCAS.

⁵ Wyoming Legislative Service Office; Preliminary figures

<u>School</u>	<u>% Reported New</u>
Whiting Alternative High	93.33%
Pathfinder Learning Center	87.50%
Cooperative School	77.78%
Arvada-Clearmont Junior High	75.00%
Westwood High School	61.11%
Roosevelt High School	47.92%
Ft. Mackenzie High School	42.86%
Rock Springs Alternative High	39.39%
Bearlodge High School	33.33%
Triumph High School	31.17%
Farson-Eden Middle School	25.00%
East Junior High, Casper	24.65%
Poison Spider (K-8)	22.22%
Wright Place	20.00%

Only those schools having 20 percent or more of their students considered new in building the first year are included. Not all the schools in this list are alternative schools, but the majority are. The Department must consider carefully its definition of and instructions to schools on counting new students if it wishes to direct additional funds for at-risk students to alternative schools.

OTHER FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

Analyzing school survey responses and looking at issues surrounding identification of and funding for students at risk of failure brings some issues to surface, answers some questions, and raises others. One particular observation made from school surveys concerned the potential co-mingling of at-risk students with students receiving special education services.

Special Education or At-Risk?

Certainly a child receiving special education services can be at risk of failure. But, districts should be able to clearly differentiate between services itemized and required by the Individual Education Plan (IEP) of a special needs student and the support that same student may require to learn math or reading.

A very high percentage of special education students were included in the at-risk numbers received from schools (Attachment 7.) Overall, 27.98 percent of the children identified as at risk were also receiving special education services, and many schools and districts include special education as part of their definition of an at-risk child. Of 85 responding schools, only 11 did not have special education children included in their at-risk count, and only two declared that special education had its own identification criteria and funding mechanism. Elementary schools identified 29.30 percent of their at-risk children as having IEPs; 32.96 percent had IEPs in middle/junior high; and in high school, approximately 20 percent were identified special education students as well. Among individual schools, percentages ranged from 0 percent to 100 percent of at-risk children also receiving special education services. During on-site interviews conducted at the 15 schools, some schools were able to clearly identify situations where, for instance, a child receiving special education services for physical therapy

would also need to attend an after school tutoring program for math. Others could not articulate this differentiation of services to their at-risk children and could not elaborate upon what kind of supports a particular student might be receiving that were not identified in their IEP.

These findings speak to the fairly urgent need to train schools on how to clearly separate the supports provided by these two programs so that counts are not polluted and reimbursement for services not duplicated.

Under Identification of At-Risk Students in High School?

Educators are aware that the upper grades will not have as many students participating in free and reduced lunch as elementary grades. Statewide the unduplicated count drops from around 37 percent free and reduced-price lunch/limited English speaking students in elementary to approximately 30 percent in junior high/middle schools, then to 16 percent in high school. The high schools surveyed for this report had an average unduplicated count of 19.45 percent (alternative schools excluded.) These same schools, however, only reported 16.16 percent of their students as being “at-risk.” Of course this 16 percent is an average of the surveyed schools. Individually, high schools reported serving from up to three times as many students as identified in the unduplicated count, to serving less than one-eighth of the number of students identified in the unduplicated count (Attachment 5.)

Not surprisingly, these findings pose some questions. To some of these questions, we may have some partial answers, at least. For instance – Why does free/reduced price lunch participation decrease so much in the upper grades? We know most high schools permit students to leave at lunch, and, unlike at the elementary and middle school levels, they do leave, and thus don’t participate in the school’s free or reduced lunch program. We know the number of children in poverty in Wyoming decreases from elementary levels of around 14 percent to 11.52 percent at ages 16 and 17 (Table 5.) As students grow older, we believe they may feel embarrassment at free or reduced lunch participation.

	<u># Children in Poverty</u>	<u>Total Population</u>	<u>% Children In Poverty</u>
Under Age 5	5,449	30,940	17.61%
Age 5	870	6,286	13.84%
Age 6 to 11	6,136	42,589	14.41%
Age 12 to 14	2,817	23,628	11.92%
Age 15	987	8,457	11.67%
Age 16 to 17	1,956	16,973	11.52%
Total # 17 & Under	18,215	128,873	14.13%
Total # in Poverty 5-17	12,766	97,933	13.04%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, "Age by Ratio of Income to Poverty Level by County, Census Tract, and City and Town."

But, the primary question posed is whether or not we may be truly under serving our at-risk high school students. Unfortunately, we know a lot of students at risk of failure simply leave. In school year 2000-01, 1,853 children between grades 9 and 12 dropped out of school – 220 freshmen, 486 sophomores, 576 juniors, and 571 seniors.⁶ In 2000-01, the statewide dropout event rate for grades 9 through 12 was 6.119 percent. This is a *one-year* rate. The dropout rate grew over last year's (1999-2000) rate of 5.689 percent. The completion rates for the two years were 77.346 percent and 77.910 percent respectively.⁷ Completion rates look at a four-year cohort of students, and are a fairly accurate representation of how many 9th graders complete (in one way or another) their high school education. In other words, about 23 percent of Wyoming's students in a given class are dropping out. Certainly we lose track of these young people, some of whom may return to an educational setting, hopefully obtaining a GED or other useful vocational skills. But how many do this is not known.

However, as Attachment 5 illustrates, the number of at-risk students identified by schools as being served dropped from 39.03 percent in junior high/middle school to 16.16 percent in high school (alternative schools excluded.) This is a decrease of 60 percent, which cannot be explained by dropout numbers alone. To begin to address the issue of equity and adequacy across the multiple programs offered to at-risk students, a review of the effectiveness and availability of these services should be undertaken.

Some districts are beginning to actively pursue the issue of why their students are leaving, where they are going, and what they can do to retain them. More attention needs to be given to dropout numbers and what they say about the health of the state's education system. It is feared that as graduation requirements become more and more stringent, more and more students will leave school. It would seem that at-risk interventions are becoming increasingly important in an environment of stricter educational accountability, especially until graduating seniors have had the benefit of exposure to this richer learning environment for their full K-12 experience.

What Does the At-Risk Student Look Like? A Common Vision

Another question posed by information obtained in this study concerns why there is such variation among schools between the number of students they identify as at-risk and those identified by unduplicated counts. As mentioned earlier concerning high schools, some reported serving up to three times as many students as identified in the unduplicated count, while others served as little as 12 percent of the students identified in the unduplicated count. This differentiation was evident within all grade spans. One thing it may tell us, along with other evidence, is that educators and/or schools do not share a common vision of what at-risk students look like.

Slightly less than half of the surveyed schools reported using the definition of an at-risk student once used by the Wyoming Department of Education in their accreditation manual,

⁶ Wyoming Department of Education. Statistical Report Series No. 3, SY2000-01. Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming Department of Education. 2002.

⁷ Wyoming Department of Education. Statistical Report Series No. 3, SY1999-00. Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming Department of Education. 2001.

“school-aged individuals who are likely to experience economic, social, and academic failure because of social or family conditions or at-risk behavior.” The State Board of Education has modified this definition to now read, “school-age individuals who exhibit behaviors that place the student at risk of experiencing educational failure.”⁸ Only a few schools responded that modifying their current definition to the one adopted by the state would result in increased numbers of students identified.

Slightly more than half of the responding schools enumerated specific identifying factors or characteristics in their policies, such as poverty, mobility, abuse, divorce, pregnancy, disability, substance abuse, depression, gifted, talented, etc. Schools most frequently cited failure as an indicator of an at-risk student. But cutoff points in their own definitions of failure varied from the 20th to the 75th percentile on local or state tests, reflecting a very wide disparity in achievement expectation among the districts.

Simply adopting a common definition will not preclude a great deal of subjectivity in identifying these students. If the legislature believes students would benefit from more equal identification and treatment throughout the state, definition of adequate student performance and identification of effective interventions will be needed.

Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

At this point, numbers of students who have limited English language skills are incorporated into the unduplicated count as part of the proxy in the adjustment for at-risk funding. They are included in all analyses and correlations done for this report, as required by the mandating legislation. The recent No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law may impact how the state funds services to these students. A new Title 3 was created by NCLB which directs federal funds to these students, and with it has come the “supplement-supplant” funding issue. This may require the state be able to identify specific funds currently dedicated to that population, which cannot be isolated in the funding formula with the inclusion of these students in the unduplicated count. Additionally, Title 3 requires districts to test the language proficiency of all these children, and federal dollars will be sent to them based only upon the number of students who fall below a certain performance level. This could dramatically change the way we identify students for this adjustment in the future, actually making it much more precise. Until clear federal programmatic requirements are available and until further cost analysis of successful interventions has been accomplished, it is recommended the funding adjustment for LEP students currently in place remain in place. This will, however, need attention within the next couple of years.

Gifted and Talented Students

Programs for gifted and talented students are also not examined in this report, as funding for them is not part of the proxy or the at-risk adjustment. Originally, MAP included in its prototype \$4.50 per ADM for this purpose. The legislature did not agree this amount was adequate and increased the reimbursement to \$9.00 per ADM. This amount is currently being distributed to districts as part of their block grant funding.

⁸ Wyoming Department of Education. Rules & Regulations. Chapter VI, Section 4(b). Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming Department of Education. 5/9/2001.

ADEQUACY OF FUNDING

Like other states across the nation, the State of Wyoming is struggling with the issue of providing its students with an “adequate” level of educational opportunity. As MAP’s James Guthrie explains for the Education Commission of the States, “As the 21st century unfolds, the principal issues in the field of education finance have become far more encompassing. The old equity issues have not disappeared....Now, however, emerging issues of resource adequacy and performance funding are elevating education finance into the main arena of policy debate.”⁹ Defining what is or is not adequate will be a constant and ongoing challenge, and will no doubt continue to change over time, especially as we require more concrete performance results from our educational system.

Before the issue of adequacy can be addressed seriously, policy makers need to identify adequate and/or inadequate student performance. At this point in time, again, there is no shared vision or agreement within the state on what satisfactory performance is. Looking at the example given above relative to when districts intervene with students, some take action when their students score below the 74th percentile, while others wait until their students are below the 19th percentile on districts tests. The school serving students at the lower percentile may or may not be doing an adequate job of serving the students they actually serve, while still falling very short of serving an adequate number of students. Obviously, the issue of adequacy cannot be based on what schools are currently doing with at-risk interventions.

Over the last decade, almost half the states have passed legislation requiring the successful completion of some sort of exit exam for graduation. Wyoming has been thoughtful in its approach to gauging student achievement, and has chosen to rely on a broad-based accumulation of a “body of evidence” rather than a single event test. Now, as compensatory education becomes more and more critical in light of the implementation of higher standards and strict new federal mandates, we find ourselves in need of identifying when and how interventions should begin with students at risk of failure so they remain engaged and successful in the educational process.

What the At-Risk Adjustment Currently Does

Management Analysis & Planning (MAP) discussed a number of possible approaches to fund services to at-risk pupil populations in their 2002 report to the legislature. Ultimately, they proposed a weighted adjustment (of 0.25) to the per pupil funding level, based on the concentration of at-risk students, defined as the unduplicated count of students participating in the free/reduced federal lunch program and those who were limited English speaking (LEP.) This adjustment is calculated at the school rather than the district level, although funds are directed to the district as part of its block grant. Adjustments are made in increments, or bands, based on the concentration of students in the unduplicated count; the full 25 percent adjustment is made only at the highest concentration of at-risk students (above 75 percent.) See Table 6, following.

⁹Guthrie, James. Constructing New Finance Models that Balance Equity, Adequacy and Efficiency with Responsiveness. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. 2001.

Table 6: The At-Risk Adjustment Detailed for Two Specific Schools

School: Arapahoe Elementary K-8

Enrollment, 294; At-Risk Count, 294 = Concentration Level of 100%

Enroll- ment	X	% Concentration Levels/Bands (Lower Limit)	=	Cumulative # of Students in Each Concentra- tion Level/Band	# Students Over Lower Limit/Band	X	Adjustment Multiplier	X	Adj Amount (25% of \$/ADM)	=	Adj Amount per Band
BASE:											
294		29% /1/		85.26	State Aver						
294		30%		88.20	2.94		0.175		2,000.00		1,029.00
294		35%		102.90	14.70		0.350		2,000.00		10,290.00
294		40%		117.60	14.70		0.450		2,000.00		13,230.00
294		45%		132.30	14.70		0.550		2,000.00		16,170.00
294		55%		161.70	29.40		0.650		2,000.00		38,220.00
294		65%		191.10	29.40		0.850		2,000.00		49,980.00
294		75%		220.50	29.40		0.950		2,000.00		55,860.00
294		100%		294.00	73.50		1.000		2,000.00		147,000.00
Total:											\$331,779.00
Average per At-Risk Student:											\$ 1,128.50
Average per Students over Statewide %age:											\$ 1,589.44

School: Meeteetse K-12

Enrollment, 154; At-Risk Count, 63 = Concentration Level of 40.91%

Enroll- ment	X	% Concentration Levels/Bands (Lower Limit)	=	Cumulative # of Students in Each Concentra- tion Level/Band	# Students Over Lower Limit/Band	X	Adjustment Multiplier	X	Adj Amount (25% of \$/ADM)	=	Adj Amount per Band
BASE:											
154		29% /1/		44.66	State Aver						
154		30%		46.20	1.54		0.175		2,000.00		539.00
154		35%		53.90	7.70		0.350		2,000.00		5,390.00
154		40%		61.60	7.70		0.450		2,000.00		6,930.00
154		45%		63.00	1.40		0.550		2,000.00		1,540.00
Total:											\$ 14,399.00
Average per At-Risk Student											\$ 228.56
Average per Student over Statewide %age:											\$ 785.11

Note /1/: Statewide average free/reduced lunch participation rate is 29%

The adjustment of \$2,000 is not a final figure. Figures are preliminary, must be cost-adjusted, and are for demonstration only.

One of the most critical elements of the adjustment developed by MAP is that at-risk funds do not flow to a school unless the school exceeds the state's average concentration of at-risk students, which now is 29 percent. MAP maintains that the prototype schools in the Cost-based Block Grant model were developed assuming a statewide average concentration of at-

risk students.¹⁰ They identified effective resource allocation strategies for at-risk pupils, and listed those they considered to be inherent parts of the model prototypes. These included strategies such as small class and/or small school size, early reading interventions, and funds specifically targeted to specialists, trainers, and professional development. And although there are certainly schools and classes literally bursting at their proverbial seams, the majority of schools in the state are below the prototype size. Until much more research is done to identify the cost of specific programs and strategies that have been *proven effective* within Wyoming, it is difficult to argue with MAP's assertion that *an average concentration of at-risk students* can be adequately served within the parameters of the current funding model.

However, there is financial information available to give policy makers an idea of the level of funding provided by the at-risk adjustment over and above the average concentration of at-risk students. Of the 25,490 pupils identified in the unduplicated count, only 15,965 students actually generate the additional funds for the adjustment. The average amount per student above the 29 percent threshold is approximately \$400.00¹¹; the average amount for *all* at-risk students (25,490) is \$250.00. Amounts vary dramatically across schools with higher or lower concentration levels, as shown to a limited degree in Table 6, which details how the adjustment is calculated.

The at-risk adjustment is made for each school. The two schools shown in Table 6 were chosen as examples because they are easily tracked to their district reimbursement levels as they are the only schools within their district. Note that the full 25 percent adjustment is not reached unless a school is at or above 75 percent at-risk students. Even then, the full \$2,000 adjustment is not given to the school for all students, but rather for only the "last band", or 25 percent of the at-risk students. In the case of Arapahoe K-8, the school receives \$1,589 for each student above the statewide average of 29 percent unduplicated count; looked at another way, the school receives \$1,129 for all students considered at-risk. Because Meeteetse only has 63 students in their unduplicated count (40.91 percent,) the school never goes beyond the reimbursement band of 55 percent of the full \$2,000 adjustment.

The 25 percent Weighted Adjustment

A number of states do use a weighted adjustment to their basic per pupil funding amounts. In general these vary from .1 to .25. The weighted amount is frequently added incrementally, dependent upon increased levels of at-risk students, as is done with the MAP concentration bands.

No state or federal agency contacted could provide background information or research supporting the weights they used. Indeed, the most promising evidence led back to the American Institute of Research, to Jay Chambers and Tom Parrish, who first used the weight of .2 twenty years ago in education cost models developed for Alaska and Illinois.¹² They

¹⁰ Seder, R., L. Picus, and J. Smith. Wyoming Education Finance: Estimating the Costs of Services for "At Risk" Students. Davis, CA: Management Analysis and Planning, Inc.

¹¹ Wyoming Legislative Service Office; Preliminary

¹² Chambers, Jay, T. Parrish. The Development of a Program Cost Model and a Cost-of-Education Index for the State of Alaska: Final Report. Volumes I-IV. Stanford, CA: Associates for Education Finance and Planning, Inc. December, 1984.

intended the adjustment to be only a “place holder” until further research could be done on actual funds needed to bring at-risk students to higher performance levels.¹³ To this day, this “place holder” is still being utilized by states who weight-adjust their per pupil funding levels for compensatory education.

“Within-day” versus “Outside-of-Day” Interventions

The distinction between what occurs within the normal school day and what occurs beyond those traditional hours is important to make when looking at the at-risk adjustment because the MAP prototypes *do not* account for extended day or extended year programs. MAP maintains the 25 percent weighted adjustment is meant to be used by schools to answer these extra time needs.

“Within-day”, or “Within-Prototype” Interventions

Schools were asked as part of their at-risk survey to provide per student expenditures for “within-day” and extended interventions (Attachment 8.) Interventions performed during the normal school day would include the provision of special intensive reading or math programs, the use of aides within the classroom, the use of teachers specially trained in at-risk intervention and/or remediation strategies, intervention teams, targeted at-risk professional development, counseling, smaller class sizes or student-teacher ratios, etc.

Many schools did not respond to the question of cost. Those that did respond yielded the following information. Elementaries reported their average per pupil expenditure for “within-day” interventions ran \$2,724 and varied from \$163/child to \$6,872/child among the different schools (Attachment 8.) Junior high/middle schools claimed an average of \$1,952/pupil, and costs ran from a low of \$290 to \$5,475 per student. Percent of students counted as at-risk by the model (unduplicated count) seemed to have absolutely no effect on costs reported by schools. One K-8 school which had an unduplicated percentage of 75 percent of students at risk reported spending \$888 per pupil for within-day interventions, while a middle school with 37 percent reported spending \$5,475. Another middle school with 36 percent at-risk students (unduplicated count) claimed to spend \$582/pupil for with-in-day interventions. High school interventions were reported to cost an average of \$1,352 per student, with a low of \$46 in one high school (25 percent unduplicated count) to a high of \$6,784 in another (with 14 percent unduplicated count.)

Costs Beyond the Prototype, or 25 percent Adjustment Expenses

Over the past few years there has been explosive growth in more intensive and systematic extended learning opportunities for students.¹⁴ As states begin to implement more challenging content and performance standards, it is becoming evident that additional time is needed for some students to meet these requirements. States have responded to this in a myriad of

¹³ Chambers, Jay., T. Parrish. The Development of a Resource Cost Model Funding Base for Education Finance in Illinois. Volume I-Executive Summary and Volume II-Technical Report. Stanford, CA: Associates for Education Finance and Planning, Inc. 1982.

¹⁴ Council of Chief State School Officers. Extended Learning & Development Opportunities. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. 2001.

ways. Some are mandating the availability of summer school and student attendance at summer school; some have passed laws mandating professional development targeted to intervention and remediation strategies. Many are adding statewide categorical programs on top of their weighted adjustment for projects such as dropout, truancy, and suicide prevention, discipline, requirement of parent involvement, collaboration with higher education, teen pregnancy, pre-schools, homeless, and on and on. These programs are frequently funded separately to ensure dollars are spent for specific, intended purposes, rather than being lost in general foundation funding. In more and more recent court decisions, states, not local districts, are being held liable for ensuring the best educational opportunities are made available to disadvantaged students, thus states are assuming more oversight of programs.¹⁵ Especially in the area of compensatory education, doing business in the same way is no longer acceptable, thus requiring particular state level scrutiny.

As the name implies, extended day opportunities provide additional instructional hours for students in need of additional learning time. The programs themselves vary greatly, and include supports which range from before and after school tutoring to week-end or evening schools and summer school. Some extended day opportunities provide safe havens, with emphasis on behavior, character building, and reduction of risk-taking behaviors, in addition to academics.¹⁶ According to surveys sent to Wyoming schools (Attachment 3), the most common offering for extended day currently is tutoring before or after school. Schools also referred students to counseling outside the regular school day, and some provided additional learning opportunities on the week-ends and at night.

When asked to identify costs for these extended day programs, results were similar to those explained earlier for within-day interventions. Elementary schools reported an average of \$671 per student for extended day programs, and these costs ranged from \$46/pupil to \$3,566/pupil (Attachment 8.) Junior high/middle schools averaged \$257/student for these programs, ranging from \$13 to \$850 per pupil. High school average cost was reported at \$398/student, again ranging from \$20 to \$1540 per pupil.

These dramatic swings in cost estimates lend credence to two observations. Not surprisingly, it is evident that remedial and intervention programs within schools vary dramatically. As mentioned earlier, there is no definition of adequate student performance, no common vision of what an at-risk student looks like, and little state level guidance on successful strategies. Second, districts need to be prepared to gather school level cost data well ahead of time. Attempting to gather cost information at the school level after the fact of expenditure will almost always ensure inadequacy or unavailability of data, particularly when those costs are incurred at the building (rather than the district) level. Analysis of costs at the school level need two full interim legislative periods to allow the Department of Education and local busi-

¹⁵ Guthrie, James. Constructing New Finance Models that Balance Equity, Adequacy and Efficiency with Responsiveness. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. 2001.

¹⁶ Wyoming is currently participating in state and federally funded 21st Century State Incentive Grants which will make available approximately \$4 million/year for three years to assist communities to reduce alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use, and promote academic success among young people. These projects must include participation from a broad spectrum of individuals and entities within the defined community, and be a collaborative approach to supporting the needs of the young people identified.

ness managers the time to establish accounting cost elements and train staff to organize and collect needed information.

Current Reimbursement Dollars versus District Expenditures

In addition to completing surveys for this study, districts were asked to share any information they may have specifically gathered relative to their at-risk program costs. Only one district was able to provide this detail, so caution is urged in drawing hard conclusions from this limited anecdotal evidence. Because the state is without an accepted standard for adequate student performance and does not supervise the use of proven intervention or remediation strategies, the issue of adequacy is not answered in examining the expenditures of this single district. Costs include salaries, benefits, purchased services, materials, and equipment. Expenditures reported by Laramie County School District #1 for at-risk interventions for school year 2001-02 (FY02) are shown in Table 7. These costs do not include estimated expenditures of an additional \$216,600 for newly initiated programs during the current school year for the needs of junior high at-risk students and pupils who have been expelled.

Elementary	<u># Served</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Parent Training	---	\$ 106,000
Reading Intervention (CLIP)	168	\$ 253,414
LEP	74	\$ 114,446
Extended Day/Tutoring	1047	\$ 149,768
Sub Total:	1289	\$ 623,628
Secondary		
Education Station	650	\$ 58,950
GRADS Teen Parenting	10	\$ 18,413
Achievement Center	550	\$ 84,329
Peer Tutoring	375	\$ 74,053
A C E	17	\$ 137,849
Reading Programs	54	\$ 31,477
7th Transitional	92	\$ 79,149
Extended Day/Tutoring (H.S.)	235	\$ 107,291
Nova Net	N/A	\$ 60,000
New Dawn	N/A	\$ 69,827
Straight Lab	N/A	\$ 55,520
Open Entry/Exit	<u>N/A</u>	<u>\$ 86,640</u>
Sub Total:	1983	\$ 863,498
Summer School		
Pre-K through 12	<u>1012</u>	<u>\$ 310,174</u>
TOTALS:	4284	\$ 1,797,300

The at-risk adjustment to the model will distribute approximately \$1,066,829 to the district. Obviously the *adjustment alone* will not fully fund the district's expenditures associated with at-risk students, but the district also receives \$466,000 for the Wyoming Reading Assess-

ment Program. (It is anticipated these funds will be incorporated into district block grants for school year 2003-04.) Some additional costs are inherently funded in the *prototype* itself up to an average concentration of at-risk pupils, but it is difficult to isolate an exact figure for this amount. Lastly, federal or other grant funds a district may receive have not been considered when attempting to answer the question of whether or not the Cost-based Block Grant Model provides adequate funding.

Based on this limited information, it is difficult to be certain whether or not dollars directed to districts by the current funding model are reimbursing districts fully for their expenditures associated with at-risk students. The limited information on this one district does, however, suggest some districts may be spending more on these programs than they are receiving through the model with the at-risk adjustment. If the model could be supplemented by isolating and funding a particular program associated with at-risk student remediation and intervention that is common to most school districts, the question of the level of funding provided by the prototype becomes less onerous. But, greater than a dollar issue alone, is the issue of whether or not quality, equitable programs are being made available to all Wyoming students.

Summer School

Increasingly states are turning to summer school as the “safety net” to prevent retention of students and to provide those who need it the additional time to meet standards. States have begun to “enact policies aimed at doing any or all of the following: 1.) providing funding for districts providing summer school; 2.) requiring summer school attendance for students not meeting academic expectations; 3.) requiring districts to *offer* summer school; 4.) authorizing districts to establish programs; or 5.) requiring summer school as one *option* of remediation.”¹⁷ It is estimated one in five students in 53 of the nation’s largest urban districts attended summer school in 2002; in Chicago, New York, and Miami, 40 percent of public school students are in school during the summer.¹⁸

In Wyoming during the summer of 2002, schools reported 6,163 students attended summer school, approximately 10 percent of enrollment in the districts taking part (Table 8.) Participation ranged from 1.43 percent to 74.38 percent of a district’s enrollment. Summer school is offered in all but six districts - Big Horn 3, Campbell, Carbon 1, Carbon 2, Park 16, and Sheridan 3. Most of these districts said they did not offer summer programs this year because of budget restrictions. One reported they had not experienced successful remediation with summer school, and instead received better results with extended day offerings during the school year.

Program offerings vary significantly among the districts, from comprehensive pre-K through 12, to those available only to high school students or only to grade school students. A few districts still make summer school available only to Title 1 or special education students. Attendance at summer school is highly encouraged, but rarely mandated. Table 8 shows the

¹⁷ Education Commission of the States. “Summer School: State Policies.” *ECS StateNotes*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. 2000.

¹⁸ Education Commission of the States. “Summer School.” *ECS Issue Site*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. 2002.

Table 8: Wyoming Summer School Offerings, 2002

<u>District</u>	<u>Grades Offered</u>	<u>Enrollment in Offered Grades</u>	<u>Number Attend</u>	<u>Percent Attend</u>	<u>Percent SpecEd</u>
Albany 1	K-12	3,790	307	8.10%	
Big Horn 1	K-12	768	150	19.53%	9.33%
Big Horn 2	K-12	703	116	16.50%	29.31%
Big Horn 4	K-8	301	27	8.97%	
Converse 1	K-8	1,114	126	11.31%	35.71%
Converse 2	1 thru 8	476	58	12.18%	
Crook 1	K-11	1,036	137	13.22%	
Fremont 1	7 thru 12	1,079	41	3.80%	
Fremont 2	K-12	286	69	24.13%	
Fremont 6	K-11	375	34	9.07%	
Fremont 14	K-12	639	164	25.67%	
Fremont 21	K-8	281	209	74.38%	
Fremont 24	K-12	328	23	7.01%	26.09%
Fremont 25	K-12	2,484	214	8.62%	
Fremont 38	K-8	294	120	40.82%	14.17%
Goshen 1	K-12	1,953	371	19.00%	19.00%
Hot Springs 1	K-5 & Gr 9	394	73	18.53%	
Johnson 1	K-12	1,257	100	7.96%	
Laramie 1	K-12	13,272	920	6.93%	
Laramie 2	1 thru 12	876	62	7.08%	
Lincoln 1	K-12	724	55	7.60%	
Lincoln 2	K-12	2,386	222	9.30%	
Natrona 1	8 thru 12	4,768	402	8.43%	
Niobrara 1	K-11	387	41	10.59%	
Park 1	K-12	1,737	221	12.72%	
Park 6	K-8	1,511	146	9.66%	
Platte 1	K-8	886	30	3.39%	
Platte 2	K-12	256	60	23.44%	
Sheridan 1	K-12	885	140	15.82%	23.44%
Sheridan 2	1 thru 12	3,024	337	11.14%	
Sublette 1	K-12	630	63	10.00%	
Sublette 9	K-5	234	35	14.96%	
Sweetwater 1	5 thru 12	2,830	213	7.53%	17.02%
Sweetwater 2	2 thru 12	2,446	297	12.14%	
Teton 1	9 thru 12	701	10	1.43%	
Uinta 1	K-12	3,162	167	5.28%	56.29%
Uinta 4	K-12	692	81	11.71%	51.85%
Uinta 6	K-8	502	68	13.55%	
Washakie 1	K-10	1,175	131	11.15%	
Washakie 2	K-12	111	15	13.51%	20.00%
Weston 1	K-12	869	86	9.90%	45.35%
Weston 7	1 thru 11	226	22	9.73%	
TOTAL:		61,848	6,163	9.96%	28.96%

State Totals:			
October	Summer	%	
<u>Enroll</u>	<u>Enroll</u>	<u>Enroll</u>	<u>Grade</u>
3396	404	11.90%	K
3559	582	16.35%	1
3983	530	13.31%	2
4170	507	12.16%	3
4303	514	11.95%	4
4741	404	8.52%	5
4789	434	9.06%	6
4913	579	11.79%	7
6004	556	9.26%	8
5767	468	8.12%	9
5893	551	9.35%	10
5432	397	7.31%	11
4898	237	4.84%	12

districts participating in summer school, the percentage of students attending in each district, and statewide percentages of attendance among the grades. Where it was provided, information on the participation of special education students was noted, although for cost purposes,

any extended year attendance required by an IEP has been excluded. The summer school data survey itself is included as Attachment 9.

All 42 districts offering summer school provide remediation for math and language arts, generally reading. About a third of the districts make social studies and science available to both elementary and secondary students, and another third offer these two additional subjects only at the secondary level. Quite a few schools are beginning to utilize computer-based instructional tools in secondary settings, and many are reporting excellent results with these self-paced offerings. Enrichment programs are generally provided through 21st Century or other grants, and are heavily utilized on the reservations, where schools are made as available as possible to students year-round.

Districts reported making quite a few changes in summer school over the last three or so years. They cited achievement of better results after moving to a standards-based teaching environment. Many have added grades or subjects to their curriculum. Six districts reported continuing to offer summer programs after realizing good results from initial beginnings due to taking advantage of Extended Learning Opportunity grants the past couple of years (no longer available.) Six districts offered summer instruction to 242 pre-kindergarten students. Two of these opened their preschool program to all children within their district; three offered a program only to students with educational delays; and one assessed every pre-kindergarten student to ascertain their level of readiness for school and offered programs accordingly. District responses to the summer school survey are delineated in Attachment 10 to this report.

It is not surprising that costs between districts vary widely. They ranged from \$1406 per student in Fremont #14 where enrichment is stressed as much as remediation, to \$82 per student in Uinta #6 (Table 9.) The average cost was \$335 per student. Typically districts use a mix of sources to fund summer school, the most common of which are their general fund, Title 1, and Title VIB. They pull in other grants as well, and some have formed partnerships with their local junior colleges or are a member of a Board of Cooperative Educational Services.

Bothersome is the fact that academic offerings vary so dramatically among districts, and that programs are available in some areas only to Title 1 or special education students. Some districts reported providing as little as 20 instructional hours per subject for summer school, while others offered up to 80 hours per remedial subject. Not surprisingly, one of the districts offering only 20 instructional hours reported minor gains, and stated summer school was not long enough to be effective. Length of sessions varied from two to ten weeks, and showed a great deal of flexibility of scheduling. Only a few schools provided statistical information on the success of their program, but those who did generally reported very high percentages (85 to 100 percent) of students satisfactorily completing the subject. Nationally, the promotion rate of summer school students ranges 45 to 65 percent.¹⁹

Summer school can be a critical component of an effective education system, especially in consideration of today's challenging content and performance standards coupled with federal mandate. It is often a student's last chance to avoid retention, which frequently results in con-

¹⁹Education Commission of the States. "Summer School." *ESC Issue Site*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. 2002.

Table 9: Summer School Costs/Sources of Funding

District	Number Students	Cost	\$ per Stu	Current Funding Sources					
				BOCES	Distr GF	Title I	Grants	Title VIB	Other
Albany 1	307	\$98,301	\$320.20		X	X		X	Perkins/Drug Free
Big Horn 1	150	\$25,338	\$168.92		X			X	Title 4
Big Horn 2	116	\$28,905	\$249.18		X			X	
Converse 1*	126	\$40,793	\$323.75		X				
Fremont 2*	69	\$16,623	\$240.91	X			21st Cent		
Fremont 6	34	\$5,700	\$167.65			X	21st-Enr	X	WRRural
Fremont 14**	164	\$230,596	\$1,406.07		X	X		X	Bilingual TVII
Fremont 21	209	\$56,992	\$272.69		X	X	21st Cent;WSTS	X	Title 9
Fremont 24	23	\$15,747	\$684.65		X		Consolidated		
Fremont 25*	214	\$41,722	\$194.96		X	X	21st-Enr		T6-Innovate
Fremont 38	120	\$56,000	\$466.67		X		JOM		T9
Goshen 1	371	\$117,649	\$317.11				Consolidated		
Hot Springs 1	73	\$13,000	\$178.08				X		
Johnson 1	100	\$22,251	\$222.51		X	X		X	
Laramie 1	1012	\$310,174	\$306.50		X				
Laramie 2	62	\$21,890	\$353.06		X		Consolidated		
Lincoln 1	55	\$9,490	\$172.55		X				
Lincoln 2*	222	\$65,201	\$293.70		X	X		x	
Natrona 1	402	\$110,632	\$275.20		X				Tuition
Niobrara 1*	41	\$10,800	\$263.41		X				
Park 1	221	\$64,853	\$293.45		X			X	
Park 6	258	\$74,394	\$288.35			X	EA 69		Titles IV, V
Platte 1*	30	\$22,702	\$756.73			X			
Platte 2	62	\$16,579	\$267.40		X	X		X	
Sheridan 1	128	\$44,985	\$351.45		X	X		X	Comm Coll- H.S.
Sheridan 2	276	\$117,508	\$425.75		X	X		X	Comm Coll- H.S.
Sublette 1	63	\$23,633	\$375.13	X					
Sublette 9*	35	\$3,500	\$100.00	X					
Sweetwater 1	213	\$67,813	\$318.37	X					
Sweetwater 2	297	\$100,000	\$336.70	X					
Teton 1	10	\$5,460	\$546.00			X			TIV
Uinta 1	172	\$52,000	\$302.33		X	X			SpecEd Innovative
Uinta 4*	108	\$31,796	\$294.41		X	X		X	Title IV, 619
Uinta 6*	68	\$5,580	\$82.06	X		X		X	
Washakie 1	131	\$35,293	\$269.41		X				Drug Free
Washakie 2*	15	\$4,000	\$266.67		X		X		
Weston 1	86	\$55,164	\$641.44		X			X	
Weston 7*	22	\$9,055	\$411.59		X				Consolidated
Totals:	6065	\$2,032,119	\$335.06						

*Offer only LA and Math

**Includes extensive enrichment programs

WR-Wind River Rural Initiative; JOM-Johnson O'Malley (Indian Education Funds)

tinued failure, perhaps culminating in drop out. More and more often, research is reiterating the fact that two or three months away from a structured learning environment is particularly detrimental to students who struggle academically, and they lose ground rapidly. Without the

opportunity to maintain or gain skills during summer, at-risk pupils have less and less chance to become successful.

Historically states have treated summer school as an add on program, distinct from the “real” work that takes place during the “regular” school year.²⁰ “Typically states have provided few or inadequate standards, regulations, or funds for summer programs.”²¹ Research has shown that when done correctly, summer school can help struggling students improve their performance. But to be successful, summer school has to have certain elements. The Southern Regional Education Board describes these needed attributes as:²²

- ◆ It should be part of a year-round program of extra time and extra help;
- ◆ It should be available to all students at no cost to parents;
- ◆ It must meet clear standards for quality, program length, and scheduling of classes;
- ◆ It must respond to the individual needs of students through the use of innovative and creative teaching strategies;
- ◆ Its priority should be placed on student mastery of reading and math;
- ◆ Teachers in summer school should have special training and/or proven ability to help struggling students; and
- ◆ It should be rigorously evaluated for student achievement and successful teaching strategies.

Effective programs generally operate over a greater time period for fewer hours per day, reducing the gaps between the regular school year and the summer program. Class sizes are usually no larger than 15 students, promoting a great deal of individual attention. Staff is carefully selected and trained, assuming that the lowest-performing students need the best teachers. Teaching strategies are different from those that did not work during the regular school year.

Wyoming now has the opportunity to develop a comprehensive and effective extended learning environment for its students at risk of failure, and to make this opportunity available to all students regardless of their socioeconomic status. It is recommended policy makers consider providing reimbursement to districts for costs associated with their summer school intervention and remedial programs. It is proposed the reimbursement be operated as a grant initiative separate from the education block grant, with application procedures and program requirements defined by the Department in association with district personnel.

²⁰Denton, David R. Unfulfilled Promise. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. 2002.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

References

- Chambers, Jay and T. Parrish. (1982.) The Development of a Resource Cost Model Funding Base for Education Finance in Illinois. Stanford, CA: Associates for Education Finance and Planning, Inc.
- Chambers, Jay and T. Parrish. (1984.) The Development of a Program Cost Model and a Cost-of-Education Index for the State of Alaska: Final Report. Stanford, CA: Associates for Education Finance and Planning, Inc.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2001.) Extended Learning and Development Opportunities. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Denton, David R. (2002.) Unfulfilled Promise. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board
- Duncombe, W. and J. Yinger. (1998.) Financing Higher Standards in Public Education: The Importance of Accounting for Educational Costs. Syracuse, NY: Center for Policy Research, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.
- Education Commission of the States. (2000.) "Summer School: State Policies." *ECS State Notes* from the ECS web site www.ecs.org. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Education Commission of the States. (2002.) "Summer School." *ECS Issue Site* from the ECS web site www.ecs.org. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Guthrie, James. (2001.) Constructing New Finance Models that Balance Equity, Adequacy and Efficiency with Responsiveness. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2002.) Education Finance Database from the NCSL web site www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/ed. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- Seder, R., L. Picus, and J. Smith. (2002.) Wyoming Education Finance: Estimating the Costs of Services for "At-Risk" Students. Davis, CA: Management Analysis and Planning, Inc.
- Wyoming Department of Education. (2001.) Statistical Report Series No. 3, SY1999-00. Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming Department of Education.
- Wyoming Department of Education. (2003.) Statistical Report Series No. 3, SY2000-01. Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming Department of Education.
- Wyoming Department of Education. (May, 2001.) Rules and Regulations. Cheyenne, WY: Wyoming Department of Education, Chapter VI, Section 4(b).

**Survey of
At-Risk Student Identification and Programs**

Due: May 20, 2002

District: _____ **School:** _____

Please use back of form or additional sheets as necessary.

1. What is the definition used by the school to identify at-risk children? (If you use different definitions for different programs, please elaborate.)
2. Based on this definition, how many students in your school do you currently identify as needing services?
 - a. How many of the children identified in #2 above also have an IEP, if any?
3. How many students are you actually serving, if different from #2 above?
 - a. How many of the children identified in #3 above also have an IEP, if any?
4. State accreditation standards define children at-risk as: "School age individuals who exhibit behaviors that place the student at risk of experiencing educational failure."
 - a. Would this definition change your number of children identified as at risk?
Yes _____ No _____
 - b. If yes, how many total students in your school would be defined as at-risk?
 - c. How many of the children you identified in 4.b., above would have an IEP, if any?
5. Check then briefly describe the interventions used by the school and/or the district to enhance learning for your at-risk students:

Programs/Interventions generally performed outside traditional school hours:

- ___ Extended Day (Before/After School):
- ___ Saturday School:
- ___ Night School:
- ___ Summer School-Remedial:
- ___ Summer School Pre-K:
- ___ Other Pre School Programs:
- ___ Full Day Kindergarten:
- ___ Tutoring (outside of regular school hours):
- ___ Peer Tutoring (outside of regular school hours):
- ___ Counseling (outside of regular school hours):
- ___ Other Extended Services:

Programs/Interventions generally performed within the normal school day:

- Reading Programs (Guided Reading, CLIP, etc.):
- Math Programs:
- Boys' Town or other related program:
- Lowered Class Sizes:
- Study Assistance Teams:
- Use of Specialized Teachers:
- Use of Classroom Aides:
- Individualized Instruction/Attention:
- Parent Programs:
- Distance Learning:
- Counseling (within school day):
- School within a School:
- Professional Development specifically targeted to at-risk intervention:
- Other "in-school" Interventions:

6. Which of the above interventions are most commonly used?
7. What additional types of interventions would you like to implement, if any?
8. Please provide as accurately as possible a cost per student of providing effective at-risk programs which take place beyond the traditional school day.
9. Please provide as accurately as possible a cost per student of providing effective at-risk programs which take place within the "typical" school day.
10. How many students in your school are limited English-speaking?
11. How do you accommodate these students' needs?
12. What is the per student cost associated with #11, above?
13. How effective have your programs been for successfully dealing with at-risk students?
How have you measured this?
14. If you do not believe all your programs have been successful, how do you plan to change those programs to make them more effective?
15. Do you have any additional comments or concerns?

If you have any questions, please directly contact Ruth Sommers, Post Office Box 2990, Cheyenne, WY 82003, (307) 632-0157.

Attachment 2: At-Risk Student Survey Participant List

<u>District</u>	<u>Elementary</u>	<u>Middle/Junior High</u>	<u>High School</u>
Albany 1	Thayer Elem K-6		Laramie High 10-12
Big Horn 1	Cowley Elem K-5**		Rocky Mtn High 9-12
Big Horn 2	Lovell Elem K-5	Lovell Middle 6-8	
Big Horn 3	Greybull Elem K-5	Greybull Middle 6-8	
Big Horn 4	Laura Irwin Elem K-4		Riverside High 9-12
Campbell 1	Rawhide K-6**		Wright Jr/Sr High 7-12
Carbon 1	Sinclair Elem K-5	Rawlins Middle Sch 6-8	
Carbon 2	Saratoga Elem K-4		H.E.M.Senior High 9-12
Converse 1	Douglas Intermed 3-5	White Elem/Middle K-8	
Converse 2	Grant Elem K-6	Glenrock Middle 7-8*	
Crook 1	Sundance Elem K-6		Hulett High 9-12
Fremont 1	North Elem K-6		Lander Valley High 9-12
Fremont 2**	Dubois Elem **		Dubois High 9-12 **
Fremont 6	Wind River Elem K-5		Wind River Secondry 6-12
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian Elem K-5		Wyo Indian High 9-12
Fremont 21		Ft. Washakie Middle 7-8	
Fremont 24	Shoshoni Elem K-6		Shoshoni High 9-12
Fremont 25	Ashgrove Elem K-5	Riverton Middle 6-8	
Fremont 38	Arapahoe K-8		
Goshen 1	Trail Elem 3-5		Torrington High 9-12
Hot Springs	Lucerne Elem 4-5	Thermopolis Middle 6-8	
Johnson 1	Meadowlark Elem K-4		Kaycee Jr/Sr High 7-12
Laramie 1	Bain Elem K-6		Triumph High 8-12
Laramie 2	Albin Elem K-6		Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr 7-12
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Elem 3-5	Kemmerer Middle 6-8	
Lincoln 2	Afton Elem K-3	Star Valley Jr High 7-8	
Natrona 1	Ft Caspar Acad K-6	East Jr High 7-9*	
Niobrara 1	Lusk Elem K-5	Lusk Middle 6-8	
Park 1	Southside Elem K-5		Powell High 9-12
Park 6	Eastside Elem K-5		Cody High School 9-12
Park 16	Meeteetse K-12		
Platte 1	West Elem K, 4-6		Glendo High 9-12
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise K-6	Guernsey-Sunrise Jr 7-8	
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Elem K-5	Tongue River Middle 6-8	
Sheridan 2	Highland Park Elem K-5	Central Middle 6-7	
Sheridan 3	Clearmont Elem K-6	Arv-Clrmnt Jr High 7-8	
Sublette 1	Pinedale Elem K-5 **		Pinedale High 9-12
Sublette 9	Big Piney Elem K-5		Big Piney High 9-12
Sweetwater 1	Desert View K-6	Rk Spgs East Jr 7-9*	
Sweetwater 2	Truman Elem K-5		Expedition Academy 9-12
Teton 1	Wilson Elem K-5		Wstrn Wyo High 9-12
Uinta 1	Uinta Meadow Elem K-5		Evanston High 9-12
Uinta 4	Ft. Bridger Elem 3-5	Mtn View Middle 6-8	
Uinta 6	Lyman Elem 4-5	Lyman Middle 6-8	
Washakie 1	Southside Elem K-5	Worland Middle 6-8	
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Elem K-6	Ten Sleep Middle 7-8	
Weston 1	Gertrude Burns Inter 3-5		Newcastle High 9-12
Weston 7		Upton Middle 6-8	Upton High 9-12

**No response

*Unable to use data

Schools in **bold** visited on-site

Attachment 3: At-Risk Student Survey, Program Offerings, Elementary

A3-1

Elementary Schools		Programs Conducted Outside the Regular School Day							
District	School Name	Extended	Friday or Saturday	Night	Full Day Kinderg	Tutor	Peer Tutor	Counseling	Other
Albany 1	Thayer Elem K-6				Targeted			Private	
Big Horn 2	Lovell Elem K-5					X			
Big Horn 3	Greybull Elem K-5	X		X		X	X		
Big Horn 4	Laura Irwin Elem K-4	Tutoring				X	X	IEP	
Carbon 1	Sinclair Elem K-5	X			X	X		X	
Carbon 2	Saratoga Elem K-4	X			X	X		X	
Converse 1	Douglas Intermediate :	X				X		X	
Converse 2	Grant Elem K-6	X			X	X			
Crook 1	Sundance Elem K-6	X-Reading							
Fremont 1	North Elem K-6	X			X				
Fremont 6	Wind River Elem K-5	X			X	X	X		X
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian Elem K-5	Tutoring	X		X	X			
Fremont 24	Shoshoni ElemK-6	X		X		X		X	
Fremont 25	Ashgrove Elem K-5	X			X	X			
Fremont 38	Arapaho K-8	X	X		X	X		X	Early Intervnt PreSch
Goshen 1	Trail Elem 3-5	X				X			
Hot Springs	Lucerne Elem 4-5	X	X						
Johnson 1	Meadowlark Elem K-4								
Laramie 1	Bain Elem K-6	X			X	X		X	
Laramie 2	Albin Elem K-6								
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Elem 3-5	X				X	X		HighSchoolHeroes
Lincoln 2	Afton Elem K-3	K-3			Selected				
Natrona 1	Ft. Caspar Academy K-6						X	X	
Niobrara 1	Lusk Elem K-5	X	X			X		X	
Park 1	Southside Elem K-5	X							
Park 6	Eastside ElemK-5	X			Selected	X		X	PK/RcAfterSchool
Park 16	Meeteetse K-12	X						X	
Platte 1	West Elem K, 4-6	X				X			FamilyMath
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise E K	X							
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Elem K-	X	X					X	YMCA;
Sheridan 2	Highland Park Elem K-	X			X	X	X	X	
Sheridan 3	Clearmont Elem K-6		X		X	X			
Sublette 1	Pinedale Elem K-5								
Sublette 9	Big Piney Elem K-5	X			X	X			
Sweetwater 1	Desert View K-6	X				X			ComputerLab
Sweetwater 2	Truman Elem K-5	X			X	X			ComputerLab
Teton 1	Wilson Elem K-5					X		X	
Uinta 1	Uinta Meadows Elem K-5					X			
Uinta 4	Ft. Bridger Elem 3-5	X				X	X	X	X
Uinta 6	Lyman Elem 4-5	X						X	
Washakie 1	Southside Elem K-5	X	X		X		X	X	MediaCtr
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Elem K-6	X				X			
Weston 1	Gertrude Burns Inter 3	X			X				
TOTAL:	45 Schools	34	7	2	18	27	8	18	

Attachment 3: At-Risk Student Survey, Program Offerings, Elementary

<u>School Name</u>	<u>Programs Conducted Within the Regular School Day</u>							
	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>BoysTown/ Other</u>	<u>Lowered ClassSize</u>	<u>StudyAsst Teams</u>	<u>Specialzd Teachers</u>	<u>Classroom Aides</u>	<u>Individz Instruction</u>
Thayer Elem K-6	X	X	X	X		T1;SpecEd	X	X
Lovell Elem K-5	X	X	X	K-3			X	
Greybull Elem K-5	X	X	X			T1;SpecEd	X	T1;SpecEd
Laura Irwin Elem K-4	X	X		X			X	T1;SpecEd
Sinclair Elem K-5	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Saratoga Elem K-4	X	X		X			X	X
Douglas Intermediate :	X	X		X		X	X	X
Grant Elem K-6	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Sundance Elem K-6	X	X		X	X	SpecEd	X	X
North Elem K-6	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Wind River Elem K-5	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Wyo Indian Elem K-5	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Shoshoni ElemK-6	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Ashgrove Elem K-5	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Arapaho K-8	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Trail Elem 3-5	X			X		X	X	
Lucerne Elem 4-5	X		X	X		X	X	X
Meadowlark Elem K-4	X					SpecEd;RR	X	SpecEd;RR
Bain Elem K-6	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Albin Elem K-6	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Kemmerer Elem 3-5	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Afton Elem K-3	X	X		X		X	T1;SpecEd	X
Ft. Caspar Academy K-6						X	X	
Lusk Elem K-5								
Southside Elem K-5	X	X	X	X			X	X
Eastside ElemK-5	X	X	X	K-3		X	T1;SpecEd	X
Meeteetse K-12	X	X				X		
West Elem K, 4-6	X			X	X	T1;SpecEd	SpecEd	Title1
Guernsey-Sunrise E K	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Tongue River Elem K-	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Highland Park Elem K-	X	X	X	X	X	X	SpecEd	SpecEd
Clearmont Elem K-6	X	X					X	X
Pinedale Elem K-5								
Big Piney Elem K-5	X			X	X	X	X	X
Desert View K-6	X	X	X	X		T1;SpecEd	X	X
Truman Elem K-5	X	X	X	X		SpecEd;T1	T1;SpecEd	SpecEd
Wilson Elem K-5	X					X	X	
Uinta Meadows Elem I	X	X		X		X	X	X
Ft. Bridger Elem 3-5	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Lyman Elem 4-5	X		X			X	X	X
Southside Elem K-5	X	X		X			X	
Ten Sleep Elem K-6	X	X	X	X		SpecEd	T1;SpecEd	X
Gertrude Burns Inter 3	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
	40	33	24	34	8	35	40	35

Attachment 3: At-Risk Student Survey, Program Offerings, Elementary

<u>School Name</u>	<u>Programs Conducted Within the Regular School Day</u>						<u>What Implement if could?</u>
	<u>Parent Program</u>	<u>Computer Learning</u>	<u>Counseling</u>	<u>School in School</u>	<u>Targeted Prof Dev</u>	<u>Other</u>	
Thayer Elem K-6			X		X		
Lovell Elem K-5			X		X		Foster Grandparents
Greybull Elem K-5	Title 1		X		X		Full Day K;summer school
Laura Irwin Elem K-4	Title 1		X		X		More Parent Involvement
Sinclair Elem K-5			X		X		Peer Tutoring
Saratoga Elem K-4	X		X		X		Additional emphasis on ESL
Douglas Int 3-5			X				Non-graded school
Grant Elem K-6			X			X	Bullyproofing;LearningLab
Sundance Elem K-6	X		X				Fulltime Behavior Spec
North Elem K-6	X		X	SpecEd	X	Success-Maker	
Wind River Elem K-5	X		X		X	Nurse;SocWkr	Staffing
Wyo Indian Elem K-5	Title		X	ISS Alt		Year-Round Educ	PODS-Vertical articulation
Shoshoni ElemK-6	X		X		X	LifeSkills;TeenParent	AddAcadCoach;expandExt/Sat
Ashgrove Elem K-5	X		X		X		PreSchool;BigSis/Bro
Arapaho K-8	X		X	AltLrngCtr	X	ISS;Vol;	Yr-RndSch;More Tutoring;VocEd
Trail Elem 3-5			X		X	Success-Maker	Math;moreExtDay;SmallerClasses
Lucerne Elem 4-5	X		X		X		
Meadowk Elem K-4			X		X		Software-FastForWord
Bain Elem K-6	X		X	X	X	Bullyproof;CaringKids	Homework Help Club
Albin Elem K-6	X		X		X	Intercept	
Kemmerer Elem 3-5	X		X		X		Stable funding source
Afton Elem K-3			X		X		
Ft. Caspar Acad K-6	X		X				
Lusk Elem K-5							Specialized recovery pgms
Southside Elem K-5	X		X		X		K-2 skill groups; multi-age
Eastside ElemK-5	X		X		X		Social worker;truancyoffcr;coordination
Meeteetse K-12	X		X		X		Title 1 extended to Middle
West Elem K, 4-6	X		X		X		Math;ProfDevon Different Instr
Guern-Sunrse E K-6			X				Monthly "checkup" on students
Tongue R Elem K-5	X		X		X		RestorativeJustice;socialwkr;open school hrs
Highland Pk Elem K-5	X		X		X	PeaceBuilders	
Clearmont Elem K-6			X		X		
Pinedale Elem K-5							
Big Piney Elem K-5	X		X		X		More extended day tutoring
Desert View K-6			X		X		
Truman Elem K-5	X		X		X	FstrGdp;Vol;DARE;Y;BigB	More traing for parents
Wilson Elem K-5			X				More ELL;more aides
Uinta Medws E K-5			X		X		ProfDev;Teaming
Ft. Bridger Elem 3-5	X		X		X	X	SocialWkr;oralfluency;Title K-8
Lyman Elem 4-5			X	X	X	X	SuppGrps;ViolencePrevention
Southside Elem K-5	X		X		X		ExtendedDay;PreSchool
Ten Sleep Elem K-6			X		X	DARE;AltEducPlans	Addtnl counseling;social wkr
Gertrude Burns Int 3-5	X		X		X		Reduce more;Aides
	26		41	5	34		

Attachment 3: At-Risk Student Survey, Program Offerings, Secondary

Middle Schools/Junior Highs

<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Programs Conducted Outside the Regular School Day</u>						
		<u>Extended</u>	<u>Friday or Saturday</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Tutor</u>	<u>Peer Tutor</u>	<u>Counseling</u>	<u>Other</u>
Big Horn 2	Lovell Middle 6-8				X			
Big Horn 3	Greybull Middle 6-8	X		X	X	X		
Carbon 1	Rawlins Middle Schoo	X	X		X			
Converse 1	White Elem/Midd K-8				X			
Fremont 21	Ft.WashakieMiddle 7-8	X			X	X	X	
Fremont 25	Riverton Middle	X	X					
Hot Springs	Thermopolis Middle 6-	X			X	X		
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Middle 6-8	X						
Lincoln 2	Star Valley Jr High 7-8	X	X		X		X	
Niobrara 1	Lusk Middle 6-8	X	X		X		X	
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise Jr 7	X						
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Middle 6	X	X		X		X	Mentors;DARE;Lockl
Sheridan 2	Central Middle 6-7	X	X		X		X	WRAPAround;BigBro
Sheridan 3	Arvada-Clearm Jr High 7-8		X					
Uinta 4	Mtn. View Middle 6-8	X			X		X	X
Uinta 6	Lyman Middle 6-8	X	X				X	
Washakie 1	Worland Middle 6-8				X		X	
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Middle 7-8	X			X			
Weston 7	Upton Middle 6-8				X			
TOTALS:	19 Schools	14	8	1	14	3	8	

High Schools

<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Programs Conducted Outside the Regular School Day</u>						
		<u>Extended</u>	<u>Friday or Saturday</u>	<u>Night</u>	<u>Tutoring</u>	<u>Peer Tutoring</u>	<u>Counseling</u>	<u>Other</u>
Albany 1	Laramie High 10-12			X	X		X	
Big Horn 1	Rocky Mtn High 9-12	X	X		X	X	X	
Big Horn 4	Riverside High 9-12				X	X	X	Mentors
Campbell 1	Wright Jr/Sr High 7-12	X			X	X		
Carbon 2	H.E. M Senior High 9-	X			X		X	
Crook 1	Hulett High 9-12	X						
Fremont 1	Lander Valley High 9-1	X	X		X		X	
Fremont 6	Wind Riv Secondary 9	X			X	X		
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian High 9-12*		X	X	X			
Fremont 24	Shoshoni High 9-12	X			X	X		
Goshen 1	Torrington High 9-12	X	X	X	X	X	X	YouthAlternatives
Johnson 1	Kaycee Jr/Sr High 7-1:	X					X	
Laramie 1	Triumph High 8-12	X						
Laramie 2	Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr 7-12	X			X	X	X	X
Park 1	Powell High 9-12	X			X		X	
Park 6	Cody High School	X	X		X	X	X	Probation Officer
Platte 1	Glendo High 9-12	X			X	X		
Sublette 1	Pinedale High 9-12	X				X	X	
Sublette 9	Big Piney High 9-12	X			X	X	X	
Sweetwater 2	Expedition Academy 9-12				X		X	Jr.CollEnroll;IndStudy
Teton 1	Western Wyo High 9-1	X				X		
Uinta 1	Evanston High 9-12		X				X	
Weston 1	Newcastle High 9-12	X	X	X				
Weston 7	Upton High 9-12	X			X			
Total:	24 Schools	19	7	4	17	12	14	

*Reports no ESL students

Attachment 3: At-Risk Student Survey, Program Offerings, Secondary

Programs Conducted Within the Regular School Day								
<u>School Name</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>BoysTown/ Other</u>	<u>Lowered ClassSize</u>	<u>StudyAsst Teams</u>	<u>Specialized Teachers</u>	<u>Classrm Aides</u>	<u>Indivldz Instruction</u>
Lovell Middle 6-8								
Greybull Middle 6-8	X	X			X	X	X	X
Rawlins Middle School 6-8		X	X		X			
White Elem/Midd K-8	X	X		X				X
Ft. Washakie Middle 7-8	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Riverton Middle							X	
Thermopolis Middle 6-8	X		X			X	X	X
Kemmerer Middle 6-8	X		X	X			X	X
Star Valley Jr High 7-8	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Lusk Middle 6-8	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Guernsey-Sunrise Jr 7-8		X	X	X		X	X	X
Tongue River Middle 6-8	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Central Middle 6-7	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Arvada-Clearm Jr High	X	X				X		X
Mtn. View Middle 6-8		X	X	X		X	X	X
Lyman Middle 6-8	X		X	X		X	X	X
Worland Middle 6-8	X	X				X	X	
Ten Sleep Middle 7-8	X	X	X	X		SpecEd		X
Upton Middle 6-8	X					X	X	SpecEd
	14	13	10	10	6	14	14	14

Programs Conducted Within the Regular School Day								
<u>School Name</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>BoysTown/ Other</u>	<u>Lowered ClassSize</u>	<u>StudyAsst Teams</u>	<u>Specialized Teachers</u>	<u>Classroom Aides</u>	<u>Individualized Instruction</u>
Laramie High 10-12						X	X	X
Rocky Mtn High 9-12	X	X	X	X		SpecEd	X	X
Riverside High 9-12	X	X						X
Wright Jr/Sr High 7-12	X			X		X	X	X
H.E. M Senior High 9-12	X	X					X	X
Hulett High 9-12				X		X	X	X
Lander Valley High 9-12	X	X		X			X	X
Wind River Secondary	X	X		X		SpecEd	X	X
Wyo Indian High 9-12*	X	X		X			X	X
Shoshoni High 9-12	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Torrington High 9-12	X	X		X		SpecEd	SpecEd	
Kaycee Jr/Sr High 7-12			X			X	X	X
Triumph High 8-12	X			X		X	X	
Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr 7-12				X			X	
Powell High 9-12				X		X	SpecEd	
Cody High School		X			SWAT		X	X
Glendo High 9-12	X			X				X
Pinedale High 9-12	X						SpecEd	X
Big Piney High 9-12	X					X	X	X
Expedition Academy 9	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Western Wyo High 9-12	X	X		X		X	X	X
Evanston High 9-12				X	X		X	X
Newcastle High 9-12	X			X		X	X	
Upton High 9-12	X	X				SpecEd	SpecEd	SpecEd
	17	12	4	16	3	14	22	19

Attachment 3: At-Risk Student Survey, Program Offerings, Secondary

<u>School Name</u>	<u>Programs Conducted Within the Regular School Day</u>						<u>What Implement if could?</u>
	<u>Parent Program</u>	<u>Computer Learning</u>	<u>Counseling</u>	<u>School in School</u>	<u>Targeted Prof Dev</u>	<u>Other</u>	
Lovell Middle 6-8			X	AltClassrm	X		VocEd
Greybull Middle 6-8	X		X		X		MoreReadInterv;TeamBldg;DecisionMaking
Rawlins Middle 6-8			X		X	Behavior	ReinstateAltClassroom
White Elem/Midd K-8							Food Program
Ft.WashakieMid 7-8	X	X	X	SafeHaven	X	SuccessMaker	Individualized math programs
Riverton Middle	X		X		X	Boys/GirlsGroups	Health Program/Teacher
Thermopolis Mid 6-8			X	SpecEd	X	AcademicCoach	SatSchool;more parent involv
Kemmerer Middle 6-8	X		X		X		Funding for interventions
Star Vall Jr High 7-8	X		X	X	X	SocialSkills	Teaming - core subjects
Lusk Middle 6-8			X		X		
Guernsey-Sun Jr 7-8		NovaNet	X		X		Tutoring
T River Middle 6-8			X		X		Restorative Justice
Central Middle 6-7	X		X		X	BehContracts	Targeted Profess Dev
Arvada-Clearm JH 7-8			X		X		
Mtn. View Middle 6-8	X		X		X	X	ExpandSafeHaven;counseling
Lyman Middle 6-8			X	X	X	X	ViolencePrevention;SuppGroups;Academic
Worland Middle 6-8				X	X	X	Bullyproofing
Ten Sleep Middle 7-8			X		X	DARE;AltEducPlans	BoysTown;ReadRecov;Counseling
Upton Middle 6-8			X		X		
	7	2	17	6	18		

<u>School Name</u>	<u>Programs Conducted Within the Regular School Day</u>						<u>What Implement if could?</u>
	<u>Parent Programs</u>	<u>Computer Learning</u>	<u>Counseling</u>	<u>School in School</u>	<u>Targeted Prof Dev</u>	<u>Other</u>	
Laramie High 10-12			X		X	X	School within School
Rocky Mtn High 9-12		X	X		X		
Riverside High 9-12		X	X		X	SSR;Bks/Tape;Oral	
Wright Jr/Sr 7-12		X	X			Behavior-Challenge	Add at-risk Aide
H.E. M Senior 9-12		Plato	X				More tutoring
Hulett High 9-12			X		X		
Lander Valley 9-12			X		X	Parentcontact	Expansion of existing
Wind River Sec 6-12		X	X		X	TeamBldg	Alternative School;Vocational
Wyo Indian 9-12*		NovaNet	X		X	ISS	
Shoshoni High 9-12		X	X		X	Acad Coach;Ext	
Torrington High 9-12		NovaNet	X		X		Alternative School
Kaycee Jr/Sr 7-12		Plato	X				Mentorships/At-Risk Teams
Triumph High 8-12		NovaNet	X		X		Enhancing existing
Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr 7-12			X		X		Study Asst Teams
Powell High 9-12			X		X	Study Skill	ReadingSpec;At-RiskCounselor
Cody High School		WEN	X	ISS;Transt	X	X	StudyHall;TruantOffcr;SubAbuseEval
Glendo High 9-12		X	X				
Pinedale High 9-12		Plato	X				
Big Piney High 9-12		X	X		X		Summer school
Exp Acad 9-12			X		X	CareerExpl;CommSvc	Night;SocialWkr/psychologist
Wstrn Wyo Hgh 9-12		X	X		X		Social Worker
Evanston High 9-12			X	X	X		SocialSkills;1 on 1 Instr
Newcastle High 9-12		X	X	X			
Upton High 9-12			X				AccelRead/Math;
	5	16	24	2	17		

Elementary							
<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Undup Count</u>	<u>Percent Enrollment</u>	<u>Students ID'd by School</u>	<u>% Enroll Identified</u>	<u>Variance with Undup Count</u>
Albany 1	Thayer Elem K-6	223	89	39.91%	94	42.15%	5.62%
Big Horn 2	Lovell Elem K-5	324	136	41.98%	166	51.23%	22.06%
Big Horn 3	Greybull Elem K-5	209	74	35.41%	80	38.28%	8.11%
Big Horn 4	Laura Irwin Elem K-4	117	56	47.86%	24	20.51%	-57.14%
Carbon 1	Sinclair Elem K-5	32	12	37.50%	3	9.38%	-75.00%
Carbon 2	Saratoga Elem K-4	130	46	35.38%	85	65.38%	84.78%
Converse 1	Douglas Intermediate 3-5	350	100	28.57%	73	20.86%	-27.00%
Converse 2	Grant Elem K-6	295	82	27.80%	112	37.97%	36.59%
Crook 1	Sundance Elem K-6	181	56	30.94%	73	40.33%	30.36%
Fremont 1	North Elem K-6	274	139	50.73%	140	51.09%	0.72%
Fremont 6	Wind River Elem K-5	145	70	48.28%	74	51.03%	5.71%
Fremont 24	Shoshoni ElemK-6	154	73	47.40%	85	55.19%	16.44%
Fremont 25	Ashgrove Elem K-5	265	69	26.04%	80	30.19%	15.94%
Goshen 1	Trail Elem 3-5	289	155	53.63%	110	38.06%	-29.03%
Hot Springs	Lucerne Elem 4-5	106	47	44.34%	42	39.62%	-10.64%
Johnson 1	Meadowlark Elem K-4	367	88	23.98%	101	27.52%	14.77%
Laramie 1	Bain Elem K-6	379	74	19.53%	150	39.58%	102.70%
Laramie 2	Albin Elem K-6	63	31	49.21%	18	28.57%	-41.94%
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Elem 3-5	162	57	35.19%	55	33.95%	-3.51%
Lincoln 2	Afton Elem K-3	365	111	30.41%	100	27.40%	-9.91%
Natrona 1	Ft. Caspar Academy K-6	396	76	19.19%	7	1.77%	-90.79%
Niobrara 1	Lusk Elem K-5	172	61	35.47%	63	36.63%	3.28%
Park 1	Southside Elem K-5	217	79	36.41%	129	59.45%	63.29%
Park 6	Eastside ElemK-5	347	116	33.43%	144	41.50%	24.14%
Park 16	Meeteetse K-12	154	63	40.91%	28	18.18%	-55.56%
Platte 1	West Elem K, 4-6	340	114	33.53%	124	36.47%	8.77%
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise E K-6	127	59	46.46%	65	51.18%	10.17%
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Elem K-5	171	83	48.54%	65	38.01%	-21.69%
Sheridan 2	Highland Park Elem K-5	363	95	26.17%	124	34.16%	30.53%
Sheridan 3	Clearmont Elem K-6	37	12	32.43%	5	13.51%	-58.33%
Sublette 9	Big Piney Elem K-5	179	66	36.87%	50	27.93%	-24.24%
Sweetwater 1	Desert View K-6	231	102	44.16%	186	80.52%	82.35%
Sweetwater 2	Truman Elem K-5	286	72	25.17%	160	55.94%	122.22%
Teton 1	Wilson Elem K-5	202	5	2.48%	5	2.48%	0.00%
Uinta 1	Uinta Meadows Elem K-5	406	143	35.22%	80	19.70%	-44.06%
Uinta 4	Ft. Bridger Elem 3-5	124	37	29.84%	31	25.00%	-16.22%
Uinta 6	Lyman Elem 4-5	99	25	25.25%	15	15.15%	-40.00%
Washakie 1	Southside Elem K-5	209	69	33.01%	56	26.79%	-18.84%
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Elem K-6	47	25	53.19%	15	31.91%	-40.00%
Weston 1	Gertrude Burns Inter 3-5	165	52	31.52%	69	41.82%	32.69%
Sub-Total:		8702	2919	33.54%	3086	35.46%	5.72%
<u>Schools at or Near 100%</u>							
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian Elem K-5	305	302	99.02%	305	100.00%	0.99%
Fremont 38	Arapaho K-8	294	294	100.00%	285	96.94%	-3.06%
TOTAL:		9301	3515	37.79%	3676	39.52%	4.58%

100% Schools OUT

Correlation between Undup Count Percentage and Reported At-Risk Percentage of Students 100% Schools OUT	
	Unduplicated Count
At-Risk % Identified by Schools:	0.427**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

100% Schools IN

Correlation between Undup Count Percentage and Reported At-Risk Percentage of Students 100% Schools IN	
	Unduplicated Count
At-Risk % Identified by Schools:	0.711**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

Attachment 5: Comparison of Unduplicated Count and At-Risk Students Identified by Schools, Secondary

Middle/Junior High							
District	School Name	Enrollment	Undup Count	Percent Enrollment	Students ID'd by School	% Enroll Identified	Variance with Undup Count
Big Horn 2	Lovell Middle 6-8	155	76	49.03%	15	9.68%	-80.26%
Big Horn 3	Greybull Middle 6-8	113	42	37.17%	25	22.12%	-40.48%
Carbon 1	Rawlins Middle School 6-8	395	140	35.44%	150	37.97%	7.14%
Converse 1	White Elem/Midd K-8	16	12	75.00%	4	25.00%	-66.67%
Fremont 25	Riverton Middle 6-8	580	220	37.93%	323	55.69%	46.82%
Hot Springs	Thermopolis Middle 6-8	177	46	25.99%	117	66.10%	154.35%
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Middle 6-8	177	50	28.25%	55	31.07%	10.00%
Lincoln 2	Star Valley Jr High 7-8	367	91	24.80%	40	10.90%	-56.04%
Niobrara 1	Lusk Middle 6-8	97	33	34.02%	49	50.52%	48.48%
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise Jr 7-8	44	20	45.45%	28	63.64%	40.00%
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Middle 6-8	138	50	36.23%	77	55.80%	54.00%
Sheridan 2	Central Middle 6-7	483	173	35.82%	250	51.76%	44.51%
Sheridan 3	Arvada-Clearm Jr High 7-8	17	1	5.88%	1	5.88%	0.00%
Uinta 4	Mtn. View Middle 6-8	160	32	20.00%	52	32.50%	62.50%
Uinta 6	Lyman Middle 6-8	174	52	29.89%	50	28.74%	-3.85%
Washakie 1	Worland Middle 6-8	342	115	33.63%	102	29.82%	-11.30%
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Middle 7-8	19	12	63.16%	13	68.42%	8.33%
Weston 7	Upton Middle 6-8	69	14	20.29%	24	34.78%	71.43%
Sub-Total:		3523	1179	33.47%	1375	39.03%	16.62%
<u>Schools at or Near 100%</u>							
Fremont 21	Ft. Washakie Middle 7-8	43	42	97.67%	42	97.67%	0.00%
TOTAL:		3566	1221	34.24%	1417	39.74%	16.05%

Correlation between Undup Count Percentage and Reported At-Risk Percentage of Students 100% Schools OUT	
At-Risk % Identified by Schools:	0.272**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

Correlation between Undup Count Percentage, and Reported At-Risk Percentage of Students 100% Schools IN	
At-Risk % Identified by Schools:	0.559**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

High School							
District	School Name	Enrollment	Undup Count	Percent of Enrollment	Students ID'd by School	% Enroll Identified	Variance w Undup Ct
Albany 1	Laramie High 10-12	841	128	15.22%	135	16.05%	5.47%
Big Horn 1	Rocky Mtn High 9-12	168	58	34.52%	61	36.31%	5.17%
Big Horn 4	Riverside High 9-12	111	33	29.73%	28	25.23%	-15.15%
Campbell 1	Wright Jr/Sr High 7-12	267	34	12.73%	50	18.73%	47.06%
Carbon 2	H.E. M Senior High 9-12	89	36	40.45%	74	83.15%	105.56%
Crook 1	Hulett High 9-12	95	21	22.11%	17	17.89%	-19.05%
Fremont 1	Lander Valley High 9-12	740	153	20.68%	40	5.41%	-73.86%
Fremont 6	Wind River Secondary 6-12	243	107	44.03%	107	44.03%	0.00%
Fremont 24	Shoshoni High 9-12	127	22	17.32%	20	15.75%	-9.09%
Goshen 1	Torrington High 9-12	445	110	24.72%	75	16.85%	-31.82%
Johnson 1	Kaycee Jr/Sr High 7-12	89	18	20.22%	34	38.20%	88.89%
Laramie 2	Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr 7-12	173	42	24.28%	38	21.97%	-9.52%
Park 1	Powell High 9-12	537	59	10.99%	77	14.34%	30.51%
Park 6	Cody High School 9-12	824	76	9.22%	144	17.48%	89.47%
Platte 1	Glendo High 9-12	33	14	42.42%	21	63.64%	50.00%
Sublette 1	Pinedale High 9-12	193	30	15.54%	12	6.22%	-60.00%
Sublette 9	Big Piney High 9-12	183	30	16.39%	30	16.39%	0.00%
Uinta 1	Evanston High 9-12	1011	256	25.32%	29	2.87%	-88.67%
Weston 1	Newcastle High 9-12	318	40	12.58%	35	11.01%	-12.50%
Weston 7	Upton High 9-12	105	15	14.29%	38	36.19%	153.33%
Sub-Total:		6592	1282	19.45%	1065	16.16%	-16.93%
<u>Schools at or Near 100%</u>							
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian High 9-12	167	167	100.00%	150	89.82%	-10.18%
Laramie 1	Triumph High 8-12	270	86	31.85%	270	100.00%	213.95%
Sweetwater 2	Expedition Academy 9-12	43	14	32.56%	43	100.00%	207.14%
Teton 1	Western Wyo High 9-12	46	2	4.35%	44	95.65%	2100.00%
TOTAL:		7118	1551	21.79%	1572	22.08%	1.35%

Correlation between Undup Count Percentage and Reported At-Risk Percentage of Students 100% Schools OUT	
At-Risk % Identified by Schools:	0.719**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

Correlation between Undup Count Percentage and Reported At-Risk Percentage of Students 100% Schools IN	
At-Risk % Identified by Schools:	0.495**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

Correlation with WyCAS Scores and School Characteristics

Grade	School Demographic	WyCAS Mean Scores		
		Reading	Writing	Math
4	F&R Lunch	-0.442**	-0.497**	-0.298**
4	Mobility	-0.087	-0.140	-0.152*
4	Attendance	0.217**	N/A	0.212**
8	F&R Lunch	-0.362**	-0.425**	-0.274**
8	Mobility	-0.528**	-0.551**	-0.550**
8	Attendance	0.593**	N/A	0.530**
11	F&R Lunch	-0.630**	-0.564**	-0.693**
11	Mobility	-0.550**	-0.509**	-0.626**
11	Attendance	0.428**	N/A	0.458**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed.)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed.)

Excludes Schools reporting 0% F&R Lunch

Mobility based on 1 year data; F&R Lunch & Scores based on 3 yr data

Correlation with Unduplicated Count & At-Risk Students Identified by Schools

Grade Span		School Survey Data	
		100% Sch OUT	100% Sch IN
Elementary	Undup Count	0.427	0.711
Middle/Jr High	Undup Count	0.272	0.559
High School	Undup Count	0.719	0.495
K-12	Undup Count	0.494	0.568

Correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient describes the direction (positive or negative) and magnitude (from zero to one) between the two variables being analyzed. A perfect correlation produces a value of 1.0 and means that as one of the variable increases, the other increases by the same proportion. Coefficients greater than (+/-) 0.7 are considered strong; between (+/-) 0.3 and 0.7 are considered moderate to strong, between (+/-) 0.1 and 0.3 are considered weak; less than (+/-) 0.1 are considered negligible. A negative correlation means that as one of the variable increases, the other decreases by the same proportion. .

Attachment 7: Percentages of At-Risk Students also in Special Education, Elementary

Elementary			Undup	Percent	Students ID'd	# Also	% ID'd
District	School Name	Enrollment	Count	Enrollment	by School	SpEd (Q2a)	Also SpEd
Albany 1	Thayer Elem K-6	223	89	39.91%	94	21	22.34%
Big Horn 2	Lovell Elem K-5	324	136	41.98%	166	44	26.51%
Big Horn 3	Greybull Elem K-5	209	74	35.41%	80	34	42.50%
Big Horn 4	Laura Irwin Elem K-4	117	56	47.86%	24	6	25.00%
Carbon 1	Sinclair Elem K-5	32	12	37.50%	3	0	0.00%
Carbon 2	Saratoga Elem K-4	130	46	35.38%	85	21	24.71%
Converse 1	Douglas Intermediate 3-5	350	100	28.57%	73	40	54.79%
Converse 2	Grant Elem K-6	295	82	27.80%	112	36	32.14%
Crook 1	Sundance Elem K-6	181	56	30.94%	73	35	47.95%
Fremont 1	North Elem K-6	274	139	50.73%	140	58	41.43%
Fremont 6	Wind River Elem K-5	145	70	48.28%	74	16	21.62%
Fremont 24	Shoshoni ElemK-6	154	73	47.40%	85	2	2.35%
Fremont 25	Ashgrove Elem K-5	265	69	26.04%	80	39	48.75%
Goshen 1	Trail Elem 3-5	289	155	53.63%	110	50	45.45%
Hot Springs	Lucerne Elem 4-5	106	47	44.34%	42	12	28.57%
Johnson 1	Meadowlark Elem K-4	367	88	23.98%	101	26	25.74%
Laramie 1	Bain Elem K-6	379	74	19.53%	150	19	12.67%
Laramie 2	Albin Elem K-6	63	31	49.21%	18	1	5.56%
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Elem 3-5	162	57	35.19%	55	0	0.00%
Lincoln 2	Afton Elem K-3	365	111	30.41%	100	29	29.00%
Natrona 1	Ft. Caspar Academy K-6	396	76	19.19%	7	2	28.57%
Niobrara 1	Lusk Elem K-5	172	61	35.47%	63	36	57.14%
Park 1	Southside Elem K-5	217	79	36.41%	129	11	8.53%
Park 6	Eastside ElemK-5	347	116	33.43%	144	55	38.19%
Park 16	Meeteetse K-12	154	63	40.91%	28	13	46.43%
Platte 1	West Elem K, 4-6	340	114	33.53%	124	34	27.42%
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise E K-6	127	59	46.46%	65	11	16.92%
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Elem K-5	171	83	48.54%	65	10	15.38%
Sheridan 2	Highland Park Elem K-5	363	95	26.17%	124	49	39.52%
Sheridan 3	Clearmont Elem K-6	37	12	32.43%	5	5	100.00%
Sublette 9	Big Piney Elem K-5	179	66	36.87%	50	21	42.00%
Sweetwater 1	Desert View K-6	231	102	44.16%	186	65	34.95%
Sweetwater 2	Truman Elem K-5	286	72	25.17%	160	30	18.75%
Teton 1	Wilson Elem K-5	202	5	2.48%	5	0	0.00%
Uinta 1	Uinta Meadows Elem K-5	406	143	35.22%	80	0	0.00%
Uinta 4	Ft. Bridger Elem 3-5	124	37	29.84%	31	23	74.19%
Uinta 6	Lyman Elem 4-5	99	25	25.25%	15	8	53.33%
Washakie 1	Southside Elem K-5	209	69	33.01%	56	47	83.93%
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Elem K-6	47	25	53.19%	15	9	60.00%
Weston 1	Gertrude Burns Inter 3-5	165	52	31.52%	69	30	43.48%
Sub-Total:		8702	2919	33.54%	3086	948	30.72%
<u>Schools at or Near 100%</u>							
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian Elem K-5	305	302	99.02%	305	78	25.57%
Fremont 38	Arapaho K-8	294	294	100.00%	285	51	17.89%
TOTAL:		9301	3515	37.79%	3676	1077	29.30%

Attachment 7: Percentages of At-Risk Students also in Special Education, Secondary

<u>Middle/Junior High</u>							
<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Undup Count</u>	<u>Percent Enrollment</u>	<u>Students ID'd by School</u>	<u># Also SpEd (Q2a)</u>	<u>% ID'd Also SpEd</u>
Big Horn 2	Lovell Middle 6-8	155	76	49.03%	15	0	0.00%
Big Horn 3	Greybull Middle 6-8	113	42	37.17%	25	6	24.00%
Carbon 1	Rawlins Middle School 6-8	395	140	35.44%	150	50	33.33%
Converse 1	White Elem/Midd K-8	16	12	75.00%	4	0	0.00%
Fremont 25	Riverton Middle 6-8	580	220	37.93%	323	88	27.24%
Hot Springs	Thermopolis Middle 6-8	177	46	25.99%	117	16	13.68%
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Middle 6-8	177	50	28.25%	55	0	0.00%
Lincoln 2	Star Valley Jr High 7-8	367	91	24.80%	40	33	82.50%
Niobrara 1	Lusk Middle 6-8	97	33	34.02%	49	17	34.69%
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise Jr 7-8	44	20	45.45%	28	5	17.86%
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Middle 6-8	138	50	36.23%	77	19	24.68%
Sheridan 2	Central Middle 6-7	483	173	35.82%	250	68	27.20%
Sheridan 3	Arvada-Clearm Jr High 7-8	17	1	5.88%	1	1	100.00%
Uinta 4	Mtn. View Middle 6-8	160	32	20.00%	52	39	75.00%
Uinta 6	Lyman Middle 6-8	174	52	29.89%	50	25	50.00%
Washakie 1	Worland Middle 6-8	342	115	33.63%	102	74	72.55%
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Middle 7-8	19	12	63.16%	13	3	23.08%
Weston 7	Upton Middle 6-8	69	14	20.29%	24	13	54.17%
Sub-Total:		3523	1179	33.47%	1375	457	33.24%
<u>High LEP or Alternative Schools:</u>							
Fremont 21	Ft. Washakie Middle 7-8	43	42	97.67%	42	10	23.81%
TOTAL:		3566	1221	34.24%	1417	467	32.96%

<u>High School</u>							
<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Undup Count</u>	<u>Percent of Enrollment</u>	<u>Students ID'd by School</u>	<u># Also SpEd (Q2a)</u>	<u>% ID'd Also SpEd</u>
Albany 1	Laramie High 10-12	841	128	15.22%	135	28	20.74%
Big Horn 1	Rocky Mtn High 9-12	168	58	34.52%	61	4	6.56%
Big Horn 4	Riverside High 9-12	111	33	29.73%	28	10	35.71%
Campbell 1	Wright Jr/Sr High 7-12	267	34	12.73%	50	13	26.00%
Carbon 2	H.E. M Senior High 9-12	89	36	40.45%	74	19	25.68%
Crook 1	Hulett High 9-12	95	21	22.11%	17	3	17.65%
Fremont 1	Lander Valley High 9-12	740	153	20.68%	40	0	0.00%
Fremont 6	Wind River Secondary 6-12	243	107	44.03%	107	36	33.64%
Fremont 24	Shoshoni High 9-12	127	22	17.32%	20	5	25.00%
Goshen 1	Torrington High 9-12	445	110	24.72%	75	22	29.33%
Johnson 1	Kaycee Jr/Sr High 7-12	89	18	20.22%	34	14	41.18%
Laramie 2	Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr 7-12	173	42	24.28%	38	9	23.68%
Park 1	Powell High 9-12	537	59	10.99%	77	18	23.38%
Park 6	Cody High School 9-12	824	76	9.22%	144	14	9.72%
Platte 1	Glendo High 9-12	33	14	42.42%	21	1	4.76%
Sublette 1	Pinedale High 9-12	193	30	15.54%	12	4	33.33%
Sublette 9	Big Piney High 9-12	183	30	16.39%	30	6	20.00%
Uinta 1	Evanston High 9-12	1011	256	25.32%	29	0	0.00%
Weston 1	Newcastle High 9-12	318	40	12.58%	35	11	31.43%
Weston 7	Upton High 9-12	105	15	14.29%	38	12	31.58%
Sub-Total:		6592	1282	19.45%	1065	229	21.50%
<u>Schools at or near 100%:</u>							
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian High 9-12	167	167	100.00%	150	32	21.33%
Laramie 1	Triumph High 8-12	270	86	31.85%	270	32	11.85%
Sweetwater 2	Expedition Academy 9-12	43	14	32.56%	43	10	23.26%
Teton 1	Western Wyo High 9-12	46	2	4.35%	44	18	40.91%
TOTAL:		7118	1551	21.79%	1572	321	20.42%

Attachment 8: Estimated Cost Per Student of Interventions from School Survey, Elementary

A8-1

Elementary

<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Cost Outside Day (Q8)</u>	<u>Cost within Day (Q9)</u>	<u># ESL? (Q10)</u>	<u>ESL Cost (Q12)</u>
Albany 1	Thayer Elem K-6			11	
Big Horn 1	Cowley Elem K-5				
Big Horn 2	Lovell Elem K-5			11	
Big Horn 3	Greybull Elem K-5	439	5475	7	1820
Big Horn 4	Laura Irwin Elem K-4	250	200	5	1000
Campbell 1	Rawhide Elem K-6				
Carbon 1	Sinclair Elem K-5			0	
Carbon 2	Saratoga Elem K-4	46	4126	6	854
Converse 1	Douglas Intermediate 3-5			1	13000
Converse 2	Grant Elem K-6	1500	7000	2	2600
Crook 1	Sundance Elem K-6			0	
Fremont 1	North Elem K-6			3	
Fremont 6	Wind River Elem K-5	1285	1625	41	1952
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian Elem K-5	573		305	
Fremont 24	Shoshoni ElemK-6	1029	4782	16	3875
Fremont 25	Ashgrove Elem K-5	2400		18	12000
Fremont 38	Arapaho K-8	3566	3291	281	
Goshen 1	Trail Elem 3-5	150		4	
Hot Springs	Lucerne Elem 4-5		3650	0	
Johnson 1	Meadowlark Elem K-4	466	2683	0	
Laramie 1	Bain Elem K-6			0	
Laramie 2	Albin Elem K-6			5	
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Elem 3-5	236	960	5	
Lincoln 2	Afton Elem K-3	144	2210	2	4250
Natrona 1	Ft. Caspar Academy K-6	18	0	13	423
Niobrara 1	Lusk Elem K-5			0	
Park 1	Southside Elem K-5	134	163	13	341
Park 6	Eastside ElemK-5	773	6872	1	4256
Park 16	Meeteetse K-12	0	2133	0	
Platte 1	West Elem K, 4-6	500	1048	11	1000
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise E K-6	77	1668	0	
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Elem K-5	100	670	Native	
Sheridan 2	Highland Park Elem K-5			2	12350
Sheridan 3	Clearmont Elem K-6			0	
Sublette 1	Pinedale Elem K-5				
Sublette 9	Big Piney Elem K-5	2000		2	5000
Sweetwater 1	Desert View K-6			0	
Sweetwater 2	Truman Elem K-5	580		15	834
Teton 1	Wilson Elem K-5			2	1000
Uinta 1	Uinta Meadows Elem K-5			0	
Uinta 4	Ft. Bridger Elem 3-5	150	4742	0	
Uinta 6	Lyman Elem 4-5	128	1187	0	
Washakie 1	Southside Elem K-5			4	
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Elem K-6			2	1000
Weston 1	Gertrude Burns Inter 3-5	219		0	
Average Cost per Student:		\$ 670.52	\$ 2,724.25	\$ 3,753.06	

Attachment 8: Estimated Cost Per Student of Interventions from School Survey, Secondary

Middle/Junior High

<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Cost Outside Day (Q8)</u>	<u>Cost within Day (Q9)</u>	<u># ESL? (Q10)</u>	<u>ESL Cost (Q12)</u>
Big Horn 2	Lovell Middle 6-8	13		1	0
Big Horn 3	Greybull Middle 6-8	439	5475	0	0
Carbon 1	Rawlins Middle School 6-8			5	
Converse 1	White Elem/Midd K-8	420	888	0	
Fermont 21	Ft. Washakie Middle 7-8	850	3100	42	
Fremont 25	Riverton Middle 6-8			127	1000
Hot Springs	Thermopolis Middle 6-8			3	
Lincoln 1	Kemmerer Middle 6-8	236	960	3	
Lincoln 2	Star Valley Jr High 7-8	150	750	0	
Niobrara 1	Lusk Middle 6-8			0	
Platte 2	Guernsey-Sunrise Jr 7-8	100	563	0	
Sheridan 1	Tongue River Middle 6-8	125	582	0	
Sheridan 2	Central Middle 6-7			2	8685
Sheridan 3	Arvada-Clearm Jr High 7-8			0	
Uinta 4	Mtn. View Middle 6-8			0	
Uinta 6	Lyman Middle 6-8	75	290	0	
Washakie 1	Worland Middle 6-8			1	0
Washakie 2	Ten Sleep Middle 7-8			0	
Weston 7	Upton Middle 6-8	166	4961	0	
Average Cost per Student:		\$ 257.40	\$ 1,952.11		\$ 1,937.00

High School

<u>District</u>	<u>School Name</u>	<u>Cost Outside Day (Q8)</u>	<u>Cost within Day (Q9)</u>	<u># ESL? (Q10)</u>	<u>ESL Cost (Q12)</u>
Albany 1	Laramie High 10-12			4	
Big Horn 1	Rocky Mtn High 9-12			0	
Big Horn 4	Riverside High 9-12		250	1	
Campbell 1	Wright Jr/Sr High 7-12	100	940	0	
Carbon 2	H.E. M Senior High 9-12		1697	0	
Crook 1	Hulett High 9-12			0	
Fremont 1	Lander Valley High 9-12	48	367	120	183
Fremont 6	Wind River Secondary 6-12	1540		56	1140
Fremont 14	Wyo Indian High 9-12			0	
Fremont 24	Shoshoni High 9-12	250	1700	11	600
Goshen 1	Torrington High 9-12	85	46	10	0
Johnson 1	Kaycee Jr/Sr High 7-12			0	
Laramie 1	Triumph High 8-12	1200		0	
Laramie 2	Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr 7-12			0	
Park 1	Powell High 9-12	617	935	0	
Park 6	Cody High School	36	485	1	5000
Platte 1	Glendo High 9-12		351	1	
Sublette 1	Pinedale High 9-12	423		0	
Sublette 9	Big Piney High 9-12	145		0	
Sweetwater 2	Expedition Academy 9-12			0	
Teton 1	Western Wyo High 9-12	900	2500	1	
Uinta 1	Evanston High 9-12	20	170	6	
Weston 1	Newcastle High 9-12	350		0	
Weston 7	Upton High 9-12	166	6784	0	
Average Cost per Student:		\$ 397.67	\$ 1,352.08		\$ 1,384.60

Attachment 9: Summer School Data Survey

District: _____

Due: August 23, 2002

Summer School Data Survey
Subset of the Legislated At-Risk Student Study
July 30, 2002

Please provide information based on the programs you are concluding or have just concluded this summer. Do not include expense or attendance information on ESY programs for special education students delivered as part of their IEP.

1. If your district does not operate a summer school program, please provide a history on this decision.
2. How does your district determine eligibility for summer school? What grades are included?
3. Is attendance mandatory or elective?
4. Describe your summer program, i.e., number of hours, length of session, curriculum/subjects offered, etc.
5. Does your district offer any summer enrichment programs? If yes, please describe.
6. List by grade last attended (May or June, 2002) the number of children enrolled in summer school this year.

K: _____	6: _____
1: _____	7: _____
2: _____	8: _____
3: _____	9: _____
4: _____	10: _____
5: _____	11: _____
	12: _____

Pre-Kindergarten: _____

If your district provides educational services to pre-Kindergarten children, please explain how you identify which children need these services, briefly describe what you offer, and include the costs associated with the program in question #7 below.

7. What was the cost to run your summer program this year? Exclude any Extended School Year (ESY) expenses for special education students delivered as part of their IEP; exclude transportation expenses for which you are reimbursed by the state. Include all other expenses such as salaries and benefits of teachers, summer school administrators, custodians, utilities, supplies and materials, contracted services, capital outlay, etc.

8. How does your district currently pay for your summer school program?

9. How effective has your summer school been for successfully dealing with and educating at-risk students? How have you measured this?

10. Briefly describe the history of your summer program. For instance, has the district traditionally offered summer school, or has it been instituted in only the past few years? If so, why? Have there been changes in subjects offered, numbers of students attending, etc.? What demands to you anticipate will be placed on summer education over the next few years, and why?

11. Do you have any additional comments, concerns, or observations?

Name of Preparer: _____

Telephone: _____

E-mail: _____

If you have any questions, please directly contact Ruth Sommers, Post Office Box 2990, Cheyenne, WY 82003. (307) 632-0157. Somm8@attbi.com

Attachment 10: Summer School Program Information

A10-1

<u>District</u>	<u>Lang Arts</u>	<u>Math</u>	<u>Soc Stud</u>	<u>Science</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Preschool</u>	<u>Computzd Instruction</u>
Albany 1	X	X	X (9+)	X (9+)			
Big Horn 1	X	X	X	X			Yes
Big Horn 2	X	X					
Big Horn 4	X	X	X	X			
Converse 1	X	X					
Converse 2	X	X (7+)	X (7+)	X (7+)			
Crook 1	X	X	(X9+?)	(X9+?)			
Fremont 1	X	X (9+)	X	X			All H.S. Subj
Fremont 2	X	X					Yes
Fremont 6	X	X	X	X			
Fremont 14	X	X	X (9+)	X			NovaNet- 9-12
Fremont 21	X	X	X	X			
Fremont 24	X	X		X			
Fremont 25	X	X					
Fremont 38	X	X	X	X		Yes	
Goshen 1	X	X	X (6+) NN	X (6+) NN			NovaNet 6-12
Hot Springs 1	X	X	X (9+)	X (9+)			
Johnson 1	X	X	X (9+)	X (9+)			
Laramie 1	X	X	X (7+)	X (7+)	StudySk	Yes	NovaNet 9-12
Laramie 2	X	X	X (7+)	X			
Lincoln 1	X	X		X (9+)			
Lincoln 2	X	X					
Natrona 1	X	X	X	X	PhysEd		
Niobrara 1	X	X					
Park 1	X	X	X	X			
Park 6	X	X	X	X		Yes	
Platte 1	X	X					
Platte 2	X	X	X (9+)	X (9+)		Yes	NovaNet 7-12
Sheridan 1	X	X	X (9+)	X (9+)	StudySk		
Sheridan 2	X	X	X	X			
Sublette 1	X	X	X	X	Computer		
Sublette 9	X	X					
Sweetwater 1	X	X	X	X			
Sweetwater 2	X	X	X (9+)	X (9+)			
Teton 1	X	X	X				Yes
Uinta 1	X	X	X			Yes	
Uinta 4	X	X				Yes	
Uinta 6	X	X					
Washakie 1	X	X	X	X			
Washakie 2	X	X					
Weston 1	X	X	X	X			
Weston 7	X	X					
Totals: (42)	42	42	28 (12Sec)	28(11Sec)			

Attachment 10: Summer School Program Information

A10-2

<u>District</u>	<u>Enrich Pgm?</u>	<u>Recent Change?</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Albany 1	PE-DriversEd	H.S. for remediation in '01	Demand will incre w grad rqmts
Big Horn 1		Move to stds-based	May eventually have to mandate attendance
Big Horn 2		Began again after few yrs	
Big Horn 4			
Converse 1		To stds-based instr	
Converse 2			Demand will incr w graduation rqmts
Crook 1		Move to Secondary	Demand increasing
Fremont 1	21st Century	SS for past 3 years	
Fremont 2	21st Century	If no grant \$, no SS	Demand w increase
Fremont 6	21st Century		Provides multiple instructional methods
Fremont 14	Yes		
Fremont 21	Yes-half day	Move to enrichment	Greater demand for enrichment and voc
Fremont 24	21st Century		
Fremont 25	21st Century		Personalized instruction;more academic
Fremont 38	JOM;TIX	Move to stds-based instr	
Goshen 1		Added NovaNet 2yrs ago	
Hot Springs 1	Yes	H.S. (Class2005) New	
Johnson 1		Began 3 years ago	Funding a problem - #s will increase
Laramie 1	Phys Ed	Big incr in secondary stu	
Laramie 2	Comp/Forensics		
Lincoln 1	Yes-K5 Core	Recently added High Sch	
Lincoln 2	Yes		
Natrona 1	DriversEd,Swim	Dropped K-7 - no sig diff	Funding problem w/o TANF; no growth
Niobrara 1		Just began ss after ELO\$	
Park 1		Move to stds-based instr	Expand beyond core-move to enrich
Park 6		Result up when attend req	
Platte 1			Numbers attending will grow
Platte 2		Secondary NovaNet new	
Sheridan 1	Cyber/Super Camps	Elem SS new since ELO	Need to expand length of session
Sheridan 2		SS 3 yrsold;SocSt/Sci 1yrold	Attend double in size 6-12
Sublette 1	Mid-SciSchools	Elem new last 2 yrs (ELO)	
Sublette 9		Expanded w ELO	Usu have MiddleSchool
Sweetwater 1	BOCES	Move to stds-based instr	Need to expand to other grades
		Added grades in Elem	Current \$ not sufficient
Sweetwater 2	music, computers	New last 2 years (ELO)	Where will future \$ come from?
Teton 1		New Pgm-Chgd-Cert Teachers	
Uinta 1	K-5 LA/Math		
Uinta 4	Key Camp	High School New	Expand HS in future;instr outside traditl struct
Uinta 6			Needs will increase w grad rqmts
Washakie 1		H.S. 3 yrs old;expanded curr.	Dramatic increase anticipated
Washakie 2	Elem Math/Sci	Incr length;added Second	
Weston 1	Yes-integrated	New in 2001, ELO	
Weston 7		New in 2001, ELO	Need to expand w grad rqmts

Attachment 10: Summer School Program Information

A10-3

Observations and Additional Comments from Districts

There are 8 required areas for graduation; districts offer remediation in only 4 as a rule
A number of distr offer only LA and Math in summer school; need to expand subject areas
SocStu/Sci frequently offered only in secondary grades
Students cannot learn what is required in 175 instructional days.
SS provides smaller setting and more interactive teaching
Platte #1-Majority Title 1 Students; Uinta #1 - K-8 SS targeted to all SpecEd or Title I; High broader
SS in past provided maintenance of skills; now moving toward remediation
Sheridan Co schools cooperate together w local jr coll for high school offerings - pay w student tuition
Time on subject varies dramatically - from 80 to 20 hours
Use of computerized credit recovery in secondary new and increasing
Park #1-Length driven by what students need to accomplish - Major variable is time
Park #1 and LCSD #1 - Moving toward students working only where they are not proficient