

# Wyoming Department of Education

Dr. Jim McBride, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor, 2300 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050
Phone 307-777-7673 Fax 307-777-6234 Website www.k12.wy.us

# Wyoming Department of Education STUDENT ENRICHMENT PILOT PROJECT

First Year Summary – Summer 2008/SY08-09
Prepared by: Ruth Sommers for the Wyoming Department of Education

# **Authority**

State funding directed specifically to student enrichment instruction was made available as a stand-alone program by the 59<sup>th</sup> Legislature under Section 11 of Senate File 0070, Enrolled Act 45. That act set aside \$450,000 from the school foundation program to be directed to districts in a competitive grant process for summer and school-year student enrichment programs

# History

The Student Enrichment Pilot Project (SEPP) had its beginnings as part of the Wyoming Bridges Grant which provides summer school and extended day learning opportunities for academically at-risk students. The Bridges Grant was broadened over time to include enrichment instruction for students who were not considered academically at risk. When the school funding model was recalibrated in 2008, the need to target academically at-risk students with additional funding was reiterated, and the grant was again focused on these students. This eliminated use of the Bridges grant for enrichment programs for other student groups.

However, during the time enrichment learning opportunities were made available under the Bridges grant, the concept of stand-alone independent enrichment programs for a broad variety of students was seen to have its own intrinsic value, and to be a vital component of student engagement and growth. Thus, the legislature set aside \$450,000 to be directed to districts in a competitive grant process, which could target funds to projects that more closely adhere to the objectives specified by policymakers, ensuring program integrity and encouraging program quality.

#### Action

Grant application and guidelines were developed immediately after the 2008 legislative session and distributed to all Wyoming school districts within statutory time-frames. Following are some of the guiding principles and program requirements established and communicated to districts:

**Purpose** – The SEPP was established to provide student enrichment instruction programs to Wyoming students. The intention of this pilot project was to help students meet or exceed state and local standards in core academic subjects by offering a range of high-quality opportunities for academic enrichment that support student learning and youth development principles as well as reinforce and complement regular academic programs.

**Enrichment Definition** – Learning opportunities and activities that engage students in developing essential knowledge, skills, values and relationships as a vehicle for inspiring learning and encouraging academic and life success.

**Link to Standards** – All activities must be linked to academic standards and should be creative, exciting, fun, engaging, relevant, active, different than the regular school day, and full of learning. Enrichment programming should also hold student attention, awaken their imagination, and inspire them to want to learn more.

**Timing** – Programs must take place during non-school hours, before school, after school, on weekends, school holidays or summer recess periods.

**Target Population** – All public school students grades K-12. No specific groups of students were targeted to ensure that all students who may receive benefit from enrichment programming could participate.

**No minimum/maximum funding limits** – Applicants were instructed to request all funds needed and reasonable to implement their proposed program(s).

Fifty applications were received from 27 Wyoming school districts requesting funding for projects costing more than \$2.5 million. Requests ranged from \$3,120 to \$217,530. These were scored separately by five individual readers, using a preestablished scoring rubric. Readers then met collectively to discuss scoring and applications. Nine districts received funding for enrichment projects this first year to cover programs that occurred during the summer of 2008 (six summer programs) and across all or some of the 2008-09 school year (six school-year programs). Programs served students in grades kindergarten through twelve and addressed standards in math, science, language arts, fine and performing arts, social studies, physical education, health, technology and career/vocational. One program (Uinta County School District #6) provided high school students the opportunity to earn academic credit in physical education, science, and computer technology.

**District Enrichment Programs** - In addition to the following description of district projects, detailed information on actual student participation and program adherence to their original proposal is included for each district as Attachment A of this report.

<u>Albany County School District #1 – Emphasis on Art - (\$17,950 awarded)</u> - The district's proposed programs included summer art enrichment for teens and afterschool enrichments for students in grades four, five and six. Standards to be addressed were to include fine and performing arts, language arts, and career/vocational education (largely geared to teenagers). The district partnered with the University of Wyoming Art Museum which had initiated a master teacher pilot program to create new ways of learning through a museum education program.

Unfortunately, the summer enrichment project for teens was not offered, but the school-year portion for elementary students continued. Six one-hour sessions over a period of three weeks were made available to interested students. The program took place at the Art Museum on the University campus. Students observed and explored various sculptures, then met with a professional writer who helped them begin writing a paper about their observations using newly learned vocabulary specific to the arts. Students could write poetry, an essay, a fictional story, or a letter to the artist, then create 2D or 3D art inspired by the sculptures they had studied. Presentations of their written and artistic projects were made by each student at the end of the timeframe.

<u>Campbell County School District #1 – Multiple Summer Learning Classes – (\$103,000 awarded)</u> - Geared to academically successful students, this four-week summer program allowed students the opportunity to take up to six different two-week classes of their choosing. The offerings included classes in technology, science, math, health, photography, logic games, sports training, flight, space, journalism/news, problem-solving, robotics, weather, environment, drama, outdoor food preparation, and virtual travel in the United States. Instruction was delivered through hands-on projects and emphasized real-world problem-solving.

<u>Converse County School District #2 – Learning through Paleontology – (\$25,000 awarded)</u> - This school-year enrichment was targeted to all interested students in grades five through eight and was proposed to run for 36 weeks during the school year, up to five days/week. The district partnered with the Paleon Foundation, and classes were held at the Paleon Museum. Standards addressed were to include science, language arts, career/vocational, social studies, and math. The program was designed to reinforce note-taking skills and problem-solving through hands-on learning mainly involving fossils or other science-based projects.

Participation in the program was not what the district had hoped. Only five fifth-grade students enrolled, and only two participated throughout the whole project.

Crook County School District #1 - Could Moorcroft Become a Ghost Town? -(\$9,800 awarded) - Hoping to attract third through sixth grade students who are academically successful or good problem-solvers, this school-year project investigated area ghost towns, studying why they became ghost towns, and then applying those parameters to their current community, Moorcroft, to determine whether or not it might follow the same path. Students met once weekly with additional Saturday field trips to explore local sites. Standards addressed included language arts, social studies, science, and math, including economics. One of the goals of the project was to analyze real-world issues using research and scientific processes and critical thinking to understand how current problems could be addressed and studied effectively. Another was to develop collaborative relationships with community members. Students determined how to make their final presentation and did so in the form of a dinner theater, inviting community members, parents, and school board members to share their findings. presented a play and a Power Point show and asked guests to draw their own conclusion on the future of Moorcroft based on the facts they put forward.

<u>Johnson County School District #1 – Multiple Offerings – (\$31,512 awarded)</u> - The district's offerings were largely made available during the summer and included different programs for elementary, middle, and high school students. The title of their program was "Let Students Shine through Real-World Experiences" which included offering authentic life experiences through engaging learning experiences in nature and fine arts. All interested students in grades kindergarten through eight were invited to participate.

The elementary school in Buffalo had two two-week sessions; during one, students created and performed a play, and the second focused on outdoor education, exploring insect and plant communities. Kaycee Elementary school students partnered with the local Boys and Girls Club for three two-week sessions during the summer. In the first session, students created and performed a play for community members and parents; the second and third sessions emphasized outdoor educational opportunities and included photography, scientific observations, and writing poetry and singing songs about nature. Clear Creek Middle School students had the opportunity to attend a week-long educational field trip to the Big Horn Mountains, which included preliminary research, journaling, writing poetry, and observing plant and animal life.

<u>Laramie County School District #1 – Discovery Boxes for Science, etc. – (\$147,866 awarded)</u> - High-tech science equipment in nine "discovery" boxes served as the hook to capture student interest to begin to learn the interdependence of core subject areas such as science, math, and language arts. The summer component of the program was targeted to all interested incoming seventh and eighth grade students, and the school-year component continued with the same targeted group. This was project-based learning in which students learned concepts of math and science through performing experiments and building various projects, then recording analytical and computation processes. Students continually maintained

journals of their discoveries and outcomes. This was a collaborative project with the University of Wyoming, and educators from the University participated in the summer portion of the project.

The program ran for seven weeks during summer, and students could elect to explore more than one Discovery Box. During the school year, students were able to attend four days per week after school. Boxes included exposure to physics, biology, geometry, genetics, geology, ecology, atmospheric sciences, forensics, genetics, and use of compasses, clinometers, thermal cyclers, telescopes and computer simulators, plus standard lab equipment/tools.

Sheridan County School District #1 — Multiple Activities through Adventure Club, Outdoor Education, and Exercise — (\$30,320 awarded) - Over 200 students in grades kindergarten through ten participated in one or multiple offerings available through these enrichment programs. In summer, Outdoor Education week focused on science, ecology, math and language arts through journaling. Each day during the week, students spent two hours on academics and four hours on integrated outdoor-based education, studying riparian zones, foothills, canyons, and high mountain habitats. The school-year Adventure Club was made available to any student who would commit to the extra work needed to complete the study and time necessary to prepare for and summarize the adventure. Many of the Adventures took place on weekends and included historical, cultural, and scientific field trips, performances (theatre, puppetry, etc.), geo-caching, and gardening. Students planned all trips or projects, researched their destination, calculated costs, established schedules, and maintained substantial field journals. During the school year, students could participate in two Adventure Club activities.

During both summer and school year, exercise options were made available to students. Some were given pedometers and kept graphs of miles covered, again journaling their experience with exercise. The district purchased and made available to all interested students activity-based gaming stations which operated only when the gamer was signed onto equipment that would log their progress. These stations were also made available during the summer to students through the community's recreation center. After students graphed results - improvements and activities they completed each week - they were able to participate in an additional adventure.

<u>Sheridan County School District #2 – Multiple Component Programs – (\$53,332 awarded)</u> - The district proposed to operate five individual enrichment programs, two for high school students during summer school (Yellowstone Expedition and Wilderness Leadership), two other summer programs for middle school students (Kid Witness News and Eco Club), and three during the school year (K-5 Science, Kid Witness News, and Eco Club. Multiple standards were addressed through the programs, and included science, math, language arts, technology, and social science.

Ultimately the district was unable to offer the Wilderness Leadership program during summer. Some high school students did participate in the Yellowstone Expedition, a week-long trip which focused on the interaction of ecology, natural history and literature surrounding the Yellowstone ecosystem. Middle school students participated during summer in Eco Club which attempted to ensure all students were exposed and able to participate in outdoor activities despite socio-economic differences. Kid Witness News focused on writing, basic editing skills, lighting, and operation of the in-school cable channel network.

No programs were made available to students during the first semester of the school year, but in the second semester, fourth grade students in one school were able to attend an after-school science enrichment program created in partnership with Rockwell, Inc. The program emphasized hands-on projects based on inquiry and the scientific method. Investigations included measurement, number operations, problem-solving, and data demonstration using graphs and charts. Students chose the curriculum, the investigations, and the method of presentation of findings.

<u>Uinta County School District #6 – Multiple Component Offerings – (\$25,220 awarded)</u> - The district emphasized that one of their primary reasons for applying for the enrichment grant was to promote the district's strong culture of music in public schools. For high school students particularly, the district wished to make available credit classes in computer technology, physical education and science (paleontology) to enable students to have enough time during the school year to earn credits needed for the Hathaway Scholarship without having to sacrifice elective credits, particularly in fine and performing arts. Summer classes in music were also made available to all students in grades three through twelve, and community concerts were performed.

Additionally the district held summer Fitness-for-Life classes that included exposure to activities that could be maintained throughout one's lifespan, as well as other summer learning opportunities such as robotics and quilting.

#### Financial

As **Table 1** below indicates, nine districts were awarded a total of \$444,000, of which \$401,100 was released. A total of \$3,873 was expended for grant administration, and the remaining unexpended grant funds were reverted to the foundation program. In total, 1,219 students participated in student enrichment programs over the time-frame of the grant. Expenditures per pupil averaged \$329, ranging from \$138 in Sheridan County School District #1 to \$5000 per student in Converse County School District #2. Additional information on each district's proposed projects, student participation by grade level, and program adherence to their original proposal is included as Attachment A of this report.

How districts expended funds is shown in **Table 2.** Not surprisingly, the majority of expenses were incurred in salaries and benefits (72 percent). This percentage

would increase further when taking into consideration that all Albany County School District #1's expenditures were spent on contract with the University of Wyoming who administered their art enrichment program.

Table 1: Wyoming Department of Education School Enrichment Pilot Project Grant Reimbursement 2008 Summer & SY08-09 Projects (FY09) - 1st grant year								
District	Programs Delivered	G	rant Amount Awarded		nt Funds Paid to District	Undup Student Count		Cost Per Student
Albany #1	SY	\$	17,950.00	\$	17,950.00	76	\$	236.18
Campbell #1	Summer	\$	103,000.00	\$	102,813.00	413	\$	248.94
Converse #2	SY	\$	25,000.00	\$	25,000.00	5	\$	5,000.00
Crook #1	SY	\$	9,800.00	\$	6,439.00	34	\$	189.38
Johnson #1	Summer	\$	31,512.00	\$	31,512.00	64	\$	492.38
Laramie #1	Summer/SY	\$	147,866.00	\$	135,931.00	162	\$	839.08
Sheridan #1	Summer/SY	\$	30,320.00	\$	29,543.00	214	\$	138.05
Sheridan #2	Summer/SY	\$	53,332.00	\$	26,692.00	76	\$	351.21
Uinta #6	Summer	\$	25,220.00	\$	25,220.00	175	\$	144.11
Totals: (9)		\$	444,000.00	\$	401,100.00	1,219	\$	329.19

**Wyoming Department of Education** 

Table 2:

District	Salaries	Benefits	Purchased Services	upplies & Materials	Indirect Costs	Total
Albany #1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,450.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	\$ 17,950.00
Campbell #1	\$ 80,230.00	\$ 15,246.00	\$ 2,813.00	\$ 4,524.00	\$ -	\$ 102,813.00
Converse #2	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 25,000.00
Crook #1	\$ 3,091.00	\$ 1,398.00	\$ 355.00	\$ 1,595.00	\$ -	\$ 6,439.00
Johnson #1	\$ 14,760.00	\$ 2,555.00	\$ 12,820.00	\$ 1,377.00	\$ -	\$ 31,512.00
Laramie #1	\$ 84,302.00	\$ 11,717.00	\$ 19,216.00	\$ 15,526.00	\$ 5,170.00	\$ 135,931.00
Sheridan #1	\$ 12,527.00	\$ 2,349.00	\$ 8,237.00	\$ 6,430.00	\$ -	\$ 29,543.00
Sheridan #2	\$ 13,292.00	\$ 2,596.00	\$ 6,136.00	\$ 4,668.00	\$ -	\$ 26,692.00
Uinta #6	\$ 22,432.00	\$ 2,236.00	\$ -	\$ 552.00	\$ -	\$ 25,220.00
Totals: (9)	\$ 250,634.00	\$ 38,097.00	\$ 65,027.00	\$ 38,672.00	\$ 8,670.00	\$ 401,100.00
Percentage:	62.49%	9.50%	16.21%	9.64%	2.16%	100.00%

#### Results

**Program Monitoring** – During summer 2008, three pilot student enrichment projects were visited by Department staff: Sheridan County School District #2, Campbell County School District #1, and Laramie County School District #1. These programs made available a wide variety of summer enrichment opportunities to their students; please see program descriptions above to understand offerings made available to students in each district.

A similar observation made across the three districts was the presence of highly committed and dedicated staff. Students observed were quite engaged in learning activities and enjoyed being there. Parents were quite supportive of all the programs, and parent volunteers were involved with daily activities in some. Only one program provided meals for students; the other two had snacks available. Learning strategies used by teachers were dynamic and hands-on and classes were aligned with specific standards. A love of learning was evident in both students and staff at all sites visited.

Analysis of program effectiveness was a challenge for most of the districts. One program had developed relevant pre/post assessments for students in each class, and two other districts were planning to use NWEA MAP data to track student achievement. However, one of these districts had not yet begun to use MAP in 2008, so relied solely on parent/teacher/student surveys, and thus had no quantitative data. The other district which was using MAP had only 16 students attend their summer program who would take a MAP assessment; and while they submitted student RIT score data, the analysis did not capture *pre-assessment* information that could be used to analyze growth as a result of program participation. That same district also had a summer program for at-risk high school students, and seven of the eight who participated remained in school or graduated, which was considered a success. Qualitative student surveys indicated good response to the programs.

Other than asking districts to refine their quantitative analysis of program quality, a common recommendation made to all three programs was to build community partnerships with businesses, parents, and other agencies to ensure support of the programs could continue should funding end. At least two of these programs were highly visible within their communities; their potential for growing private financial support locally was great.

Assessing Program Effectiveness - District ability to effectively evaluate the success of enrichment programming was a specific component of the grant application, and district response to this question was heavily weighted on the grant's scoring rubric. Nevertheless, use of quantitative data to analyze programmatic effectiveness is still challenging to districts. Nearly all districts used parent, teacher, and/or student surveys to help evaluate the quality of their programs. These kinds of

surveys are qualitative in nature, and do not necessarily provide "proof" of program effectiveness. Responses in these surveys, across all programs offered, were quite enthusiastic. Parents and students both perceived they learned a great deal from their experiences. Participants, their families, and teachers all expressed hope that these opportunities for learning can continue and worry that without this targeted funding, they will no longer be made available to students.

Isolating and assessing the quality of programs which operate concurrently with the school year is a consistent problem faced by data analysts. At the least, this requires sophisticated record-keeping and a large population of students so program segregation can be accomplished. For districts with small student populations, it is very challenging. However, because summer programs occur uniquely, without other kinds of instructional programming, the ability to analyze their effectiveness improves greatly.

Six districts offered summer programs to students: Campbell County School District #1, Johnson County School District #1, Laramie County School District #1, Sheridan County School District #1 and Sheridan County School District #2. Their quantitative studies of program effectiveness are summarized below:

- ✓ Campbell County School District #1 relied largely on qualitative survey data to assess program effectiveness. The district did track attainment of goals set forth in Individual Student Learning Plans (ILPs): 91.1 percent of students met all their ILP goals; 6.3 percent met some, and 2.6 percent did not meet any ILP goals.
- ✓ Johnson County School District #1 included *all* students in their analysis of district writing assessments and MAP results, with no specific pre/post assessment given to program participants to isolate program effectiveness.
- ✓ Laramie County School District #1 gathered and analyzed student quantitative data in the form of pre/post testing ahead and behind partcipation in specific classes. Students indicated an overall 42 percent increase in their knowledge of the materials presented in the various classes during summer, (i.e. flight exploration, astronomy, geology, genetics, meteorology, etc.), and a 36 percent increase of material presented in the after-school clubs.
- ✓ Sheridan County School District #1 appears to have included all students who participated in any kind of summer programming in their analysis of MAP results, including students who attended outdoor education enrichment classes as well as those considered academically at-risk and referred to summer school. The district reported that 82 percent of the students in grades three through eight who attended summer programs either maintained or improved reading skills, and 89 percent maintained or increased math skills. Students who participated in Exercise Club, which ran through both summer and school year, tracked their progress using pedometers and a

health scale, earning "footprints" for miles logged by the end of first semester. It is also interesting to note that all but nine students in grades three through five participated in the district's year-round Adventure Clubs. This high level of participation is seen by the district as an indicator of program success.

- ✓ Sheridan County School District #2 relied heavily on pre/post survey tools completed by students to assess their perception of the courses in which they participated. It was obvious in these surveys that students enjoyed their experiences, and there was a great deal less ambiguity in the post surveys after having exposure to course content. The district did summarize academic MAP raw data scores of participating students; however, these summaries were merely statements of student proficiency levels as measured by 2009 spring assessments rather than an analysis of growth from before and after the program. The district's summer program targeted to academically at-risk high school students resulted in seven of the eight students who participated remaining in school or graduating, which the district considers successful.
- ✓ Uinta County School District #6 awarded semester credits (1/2 a Carnegie unit) to 62 high school students this summer in paleontology, physical education and technology. There is no quantitative performance data for students participating in programs in grades three through eight. However, the district cites as evidence of success that seven students participated in all-state band, and twelve students won ten ribbons at their county fair.

#### Recommendations

Not surprisingly, this program remains quite popular among districts as well as the parents, teachers, and students who experience them firsthand. However, if the program is to continue, the Department suggests modifications to assure programs are rigorous and that districts are accountable for programmatic results. To this end, the following recommendations are made:

- Greatly increase technical assistance to districts to help guide them in effectively developing systems that direct their curriculum development, instruction, assessment, and accountability;
- ➤ In the application process, districts should provide evidence that programs they propose are research-based; encourage districts to utilize the national lab network to discover and implement these practices;
- ➤ Narrow the focus of the grant to target summer-only programs to stem summer learning loss; school-year club-type programs are funded through the school funding block grant model and are difficult to assess as a unique entity;
- Analyze effectiveness of summer enrichment programs utilizing NorthWest Education Association's Measurement of Academic Progress (MAP), segregating the student population attending enrichment programs;

- Rather than allowing districts to draw their full grant award before programs are delivered, reimburse districts for actual expenditures up to the grant award amount;
- Retain program categorically outside the school funding block grant model to ensure it is not eroded or its quality diminished through lack of specific program management and oversight.

			Actual Pa	rticipation	
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Tot Duplicated Enrollment
K	No Proposal				
1	No Proposal				
2	No Proposal				
3	No Proposal				
4	School Year Pgm		5	20	25
5	School Year Pgm		7	24	31
6	School Year Pgm		8	10	18
7	Summer Pgm	0			0
8	Summer Pgm	0			0
9	Summer Pgm	0			0
10	Summer Pgm	0			0
11	Summer Pgm	0			0
12	Summer Pgm	0			0
# Grade Levels:	9	0	3	3	3
# Participants:	20/Day or Sess	0	30	54	84
Total Students, Undup:					
F/R Lunch	N/A	0	6	25	
ELL	N/A	0	0	0	
SPED	N/A	0	1	3	

#### **Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual**

			<b>Actual Participatio</b>	n
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem: Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	Open to All Gr 9-12 Open to All Gr 4-6 Open to All Gr 4-7	None	Any Interested	Any Interested
Pgm Frequency, Summer: Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem: Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem: Number of Weeks:	5 days/week 2 days/week 2 days/week 39	No Frequency	2 days/week 3	2 days/week 3
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer: Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem: Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	4 hrs/day 1 hr/day 1 hr/day	No Hours	1 hr/day	1 hr/day

**Deviation from Proposed Program:** 

Significant

3 grade levels rather than 9 grade levels

No summer offering 6 weeks instead of 39

			Actual Par	ticipation		1
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Total Enrollment	
K	Summer Pgm	61			61	
1	Summer Pgm	69			69	
2	Summer Pgm	70			70	
3	Summer Pgm	68			68	
4	Summer Pgm	61			61	
5	Summer Pgm	52			52	
6	Summer Pgm	32			32	
7	No Proposal					
8	No Proposal					
9	No Proposal					
10	No Proposal					
11	No Proposal					
12	No Proposal					
# Grade Levels:	7	7			7	
# Participants:	400	413			413	
Total Students, Undup:						
F/R Lunch	N/A	53				Τ
ELL	N/A	4				
SPED	N/A	12				I

#### **Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual**

		Actual Participation			
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	
Tarreted Decidation Commercia	COT A and Cusanastul	COT Acad Cusassaful			
Targeted Population, Summer:	G&TAcad Successful	G&TAcad Successful			
Targeted Population, 1st Sem:	No Proposal				
Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	No Proposal				
Pgm Frequency, Summer:	4 days/week	4 days/week			
Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem:	No Proposal				
Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem:	No Proposal				
Number of Weeks:	4	4			
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer:	5 hrs/day	5 hrs/day			
Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem:	No Proposal				
Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	No Proposal				

**Deviation from Proposed Program:** 

			Actual Pa	rticipation	
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Tot Duplicated Enrollment
K	No Proposal				
1	No Proposal				
2	No Proposal				
3	No Proposal				
4	No Proposal				
5	School Year Pgm		5	2	7
6	School Year Pgm		0	0	0
7	School Year Pgm		0	0	0
8	School Year Pgm		0	0	0
9	No Proposal				
10	No Proposal				
11	No Proposal				
12	No Proposal				
# Grade Levels:	4		1	1	1
# Participants:	20-25		5	2	7
Total Students, Undup:					
F/R Lunch	N/A		1	0	
ELL	N/A		0	0	
SPED	N/A		0	0	

#### **Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual**

		Α	ctual Participation	on
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem: Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	No Proposal Open to All Grades 5-8 Open to All Grades 5-9		Any Interested	Any Interested
Pgm Frequency, Summer: Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem: Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem: Number of Weeks:	No Proposal 5 days/week 5 days/week 35		5 days/week	5 days/week
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer: Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem: Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	No Proposal 1.5 hrs/day 1.5 hrs/day		1.5 hrs/day	1.5 hrs/day

**Deviation from Proposed Program:** 

Significant

Only 5 students participated 1 grade level rather than 4

		Actual Participation					
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Tot Duplicated Enrollment		
FK	No Proposal						
1	No Proposal						
2	No Proposal						
3	School Year Pgm		13	9	22		
4	School Year Pgm		8	9	17		
5	School Year Pgm		9	7	16		
6	School Year Pgm		4	1	5		
7	No Proposal						
8	No Proposal						
9	No Proposal						
10	No Proposal						
11	No Proposal						
12	No Proposal						
# Grade Levels:	4		4	4	4		
# Participants:	30/Day		34	26	60		
Total Students, Undup:							
F/R Lunch	N/A		12	11			
ELL	N/A		0	0			
SPED	N/A		0	0			

#### **Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual**

		A	ctual Participation	on
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem: Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	No Proposal Acad successful Acad successful		Acad successful	Acad successful
Pgm Frequency, Summer: Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem: Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem: Number of Weeks:	No Proposal 2 days/week 2 days/week 36		1 day/week	1 day/week
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer: Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem: Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	No Proposal 1.25 hr/day 1.25 hr/day		1.5 hr/day	1.5 hr/day

**Deviation from Proposed Program:** 

Mild Deviation - program shortened

			Actual Part	ticipation		1
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Total Enrollment	
						1
K	Summer Pgm	8			8	
1	Summer Pgm	8			8	
2	Summer Pgm	8			8	
3	Summer Pgm	10			10	
4	Summer Pgm	4			4	
5	Summer Pgm	8			8	
6	Summer Pgm	2			2	
7	Summer Pgm	2			2	
8	Summer Pgm	14			14	
9	No Proposal					
10	No Proposal					
11	No Proposal					
12	No Proposal					
# Grade Levels:	9	9			9	
# Participants:	60/60	64			64	
Total Students, Undup:					-	Ĺ
F/R Lunch	N/A	25				Г
ELL	N/A	0				
SPED	N/A	5				

#### **Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual**

		Actual Participation			
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem: Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	Open to All Gr K-8	Any interested			
Pgm Frequency, Summer: Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem: Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem:	4 days/week	4 days/week			
Number of Weeks:	6 summer/36 SY	6 summer/			
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer: Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem: Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	4 hrs/day	3 hrs/day			

**Deviation from Proposed Program:** 

Insignificant

		Actual Participation				
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Tot Duplicated Enrollment	
K	No December					
_	No Proposal					
1	No Proposal					
2	No Proposal					
3	No Proposal					
4	No Proposal					
5	No Proposal					
6	No Proposal					
7	Summer & School Yr	56	46	55	157	
8	Summer & School Yr	30	14	21	65	
9	No Proposal					
10	No Proposal					
11	No Proposal					
12	No Proposal					
# Grade Levels:	2	2	2	2	2	
# Participants:	200 summer/50 SY	86	60	76	222	
Total Students, Undup:						16
F/R Lunch	N/A	10	14	18		
ELL	N/A	2	4	1		
SPED	N/A	11	7	6		

#### **Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual**

		Actual Participation		
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem:	Open to All Gr 7-8 Open to All Gr 7-8	Any interested	Any interested	
Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	Open to All Gr 7-8		7 trly intoroctou	Any interested
Pgm Frequency, Summer:	5 days/wk	5 days/wk		
Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem:	1 day/wk		4 days/wk	
Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem:	1 day/wk			4 days/wk
Number of Weeks:	6 summer/16 SY	7		
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer:	7 hrs/day	6 hrs/day		
Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem:	2 hrs/day		1.5 hrs/day	
Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	2 hrs/day			1.5 hrs/day

**Deviation from Proposed Program:** 

		Actual Participation				
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Tot Duplicated Enrollment	
K	Summer & School Yr	13	7	1	21	
1	Summer & School Yr	15	33	37	85	
2	Summer & School Yr	14	30	3	47	
3	Summer & School Yr	19	52	69	140	
4	Summer & School Yr	17	48	65	130	
5	Summer & School Yr	22	35	95	152	
6	Summer & School Yr	11	3	12	26	
7	Summer & School Yr	9	2	11	22	
8	Summer & School Yr	3	1	8	12	
9	No Proposal	4	1		5	
10	No Proposal	5			5	
11	No Proposal					
12	No Proposal					
# Grade Levels:	9	11	10	9	11	
# Participants:	240	132^	212^	301^	645	
Total Students, Undup:						
F/R Lunch	N/A	39	62	62		
ELL	N/A	0	0	0		
SPED	N/A	6	11	15		

<sup>^</sup>Students counted more than once in multiple programs

#### Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual

		Actual Participation		
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem: Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	Open to All Gr K-8 Open to All Gr K-8 Open to All Gr K-8	SS & any interested	Any interested	Any interested
Pgm Frequency, Summer: Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem: Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem: Number of Weeks:	15, 4, & 30 days* Multiple pgms (10) Multiple pgms (10) N/A	15, 4, & 30 days*	Multiple pgms(6)	Multiple pgms (10)
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer: Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem: Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	8, 8, & 1 hours/day* Multiple timeframes Multiple timeframes	8, 8, & 1 hours/day*	Multiple timeframes	Multiple timeframes

**Deviation from Proposed Program:** 

<sup>\*</sup>Three separate programs - enr for ss students/outdoor education/exercise pgm

		Actual Participation				
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Total Enrollment	
K	School Year Pgm		0	0	0	
1	School Year Pgm		0	0	0	
2	School Year Pgm		0	0	0	
3	School Year Pgm		0	0	0	
4	School Year Pgm		0	51	51	
5	School Year Pgm		0	0	0	
6	Summer Pgms*	1			1	
7	Summer Pgms*	11			11	
8	Summer Pgms*	5			5	
9	Summer Pgms*	2			2	
10	Summer Pgms*	2			2	
11	Summer Pgms*	3			3	
12	Summer Pgms*	1			1	
# Grade Levels:	7 summer/6 SY	7	0	1	7 summ/1 SY	
# Participants:	120/program	25	0	51	76	
Total Students, Undup:						
F/R Lunch	N/A	5	0	23		
ELL	N/A	0	0	0		
SPED	N/A	1	0	14		

### Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual

		Actual Participation		
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem: Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	Varied** Open to All Gr K-5 Open to All Gr K-5	Varied***	No Program	Acad successful
Pgm Frequency, Summer: Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem: Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem: Number of Weeks:	5 days SY - 40 weeks	5 days	No Program	4 days/week
Hrs/Day or Session, Summer: Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem: Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	8-8-4-4 hrs/day*	0-8-4-4 hrs/day***	No Program	1.5 hrs/day

Deviation from Proposed Program: Significant 3 of 4 proposed summer pgms held;

(No Summer Wilderness Leadership) No pgms held in fall semester

Only 1 of 6 grades participated in 2nd sem pgm

Eye Witneww News - Any 6-8 grader; ECO Club at-risk 6-8 graders

<sup>\*</sup> Four pgms proposed - Wilderness Leadership; Yellowstone Exp, Kidwitness News; ECO Club

<sup>\*\*</sup> Wildernss Ldrship tgtd to academically succsful h.s. students; Yell Expdtn for academ at-risk h.s.students

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>Three pgms held - Yell Expdtn for high schoo; Eye Witness News and Eco Club for 6th/8th graders

		Actual Participation				
Grade	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09	Total Enrollment	
К	110914		0.0000	0.0000		1
1						
2						
3	Summer Pgms*	5			5	
4	Summer Pgms*	2			2	
5	Summer Pgms*	8			8	
6	Summer Pgms*	28			28	
7	Summer Pgms*	18			18	
8	Summer Pgms*	25			25	
9	Summer Pgms*	37			37	
10	Summer Pgms*	44			44	
11	Summer Pgms*	8			8	
12	Summer Pgms*					
# Grade Levels:	10	9			9	
# Participants:	40/Program	175			175	
Total Students, Undup:						175
F/R Lunch	N/A	22				
ELL	N/A	0				
SPED	N/A	8				

#### **Programmatic Detail - Proposed and Actual**

		Actual Participation		
Data Element	Proposed Program	Summer 2008	1st Semester SY08-09	2nd Semester SY08-09
Targeted Population, Summer: Targeted Population, 1st Sem: Targeted Population, 2nd Sem:	Open to All Gr 3-12	Any interested		
Pgm Frequency, Summer: Pgm Frequency, 1st Sem: Pgm Frequency, 2nd Sem:	5 days/wk	5 days/wk		
Number of Weeks:  Hrs/Day or Session, Summer:  Hrs/Day or Session, 1st Sem:  Hrs/Day or Session, 2nd Sem:	8 hrs/day	8 hrs/day		

**Deviation from Proposed Program:**