

## **Wyoming Bridges Extended Day Programs, SY07-08**

---

### **A Legislative Grant Program Funding Summer School and Extended Day Learning Opportunities for K-12 Students in Wyoming December 1, 2008**

---

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

#### **Authority**

State funds specifically targeted to summer school and extended day interventions were first made available to districts by the 58<sup>th</sup> Legislature of the State of Wyoming in 2004 as Section 1001 of Chapter 108, now referred to as Wyoming Bridges. It was funded for the second time in 2005. In 2006, policymakers again determined to keep the Bridges program apart from the block grant and funded it for the third time as separate and independently functioning through Section 3 of Chapter 37 of the 2006 Wyoming Session Laws. Chapter 37 of the 2006 Wyoming Session Laws was amended in 2007 to extend funding yet another grant cycle, for the summer program for 2007 (FY08) and school year 2007-08. The grant program was enacted into legislation with the 59<sup>th</sup> Legislature; its funding formula and programmatic function are now described under W.S. 21-13-334, and actual funding for the program is requested through the biennial budget process of the Wyoming Department of Education. Appropriation still remains apart from the cost-based block grant education funding model, and for the FY09-10 biennium is \$20 million.

#### **History**

Need for funds targeted specifically to summer school and extended day interventions was originally identified in a 2002 study which examined the at-risk adjustment to Wyoming's cost-based block grant funding model for public schools. That report emphasized that the cost-based block grant did not fund programs outside the regular school day, and that educational services provided to students needing additional instruction varied so greatly among the districts that policymakers could not be assured all students were exposed equally to quality educational supports.

A subsequent 2003 report on summer school emphasized the impact summer learning loss has on students. The report proposed the idea that some of the problems associated with inconsistencies and potential inequities across districts could be somewhat alleviated through a grant program that set forth requirements which emphasize components identified nationally as encouraging success in student achievement. The resultant legislation created a non-

competitive grant program which required districts make available remedial programs emphasizing at least language arts and math, a minimum length of instructional time, targeted professional development, individual learning plans, program monitoring, and performance evaluation. Legislators broadened the grant program beyond summer school to allow districts to offer extended day opportunities to students needing additional time to master standards during the school year.

In the 2006 legislative session, lawmakers doubled the grant amount available to districts, increasing it from \$500 to \$1,000/student, limited to ten percent of a district's prior October 1 enrollment. With these additional funds came the ability for districts to offer stand-alone, separate enrichment programs to different student groups needing supplemental instruction.

Before model recalibration in 2008, the Bridges Design Team worked closely with Picus & Associates to revisit the philosophy and funding formula currently being utilized by the summer school and extended day grant program. This dialogue ended with two major changes being suggested by the design team to the Joint Education Committee and the full legislature, which adopted the changes. The funding formula was modified to direct dollars to districts according to levels of student at-risk proxy numbers rather than being based on enrollment; funding amounts are calculated using current model teacher salary data rather than a finite per capita figure. This move is in keeping with the philosophy of directing at-risk dollars according to academic need as demonstrated by socio-economic indicators reflected in the model's student proxy count. The second major change to the Wyoming Bridges grant was made to reiterate the original intent to direct funds to students who are considered to be academically at risk and in need of intervention and remediation. As of the summer of 2008, stand-alone, separate enrichment programs targeted to student groups other than those needing academic intervention/remediation is no longer funded by Wyoming Bridges, although the grant retains requirements for use of enriched instructional strategies. Thus, this report contains information on the last independent enrichment programs funded through Wyoming Bridges. However, in 2008, the 59<sup>th</sup> Legislature did fund separately a pilot school enrichment program in the amount of \$500,000.

Implementation of the Wyoming Bridges grant is guided by policymakers, administrators and teachers through the Bridges Design Team. This group meets to review the operation of and data from the program, including feedback from districts, and to propose modifications to improve it. The team also studies changes made to legislation, discusses policy implications as a result of those changes, updates rules and regulations, and make suggestions to the Department in the administration of the program

## **Action – Extended Day Intervention Programs**

Twenty-six districts devoted funds from their FY08 Wyoming Bridges grant to use in extended day programs for the 2007-08 school year. Although the number of districts utilizing the grant increased from twenty-one the prior year, the number of students enrolled decreased approximately 5% to 5,666. However, expenditures per pupil rose noticeably, by 44%, from \$390/student in SY06-07 to \$562 in SY07-08. Districts vary widely in their offerings, some targeting high school or elementary students only, others targeting all students K-12, many working closely with 21<sup>st</sup> Century or local Boys & Girls Clubs to emphasize and provide additional instruction within those programs.

Nearly all participating districts make available additional instruction in math and language arts. Many report providing additional instructional opportunities for social studies and science in secondary grades, particularly high school; a few provide science and social science instruction at the elementary level as well. Interestingly, some districts also report providing supplemental instruction in art, physical education, and health. The majority of districts report that certified teachers are delivering their supplemental extended day instruction, and some employ paraprofessionals under the direct supervision of a certified teacher. Districts also utilize tutors and instructional facilitators in extended day instructional settings.

Again this year, districts reported consciously trying to intervene sooner in identifying students needing additional learning time, rather than waiting until summer to remediate, and as a result, some have decreased summer school referral numbers. The Bridges grant is flexible enough to allow districts to change emphasis between summer school and extended day programs, enabling districts to target resources where they deem most appropriate.

## **Financial Information – Extended Day Intervention Programs**

Readers of this report should know that statistical and other information provided within it pertains only to those districts utilizing Wyoming Bridges grant funds for extended day programs. It is not meant to be a comprehensive accounting of all supplemental instructional programs offered by districts, which are broader and more numerous than those reported herein.

In the table below, expenditure and enrollment information is displayed for each district utilizing the Wyoming Bridges grant. Per pupil expenditure varied from a low of \$74/student in Goshen County School District #1 to a high of \$3,228/student in Sweetwater County School District #1, with an average per pupil expenditure of \$538. Average per pupil expenditure increased \$172 over the prior year, an increase of 44 percent. Districts participating in Bridges extended day programs expended \$3,045,338 in SY07-08 (versus \$2,334,065

the prior year, a 30 percent increase), of which \$2,217,808 were Bridges grant funds. The grant funds were supplemented with \$827,530 from other sources, mainly from 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning, local BOCES, and district general funds. Bridges grant funds supported approximately 73 percent of the costs reported by districts for their extended day programs.

**Table 1: Wyoming Department of Education  
SY07-08 Extended Day Enrollment and Expenditure Data**

<b>District</b>	<b>Bridges Grant Funds</b>	<b>Total Ext Day Expenditures</b>	<b>Number* Enrolled</b>	<b>Expenditures per Student</b>
Albany (1-12)	\$ 165,100	\$ 261,072	507	\$ 514.93
Big Horn #1 (9-12 LA)	\$ 7,495	\$ 14,103	9	\$ 1,567.00
Campbell (K-12)	\$ 127,556	\$ 183,169	679	\$ 269.76
Carbon #2 (K-12)	\$ 18,968	\$ 18,968	79	\$ 240.10
Converse #1(1-8)	\$ 71,104	\$ 150,316	213	\$ 705.71
Crook #1(K-12)	\$ 33,872	\$ 46,346	207	\$ 223.89
Fremont #1(1-12)	\$ 51,887	\$ 122,988	125	\$ 983.90
Fremont #25 (1-12)	\$ 131,589	\$ 212,978	399	\$ 533.78
Goshen (6-8)	\$ 6,702	\$ 6,702	90	\$ 74.47
Johnson #1(5-12)	\$ 2,700	\$ 124,257	123	\$ 1,010.22
Laramie #1 (K-12)	\$ 247,592	\$ 247,592	479	\$ 516.89
Laramie #2 (K-6)	\$ 54,270	\$ 62,716	176	\$ 356.34
Lincoln #1(7-12)	\$ 5,416	\$ 5,416	33	\$ 164.12
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	\$ 122,171	\$ 132,171	182	\$ 726.21
Natrona (K-12)	\$ 475,361	\$ 495,361	753	\$ 657.85
Niobrara (K-8)	\$ 7,249	\$ 7,249	33	\$ 219.67
Park #6 (K-8)	\$ 94,226	\$ 108,172	51	\$ 2,121.02
Platte #1(K-12)	\$ 38,479	\$ 52,535	120	\$ 437.79
Sheridan #2(1-12)	\$ 41,236	\$ 41,236	241	\$ 171.10
Sublette #1(1-8)	\$ 25,613	\$ 25,613	52	\$ 492.56
Swtwter #1 (3-4;9-12)	\$ 118,097	\$ 313,097	97	\$ 3,227.80
Swtwter #2 (1-6)	\$ 79,409	\$ 79,409	152	\$ 522.43
Teton (1-12)	\$ 103,640	\$ 103,640	133	\$ 779.25
Uinta #1 (9-12 Math)	\$ 167,610	\$ 187,610	482	\$ 389.23
Uinta #4 (K-12)	\$ 17,766	\$ 18,766	161	\$ 116.56
Uinta #6 (2-8)	\$ 2,700	\$ 23,856	88	\$ 271.09
<b>Total (26):</b>	<b>\$ 2,217,808</b>	<b>\$ 3,045,338</b>	<b>5664</b>	<b>\$ 537.67</b>

\* Reflects the highest participation in subject

## Results – Extended Day Intervention Programs

Tables 2 and 3 display student enrollment and completion data for Bridges SY07-08 extended day offerings in math and language arts, respectively. More students attended extended day programs for additional instructional support in language arts than in math, but only slightly. As in prior years, approximately 85 percent of students met goals set forth in their Individual Learning Plans (ILP) in language arts, and around 89 percent in math. Student success in meeting learning plan goals varies among the districts, from 40 percent to 100 percent of participating students meeting ILP goals.

**Table 2: Wyoming Department of Education** **Math**  
**Wyoming Bridges Extended Day SY07-08 Completion Data**

District	# Students Enrolled	# Students Meeting ALL or SOME ILP Goals	Percent Meeting All or SOME Goals	# Students Meeting NO ILP Goals	Percent Meeting NO Goals	Percent also Attending for Lang Arts
Albany (1-12)	419	399	95.23%	20	4.77%	69.00%
Big Horn #1 (No math)	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0.00%
Campbell (K-12)	486	475	97.74%	0	0.00%	87.00%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	67	66	98.51%	1	1.49%	39.00%
Converse #1(1-8)	213	87	40.85%	16	7.51%	100.00%
Crook #1(K-12)	170	167	98.24%	2	1.18%	N/A
Fremont #1(1-12)	113	86	76.11%	0	0.00%	67.00%
Fremont #25 (1-12)	395	348	88.10%	7	1.77%	68.00%
Goshen (6-8)	90	72	80.00%	9	10.00%	33.00%
Johnson #1(5-12)	111	106	95.50%	5	4.50%	17.00%
Laramie #1 (K-8 Math)	265	255	96.23%	2	0.75%	24.00%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	176	172	97.73%	4	2.27%	100.00%
Lincoln #1(7-12)	28	26	92.86%	0	0.00%	61.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	177	166	93.79%	3	1.69%	56.00%
Natrona (K-12)	750	613	81.73%	97	12.93%	71.00%
Niobrara (K-8)	33	29	87.88%	4	12.12%	42.00%
Park #6 (K-8)	51	51	100.00%	0	0.00%	100.00%
Platte #1(K-12)	120	104	86.67%	0	0.00%	48.00%
Sheridan #2(1-12)	234	171	73.08%	62	26.50%	100.00%
Sublette #1(1-8)	37	35	94.59%	2	5.41%	41.00%
Swtwter #1 (3-4;9-12)	97	95	97.94%	0	0.00%	35.00%
Swtwter #2 (1-6)	82	74	90.24%	3	3.66%	48.00%
Teton (1-12)	133	108	81.20%	4	3.01%	23.00%
Uinta #1 (9-12-Math)	482	482	100.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	161	161	100.00%	0	0.00%	48.00%
Uinta #6 (2-8)	75	60	80.00%	9	12.00%	93.00%
<b>Totals: (26)</b>	<b>4965</b>	<b>4408</b>	<b>88.78%</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>5.04%</b>	

The far right column in Table 2 above indicates the percentage of children attending extended day programs for math who also had after-school instruction in language arts. It appears some districts make instruction in both subjects available to all students as a routine matter, while other districts specifically target a particular subject for intervention. For instance, Uinta County School District #1 focused their Bridges extended day program on high school students needing intervention in math; Converse #1, Laramie #2, Park #6, Park #16, and Sheridan #2 appear to offer instruction in both language arts and math to all students in attendance.

<b>District</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b># Students Meeting ALL or SOME ILP Goals</b>	<b>Percent Meeting All or SOME Goals</b>	<b># Students Meeting NO ILP Goals</b>	<b>Percent Meeting NO Goals</b>
Albany (1-12)	507	440	86.79%	15	2.96%
Big Horn #1 (9-12)	9	8	88.89%	1	11.11%
Campbell (K-12)	679	644	94.85%	0	0.00%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	79	76	96.20%	1	1.27%
Converse #1(1-8)	213	85	39.91%	18	8.45%
Crook #1(K-12)	207	203	98.07%	2	0.97%
Fremont #1(1-12)	125	100	80.00%	0	0.00%
Fremont #25 (1-12)	399	290	72.68%	8	2.01%
Goshen (6-8)	90	77	85.56%	4	4.44%
Johnson (5-12)	123	116	94.31%	7	5.69%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	479	386	80.58%	17	3.55%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	176	172	97.73%	4	2.27%
Lincoln #1(7-12)	33	31	93.94%	2	6.06%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	182	157	86.26%	0	0.00%
Natrona (K-12)	753	626	83.13%	91	12.08%
Niobrara (K-8)	33	33	100.00%	0	0.00%
Park #6 (K-8)	50	50	100.00%	0	0.00%
Platte #1(K-12)	107	103	96.26%	0	0.00%
Sheridan #2(1-12)	241	176	73.03%	62	25.73%
Sublette #1(1-6)	52	51	98.08%	0	0.00%
Swatwter #1 (3-4;9-12)	79	75	94.94%	0	0.00%
Swatwter #2 (1-6)	152	137	90.13%	2	1.32%
Teton (1-12)	100	67	67.00%	2	2.00%
Uinta #1 (Math only)	0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Uinta #4 (K-12)	114	114	100.00%	0	0.00%
Uinta #6 (2-8)	88	88	100.00%	0	0.00%
<b>Totals: (26)</b>	<b>5070</b>	<b>4305</b>	<b>84.91%</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>4.62%</b>

Historical district participation, student enrollment, and expenditure data is displayed in Table 4 and includes information from SY04-05 through SY07-08.

<b>Table 4 : Wyoming Department of Education Extended Day Enrollment* &amp; Expenditure History</b>				
<b>District</b>	<b>SY07-08 Enrollment</b>	<b>SY06-07 Enrollment</b>	<b>SY05-06 Enrollment</b>	<b>SY04-05 Enrollment</b>
Albany	507	775	737	797
Big Horn #1	9	22		
Campbell #1	679	637		443
Carbon #1				31
Carbon #2	79	127		6
Converse #1	213	228		77
Crook #1	207	185	16	
Fremont #1	125	134	27	35
Fremont #25	399	409	179	
Goshen #1	90	260	112	
Johnson #1	123	44		
Laramie #1	479	812		387
Laramie #2	176	125		
Lincoln #1	33			
Lincoln #2	182	176	192	128
Natrona #1	753	499	552	435
Niobrara #1	33			
Park #1				124
Park #6	51	63	322	280
Park #16		8	9	
Platte #1	120	75		
Sheridan #2	241		408	298
Sublette #1	52			
Sweetwater #1	97	49	22	14
Sweetwater #2	152	242	144	248
Teton #1	133	84	72	53
Uinta #1	482	1024	330	
Uinta #4	161			73
Uinta #6	88			
Washakie #2			69	
<b># Students:</b>	<b>5664</b>	<b>5978</b>	<b>3191</b>	<b>3429</b>
<b># Districts:</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Bridges Funds:</b>	<b>\$ 2,217,808</b>	<b>\$ 1,928,454</b>	<b>\$ 858,607</b>	<b>\$ 716,077</b>
<b>Total Funds:</b>	<b>\$ 3,045,338</b>	<b>\$ 2,334,065</b>	<b>\$ 980,484</b>	<b>\$ 846,683</b>
<b>Per Pupil:</b>	<b>\$ 538</b>	<b>\$ 390</b>	<b>\$ 307</b>	<b>\$ 247</b>

\*Enrollment numbers based on highest participation in subject

The final data in this portion of report is presented in Table 5 and gives readers an idea of the level of repeated supplemental instruction needed by students participating in Bridges extended day programs for SY07-08. Districts estimated an average of 54 percent of students participating in SY07-08 extended day programs had also taken part in supplemental instruction programs the past year or summer. This is in keeping with the number of summer school students who also participate in additional learning opportunities, reported in that companion report.

<b>District</b>	<b>Percent attending prior year intervention programs</b>
Albany (1-12)	50.00%
Big Horn #1 (9-12 LA)	N/A
Campbell (K-12)	60.00%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	76.00%
Converse #1(1-8)	15.00%
Crook #1(K-12)	58.00%
Fremont #1(1-12)	70.00%
Fremont #25 (1-12)	53.00%
Goshen (6-8)	75.00%
Johnson #1(5-12)	33.00%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	43.00%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	14.00%
Lincoln #1(7-12)	90.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	40.00%
Natrona (K-12)	40.00%
Niobrara (K-8)	82.00%
Park #6 (K-8)	95.00%
Platte #1(K-12)	34.00%
Sheridan #2(1-12)	15.00%
Sublette #1(1-8)	N/A
Sweetwater #1 (3-4;9-12)	63.00%
Sweetwater #2 (1-6)	57.00%
Teton (1-12)	30.00%
Uinta #1 (9-12 Math)	68.00%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	80.00%
Uinta #6 (2-8)	50.00%
<b>Total (26):</b>	<b>53.79%</b>



## **Results – Best Practice**

During SY2007-08, thirty schools in Natrona County School District #1 made available additional learning opportunities for a full week over Christmas break to students who needed additional time to master standards, complete first semester credits, or to students interested in enrolling in independent enrichment classes. Most of this instruction was provided through tutors under the guidance of teachers. Approximately one half of the programs operated in both the morning and afternoon, with the other half operating in the morning only. Approximately 500 children attended these additional learning opportunities, and around eighty high school students were able to complete first semester classes, avoiding failure and later remediation. The district plans to continue this highly successful program during SY2008-09.

## **Recommendations to Policymakers – Extended Day Intervention Programs**

Recommendations made last year to policymakers concerning the operation of the Wyoming Bridges grant were adopted, and the program was officially defined in statute at W.S. 21-13-334. One of the major changes that was made included modifying the grant's funding formula from one based on district student enrollment to one based on the district's estimate of at-risk students based on their at-risk proxy numbers in the school funding model. The other major shift was to move funding for stand-alone independent enrichment programs to a separate funding mechanism, which could better ensure high quality programs were in place by establishing a competitive grant process to fund the best projects. The Student Enrichment Instruction Pilot Project was funded in the amount of \$500,000.

The Bridges Design Team further applauds the legislature's decision to maintain the grant separate and independent of the block grant school funding model to ensure program quality, integrity, and effectiveness can be maintained, and to allow both summer school and extended day programs to be funded as a single entity, giving districts flexibility in targeting resources according to need. The only recommendations made this year are to continue these practices, and to continue funding for the Wyoming Bridges grant under the Wyoming Department of Education's budget process.

## **Recommendations to the Department – Extended Day Intervention Pgms**

Each year districts are asked to make recommendations to Bridges administrators on how the program can be made more efficient and effective. Many districts express their appreciation of the availability of the Wyoming Bridges grant to fund after-school programs for their struggling students, and

request that the program continue. The most frequently mentioned recommendations are:

- Provide assistance to districts on how to assess students and evaluate extended day programs;
- Continue training on effective at-risk interventions and working with at-risk students; offer training regionally;
- Develop a data base of best practices for districts to peruse (NOTE: The Department is pursuing this through utilization of Fusion);
- Work in concert with other extended day programs like 21st Century Learning to assure as much as possible that record-keeping, attendance requirements, and assessment are the same or similar.

## Stand-alone Independent Enrichment Programs

### **Action – Stand-alone Independent Enrichment Programs**

Eight districts made available after-school enrichment programs during the SY07-08 school year, a decrease of four from the prior school year, with a corresponding decrease in participants of over 900 students (57% decrease). The majority of these after-school activities did not specifically target academically at-risk students but rather were open to all students within identified grade spans who had an interest in specific subjects or projects. Three districts focused on academically at-risk or students: Lincoln #2 targeted academically struggling and latchkey students in grades four, five and six to provide them after-school opportunities for experiences in physical education, science, and ecology; Natrona #1 middle school students explored various careers and job market trends, goal-setting, and character building; Park #1's academic after-school program focused on latchkey students in grades K through 5.

Three of the districts established after-school special interest clubs in foreign language, chess, math, science, robotics, etc. (Laramie #2, Natrona #1 elementary, Sublette #1), activities that are allowable for funding through the school funding model. Only one district this year (Natrona #1) gave students opportunities to earn high school credit in driver's education, and 60 students took advantage of this. No first-time credits were earned this year in subjects other than driver's education, as last year when credits were earned in math, language arts, and interior design. Goshen #1 funded a field trip for all grade four students as a culminating event to a history project; Washakie #2 had students engaged in producing a musical work; Weston #1 provided ACT preparatory classes for interested high school students as well as providing an opportunity for students in grades three through six to see and experience how books were created and published.

Interestingly, three of the districts offering additional enrichment opportunities to students did not have extended day programs funded by the Bridges grant.

### **Financial Information – Stand-Alone Independent Enrichment Programs**

Please see in Table 6 the districts making available extended day independent enrichment programs through the Bridges grant to their students in the 2007-08 school year. These eight districts requested reimbursement from the grant totaling \$85,606. Only Park County School District #1 expended additional local funds for their student enrichment program, bringing total reported expenditures to \$93,347. Per pupil expenditure averaged \$81, and a total of 673 students participated in the programs they reported, less than half of the numbers of students participating in SY06-07 (1583).

**Table 6: Wyoming Department of Education  
SY07-08 Expenditure and Enrollment Data  
Bridges Independent Enrichment Programs**

<b>District</b>	<b>Bridges Grant Funds</b>	<b>Total Expenditures for Ind Enrichment</b>	<b># Students Enrolled</b>	<b>Expenditure per Student</b>
Goshen (4)	\$ 431	\$ 431	20	\$ 21.55
Laramie #2 (7-11)	\$ 6,989	\$ 6,989	26	\$ 268.81
Lincoln #2 (4,5,6)	\$ 1,826	\$ 1,826	51	\$ 35.80
Natrona (K-12)	\$ 29,471	\$ 29,471	228	\$ 129.26
*Park #1 (K-5)	\$ 32,982	\$ 40,723	88	\$ 462.76
Sublette #1 (3-8)	\$ 5,842	\$ 5,842	185	\$ 31.58
*Washakie #2 (K-8)	\$ 4,736	\$ 4,736	36	\$ 131.56
*Weston #1 (3-5 & 11-12)	\$ 3,329	\$ 3,329	39	\$ 85.36
<b>Totals: (8)</b>	<b>\$ 85,606</b>	<b>\$ 93,347</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>\$ 80.98</b>

\*No Bridges Ext Day Intervention Programs

## **Results – Stand-Alone Independent Enrichment Programs**

Districts are asked to report to the Department how they evaluate the success of their independent enrichment programs. The majority of districts did not tie program evaluation to student achievement although there seemed to be an improvement in evaluation over last year. Some districts mentioned their careful definition and work toward achieving goals stated in student Individual Learning Plans; another evaluated success through DIBELS and improved ACT scores; one mentioned administering the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2); and another their placement of third in the state chess championship as indicator of their successful chess club. Four districts asked students, teachers, and/or parents to evaluate programs, and all were evaluated positively. Quite a few districts deemed their project successful based primarily upon student interest and attendance.