

Wyoming Bridges Extended-Day Programs, SY09-10

A Legislative Grant Program Funding Summer School and Extended-Day Learning Opportunities for K-12 Students in Wyoming December 1, 2010

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 57th Legislature of the State of Wyoming in 2004 as Section 1001 of Chapter 108, now referred to as Wyoming Bridges. The program 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 59th 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 as part of the foundation program. Total grant funds available to districts for FY10 (summer 2009 and School Year 2009-10) was \$9.8 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 or beyond the traditional school year, 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 highlighted the impact summer learning loss has on students and proposed the idea that some of the problems previously identified with inconsistencies and potential inequities across district summer programs could be addressed through a grant program that sets 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. A district's grant award was calculated based at \$500/student for ten percent of the district's total student enrollment.

In the 2006 legislative session, lawmakers doubled the grant amount available to districts, increasing it from \$500 to \$1,000/student, still 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 resulted in the design team suggesting two major changes to the Joint Education Committee and the full legislature, which were adopted. Rather than using a finite per capita figure based on student enrollment, the funding formula was modified to direct dollars to districts according to levels of student at-risk proxy numbers and calculated using current model teacher salary data. 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, particularly considering extensive research that shows significant summer learning loss among students in lower socio-economic groups. 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. However, in 2008, the 59th Legislature did fund separately a pilot school enrichment program in the amount of \$450,000. This program was continued by legislative action again for FY10 and FYFY11.

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 proposes 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 makes suggestions to the Department concerning administration of the program.

Enrollment – Extended-Day Intervention Programs

New levels of participation were set this school year for Bridges extended-day programs, both in the numbers of districts participating, and in the numbers of students enrolled. The number of districts participating has doubled since the grant's inaugural year, SY04-05, and numbers of students has more than

doubled over this six-year timeframe (from 3,429 to 7,444). See Table 4 for more detailed information.

Thirty-three districts devoted funds from their FY10 Wyoming Bridges grant to use in extended-day programs for the 2009-10 school year. The number of districts utilizing the grant increased from twenty-nine the prior year, with student enrollment in these programs rising approximately 21 percent to 7,444. Per pupil expenditures decreased slightly from the prior year, down \$13, to \$548. Districts vary in their offerings, with some targeting students in grades K-12, while others provide programs only for students in specific grade groups, i.e., only elementary, only middle, or only high school grades.

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 studies instruction at the elementary level as well. In SY09-10, a number of districts mentioned use of extended-day to specifically supplement instruction to English language learners; this has rarely been mentioned in the past.

Another distinction noted by districts in SY09-10 was the use of extended-day programs by students to maintain eligibility for non-academic activities or to “buy back” lost attendance time. This practice will be researched over the coming year to clarify whether some districts could be using the Bridges grant, which is clearly meant to provide additional instructional time over and above the traditional student-teacher contact time, for the provision of first-time instructional hours. Program administrators are noting increasing requests to use Bridges funds to pay for first-time instruction needed by students as a result of absenteeism, frequently absenteeism due to participation in sponsored school activities.

The majority of districts report that certified teachers are delivering their supplemental extended-day instruction. Some employ paraprofessionals under the direct supervision of a certified teacher, and others utilize tutors and instructional facilitators in extended-day instructional settings.

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. As last year, districts again reported consciously trying to intervene sooner in identifying students needing additional learning time, rather than waiting until summer to remediate; as a result, some districts have decreased summer school referral numbers. This year Fremont #1 joins Platte #1 as a district which has been particularly successful in this endeavor. Fremont #1 increased the number of students attending extended-day programs in SY09-10 by 78 percent; the number of students enrolled in summer school in 2010 decreased 40 percent in one year. Last summer (2010), Platte #1 enrolled only 68 students in summer school; in the summer of 2006, 152 students attended. Natrona County School District #1 continues to

target struggling high school students by providing additional learning time during winter and spring breaks to ensure they earn high school credits during the school year rather than waiting to recover them during summer. Park County School District #6 also follows this philosophy by offering fall credit recovery in January.

Financial information – Extended Day Intervention Programs

Readers of this report should understand that statistical and other information provided within it pertain 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 all districts during the school year, which are broader and more numerous than those reported herein.

In Table 1 below, expenditure and enrichment information is displayed for each district utilizing the Wyoming Bridges grant. Per pupil expenditure varied from a low of \$56/student in Park County School District #16 to a high of \$2,014/student in Big Horn County School District # #4; average per pupil expenditure was \$548 in school year 2009-2010, a decrease of \$13 from the prior year (2 percent). Districts participating in Bridges extended-day programs expended a total of \$4,077,982 in SY09-10 versus \$3,432,415 the prior year (an 18.8 percent increase), of which \$2,968,259 were Bridges grant funds. This increase corresponds with the increase in the number of students enrolled in Bridges extended day programs in SY09-10. Grant funds were supplemented with \$1,109,723 from other sources, primarily Title I and 21st Century Learning; from their general funds districts contributed only 4.47 percent to Bridges extended-day programs. Local contribution to Bridges extended-day programs increased \$584,183 over the prior year. Bridges grant funds supported approximately 73 percent of the costs reported by districts for these extended day programs in SY09-10 versus 85 percent the prior school year (Table 2).

**Table 1: Wyoming Department of Education
SY09-10 Extended Day Enrollment and Expenditure Data**

District	Bridges Grant Funds	Total Ext Day Expenditures	*Number Enrolled	Expenditures per Student
Albany #1(1-12)	\$ 183,050	\$ 305,050	427	\$ 714.40
Big Horn #1 (7-12)	\$ 11,035	\$ 11,035	42	\$ 262.74
Big Horn #2 (6-8)	\$ 11,599	\$ 11,599	29	\$ 399.97
Big Horn #3 (1-8)	\$ 11,402	\$ 11,402	24	\$ 475.08
Big Horn #4 (9-12)	\$ 8,138	\$ 18,128	9	\$ 2,014.22
Campbell #1 (K-12)	\$ 180,850	\$ 236,753	1111	\$ 213.10
Carbon #1 (K-7)	\$ 138,573	\$ 138,573	73	\$ 1,898.26
Carbon #2 (K-12)	\$ 102,189	\$ 102,189	119	\$ 858.73
Converse #1 (1-8)	\$ 74,128	\$ 134,365	151	\$ 889.83
Crook #1 (K-12)	\$ 57,631	\$ 57,631	220	\$ 261.96
Fremont #1 (K-12)	\$ 105,851	\$ 136,151	213	\$ 639.21
Fremont #14 (1-12)	\$ 960	\$ 257,604	242	\$ 1,064.48
Fremont #25 (1-12)	\$ 118,657	\$ 148,831	262	\$ 568.06
Hot Springs #1 (1-12)	\$ 51,671	\$ 51,671	173	\$ 298.68
Johnson #1 (6-12)	\$ 28,002	\$ 37,995	80	\$ 474.94
Laramie #1 (K-12)	\$ 464,546	\$ 464,546	707	\$ 657.07
Laramie #2 (K-6)	\$ 36,016	\$ 88,310	190	\$ 464.79
Lincoln #1 (5-8)	\$ 2,594	\$ 2,594	44	\$ 58.95
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	\$ 34,011	\$ 34,011	110	\$ 309.19
Natrona #1 (K-12)	\$ 518,421	\$ 518,421	936	\$ 553.87
Park #6 (K-12)	\$ 46,948	\$ 82,431	92	\$ 895.99
Park #16 (K-6)	\$ 1,184	\$ 1,184	21	\$ 56.38
Platte #1 (K-12)	\$ 82,788	\$ 97,023	149	\$ 651.16
Platte #2 (6-12)	\$ 6,383	\$ 6,383	16	\$ 398.94
Sheridan #2 (1-5 & 9-12)	\$ 71,408	\$ 71,408	242	\$ 295.07
Sublette #1(1-4)	\$ 9,394	\$ 9,394	28	\$ 335.50
Sweetwater #1 (1-12)	\$ 138,125	\$ 336,014	442	\$ 760.21
Sweetwater #2 (1-8)	\$ 37,190	\$ 97,909	116	\$ 844.04
Teton #1 (K-12)	\$ 154,129	\$ 154,129	169	\$ 912.01
Uinta #1 (3-12)	\$ 180,084	\$ 343,567	601	\$ 571.66
Uinta #4 (K-12)	\$ 8,341	\$ 8,341	87	\$ 95.87
Washakie #1 (K-12)	\$ 81,682	\$ 81,682	283	\$ 288.63
Weston #7 (1-8)	\$ 11,279	\$ 21,658	36	\$ 601.61
Total (33):	\$ 2,968,259	\$ 4,077,982	7444	\$ 547.82

* Reflects the highest participation in subject

**Table 2: Wyoming Department of Education
SY09-10 Expenditure Information - Funding Sources**

District	Bridges Funds	Title I	Title VI B	Gen Fund	Other	Total Expenses
Albany #1(1-12)	\$ 183,050	\$ 95,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 305,050
Big Horn #1 (7-12)	\$ 11,035					\$ 11,035
Big Horn #2 (6-8)	\$ 11,599					\$ 11,599
Big Horn #3 (1-8)	\$ 11,402					\$ 11,402
Big Horn #4 (9-12)	\$ 8,138			\$ 9,990		\$ 18,128
Campbell #1 (K-12)	\$ 180,850			\$ 55,903		\$ 236,753
Carbon #1 (K-7)	\$ 138,573					\$ 138,573
Carbon #2 (K-12)	\$ 102,189					\$ 102,189
Converse #1 (1-8)	\$ 74,128				\$ 60,237	\$ 134,365
Crook #1 (K-12)	\$ 57,631					\$ 57,631
Fremont #1 (K-12)	\$ 105,851		\$ 3,300		\$ 27,000	\$ 136,151
Fremont #14 (1-12)	\$ 960	\$ 187,922			\$ 68,722	\$ 257,604
Fremont #25 (1-12)	\$ 118,657	\$ 7,582	\$ 16,162	\$ 6,430		\$ 148,831
Hot Springs #1 (1-12)	\$ 51,671					\$ 51,671
Johnson #1 (6-12)	\$ 28,002			\$ 9,993		\$ 37,995
Laramie #1 (K-12)	\$ 464,546					\$ 464,546
Laramie #2 (K-6)	\$ 36,016	\$ 27,648	\$ 14,895	\$ 9,751		\$ 88,310
Lincoln #1 (5-8)	\$ 2,594					\$ 2,594
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	\$ 34,011					\$ 34,011
Natrona #1 (K-12)	\$ 518,421					\$ 518,421
Park #6 (K-12)	\$ 46,948			\$ 35,483		\$ 82,431
Park #16 (K-6)	\$ 1,184					\$ 1,184
Platte #1 (K-12)	\$ 82,788			\$ 14,235		\$ 97,023
Platte #2 (6-12)	\$ 6,383					\$ 6,383
Sher #2 (1-5 & 9-12)	\$ 71,408					\$ 71,408
Sublette #1(1-4)	\$ 9,394					\$ 9,394
Sweetwater #1 (1-12)	\$ 138,125			\$ 27,889	\$ 170,000	\$ 336,014
Sweetwater #2 (1-8)	\$ 37,190	\$ 9,717	\$ 9,562		\$ 41,440	\$ 97,909
Teton #1 (K-12)	\$ 154,129					\$ 154,129
Uinta #1 (3-12)	\$ 180,084	\$ 161,013		\$ 2,470		\$ 343,567
Uinta #4 (K-12)	\$ 8,341					\$ 8,341
Washakie #1 (K-12)	\$ 81,682					\$ 81,682
Weston #7 (1-8)	\$ 11,279			\$ 10,379		\$ 21,658
Total (33):	\$ 2,968,259	\$ 488,882	\$ 49,919	\$ 182,144	\$ 378,399	\$ 4,077,982
% Total Exp:	72.79%	11.99%	1.22%	4.47%	9.28%	

Results – Bridges Expended Day Intervention Programs

Tables 3 and 4 display student enrollment and completion data for Bridges SY09-10 extended-day offerings in math and language arts, respectively. More students attended extended day programs for additional instructional support in language arts this past year, a practice followed in five of the grant's six years of implementation.

Approximately 89 percent of students met goals set forth in their Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) in math, and approximately 91 percent met goals identified for language arts. Student success in meeting learning plan goals varies among the districts, from 54 percent to 100 percent of participating students meeting some or all ILP goals.

The far right column in Table 3 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, it appears that Teton #1 and Laramie #1 focused their Bridges extended-day program primarily on students needing intervention in math, while Big Horn #1, Big Horn #3, Carbon #2, Converse #2, Laramie #2, and Park #16, offered instruction in both language arts and math to all students in attendance.

Historical district participation, student enrollment, and expenditure data is displayed in Table 5 and includes information from SY04-05 through SY09-10. Student participation over this six-year period has increased 117 percent; district participation doubled. Bridges grant funds expended have increased more than fourfold over the six-year history of this grant.

The final data presented in Table 6 gives readers an idea of the level of repeated supplemental instruction needed by students participating in Bridges extended-day programs for SY09-10 (Big Horn #4 excluded – unknown). Districts estimated an average of 56 percent of students participating in SY09-10 extended-day programs had also taken part in supplemental instruction programs the previous year or the prior summer. This percentage ranged among districts from an estimated high of 90 percent to a low of 17 percent.

**Table 3: Wyoming Department of Education
Wyoming Bridges Extended Day SY09-10 Completion Data**

Math

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 (K-12)	427	364	85.25%	63	14.75%	49.10%
Big Horn #1 (7-12)	36	36	100.00%	0	0.00%	100.00%
Big Horn #2 (6-8)	29	23	79.31%	6	20.69%	65.50%
Big Horn #3 (1-5)	19	19	100.00%	0	0.00%	100.00%
Big Horn #4 (9-12)	9	7	77.78%	2	22.22%	22.22%
Campbell #1 (K-12)	823	719	87.36%	104	12.64%	58.00%
Carbon #1 (1-5)	68	68	100.00%	0	0.00%	29.40%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	119	102	85.71%	17	14.29%	100.00%
Converse #1 (3-8)	122	92	75.41%	30	24.59%	100.00%
Crook #1 (K-12)	170	163	95.88%	7	4.12%	Unk
Fremont #1 (K-12)	213	193	90.61%	20	9.39%	40.80%
Fremont #14 (1-12)	235	127	54.04%	108	45.96%	42.50%
Fremont #25 (1-12)	262	186	70.99%	76	29.01%	52.20%
Hot Springs (1-12)	173	172	99.42%	1	0.58%	24.80%
Johnson #1 (4-12)	80	80	100.00%	0	0.00%	87.50%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	547	497	90.86%	50	9.14%	19.00%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	190	190	100.00%	0	0.00%	100.00%
Lincoln #1 (5-8)	27	27	100.00%	0	0.00%	62.90%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	125	110	88.00%	15	12.00%	36.00%
Natrona #1 (K-12)	914	780	85.34%	134	14.66%	79.10%
Park #6 (2-8)	63	55	87.30%	8	12.70%	96.00%
Park #16 (K-6)	21	20	95.24%	1	4.76%	100.00%
Platte #1 (K-12)	143	138	96.50%	5	3.50%	58.70%
Platte #2 (6-12)	16	14	87.50%	2	12.50%	43.70%
Sher #2 (3-5 & 9-12)	183	163	89.07%	20	10.93%	72.10%
Sublette #1(2-4)	15	15	100.00%	0	0.00%	60.00%
Sweetwater #1 (K-12)	411	363	88.32%	48	11.68%	44.00%
Sweetwater #2 (3-12)	116	104	89.66%	12	10.34%	77.50%
Teton #1 (K-10)	83	76	91.57%	7	8.43%	18.00%
Uinta #1 (2-12)	601	601	100.00%	0	0.00%	38.60%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	87	87	100.00%	0	0.00%	40.20%
Washakie #1 (2-12)	224	210	93.75%	14	6.25%	78.10%
Weston #7 (1-8)	35	35	100.00%	0	0.00%	85.70%
Totals: (33)	6586	5836	88.61%	750	11.39%	

**Table 4: Wyoming Department of Education
Wyoming Bridges Extended Day SY09-10 Completion Data**

**Language
Arts**

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
Albany #1 (1-12)	378	365	96.56%	13	3.44%
Big Horn #1 (7-12)	42	42	100.00%	0	0.00%
Big Horn #2 (6-8)	27	20	74.07%	7	25.93%
Big Horn #3 (1-8)	24	24	100.00%	0	0.00%
Big Horn #4 (9)	3	3	100.00%	0	0.00%
Campbell #1 (K-12)	1111	1031	92.80%	80	7.20%
Carbon #1 (1-5)	73	71	97.26%	2	2.74%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	79	71	89.87%	8	10.13%
Converse #1 (1-8)	151	121	80.13%	30	19.87%
Crook #1 (K-12)	220	210	95.45%	10	4.55%
Fremont #1 (K-12)	97	77	79.38%	20	20.62%
Fremont #14 (1-12)	242	130	53.72%	112	46.28%
Fremont #25 (1-12)	225	180	80.00%	45	20.00%
Hot Springs #1 (1-12)	92	90	97.83%	2	2.17%
Johnson #1 (4-12)	77	77	100.00%	0	0.00%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	707	688	97.31%	19	2.69%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	190	190	100.00%	0	0.00%
Lincoln #1 (5-8)	44	44	100.00%	0	0.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	92	90	97.83%	2	2.17%
Natrona #1 (K-12)	936	799	85.36%	137	14.64%
Park #6 (K-12)	92	80	86.96%	12	13.04%
Park #16 (K-6)	21	21	100.00%	0	0.00%
Platte #1 (K-12)	149	131	87.92%	18	12.08%
Platte #2 (6-12)	15	14	93.33%	1	6.67%
Sher #2 (1-5 & 9-12)	242	216	89.26%	26	10.74%
Sublette #1(1-4)	28	27	96.43%	1	3.57%
Sweetwater #1 (K-12)	442	392	88.69%	50	11.31%
Sweetwater #2 (3-12)	147	115	78.23%	32	21.77%
Teton #1 (K-12)	169	159	94.08%	10	5.92%
Uinta #1 (3-12)	271	271	100.00%	0	0.00%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	61	61	100.00%	0	0.00%
Washakie #1 (2-12)	283	283	100.00%	0	0.00%
Weston #7 (1-8)	36	36	100.00%	0	0.00%
Totals: (33)	6766	6129	90.59%	637	9.41%

**Table 5 : Wyoming Department of Education
Extended Day Enrollment & Expenditure History (SY09-10)**

District	SY09-10 Enrollment	SY08-09 Enrollment	SY07-08 Enrollment	SY06-07 Enrollment	SY05-06 Enrollment	SY04-05 Enrollment
Albany #1	427	425	507	775	737	797
Big Horn #1	42	11	9	22		
Big Horn #2	29					
Big Horn #3	24					
Big Horn #4	9					
Campbell #1	1111	916	679	637		443
Carbon #1	73	59				31
Carbon #2	119	92	79	127		6
Converse #1	151	213	213	228		77
Crook #1	220	188	207	185	16	
Fremont #1	213	119	125	134	27	35
Fremont #2		2				
Fremont #14	242	270				
Fremont #25	262	230	399	409	179	
Goshen #1			90	260	112	
Hot Springs #1	173					
Johnson #1	80	18	123	44		
Laramie #1	707	674	479	812		387
Laramie #2	190	151	176	125		
Lincoln #1	44		33			
Lincoln #2	110	123	182	176	192	128
Natrona #1	936	914	753	499	552	435
Niobrara #1			33			
Park #1						124
Park #6	92	67	51	63	322	280
Park #16	21	29		8	9	
Platte #1	149	100	120	75		
Platte #2	16	13				
Sheridan #2	242	168	241		408	298
Sublette #1	28	78	52			
Sweetwater #1	442	157	97	49	22	14
Sweetwater #2	116	149	152	242	144	248
Teton #1	169	97	133	84	72	53
Uinta #1	601	357	482	1024	330	
Uinta #4	87	161	161			73
Uinta #6			88			
Washakie #1	283	287				
Washakie #2					69	
Weston #7	36	49				
# Students:	7444	6117	5664	5978	3191	3429
# Districts:	33	29	26	21	15	16
Brdges Funds:	\$ 2,968,259	\$ 2,906,875	\$ 2,217,808	\$ 1,928,454	\$ 858,607	\$ 716,077
Total Funds:	\$ 4,077,982	\$ 3,432,415	\$ 3,045,338	\$ 2,334,065	\$ 980,484	\$ 846,683
Per Pupil:	\$ 548	\$ 561	\$ 538	\$ 390	\$ 307	\$ 247

**Table 6: Wyoming Department of Education
Estimated Ext Day or Summer Sch Repeaters
School Year 2009-10**

District	Percent attending prior year intervention programs
Albany #1 (K-12)	65.00%
Big Horn #1 (7-12)	60.00%
Big Horn #2 (6-8)	32.00%
Big Horn #3 (1-8)	68.00%
Campbell #1 (K-12)	40.00%
Carbon #1 (K-7)	40.00%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	80.00%
Converse #1 (1-8)	60.00%
Crook #1 (K-12)	48.00%
Fremont #1 (K-12)	76.00%
Fremont #14 (1-12)	75.00%
Fremont #25 (1-12)	53.00%
Hot Springs #1 (1-12)	37.00%
Johnson #1 (6-12)	17.00%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	63.00%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	50.00%
Lincoln #1 (5-8)	90.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	40.00%
Natrona #1 (K-12)	73.00%
Park #6 (K-12)	80.00%
Park #16 (K-6)	80.95%
Platte #1 (K-12)	65.00%
Platte #2 (6-12)	56.00%
Sheridan #2 (1-5 & 9-12)	40.00%
Sublette #1 (148)	30.00%
Sweetwater #1 (1-12)	45.00%
Sweetwater #2 (1-8)	38.00%
Teton #1 (K-12)	63.00%
Uinta #1 (3-12)	64.00%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	80.00%
Washakie #1 (K-12)	24.30%
Weston #7 (1-8)	60.00%
Average:	56.04%

Results – Best Practice

During SY2009-10, all schools in Natrona County School District #1 again 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. Intervention and remedial instruction was provided through tutors under the guidance of teachers. This is the third year the district has operated this highly successful program. The districts additionally make classes available to students over the spring break period, providing them with time to catch up on incomplete assignments.

Park County School District #6 has implemented a program called ExCEL (Extended Classroom Education and Learning), funded through the Bridges grant, which identifies students at the end of the first and third grades who, in lieu of retention, participate in additional instructional opportunities over a period of two years. These students are identified as the result of assessment and observation under the auspices of the Building Intervention Team (BIT) process. ExCEL students and their parents commit to a two-year process aimed at bringing the student to academically proficient levels. The process requires at least two days a week of after-school instruction during the school year, and attendance at summer school for two continuous summers. A student could potentially be in the ExCEL program for four years, being referred once at the end of first grade, and another time at the end of third grade. Student strengths and weaknesses are identified in an Individual Learning Plan, which is retained and updated through the entire ExCEL timeframe.

Recommendations from Districts

Each year as part of the end-of-program reporting process, districts are asked to relate information they think might be helpful to other districts in planning or operating extended-day programs. Recommendations include:

- Pay teachers at contract rate so there is competition for positions, increasing a district's ability to hire the best possible teachers to help struggling students;
- Make sure extended-day programs differ substantially in their approach to learning from what students experienced during the regular school day to both enable students to learn and to encourage attendance;
- Provide authentic and project-based learning;
- Be diligent in identifying and intervening as early as possible with students to ensure they don't fall behind in their understanding of instructional material;
- Make credit recovery available to secondary students as soon as possible rather than waiting until the following summer;

- Increase participation in extended-day programs by holding them *before* school and/or on Saturdays rather than after school;
- Teach good study habits and skills as part of the extended-day experience to improve student academic success;
- Offer transportation and substantial snacks. Both are popular with parents and students and encourage attendance;
- Surprise students with a once-a-week unannounced “fun day” where they play games, watch movies, learn martial arts, etc – let students propose activities;
- Make scheduling flexible by encouraging teachers to collaborate with one another so they teach extended-day programs only part of the time;
- Implement innovative programs to engage academically at-risk students proposed by teachers;
- Partner with existent community (recreation and other) programs to supplement your extended-day academic focus, i.e., Boys & Girls Clubs, BOCES and 21st Century offerings, etc.

Recommendations to the Department

Districts have requested that the Department provide them with more guidance on what successful extended day programming is. The Department has undertaken the monitoring of summer school programs over the past three years and has learned a great deal about what models of successful summer programs look like. Identification of effective summer learning programs will be even more honed as the evaluation of student summer growth is analyzed throughout all districts in the state, anticipated to be initially completed mid-year in 2011. During the current school year, (SY10-11), the Department will additionally undertake the task of visiting extended day programs to gain a better understanding of what is working well throughout the state in these after-school programs so this information can be passed to interested districts, as well as policymakers.

Recommendations to Policymakers – Extended-Day Intervention Programs

The Bridges Design Team applauds the legislature’s decision to maintain the operation of the Bridges summer school and extended-day grant independent of the block grant school funding model to ensure program quality, integrity, and effectiveness can be maintained. Additionally, allowing both summer school and extended-day programs to be funded as a single entity gives districts flexibility in targeting resources according to perceived need. Policymakers are asked to continue these practices and to retain funding for the Wyoming Bridges grant under the Wyoming Department of Education’s budget process.