

Cindy Hill, Superintendent of Public Instruction



Wyoming Department of Education

2300 Capitol Avenue, Hathaway Building 2nd Floor, Cheyenne WY 82002-0050
307-777-7675 Office 307-777-6234 Fax <http://edu.wyoming.gov>

Wyoming Bridges
A Legislative Grant Program
Funding Summer School and Extended-Day Learning Opportunities
for K-12 Students in Wyoming

A Report of Bridges Extended Day Learning Programs School Year 2011-12

Prepared by Ruth Sommers
for the Wyoming Department of Education
December 1, 2012
Prepared August 15, 2012

The Wyoming Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability in admission or access to, or treatment of employment in its programs or activities. Inquiries concerning Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, and ADA may be referred to Wyoming Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights Coordinator, 2300 Capitol Ave., Cheyenne, WY, 82002-0050 or 307-777-7673, or the Office for Civil Rights, Region VIII, U. S. Department of Education, Federal Building, Suite 310, 1244 Speer Boulevard, Denver, CO 80204-3582, or 303-844-5695 or TDD 303-844-3417. This information will be provided in an alternative format upon request.

Wyoming Bridges Extended-Day Programs, SY11-12

A Legislative Grant Program Funding Summer School and Extended-Day Learning Opportunities for K-12 Students in Wyoming December 1, 2012

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 retain the Bridges program 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 dollars for the program are 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 FY12 (summer 2011 and School Year 2011-12) were \$13.1 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 was guided by policymakers, administrators and teachers through the Bridges Design Team. This group met to review the operation of and data from the program, including feedback from districts, and proposed modifications to improve it. The team also studied changes made to legislation, discussed policy implications as a result of those changes, updated rules and regulations, and made suggestions to the Department concerning administration of the program.

Enrollment – Extended-Day Intervention Programs

New levels of participation were again set this school year for Bridges extended-day programs, both in the numbers of districts participating, and in the numbers of students enrolled. Forty-two districts utilized Bridges funds for extended day programs in SY11-12; generally, districts with funds remaining in the grant from the prior summer school year (2011) used these funds to provide additional learning programs outside the school day. The number of students in extended day programs grew noticeably during SY2011-12, with 9,931 students enrolled; participation has almost tripled over the eight-year timeframe of the grant, from

3,429 to 9,931. See Table 6 for more detailed information on historical district and student participation over the life of the program.

Forty-two districts devoted funds from their FY12 Wyoming Bridges grant to use in extended-day programs for the 2011-12 school year. The number of districts utilizing the grant increased from 34 the prior year, with student enrollment in these programs increasing a significant nineteen percent over the prior year to 9,931, eleven percent of total statewide student enrollment. Per pupil expenditures decreased slightly from the prior year, down \$39, to \$474.

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. Additionally, districts sometimes concentrate supplemental instruction in only a single subject in keeping with their district goals.

Although the added instructional time offered through the Bridges grant during the school year is referred to as “extended day”, in reality, this time is offered in a variety of way. Before and after-school programs are the most common settings, but quite a few districts also offer extra learning time on Saturdays; many districts which operate four-day schedules make instruction available for students who need it on Fridays.

All participating districts make available supplemental instruction in math and language arts. Many report providing additional instructional opportunities for social studies, science, foreign language, and health, particularly in secondary grades. In SY11-12, some districts mentioned use of extended day to specifically supplement instruction to English language learners; this was noticed for the first time two years ago, and seems to be focused in a limited number of districts with high concentrations of foreign language learners.

As Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies are adopted more widely by districts, the RTI approach is also being used to address academic needs for students in Bridges programs. Use of this common methodology seems very effective and efficient and is encouraged.

Another distinction noted by districts two years ago was the use of extended-day programs by students to maintain eligibility for non-academic activities (usually sports) or to “buy back” lost attendance time. Some districts stated that many of the students in extended day programs are students with high absenteeism.

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, student teachers, instructional facilitators, and even principals 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 in prior years, some districts reported consciously trying to intervene sooner in identifying students needing additional learning time during the school year, rather than waiting until summer to remediate; as a result, some districts have decreased summer school referral numbers. This year Fremont #1, Fremont #2, Lincoln #2, Park #6 and Platte #1 have been successful in this endeavor; Johnson #1 is moving in this direction as well. Big Horn County School District #1 stated specifically in their report that the number of academically at-risk students has dwindled as students attend after-school tutoring to keep on top of assignments and learning. Laramie County School District #1 targeted struggling secondary students by providing additional learning time during winter spring break to ensure student success during the school year rather than waiting to assign students to summer school. The ability to recover first-semester credits during spring semester extended day programs was cited as being offered in Campbell #1, Lincoln #2, Park #6, and Washakie #1.

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 \$70/student in Park County School District #16 to a high of \$1,686/student in Park County School District #6; average per pupil expenditure was \$474 in school year 2011-12, a decrease of \$39 from the prior year (seven percent). Districts participating in Bridges extended-day programs expended a total of \$4,711,594 in SY11-12 versus \$4,281,447 the prior year (a ten percent increase), of which \$4,194,624 were Bridges grant funds. (Please note these figures are not final – one district still had pending expenditure data as this report was prepared, August 15, 2012.) Grant funds were supplemented with \$516,970 from other sources, primarily 21st Century Learning funds. From their general funds districts contributed only 1.72 percent to Bridges extended-day programs, the lowest level of general fund participation since the grant's beginning. Local contribution to Bridges extended-day programs decreased \$171,657 from the prior year. This trend has been consistent throughout the history of the grant; district reports indicate that fewer and fewer non-Bridges dollars support extended day programs each year. Bridges grant funds supported approximately 89 percent of the costs reported by districts for these extended day programs in

**Table 1: Wyoming Department of Education
SY11-12 Extended Day Per Student Expenditures**

District	Bridges Grant Funds	Total Ext Day Expenditures	*Number Enrolled	Expenditures per Student
Albany #1 (K-12)	\$ 150,742	\$ 202,842	477	\$ 425.25
Big Horn #1 (K-12)	\$ 14,326	\$ 14,326	100	\$ 143.26
Big Horn #2 (6-12)	\$ 14,223	\$ 14,223	36	\$ 395.08
Big Horn #3 (K-5)	\$ 21,032	\$ 21,818	59	\$ 369.80
Big Horn #4 (5-8)	\$ 5,865	\$ 5,865	62	\$ 94.60
Campbell #1 (K-12)	\$ 212,135	\$ 238,291	1122	\$ 212.38
Carbon #1 (K-5)	\$ 64,481	\$ 64,481	192	\$ 335.84
Carbon #2 (K-12)	\$ 57,086	\$ 57,086	203	\$ 281.21
Converse #1 (1-12)	\$ 75,054	\$ 140,000	256	\$ 546.88
Converse #2 (1-6)	\$ 25,182	\$ 25,204	60	\$ 420.07
Crook (K-12)	\$ 63,780	\$ 63,780	219	\$ 291.23
Fremont #1 (K-12)	\$ 111,916	\$ 135,730	197	\$ 688.98
Fremont #2 (2 & 9-12)	\$ 7,387	\$ 11,031	14	\$ 787.93
Fremont #14 (1-12)	\$ 13,648	\$ 23,683	165	\$ 143.53
Fremont #25 (K-12)	\$ 162,010	\$ 193,950	254	\$ 763.58
Fremont #38 (3-8)	\$ 6,879	\$ 6,879	28	\$ 245.68
Goshen (9-12)	\$ 8,636	\$ 8,636	18	\$ 479.78
Hot Springs (2-12)	\$ 23,870	\$ 23,870	204	\$ 117.01
Johnson #1 (4-12)	\$ 62,045	\$ 68,702	101	\$ 680.22
Laramie #1 (K-12)	\$ 978,214	\$ 978,214	1484	\$ 659.17
Laramie #2 (K-6)	\$ 73,450	\$ 86,935	185	\$ 469.92
Lincoln #1 (1-12)	\$ 9,510	\$ 9,510	51	\$ 186.47
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	\$ 169,148	\$ 219,487	430	\$ 510.43
Natrona #1 (K-12)	\$ 626,598	\$ 626,598	1165	\$ 537.85
Niobrara (3-8)	\$ 28,508	\$ 28,508	63	\$ 452.51
Park #1 (K-5)	\$ 6,118	\$ 6,118	36	\$ 169.94
Park #6 (K-12)	\$ 106,192	\$ 106,192	63	\$ 1,685.59
Park #16 (K-8)	\$ 1,184	\$ 1,184	17	\$ 69.65
Platte #1 (K-12)	\$ 47,233	\$ 47,233	130	\$ 363.33
Platte #2 (K-6)	\$ 8,281	\$ 8,281	35	\$ 236.60
Sheridan #1 (K-5)	\$ 8,343	\$ 13,402	118	\$ 113.58
Sheridan #2 (1-12)	\$ 178,400	\$ 178,400	352	\$ 506.82
Sublette #1 (3-5)	\$ 5,777	\$ 5,777	26	\$ 222.19
Sublette #9 (1-4)	\$ 15,403	\$ 24,563	17	\$ 1,444.88
#Sweetw #1 (K-12)	\$ 227,909	\$ 371,511	497	\$ 747.51
Sweetw #2 (1-12)	\$ 83,878	\$ 98,813	156	\$ 633.42
Teton #1 (K-12)	\$ 150,473	\$ 197,340	368	\$ 536.25
Uinta #1 (1-12)	\$ 219,798	\$ 219,798	516	\$ 425.97
Uinta #4 (K-12)	\$ 12,811	\$ 12,811	69	\$ 185.67
Uinta #6 (K-12)	\$ 34,095	\$ 36,657	127	\$ 288.64
Washakie #1 (2-12)	\$ 94,087	\$ 94,087	211	\$ 445.91
Weston #7 (K-5)	\$ 8,917	\$ 19,778	48	\$ 412.04
Total (42):	\$ 4,194,624	\$ 4,711,594	9931	\$ 474.43

Table 2: SY11-12 Expenditure Information - Sources

District	Bridges Funds	Title I	Title VI B	Gen Fund	Other	Total Expenses
Albany #1 (K-9)	\$ 150,742	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 52,100	\$ 202,842
Big Horn #1 (K-12)	\$ 14,326	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,326
Big Horn #2 (6-12)	\$ 14,223	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,223
Big Horn #3 (K-5)	\$ 21,032	\$ 786	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,818
Big Horn #4 (5-8)	\$ 5,865	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,865
Campbell #1 (K-12)	\$ 212,135	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,156	\$ -	\$ 238,291
Carbon #1 (K-5)	\$ 64,481	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,481
Carbon #2 (K-12)	\$ 57,086	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,086
Converse #1 (1-12)	\$ 75,054	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,946	\$ 140,000
Converse #2 (1-6)	\$ 25,182	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22	\$ 25,204
Crook (K-12)	\$ 63,780	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,780
Fremont #1 (K-12)	\$ 111,916	\$ 6,582	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,232	\$ 135,730
Fremont #2(2,9-12)	\$ 7,387	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,644	\$ 11,031
Fremont #14 (1-12)	\$ 13,648	\$ 9,450	\$ -	\$ 585	\$ -	\$ 23,683
Fremont #25 (K-12)	\$ 162,010	\$ 7,800	\$16,174	\$ 7,966	\$ -	\$ 193,950
Fremont #38 (3-8)	\$ 6,879	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,879
Goshen (9-12)	\$ 8,636	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,636
Hot Springs (2-12)	\$ 23,870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,870
Johnson #1 (4-12)	\$ 62,045	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,657	\$ 68,702
Laramie #1 (K-12)	\$ 978,214	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 978,214
Laramie #2 (K-6)	\$ 73,450	\$ -	\$10,108	\$ 3,377	\$ -	\$ 86,935
Lincoln #1 (1-12)	\$ 9,510	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,510
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	\$ 169,148	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,967	\$ 18,372	\$ 219,487
Natrona #1 (K-12)	\$ 626,598	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 626,598
Niobrara (3-8)	\$ 28,508	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 28,508
Park #1 (K-5)	\$ 6,118	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,118
Park #6 (K-12)	\$ 106,192	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 106,192
Park #16 (K-8)	\$ 1,184	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,184
Platte #1 (K-12)	\$ 47,233	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,233
Platte #2 (K-6)	\$ 8,281	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,281
Sheridan #1 (K-5)	\$ 8,343	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,059	\$ 13,402
Sheridan #2 (1-12)	\$ 178,400	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 178,400
Sublette #1 (3-5)	\$ 5,777	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,777
Sublette #9 (1-4)	\$ 15,403	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,160	\$ 24,563
#Sweetw #1 (K-12)	\$ 227,909	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,602	\$ 371,511
Sweetw #2 (1-12)	\$ 83,878	\$ 7,273	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,662	\$ 98,813
Teton #1 (K-12)	\$ 150,473	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46,867	\$ 197,340
Uinta #1 (1-12)	\$ 219,798	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 219,798
Uinta #4 (K-12)	\$ 12,811	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,811
Uinta #6 (K-12)	\$ 34,095	\$ -	\$ 2,562	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,657
Washakie #1 (2-12)	\$ 94,087	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 94,087
Weston #7 (K-5)	\$ 8,917	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,861	\$ -	\$ 19,778
Total (42):	\$ 4,194,624	\$ 31,891	\$28,844	\$ 80,912	\$ 375,323	\$ 4,711,594
% Total Exp:	89.03%	0.68%	0.61%	1.72%	7.97%	

*Prior year ext day exp; SY11-12 data unavailable

SY11-12 versus 84 percent the prior school year (Table 2). It is of interest to note that Sheridan County School District #1 received a private donation in the amount of approximately \$5000 to help support enrichment activities associated with their extended day program.

Bridges grant application guidelines and policies encourage districts to expend funds on personnel resources, ensuring student-teacher ratios are very low in order to assure individualized instruction for students needing the additional time to master content and performance areas. Overall, districts used approximately 82 percent of extended day funds on personnel resources. Districts are generally careful to request exception for expenditures in excess of twenty percent in series other than salary and benefits. See Table 3 for district detail.

Results – Bridges Expended Day Intervention Programs

Tables 4 and 5 display student enrollment and completion data for Bridges SY11-12 extended-day offerings in math and language arts respectively. More students attended extended day programs for additional instructional in language arts (9,256 students enrolled) than in math (8,633), a practice typical of seven of the grant's eight years of implementation.

Approximately eighty percent of students identified as needing to attend extended day programs actually enrolled in these additional learning opportunities. Of those enrolled, 84 percent of students met some or all goals set forth in their Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) in language arts and 82% in math. Student success in meeting learning plan goals varies among the districts, from 48 to one hundred percent of participating students meeting some or all ILP goals.

Historical district participation, student enrollment, and expenditure data is displayed in Table 6 and includes information from SY04-05 through SY11-12, with some school years excluded due to table size. Student participation over this eight-year period has almost tripled, from 3,429 the first year of the grant to 9,931 SY11-12; the number of districts participating over this timeframe has almost tripled as well. Bridges grant funds expended have increased more than fivefold over the eight-year history of this grant.

The final data presented in Table 7 gives readers an idea of the level of repeated supplemental instruction needed by students participating in Bridges extended-day programs during SY11-12. Districts estimated an average of 57 percent of students participating in SY11-12 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 one hundred percent to a low of 7.8 percent.

Table 3: SY11-12 Expenditure Information - Salaries and Benefits

District	Salary Expend	Benefits Expend	Total	Percent of Tot Exp
Albany #1 (K-9)	\$ 120,198	\$ 28,659	\$ 148,857	73.39%
Big Horn #1 (K-12)	\$ 11,959	\$ 2,367	\$ 14,326	100.00%
Big Horn #2 (6-12)	\$ 11,547	\$ 1,243	\$ 12,790	89.92%
Big Horn #3 (K-5)	\$ 12,270	\$ 2,568	\$ 14,838	68.01%
Big Horn #4 (5-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%
Campbell #1 (K-12)	\$ 179,068	\$ 36,086	\$ 215,154	90.29%
Carbon #1 (K-5)	\$ 41,633	\$ 8,466	\$ 50,099	77.70%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	\$ 20,934	\$ 3,892	\$ 24,826	43.49%
Converse #1 (1-12)	\$ 94,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 119,000	85.00%
Converse #2 (1-6)	\$ 22,815	\$ 1,746	\$ 24,561	97.45%
Crook (K-12)	\$ 28,551	\$ 7,965	\$ 36,516	57.25%
Fremont #1 (K-12)	\$ 84,794	\$ 18,460	\$ 103,254	76.07%
Fremont #2 (2 & 9-12)	\$ 9,063	\$ 746	\$ 9,809	88.92%
Fremont #14 (1-12)	\$ 19,600	\$ 4,083	\$ 23,683	100.00%
Fremont #25 (K-12)	\$ 139,008	\$ 26,781	\$ 165,789	85.48%
Fremont #38 (3-8)	\$ 5,404	\$ 1,475	\$ 6,879	100.00%
Goshen (9-12)	\$ 7,092	\$ 1,544	\$ 8,636	100.00%
Hot Springs (2-12)	\$ 16,051	\$ 5,013	\$ 21,064	88.24%
Johnson #1 (4-12)	\$ 51,059	\$ 10,986	\$ 62,045	90.31%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	\$ 603,050	\$ 122,759	\$ 725,809	74.20%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	\$ 64,493	\$ 13,987	\$ 78,480	90.27%
Lincoln #1 (1-12)	\$ 7,835	\$ 1,675	\$ 9,510	100.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	\$ 123,751	\$ 27,594	\$ 151,345	68.95%
Natrona #1 (K-12)	\$ 429,510	\$ 115,187	\$ 544,697	86.93%
Niobrara (3-8)	\$ 3,836	\$ 844	\$ 4,680	16.42%
Park #1 (K-5)	\$ 5,683	\$ 435	\$ 6,118	100.00%
Park #6 (K-12)	\$ 83,273	\$ 15,910	\$ 99,183	93.40%
Park #16 (K-8)	\$ 231	\$ 18	\$ 249	21.03%
Platte #1 (K-12)	\$ 33,808	\$ 8,725	\$ 42,533	90.05%
Platte #2 (K-6)	\$ 6,417	\$ 1,397	\$ 7,814	94.36%
Sheridan #1 (K-5)	\$ 6,905	\$ 1,121	\$ 8,026	59.89%
Sheridan #2 (1-12)	\$ 135,915	\$ 28,857	\$ 164,772	92.36%
Sublette #1 (3-5)	\$ 4,305	\$ 1,142	\$ 5,447	94.29%
Sublette #9 (1-4)	\$ 18,453	\$ 4,017	\$ 22,470	91.48%
#Sweetwater #1(K-12)	\$ 247,482	\$ 49,310	\$ 296,792	79.89%
Sweetwater #2 (1-12)	\$ 79,740	\$ 17,075	\$ 96,815	97.98%
Teton #1 (K-12)	\$ 167,725	\$ 29,615	\$ 197,340	100.00%
Uinta #1 (1-12)	\$ 167,488	\$ 50,590	\$ 218,078	99.22%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	\$ 10,613	\$ 2,198	\$ 12,811	100.00%
Uinta #6 (K-12)	\$ 20,035	\$ 4,646	\$ 24,681	67.33%
Washakie #1 (2-12)	\$ 40,001	\$ 8,329	\$ 48,330	51.37%
Weston #7 (K-5)	\$ 16,242	\$ 3,536	\$ 19,778	100.00%
Total (42):	\$ 3,151,837	\$ 696,047	\$ 3,847,884	81.67%

#Prior year ext day exp; SY11-12 data not available

Table 4: Bridges SY11-12 Extended Day Completion Data

District	# Students ID'd to Attend	# Students Enrolled	Math			
			Meeting ALL or SOME ILP Goals	Meeting All or SOME Goals	Meeting NO ILP Goals*	Meeting NO Goals
Albany #1 (K-9)	475	434	379	87.33%	55	12.67%
Big Horn #1 (2-12)	77	68	64	94.12%	4	5.88%
Big Horn #2 (6-12)	36	36	25	69.44%	11	30.56%
Big Horn #3 (1-5)	68	52	41	78.85%	11	21.15%
Big Horn #4 (5-8)	62	62	62	100.00%	0	0.00%
Campbell #1 (K-12)	1004	800	703	87.88%	97	12.13%
Carbon #1 (K-5)	403	192	92	47.92%	100	52.08%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	237	203	160	78.82%	43	21.18%
Converse #1 (1-12)	276	256	171	66.80%	85	33.20%
Converse #2 (4)	3	3	2	66.67%	1	33.33%
Crook (K-12)	229	195	192	98.46%	3	1.54%
Fremont #1 (K-12)	159	159	158	99.37%	1	0.63%
Fremont #2 (9-12)	15	14	14	100.00%	0	0.00%
Fremont #14 (1-12)	269	152	140	92.11%	12	7.89%
Fremont #25 (K-12)	356	211	170	80.57%	41	19.43%
Fremont #38 (3-8)	109	28	23	82.14%	5	17.86%
Goshen (9-12)	18	18	17	94.44%	1	5.56%
Hot Springs (2-12)	164	164	154	4.00%	10	6.10%
Johnson #1 (4-12)	101	101	99	98.02%	2	1.98%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	1531	1422	915	64.35%	616	43.32%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	185	185	185	100.00%	0	0.00%
Lincoln #1 (1-12)	40	40	40	100.00%	0	0.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	463	430	368	85.58%	62	14.42%
Natrona #1 (K-12)	1159	1159	856	73.86%	305	26.32%
Niobrara (3-8)	66	63	56	88.89%	7	11.11%
Park #1 (K-5)	38	36	33	91.67%	3	8.33%
Park #6 (K-12)	80	63	60	95.24%	3	4.76%
Park #16 (K-8)	20	17	17	100.00%	0	0.00%
Platte #1 (K-12)	130	130	97	74.62%	33	25.38%
Platte #2 (K-6)	38	32	32	100.00%	0	0.00%
Sheridan #1 (K-5)	118	118	115	97.46%	3	2.54%
Sheridan #2 (1-12)	1142	347	315	90.78%	32	9.22%
Sublette #1 (3-5)	26	26	26	100.00%	0	0.00%
Sublette #9 (1-4)	17	17	17	100.00%	0	0.00%
Sweetwater#1(K12)	69	69	53	76.81%	16	23.19%
Sweetwate #2(1-12)	222	156	145	92.95%	11	7.05%
Teton #1 (3-12)	321	273	238	87.18%	35	12.82%
Uinta #1 (1-12)	667	459	397	86.49%	62	13.51%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	84	69	67	97.10%	2	2.90%
Uinta #6 (K-12)	150	115	85	73.91%	20	17.39%
Washakie #1 (2-12)	211	211	208	98.58%	3	1.42%
Weston #7 (K-5)	48	48	48	100.00%	0	0.00%
Totals: (42)	10886	8633	7039	81.54%	1695	19.63%

*Includes students who did not complete

Table 5: Bridges SY11-12 Extended Day Completion Data

Language Arts

District	# Students ID'd to Attend	# Students Enrolled	Meeting ALL or SOME ILP Goals	Meeting All or SOME Goals	Meeting NO ILP Goals*	Meeting NO Goals
Albany #1 (K-9)	477	477	412	86.37%	65	13.63%
Big Horn #1 (K-12)	103	100	94	94.00%	6	6.00%
Big Horn #2 (6-12)	35	35	32	91.43%	3	8.57%
Big Horn #3 (K-5)	84	59	48	81.36%	11	18.64%
Big Horn #4 (5-8)	46	46	46	100.00%	0	0.00%
Campbell #1 (K-12)	1328	1122	1009	89.93%	113	10.07%
Carbon #1 (2)	76	4	4	100.00%	0	0.00%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	239	199	153	76.88%	46	23.12%
Converse #1 (1-12)	237	238	125	52.52%	0	0.00%
Converse #2 (1-6)	72	60	51	85.00%	9	15.00%
Crook (K-12)	239	219	206	94.06%	10	4.57%
Fremont #1 (K-12)	197	197	197	100.00%	0	0.00%
Fremont #2(2, 9-12)	12	12	12	100.00%	0	0.00%
Fremont #14 (1-12)	387	165	132	80.00%	33	20.00%
Fremont #25 (K-12)	359	254	194	76.38%	60	23.62%
Fremont #38 (3-8)	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Goshen (9-12)	6	6	4	66.67%	2	33.33%
Hot Springs (2-12)	204	204	193	94.61%	11	5.39%
Johnson #1 (4-12)	76	76	76	100.00%	0	0.00%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	1694	1484	1135	76.48%	349	23.52%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	185	185	185	100.00%	0	0.00%
Lincoln #1 (1-12)	51	51	51	100.00%	0	0.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	368	255	240	94.12%	15	5.88%
Natrona #1 (K-12)	1165	1165	871	74.76%	294	25.24%
Niobrara (3-8)	25	22	19	86.36%	3	13.64%
Park #1 (1-2)	10	10	9	90.00%	1	10.00%
Park #6 (K-12)	79	62	61	98.39%	1	1.61%
Park #16 (K-8)	20	17	17	100.00%	0	0.00%
Platte #1 (K-12)	90	90	61	67.78%	29	32.22%
Platte #2 (K-6)	40	35	35	100.00%	0	0.00%
Sheridan #1 (K-5)	118	118	115	97.46%	3	2.54%
Sheridan #2 (1-12)	1176	352	318	90.34%	34	9.66%
Sublette #1 (3-5)	26	26	26	100.00%	0	0.00%
Sublette #9 (1-4)	17	17	17	100.00%	0	0.00%
Sweetwater #1(K-12)	497	497	407	81.89%	90	18.11%
Sweetwater #2(1-12)	153	91	88	96.70%	3	3.30%
Teton #1 (K-12)	407	368	340	92.39%	28	7.61%
Uinta #1 (1-12)	711	516	436	84.50%	80	15.50%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	97	64	58	90.63%	6	9.38%
Uinta #6 (K-12)	163	127	98	77.17%	29	22.83%
Washakie #1 (2-12)	186	186	150	80.65%	36	19.35%
Weston #7 (K-5)	48	48	48	100.00%	0	0.00%
Totals: (42)	11503	9259	7773	83.95%	1370	14.80%

*Includes students who did not complete

Table 6: Extended Day Enrollment & Expenditure History

District	SY11-12 Enrollment	SY09-10 Enrollment	SY07-08 Enrollment	SY05-06 Enrollment	SY04-05 Enrollment
Albany #1	477	427	507	737	797
Big Horn #1	100	42	9		
Big Horn #2	36	29			
Big Horn #3	59	24			
Big Horn #4	62	9			
Campbell #1	1122	1111	679		443
Carbon #1	192	73			31
Carbon #2	203	119	79		6
Converse #1	256	151	213		77
Converse #2	60				
Crook #1	219	220	207	16	
Fremont #1	197	213	125	27	35
Fremont #2	14				
Fremont #14	165	242			
Fremont #25	254	262	399	179	
Fremont #38	28				
Goshen #1	18		90	112	
Hot Springs #1	204	173			
Johnson #1	101	80	123		
Laramie #1	1484	707	479		387
Laramie #2	185	190	176		
Lincoln #1	51	44	33		
Lincoln #2	430	110	182	192	128
Natrona #1	1165	936	753	552	435
Niobrara #1	63		33		
Park #1	36				124
Park #6	63	92	51	322	280
Park #16	17	21		9	
Platte #1	130	149	120		
Platte #2	35	16			
Sheridan #1	118				
Sheridan #2	352	242	241	408	298
Sublette #1	26	28	52		
Sublette #9	17				
Swtwter #1	497	442	97	22	14
Swtwter #2	156	116	152	144	248
Teton #1	368	169	133	72	53
Uinta #1	516	601	482	330	
Uinta #4	69	87	161		73
Uinta #6	127		88		
Washakie #1	211	283			
Weston #7	48	36			
# Students:	9931	7444	5664	3122	3429
# Districts:	42	33	26	15	16
Brdges Funds:	\$ 4,194,624	\$ 2,968,259	\$ 2,217,808	\$ 858,607	\$ 716,077
Total Funds:	\$ 4,711,594	\$ 4,077,982	\$ 3,045,338	\$ 980,484	\$ 846,683
Per Pupil:	\$ 474	\$ 548	\$ 538	\$ 314	\$ 247

Table 7: Estimated Ext Day or SS Repeaters

District	Percent attending prior year intervention programs
Albany #1 (K-12)	50.00%
Big Horn #1 (K-12)	85.00%
Big Horn #2 (6-12)	75.00%
Big Horn #3 (K-5)	67.00%
Big Horn #4 (5-8)	93.00%
Campbell #1 (K-12)	40.00%
Carbon #1 (K-5)	50.00%
Carbon #2 (K-12)	62.00%
Converse #1 (1-12)	42.00%
Converse #2 (1-6)	60.00%
Crook (K-12)	56.00%
Fremont #1 (K-12)	100.00%
Fremont #2 (2 & 9-12)	42.00%
Fremont #14 (1-12)	75.00%
Fremont #25 (K-12)	48.00%
Fremont #38 (3-8)	52.00%
Goshen (9-12)	60.00%
Hot Springs (2-12)	56.00%
Johnson #1 (4-12)	20.00%
Laramie #1 (K-12)	36.00%
Laramie #2 (K-6)	75.00%
Lincoln #1 (1-12)	80.00%
Lincoln #2 (1-12)	65.00%
Natrona #1 (K-12)	70.00%
Niobrara (3-8)	17.00%
Park #1 (K-5)	60.00%
Park #6 (K-12)	75.00%
Park #16 (K-8)	50.00%
Platte #1 (K-12)	37.00%
Platte #2 (K-6)	39.00%
Sheridan #1 (K-5)	100.00%
Sheridan #2 (1-12)	9.50%
Sublette #1 (3-5)	50.00%
Sublette #9 (1-4)	100.00%
Sweetwater #1 (K-12)	62.00%
Sweetwater #2 (1-12)	30.29%
Teton #1 (K-12)	48.00%
Uinta #1 (1-12)	85.00%
Uinta #4 (K-12)	85.00%
Uinta #6 (K-12)	37.00%
Washakie #1 (2-12)	7.82%
Weston #7 (K-5)	50.00%
Average:	57.18%

Results – Best Practice

For the second year, Laramie County School District #1 made available additional learning opportunities for two weeks over Christmas break to students who needed additional time to master standards or successfully complete first semester credits. The program was open to all secondary students within the district and held at East High School. It was well advertised, with articles in the district's school newspaper as well as local community newspapers.

Participating teachers were able to access information on students via the district's student data base (Pinnacle) and thus could see in which areas study and skill-building were needed or assignments were missing. Teachers assured students knew the fundamentals they needed to complete and understand assignments and concepts. The program was staffed nearly exclusively from certified teachers from East High school, the majority of whom were science, math and language arts teachers. Foster grandparents were also on site, as were peer tutors and GEARUP volunteers. In total, around 183 students took advantage of this break opportunity – 129 high school students and 54 junior high students. While most attended for only one or two days, a dozen students attended six or more sessions.

Cole Elementary School in Cheyenne makes sure learning always comes first. One way this is encouraged is by scheduling all sporting practices and events later in the day, at 5:30 rather than right after school ends. There is very high student participation and attendance in the building's vibrant after-school programs, both Bridges extended day, and 21st century learning.

Park County School District #6 continues to operate 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.

In order to assure students had ample support from accredited teachers after school hours, Albany County School District #1 negotiated contracts wherein some teachers start their school day later, thus extending the day by one or two hours so they are available to students later.

Some districts work very closely with the 21st century learning or other youth programs in their community to build wrap-around supports to students before or after an extended day learning time.

Result – Site Monitoring Visits

The Department has undertaken the monitoring of both summer and extended day programs over the past five years and is learning what models of successful programs look like. During the 2011-12 school year, Bridges staff visited extended day programs in Laramie County School District #1.

Six schools in the district were visited - four elementary and two secondary programs. Supplemental learning supports are available to students in all but two schools in the district. At this point the district does not approach extended day learning with a single effort, but rather schools develop their own programs based on the perceived need of their students. Schools present a proposal to the district for approval; funding is allocated based on student enrollment. (Please see best practices above for information on the district's Christmas break program and the approach one elementary school has taken to timing of activities within the school to encourage learning time is their primary emphasis.)

Through the efforts of a mature and disciplined Professional Learning Community (PLC), there is evidence of good communication among school principals about using common methodologies and Response to Intervention strategies, particularly at the elementary level. Use of common intervention programs is evident particularly in language arts, with nearly all elementary schools observed utilizing Lindamood-Bell, Successful Reader, Read Naturally, Leveled Learning Intervention, Read 180, or Clinical Language Intervention Program.

The district is embracing the effective use of student achievement data to identify students needing interventions, to target specific skills needing attention, and to monitor student growth. There is similar proficiency/performance screening for program eligibility among the schools. Assessment results are also used to group students across grade according to need so specific skills can be targeted.

Extended day instructors are hired through a competitive process within each school. The district has available many paraprofessionals who are also certified teachers, and extended day positions are filled with a broad array of teachers, paraprofessionals, and instructional facilitators who serve as tutors. Peer tutoring is also utilized in high school settings. The district is fortunate that staff seem ready and quite willing to dedicate the additional time needed to assure student success.

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 over time 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. Solicit the most creative, highly qualified teachers;
- 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;
- 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 rather than every day;
- Implement innovative programs by teachers to engage academically at-risk students;
- Partner with existent community (recreation and other) programs to supplement your extended-day academic focus, i.e., Boys & Girls Clubs, BOCES and 21st Century, Big Brothers/Big Sisters, a recreation district, etc;
- Provide fun hands-on enrichment opportunities for students after studies are completed. This helps students develop a curiosity and commitment to want to continue learning;
- Both teachers and students are quite tired at the end of a long school day, making learning time after school a challenge. This can be eased somewhat by holding before-school programs, Saturday sessions, or hiring extended-day staff who have not taught all day (retirees, tutors or teachers on a different schedule).
- Modify teacher contract requirements to begin days for some later in the morning and extend into after-school hours.

Recommendations to the Department

Districts have requested that the Department provide them with more guidance on what successful extended day programming is. They suggest doing this through conference opportunities where successful program information can be shared with each another. The Department has made these types of conferences available in the past and they have been well received.

In some districts, the focus of extended-day programs has narrowed to support student homework and completion of assignments, while other districts use this time to concentrate on specific learning strategies. Originally the grant required sixty hours of individual student participation in order that this concentrated instruction could be delivered so that content and performance standards could be mastered. It is suggested the Department reconvene the Bridges Design Team to discuss this and other issues surrounding extended day learning such as the use of Individual Learning Plans, to identify more clearly how these programs can help support Wyoming students.

Recommendations to Policymakers – Extended-Day Intervention Programs

Districts continue to express their appreciation of the availability of Bridges funds to provide summer and extended day learning opportunities for students. They see these funds supporting programs that can personalize instruction for students and strengthen their skills and knowledge by addressing individual needs in a timely manner. Districts appreciate the legislature's continued policy of maintaining the administration 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 as part of the Wyoming Department of Education's budget process.