

**KIDS ON COURSE SUMMER UNIVERSITY
DEMOGRAPHICS, ATTENDANCE, AND
ACADEMICS**

Summer 2016

DRAFT

Prepared by the National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice
University of Iowa

January 2017

Summary of Findings

This report presents data on student demographics, attendance, and academic performance before and after participation in Kids on Course Summer University. Data were gathered by program staff and analyzed by researchers at the University of Iowa. Students who attended fewer than five days were omitted from the analysis. **This report is based on data provided for 582 students who participated in the program during summer 2016.**

Demographic information gathered includes race (black, white, Asian/Pacific Islander, mixed race), ethnicity (Hispanic), gender, translation needs, and special services including English language learning education, individualized education program (IEP) participation, and free and reduced lunch participation. The majority of Kids on Course participants were white, non-Hispanic, free and reduced lunch program participants, although some schools exhibit greater diversity in race and ethnicity.

The program also collected information about student daily program attendance, parent night attendance, and program transportation needs. The average student attended 25.88 of 30 program days (with a standard deviation of 4.8). Parent night attendance fell short of the 20% goal established by the program (16.7% of parents attended). Transportation provided by the program was utilized by 39.2% of students.

Finally, academic performance was assessed with the following measures, as outlined in the program goals: percentage of students increasing reading scores, percentage of students increasing scores or losing fewer than 8 reading points, percentage of students not increasing scores who lost fewer than 8 points, and percentage of students increasing math skills. Change in the percentage of students meeting benchmark scores was also assessed. **In aggregate, Kids on Course met or exceeded all academic goals: 59.6% of Kids on Course students increased their reading scores from spring to fall, exceeding the 40% goal; 89% of students either increased their reading scores or lost fewer than 8 reading points, exceeding the 70% goal; and 72.7% of students who did not increase reading scores lost fewer than 8 points, exceeding the 30% goal. With regard to math, 76.6% of students increased their math scores during their participation in the summer program, exceeding the 70% goal.** The increase in benchmark scores from spring to fall also indicates that the program increased academic performance or minimized summer slide in the majority of students.

In addition to examining demographic, attendance, and academic data in the aggregate, we also provide school and grade-specific data in this report. These data reveal where academic performance did not achieve the desired goals, and can be used to pinpoint areas for improvement. In this report, “school” refers to the school that the student attended for KCU, not the student’s home school.

Student Demographics

Kids on Course Summer University participants were primarily white (61.6%), non-Hispanic (85.5%), and participated in the free and reduced lunch program (82.8%), although these results differ somewhat by school. At Cleveland and Grant Wood, there were almost as many black students as white students (45.1% black / 46.1% white and 41.3% black / 47.9% white, respectively); at Harrison, 23.8% of students were Hispanic.

Over 16% of students had a need for translation services and English language (ELL) education. Kids on Course students with these needs were most likely to speak Spanish (46 students) or Swahili (14

students). Students from Cleveland and Harrison were most likely to need translation and ELL services (44.1% needed translation and 25.2% needed ELL at Cleveland, while 36.5% needed translation and 24.6% needed ELL at Harrison). No Grant Wood students needed either service.

All Schools											
Grade	Race				Ethnicity*	Gender		Translation	Special Services		
	Black	White	Asian/Pacific Islander	Mixed Race	Hispanic/Latino	Female	Male	Translation Needed*	ELL	IEP	F/R
All Grades (N=582)	164 (33.7%)	300 (61.6%)	4 (0.8%)	19 (3.9%)	74 (14.5%)	268 (46.7%)	306 (53.3%)	71 (16.2%)	90 (16.4%)	137 (24.8%)	352 (82.8%)
1 (N=85)	30 (46.2%)	34 (52.3%)	0 (-)	1 (1.5%)	17 (26.2%)	39 (47.0%)	44 (53.0%)	8 (9.4%)	7 (10.0%)	16 (20.5%)	58 (80.6%)
2 (N=130)	35 (30.2%)	74 (63.8%)	1 (0.9%)	6 (5.2%)	12 (10.6%)	61 (47.7%)	67 (52.3%)	10 (7.7%)	18 (14.4%)	21 (16.9%)	102 (85.7%)
3 (N=143)	37 (32.2%)	76 (66.1%)	1 (0.9%)	1 (0.9%)	14 (10.9%)	53 (37.3%)	89 (62.7%)	20 (14.0%)	28 (20.1%)	35 (25.2%)	111 (85.4%)
4 (N=126)	32 (25.8%)	81 (65.3%)	1 (0.8%)	10 (8.1%)	16 (12.9%)	61 (48.8%)	64 (51.2%)	19 (15.1%)	20 (15.9%)	36 (28.8%)	15 (83.3%)
5 (N=98)	30 (44.8%)	35 (52.2%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	15 (18.5%)	54 (56.3%)	42 (43.8%)	14 (14.3%)	17 (19.1%)	29 (33.3%)	66 (76.7%)

*Some classes categorized Hispanic students as a race rather than as ethnicity; as such, the school-specific demographic tables that follow include Hispanic as both a race and ethnicity category.

Cleveland												
Grade	Race					Ethnicity	Gender		Translation	Special Services		
	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Female	Male	Translation Needed*	ELL	IEP	F/R
All Grades (N=106)	46 (45.1%)	47 (46.1%)	4 (3.9%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (4.0%)	12 (11.8%)	45 (45.0%)	55 (55.0%)	15 (44.1%)	26 (25.2%)	23 (22.3%)	65 (83.3%)
1 (N=21)	13 (61.9%)	7 (33.3%)	1 (4.8%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	8 (38.1%)	8 (38.1%)	13 (61.9%)	3 (14.3%)	1 (4.8%)	4 (19.0%)	18 (85.7%)
2 (N=16)	4 (25.0%)	11 (68.8%)	1 (6.3%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	7 (50.0%)	7 (50.0%)	1 (6.3%)	5 (31.3%)	2 (12.5%)	14 (87.5%)
3 (N=26)	12 (48.0%)	10 (40.0%)	2 (8.0%)	1 (4.0%)	0 (-)	2 (8.0%)	9 (36.0%)	16 (64.0%)	4 (15.4%)	10 (40.0%)	9 (36.0%)	20 (80.0%)
4 (N=25)	8 (33.3%)	12 (50.0%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	4 (16.7%)	2 (8.3%)	13 (54.2%)	11 (45.8%)	5 (20.0%)	6 (24.0%)	5 (20.0%)	-
5 (N=18)	9 (56.3%)	7 (43.8%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	8 (50.0%)	8 (50.0%)	2 (11.1%)	4 (25.0%)	3 (18.8%)	13 (81.3%)

Garfield												
Grade	Race					Ethnicity	Gender		Translation	Special Services		
	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Female	Male	Translation Needed*	ELL	IEP	F/R
All Grades (N=100)	28 (28.3%)	63 (63.6%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	8 (8.0%)	13 (13.0%)	46 (46.0%)	54 (54.0%)	12 (12.8%)	14 (14.0%)	29 (29.0%)	62 (75.6%)
1 (N=14)	5 (35.7%)	9 (64.3%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (14.3%)	7 (50.0%)	7 (50.0%)	1 (7.1%)	1 (7.1%)	5 (35.7%)	11 (78.6%)
2 (N=28)	7 (25.0%)	19 (67.9%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (7.1%)	3 (10.7%)	12 (42.9%)	16 (57.1%)	3 (10.7%)	4 (14.3%)	5 (17.9%)	23 (82.1%)
3 (N=25)	7 (29.2%)	16 (66.7%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (4.2%)	1 (4.0%)	14 (56.0%)	11 (44.0%)	1 (4.0%)	2 (8.0%)	8 (32.0%)	20 (80.0%)
4 (N=17)	5 (29.4%)	8 (47.1%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	6 (35.3%)	11 (64.7%)	5 (29.4%)	5 (29.4%)	6 (35.3%)	-
5 (N=16)	4 (25.0%)	11 (68.8%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (6.3%)	3 (18.8%)	7 (43.8%)	9 (56.3%)	2 (12.5%)	2 (12.5%)	5 (31.3%)	8 (53.3%)

Grant Wood												
Grade	Race					Ethnicity	Gender		Translation	Special Services		
	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Female	Male	Translation Needed*	ELL	IEP	F/R
All Grades (N=135)	50 (41.3%)	58 (47.9%)	9 (7.4%)	0 (-)	4 (3.3%)	9 (8.0%)	58 (43.6%)	75 (56.4%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	30 (25.0%)	78 (85.7%)
1 (N=20)	6 (46.2%)	4 (30.8%)	2 (15.4%)	0 (-)	1 (7.7%)	2 (28.6%)	8 (44.4%)	10 (55.6%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (7.7%)	12 (92.3%)
2 (N=38)	18 (48.6%)	16 (43.2%)	2 (5.4%)	0 (-)	1 (2.9%)	2 (5.9%)	16 (42.1%)	22 (57.9%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	4 (11.8%)	30 (88.2%)
3 (N=31)	7 (24.1%)	20 (69.0%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (6.9%)	8 (25.8%)	23 (74.2%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	3 (10.3%)	25 (89.3%)
4 (N=28)	11 (40.7%)	14 (51.9%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (7.4%)	0 (-)	14 (50.0%)	14 (50.0%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	12 (42.9%)	-
5 (N=18)	8 (53.3%)	4 (26.7%)	3 (20.0%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	3 (18.8%)	12 (66.7%)	6 (33.3%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	10 (62.5%)	11 (68.8%)

Harrison												
Grade	Race					Ethnicity	Gender		Translation	Special Services		
	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Female	Male	Translation Needed*	ELL	IEP	F/R
All Grades (N=139)	20 (15.4%)	77 (59.2%)	22 (16.9%)	1 (0.8%)	10 (7.7%)	29 (23.8%)	66 (47.5%)	73 (52.5%)	27 (36.5%)	32 (24.6%)	28 (21.7%)	81 (82.7%)
1 (N=19)	5 (26.3%)	11 (57.9%)	3 (15.8%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	3 (15.8%)	11 (57.9%)	8 (42.1%)	3 (15.8%)	4 (21.1%)	2 (10.5%)	9 (69.2%)
2 (N=35)	5 (14.7%)	21 (61.8%)	5 (14.7%)	0 (-)	3 (8.8%)	5 (19.2%)	19 (54.3%)	16 (45.7%)	5 (14.3%)	8 (23.5%)	8 (23.5%)	24 (82.8%)
3 (N=34)	7 (21.2%)	18 (54.5%)	8 (24.2%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	9 (27.3%)	10 (29.4%)	24 (70.6%)	8 (23.5%)	9 (27.3%)	8 (24.2%)	22 (88.0%)
4 (N=31)	2 (6.5%)	22 (71.0%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	7 (22.6%)	6 (19.4%)	17 (54.8%)	14 (45.2%)	5 (16.1%)	5 (16.1%)	6 (20.0%)	15 (83.3%)
5 (N=20)	1 (7.7%)	5 (38.5%)	6 (46.2%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (-)	6 (46.2%)	9 (45.0%)	11 (55.0%)	6 (30.0%)	6 (46.2%)	4 (30.8%)	11 (84.6%)

Hiawatha												
Grade	Race					Ethnicity	Gender		Translation	Special Services		
	Black	White	Hispanic	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mixed Race	Hispanic/ Latino	Female	Male	Translation Needed*	ELL	IEP	F/R
All Grades (N=102)	19 (26.8%)	40 (56.3%)	1 (1.4%)	2 (2.8%)	9 (12.6%)	7 (9.7%)	53 (52.0%)	49 (48.0%)	17 (17.0%)	18 (17.6%)	27 (26.7%)	66 (86.8%)
1 (N=11)	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (25.0%)	5 (45.5%)	6 (54.5%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (36.4%)	8 (72.7%)
2 (N=13)	1 (11.1%)	7 (77.8%)	0 (-)	1 (11.1%)	0 (-)	1 (11.1%)	7 (53.8%)	6 (46.2%)	1 (7.7%)	1 (7.7%)	2 (16.7%)	11 (91.7%)
3 (N=27)	4 (25.0%)	12 (75.0%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	12 (44.4%)	15 (55.6%)	7 (25.9%)	7 (25.9%)	7 (25.9%)	24 (88.9%)
4 (N=25)	5 (20.0%)	10 (40.0%)	0 (-)	1 (4.0%)	9 (36.0%)	4 (16.0%)	11 (44.0%)	14 (56.0%)	4 (16.0%)	4 (16.0%)	7 (28.0%)	-
5 (N=26)	8 (47.1%)	8 (47.1%)	1 (5.9%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (5.6%)	18 (69.2%)	8 (30.8%)	4 (15.4%)	5 (19.2%)	7 (26.9%)	23 (88.5%)

Translation Needs by School and Grade						
School	Grade	Language				
		Spanish	Swahili	French	Nepali	Mandingo
Aggregate	All	46	14	3	6	2
	1 st	5	1	2	-	-
	2 nd	6	3	-	-	1
	3 rd	13	5	-	2	-
	4 th	13	3	1	1	1
	5 th	9	2	-	3	-
Cleveland	All	2	10	3	-	-
	1 st	-	1	2	-	-
	2 nd	-	1	-	-	-
	3 rd	-	4	-	-	-
	4 th	2	2	1	-	-
	5 th	-	2	-	-	-
Garfield	All	7	3	-	-	2
	1 st	1	-	-	-	-
	2 nd	1	1	-	-	1
	3 rd	-	1	-	-	-
	4 th	3	1	-	-	1
	5 th	2	-	-	-	-
Grant Wood	All	-	-	-	-	-
	1 st -5 th	-	-	-	-	-
Harrison	All	26	1	-	-	-
	1 st	3	-	-	-	-
	2 nd	4	1	-	-	-
	3 rd	8	-	-	-	-
	4 th	5	-	-	-	-
	5 th	6	-	-	-	-
Hiawatha	All	11	-	-	6	-
	1 st	1	-	-	-	-
	2 nd	1	-	-	-	-
	3 rd	5	-	-	2	-
	4 th	3	-	-	1	-
	5 th	1	-	-	3	-

Program Attendance, Parent Night, and Transportation

Kids on Course students attended an average of 25.88 of 30 program days. When divided into quintiles, the majority of students (70.1% in aggregate) attended 26 or more days of class. Ninety-two students (16.2%) had perfect attendance of 30 days. Statistical examination showed that the average attendance was lower in Cleveland compared with Garfield or Hiawatha; there were no differences in attendance according to grade level.

Overall 16.7% of parents attended the parent night, short of the 20% goal set by the program. Parents from Garfield and Harrison were most likely to attend (29.0% and 29.5% of parents, respectively); two parents from Hiawatha attended.

Overall, 39.2% of students utilized Kids on Course transportation assistance. Students from Harrison and Hiawatha were most likely to utilize transportation (59.0% and 57.8%, respectively).

Aggregate									
Grade	Attendance							Parent Night	Transportation
	Mean Number of Days Attended	Std. Deviation of Days Attended	Present 5 to 10 Days	Present 11 to 15 Days	Present 16 to 20 Days	Present 21 to 25 Days	Present 26 to 30 Days	Number of Parents Attending Parent Night (%)	Number of Students Utilizing KCU Transportation (%)
All Grades	25.88	4.822	11 (1.9%)	21 (3.7%)	37 (6.5%)	100 (17.7%)	397 (70.1%)	97 (16.7%)	228 (39.2%)
1 st	25.45	5.660	2 (2.4%)	7 (8.2%)	5 (5.9%)	10 (11.8%)	61 (71.8%)	17 (20.0%)	34 (40.0%)
2 nd	26.11	4.873	2 (1.6%)	5 (4.0%)	9 (7.2%)	17 (13.6%)	92 (73.6%)	27 (20.8%)	47 (36.2%)
3 rd	26.26	3.843	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.4%)	11 (7.9%)	25 (17.9%)	101 (72.1%)	25 (17.5%)	57 (39.9%)
4 th	25.85	5.234	5 (4.1%)	3 (2.4%)	4 (3.3%)	27 (22.0%)	84 (68.3%)	18 (14.3%)	50 (39.7%)
5 th	25.45	4.719	1 (1.1%)	4 (4.3%)	8 (8.6%)	21 (22.6%)	59 (63.4%)	10 (10.2%)	40 (40.8%)

Cleveland									
Grade	Attendance							Parent Night	Transportation
	Mean Number of Days	Std. Deviation of Days Attended	Present 5 to 10 Days	Present 11 to 15 Days	Present 16 to 20 Days	Present 21 to 25 Days	Present 26 to 30 Days	Number of Parents Attending Parent Night (%)	Number of Students Utilizing KCU Transportation (%)
All Grades	24.97	6.489	7 (6.6%)	7 (6.6%)	4 (3.8%)	14 (13.2%)	74 (69.8%)	12 (11.3%)	27 (25.5%)
1 st	23.86	7.532	2 (9.5%)	2 (9.5%)	1 (4.8%)	3 (14.3%)	13 (61.9%)	3 (14.3%)	5 (23.8%)
2 nd	27.56	4.351	0 (-)	1 (6.3%)	0 (-)	0 (-)	15 (93.8%)	2 (12.5%)	5 (31.3%)
3 rd	24.92	5.268	1 (3.8%)	1 (3.8%)	3 (11.5%)	5 (19.2%)	16 (61.5%)	2 (7.7%)	7 (26.9%)
4 th	23.92	7.444	3 (12.0%)	1 (4.0%)	0 (-)	5 (20.0%)	16 (64.0%)	2 (8.0%)	7 (28.0%)
5 th	25.50	6.913	1 (5.6%)	2 (11.1%)	0 (-)	1 (5.6%)	14 (77.8%)	3 (16.7%)	3 (16.7%)

Garfield									
Grade	Attendance							Parent Night	Transportation
	Mean Number of Days	Std. Deviation of Days Attended	Present 5 to 10 Days	Present 11 to 15 Days	Present 16 to 20 Days	Present 21 to 25 Days	Present 26 to 30 Days	Number of Parents Attending Parent Night (%)	Number of Students Utilizing KCU Transportation (%)
All Grades	26.97	2.634	0 (-)	0 (-)	5 (5.0%)	17 (17.0%)	78 (78.0%)	29 (29.0%)	29 (29.0%)
1 st	27.29	2.054	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (14.3%)	12 (85.7%)	4 (28.6%)	4 (28.6%)
2 nd	27.36	2.921	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (7.1%)	4 (14.3%)	22 (78.6%)	8 (28.6%)	6 (21.4%)
3 rd	26.80	2.723	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (8.0%)	3 (12.0%)	20 (80.0%)	11 (44.0%)	5 (20.0%)
4 th	27.29	2.173	0 (-)	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (11.8%)	15 (88.2%)	4 (23.5%)	8 (47.1%)
5 th	25.94	2.863	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (6.3%)	6 (37.5%)	9 (56.3%)	2 (12.5%)	6 (37.5%)

Grant Wood									
Grade	Attendance							Parent Night	Transportation
	Mean Number of Days Attended	Std. Deviation of Days Attended	Present 5 to 10 Days	Present 11 to 15 Days	Present 16 to 20 Days	Present 21 to 25 Days	Present 26 to 30 Days	Number of Parents Attending Parent Night (%)	Number of Students Utilizing KCU Transportation (%)
All Grades	25.44	4.884	1 (0.8%)	7 (5.6%)	10 (8.1%)	25 (20.2%)	81 (65.3%)	13 (9.6%)	31 (23.0%)
1 st	23.70	6.449	0 (-)	4 (20.0%)	2 (10.0%)	0 (-)	14 (70.0%)	3 (15.0%)	8 (40.0%)
2 nd	26.24	4.039	0 (-)	1 (3.0%)	2 (6.1%)	7 (21.2%)	23 (69.7%)	6 (15.8%)	7 (18.4%)
3 rd	25.79	4.095	0 (-)	1 (3.6%)	2 (7.1%)	7 (25.0%)	18 (64.3%)	2 (6.5%)	6 (19.4%)
4 th	25.07	5.240	1 (3.7%)	0 (-)	3 (11.1%)	8 (29.6%)	15 (55.6%)	1 (3.6%)	6 (21.4%)
5 th	25.94	4.919	0 (-)	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)	3 (18.8%)	11 (68.8%)	1 (5.6%)	4 (22.2%)

Harrison									
Grade	Attendance						Parent Night	Transportation	
	Mean Number of Days Attended	Std. Deviation of Days Attended	Present 5 to 10 Days	Present 11 to 15 Days	Present 16 to 20 Days	Present 21 to 25 Days	Present 26 to 30 Days	Number of Parents Attending Parent Night (%)	Number of Students Utilizing KCU Transportation (%)
All Grades	25.45	5.248	3 (2.2%)	6 (4.5%)	12 (9.0%)	26 (19.4%)	87 (64.9%)	41 (29.5%)	82 (59.0%)
1 st	26.47	4.575	0 (-)	1 (5.3%)	1 (5.3%)	4 (21.1%)	13 (68.4%)	7 (36.8%)	12 (63.2%)
2 nd	23.80	6.610	2 (5.7%)	3 (8.6%)	4 (11.4%)	5 (14.3%)	21 (60.0%)	9 (25.7%)	21 (60.0%)
3 rd	26.68	3.772	0 (-)	0 (-)	3 (8.8%)	5 (14.7%)	26 (76.5%)	10 (29.4%)	22 (64.7%)
4 th	26.31	4.979	1 (3.4%)	1 (3.4%)	0 (-)	8 (27.6%)	19 (65.5%)	11 (35.5%)	15 (48.4%)
5 th	23.76	5.007	0 (-)	1 (5.9%)	4 (23.5%)	4 (23.5%)	8 (47.1%)	4 (20.0%)	12 (60.0%)

Hiawatha									
Grade	Attendance						Parent Night	Transportation	
	Mean Number of Days Attended	Std. Deviation of Days Attended	Present 5 to 10 Days	Present 11 to 15 Days	Present 16 to 20 Days	Present 21 to 25 Days	Present 26 to 30 Days	Number of Parents Attending Parent Night (%)	Number of Student Utilizing KCU Transportation (%)
All Grades	26.87	3.266	0 (-)	1 (1.0%)	6 (5.9%)	18 (17.6%)	77 (75.5%)	2 (2.0%)	59 (57.8%)
1 st	27.55	3.236	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	9 (81.8%)	0 (-)	5 (45.5%)
2 nd	27.54	3.307	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (7.7%)	1 (7.7%)	11 (84.6%)	2 (15.4%)	8 (61.5%)
3 rd	27.00	2.617	0 (-)	0 (-)	1 (3.7%)	5 (18.5%)	21 (77.8%)	0 (-)	17 (63.0%)
4 th	27.08	3.763	0 (-)	1 (4.0%)	1 (4.0%)	4 (16.0%)	19 (76.0%)	0 (-)	14 (56.0%)
5 th	25.92	3.393	0 (-)	0 (-)	2 (7.7%)	7 (26.9%)	17 (65.4%)	0 (-)	15 (57.7%)

Student Academic Performance

Academic performance was assessed with the following measures, as outlined in the program goals: percentage of students increasing reading scores, percentage of students increasing scores or losing fewer than 8 aReading points, percentage of students not increasing scores who lost fewer than 8 points, and percentage of students increasing math skills. Change in the percentage of students meeting benchmark reading scores was also assessed. All grades utilized aReading scores with the exception of 1st graders, who utilized composite reading scores.

Reading

Overall, 59.6% of Kids on Course students increased their reading scores from spring to fall, exceeding the 40% goal; 89% of students either increased their reading scores or lost fewer than 8 reading points, exceeding the 70% goal; and 72.7% of students who did not increase reading scores lost fewer than 8 points, exceeding the 30% goal. All classes witnessed increases in reading scores that met or exceeded the 40% goal except Grant Wood and Hiawatha 1st graders. All classes met or exceeded the 70% goal (of increasing reading scores or losing fewer than 8 points) except Garfield 4th graders and Harrison 2nd graders. All classes met or exceeded the 30% goal (among students who did not increase reading scores, lose fewer than 8 points) except Harrison 2nd graders, Grant Wood 5th graders and Garfield 4th graders (note that Grant Wood and Garfield's numbers are based on low scores of 1 and 2 students, respectively).

Reading benchmarks

In aggregate, all grades increased the percentage of students meeting benchmark scores from spring to fall. All individual grades increased the percentage of student meeting benchmark scores from spring to fall except Grant Wood 1st and 2nd grade classes and Harrison 3rd grade.

Math

Overall, 76.6% of students increased their math scores from spring to fall, exceeding the 70% goal. No Cleveland classes met the 70% growth goal this year; and 1st graders on the aggregate level and at Garfield, Grant Wood, and Harrison did not meet the math goal this year. Hiawatha 2nd graders also did not meet the goal.

In the following tables, classes which did not meet or exceed each goal are marked with (N).

Aggregate					
Grade	Reading				Math
	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores or Losing Fewer Than 8 Points	Percentage of Students Not Increasing Scores Who Lost Fewer Than 8 Points	Change in Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark Scores (Fall - Spring)	Percentage of Students Increasing Skills
All Grades	59.6%	89.0%	72.7%	12.4% (22.1% Fall –9.7% Spring)	76.6%
1 st	42.4%	N/A	N/A	8.3% (29.9% Fall –21.6% Spring)	62.2% (N)
2 nd	62.5%	85.4%	61.1%	15.3% (24.7% Fall –9.4% Spring)	81.4%
3 rd	52.8%	87.0%	72.5%	8.1% (16.7% Fall –8.6% Spring)	78.6%
4 th	66.7%	86.7%	60.1%	13.7% (22.0% Fall –8.3% Spring)	N/A
5 th	70.6%	90.6%	68.0%	16.7% (20.9% Fall –4.2% Spring)	79.5%
Cleveland					
Grade	Reading				Math
	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores or Losing Fewer Than 8 Points	Percentage of Students Not Increasing Scores Who Lost Fewer Than 8 Points	Change in Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark Scores (Fall - Spring)	Percentage of Students Increasing Skills
All Grades	65.9%	93.6%	81.5%	18.1% (22.4% Fall –4.3% Spring)	62.7% (N)
1 st	70.0%	N/A	N/A	26.2% (44.4% Fall –18.2% Spring)	62.5% (N)
2 nd	81.3%	100.0%	100.0%	25.0% (25.0% Fall –0.0% Spring)	64.3% (N)
3 rd	52.2%	87.0%	72.7%	8.3% (8.3% Fall –0.0% Spring)	59.1% (N)
4 th	77.3%	95.4%	80.0%	21.8% (26.1% Fall –4.3% Spring)	N/A
5 th	52.9%	94.1%	87.5%	5.9% (11.8% Fall –5.9% Spring)	66.7% (N)

Garfield					
Grade	Reading				Math
	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores or Losing Fewer Than 8 Points	Percentage of Students Not Increasing Scores Who Lost Fewer Than 8 Points	Change in Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark Scores (Fall - Spring)	Percentage of Students Increasing Skills
All Grades	56.8%	81.0%	54.4%	17.6% (32.6% Fall –15.0% Spring)	82.7%
1 st	45.5%	N/A	N/A	5.9% (27.3% Fall –21.4% Spring)	64.3% (N)
2 nd	59.3%	85.2%	63.6%	26.4% (40.7% Fall –14.3% Spring)	89.3%
3 rd	60.0%	88.0%	70.0%	20.0% (40.0% Fall –20.0% Spring)	79.2%
4 th	50.0%	62.5% (N)	25.0% (n=2 students) (N)	7.0% (18.8% Fall –11.8% Spring)	N/A
5 th	62.5%	81.2%	50.0%	18.7% (25.0% Fall –6.3% Spring)	93.3%

Grant Wood					
Grade	Reading				Math
	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores or Losing Fewer Than 8 Points	Percentage of Students Not Increasing Scores Who Lost Fewer Than 8 Points	Change in Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark Scores (Fall - Spring)	Percentage of Students Increasing Skills
All Grades	58.2%	89.4%	70.0%	2.0% (12.9% Fall –10.9% Spring)	76.4%
1 st	15.4% (N)	N/A	N/A	-23.9% (7.7% Fall –31.6% Spring)	62.5% (N)
2 nd	47.4%	84.2%	70.0%	-5.5% (5.3% Fall -10.8% Spring)	77.4%
3 rd	58.6%	93.1%	83.3%	9.2% (16.1% Fall –6.9% Spring)	84.6%
4 th	69.6%	87.0%	57.1%	1.3% (8.7% Fall –7.4% Spring)	N/A
5 th	92.9%	92.9%	0.0% (n=1) (N)	26.7% (26.7% Fall –0.0% Spring)	75.0%
Harrison					
Grade	Reading				Math
	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores or Losing Fewer Than 8 Points	Percentage of Students Not Increasing Scores Who Lost Fewer Than 8 Points	Change in Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark Scores (Fall - Spring)	Percentage of Students Increasing Skills
All Grades	63.3%	79.5%	37.7%	11.6% (22.0% Fall –10.4% Spring)	78.9%
1 st	47.1%	N/A	N/A	9.0% (35.3% Fall –26.3% Spring)	47.1% (N)
2 nd	63.6%	68.2% (N)	12.6% (N)	10.1% (13.0% Fall -2.9% Spring)	96.3%
3 rd	52.4%	76.2%	50.0%	-2.6% (9.5% Fall –12.1% Spring)	78.1%
4 th	75.0%	87.5%	50.0%	27.2% (37.5% Fall –10.3% Spring)	N/A
5 th	85.7%	92.9%	50.0%	16.4% (21.4% Fall –5.0% Spring)	85.7%

Hiawatha					
Grade	Reading				Math
	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores	Percentage of Students Increasing Scores or Losing Fewer Than 8 Points	Percentage of Students Not Increasing Scores Who Lost Fewer Than 8 Points	Change in Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark Scores (Fall - Spring)	Percentage of Students Increasing Skills
All Grades	53.7%	93.9%	86.8%	13.8% (20.7% Fall –6.9% Spring)	79.7%
1 st	37.5% (N)	N/A	N/A	25.0% (25.0% Fall –0.0% Spring)	81.8%
2 nd	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	18.6% (41.7% Fall –23.1% Spring)	61.5% (N)
3 rd	40.0%	88.0%	80.0%	4.3% (8.0% Fall –3.7% Spring)	88.9%
4 th	53.8%	100.0%	100.0%	15.1% (23.1% Fall –8.0% Spring)	N/A
5 th	66.7%	91.7%	75.0%	17.0% (20.8% Fall –3.8% Spring)	78.3%

Factors related to academic improvement

We examined improvement in reading and math in relation to a number of different factors at the aggregate level. For this analysis, we used improvement in reading, meeting the fall reading benchmark, and change in math scores as the three outcomes of interest.

With regard to demographic characteristics, there were no differences in any of these outcome measures by Hispanic ethnicity, gender, or free/reduced lunch recipients.

Black students were less likely to increase their reading scores from spring to fall, but there were no differences in terms of meeting the fall benchmarks or in math scores.

English language learners, students who needed translation assistance, and students who received transportation assistance were less likely to achieve the fall reading benchmark, though they did not differ on the other outcomes. Students with IEPs demonstrated a lower likelihood of achieving the fall reading benchmark and demonstrated less improvement in math than students without an IEP.

We also examined outcomes in relation to attendance at KCJ, but found little relationship between attendance and academic improvement. Students who improved their reading scores from spring to fall had a slightly higher (but statistically significant) average attendance of 26.6 days compared with 25.4 days for students whose reading scores did not improve at all. However, having perfect attendance (all 30 days) was not related to any differences in outcomes. We also examined attendance in terms of quintiles, but levels of attendance was also not substantially related to academic improvement.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from the first Kids on Course Summer University, we offer the following recommendations:

1. We suggest using consistent classifications for race and ethnicity across all schools in the future. This will minimize confusion and enable a clearer examination of racial and ethnic differences in outcomes in future years.
2. Parent night participation fell short of the target goal of 20%. Involving parents as stakeholders in planning these activities, increasing communication with parents, and advertising these activities with sufficient advance notice (and possibly transportation assistance) might help to generate more interest in the future.
3. Overall the outcomes for academic improvement were impressive. The detailed data by school and grade indicates where individual school/grades fell short of the target goals. A review of the math curriculum, particularly for the 1st grade, might be useful, since 4 of the 5 school did not meet the target.

At Cleveland, no grades met the target goal for math; a review of the math program at Cleveland is recommended.

4. Project management should consider extending the number of days for the Kids on Course Summer University in future years. The state evaluation report will require that KCU report data for both “regular” attendees and “all” attendees, with regular attendance being considered 30 days. For KCU summer of 2016, the program was 30 days long, which means that regular attendees were those with perfect attendance-- 16% of the students. Extending the program by a few more days may alleviate this problem somewhat.

5. We recommend further consideration of the factors found to be related to academic achievement. Black students were less likely to improve their reading scores. English language learners, students who needed translation assistance, students who received transportation assistance, and students with IEPs were less likely to achieve the fall reading benchmark. Students with IEPs also demonstrated less improvement in math. The program might consider whether modifications are needed to reduce disparate outcomes in the future.