

Local Evaluation for *Grantee Name*
Iowa 21st CCLC for 2017-2018

Overview

To assist grantees with meeting the local evaluation requirements, the Iowa DOE provides a standardized form for local evaluations of the 21st CCLC Programs. Each grantee is required to complete the local evaluation form with data from the previous school year. Each grantee must submit **ONE** evaluation that encompasses all centers funded by the grantee. Cohorts 8-12 are to be included for reporting data for the 2017-2018 school year. Reported data will be from the Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2018. Data will also be reported for the Summer of 2017. The table below lists the eight required sections of the local evaluation. Each section includes a checklist of required items to include. The completed form should be saved with the filename <**Grantee Name** 21st CCLC Local Evaluation Form 2017-2018>. The form must be completed and submitted in Word format. *(Note: Instructions for clarifications are shown in RED.)*

Required Section	Complete?
1. General Information	X
2. Introduction/Executive Summary	X
3. Demographic Data	X
4. GPRA Measures	X
5. Local Objectives	X
6. Anecdotal Data	X
7. Sustainability Plans	X
8. Summary and Recommendations	X

1. General Information

General Information Required Elements	Complete?
Basic Information Table	X
Center Information Table	X

Basic Information Table	
Item	Information
Date Form Submitted	11/29/18
Grantee Name	Cedar Rapids CSD
Program Director Name	Amy Evans
Program Director E-mail	AmEvans@cr.k12.ia.us
Program Director Phone	319-560-5816
Evaluator Name	Dr. Miriam Landsman
Evaluator E-mail	Miriam-landsman@uiowa.edu
Evaluator Phone	319-335-4934
Additional Information from Grantee (optional)	Project Director: Beth Malicki bmalicki@kidsoncoursecr.com

Center Information Table	
Cohort	Centers
<i>(If not in a cohort, leave that cohort info blank)</i>	<i>(Enter Names of Centers, separated by commas)</i>
Cohort 8	
Cohort 9	
Cohort 10	
Cohort 11	Arthur Elementary, Harrison Elementary, Madison Elementary, Truman Elementary, Wright Elementary
Cohort 12	
Additional Information from Grantee (optional)	

2. Introduction/Executive Summary

Introduction/Executive Summary Required Elements	Complete?
Program Implementation	X
• Needs Assessment Process	X
• Key People Involved	X
• Development of Objectives	X
Program Description	X
• Program days and hours	X
• List of activities	X
• Location of centers	X
• Attendance requirements	X
• Governance (board, director, etc.)	X
Program Highlights	X

Type or copy and paste Introduction/Executive Summary here.

Kids on Course University is a six week summer program that offered reading, math, writing, enrichment and meals to students in the summer of 2017. The program ran for 33 days from 8:30AM – 1:30PM at five elementary schools in Cedar Rapids and was free to all participants. Students eligible to attend were those with a demonstrated reading deficiency who attended a Title I school (a school with a high percentage of students who qualify for free or reduced price lunches). Students attending non-public schools within the centers' attendance areas who had a demonstrated reading need were also invited. The Cedar Rapids Community School District was the fiscal agent and employer of record for Kids on Course University. The Zach Johnson Foundation created the program and worked in concert with the district in implementation, evaluation and funding of the program.

Summer is a critical time for students who are behind academically. Research has found that summer learning loss accounts for about two-thirds of the ninth grade achievement gap in reading (Alexander, Entwisle & Olson, 2007). Kids on Course University's summer program runs every weekday, provides two meals and transportation, and targets summer learning loss with demonstrated methods of support, instruction and fun.

The summer program, Kids on Course University, utilizes an independent evaluator from the University of Iowa, Dr. Miriam Landsman, to compile all research and surveys. According to her report from the 746 students who in the summer of 2017, 77.3% of students were eligible for free or reduced price lunches, which is significantly higher than the district average of 54%. In aggregate, Kids on Course met or exceeded all academic goals in its summer program: 50% of Kids on Course students increased their reading scores from spring to fall, exceeding the 40% goal. Furthermore 80% of students increased their math scores from the beginning to the end of the summer program, exceeding the 70% objective. All children met the targets for participation in regular physical fitness and library access as well as enrichments through field trips in the community.

Kids on Course University is a no-cost opportunity for families who want to be sure their children are prepared to start the next year stronger than ever. Summer should be a time of exploration, friendship

and swimming, in addition to learning new skills and trying new things. Kids on Course University combines all of the fun and freedom that summer entails and combines it with high quality math, writing and reading instruction in a caring and safe environment. Families sign an attendance expectation acknowledgement when they enroll their students which states that children must be able to attend the full program. During the course of the summer no child is punished for lack of attendance. Data shows student attendance in the seven-week summer program is excellent. In the summer of 2017 80.8% of Kids on Course University participants attended at least 75% of the program. And more than half of the students attended 30 or more days of the program, which is over 90% of the days offered.

The centers where Kids on Course University took place were five elementary schools with a disproportionate number of students living in poverty. These schools were Arthur, Harrison, Madison, Truman and Wright elementary schools. While students in need of busing could access it free, the proximity of these schools to high-needs neighborhoods meant many students walked.

Kids on Course University started in 2013 with 60 students in the Kids on Course year-round program. Kids on Course is a program of the Zach Johnson Foundation. The summer of 2014 and 2015 the program grew exponentially, with impressive results. More students were starting the new school year with higher reading scores than they finished the last school year, reversing the “summer slide.” In 2015 The Zach Johnson Foundation partnered with the Cedar Rapids Community School District to expand the program to reach students from 16 schools in Cedar Rapids, thanks to the 21st Community Learning Center grant and private donors. The program also provides more than 30,000 meals and weekend food bags to students every Friday, so they don’t go hungry over the weekend.

The governance of Kids on Course University consists of leaders within the Cedar Rapids Community School District and the Zach Johnson Foundation. Each center, also known as a Super Site, has a principal present to oversee safety and compliance. Each site also has a Lead Teacher who ensures staff is maximizing the children’s experiences while also collaborating with parents and community stakeholders. All of the Lead Teachers report to the Program Director, Amy Evans. Evans has been part of Kids on Course University since its inception in 2013. She is an instructional design strategist at Coolidge Elementary during the school year, a role in which she is a teacher coach. A committee that oversees Amy Evans as well as the funding, administrative duties, goal evaluation and sustainability of Kids on Course consists of the following:

Val Dolezal, Cedar Rapids Community School District Executive Director of Pre-Kindergarten – 5th grade

Beth Malicki, Kids on Course University Project Director and Zach Johnson Foundation Board Member

Eric Anderson, Cedar Rapids Community School District Payroll Specialist

Jonathan Galbraith, Cedar Rapids Community School District Building and Grounds Manager

Matt Dunbar, Cedar Rapids Community School District Custodial and Grounds Manager

Suzy Ketelsen, Cedar Rapids Community School District Food & Nutrition

Michelle Koelling, Cedar Rapids Community School District Confidential Secretary

Patti Lucas, Cedar Rapids Community School District Confidential Secretary

Sherry Luskey, Cedar Rapids Community School District Accountant Manager

Demographic Data

Demographic Data Required Elements	Complete?
2017-2018 School Year Attendance Tables	
• 2017-2018 School Year Attendance Summary Table	NA
• 2017-2018 School Year Attendance Ethnicity Table	NA
• 2017-2018 School Year Attendance Special Needs Table	NA
Summer of 2017 Attendance Tables	X
• Summer of 2017 Attendance Summary Table	X
• Summer of 2017 Attendance Ethnicity Table	X
• Summer of 2017 Attendance Special Needs Table	X
Attendance Discussion	X
Partnerships	X
• Partnerships Table	X
• Partnerships Discussion	X
Parent Involvement Information and Discussion	X

2017-2018 School Year Attendance. *Enter data in the appropriate fields in the tables below. Data will be from the Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2018. There are separate tables for the Summer of 2017. Leave blank any cohorts that do not apply.*

21 st CCLC Program 2017-2018 School Year Attendance <i>Summary</i> Table				
Cohort	Attendees	Total Attendance	Male	Female
<i>Leave Blank if NA</i>		<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>
8	All			
	Regular*			
9	All			
	Regular*			
10	All			
	Regular*			
11	All			
	Regular*			
12	All			
	Regular*			

*Regular Attendees have attended the program for 30 or more days.

21 st CCLC Program 2017-2018 School Year Attendance <i>Ethnicity</i> Table							
Cohort	Attendees	White	Hispanic/ Latino	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Black/ African American	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Unknown Race
<i>Leave Blank if NA</i>		<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>
8	All						
	Regular*						

9	All					
	Regular*					
10	All					
	Regular*					
11	All					
	Regular*					
12	All					
	Regular*					

*Regular Attendees have attended the program for 30 or more days.

21 st CCLC Program 2017-2018 School Year Attendance <i>Special Needs</i> Table				
Cohort	Attendees	LEP	Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	Special Needs
<i>Leave Blank if NA</i>		<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>
8	All			
	Regular*			
9	All			
	Regular*			
10	All			
	Regular*			
11	All			
	Regular*			
12	All			
	Regular*			

*Regular Attendees have attended the program for 30 or more days.

Summer of 2017 Attendance. *Enter data in the appropriate fields in the tables below. Data will be from the Summer of 2017 ONLY. Leave blank any cohorts that do not apply.*

21 st CCLC Program Summer 2017 Attendance <i>Summary</i> Table				
Cohort	Attendees	Total Attendance	Male	Female
<i>Leave Blank if NA</i>		<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>
8	All			
	Regular*			
9	All			
	Regular*			
10	All			
	Regular*			
11	All	746	419 (56.2%)	327 (43.8%)
	Regular*	378	210 (55.6%)	168 (44.4%)
12	All			
	Regular*			

*Regular Attendees have attended the program for 30 or more days.

21 st CCL Program Summer 2017 Attendance <i>Ethnicity</i> Table							
Cohort	Attendees	White	Hispanic/ Latino	American Indian/ Alaska Native	Black/ African American	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Unknown Race
<i>Leave Blank if NA</i>		<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>
8	All						
	Regular*						
9	All						
	Regular*						
10	All						
	Regular*						
11	All	391 (52.5%)	64 (8.6%)	3 (4%)	264 (35.4%)	23 (3.1%)	--
	Regular*	217 (57.4%)	43 (11.4%)	1 (.5%)	101 (26.7%)	15 (4.0%)	--
12	All						
	Regular*						

*Regular Attendees have attended the program for 30 or more days.

21 st CCLC Program Summer 2017 Attendance <i>Special Needs</i> Table				
Cohort	Attendees	LEP	Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	Special Needs
<i>Leave Blank if NA</i>		<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>	<i>Enter #</i>
8	All			
	Regular*			
9	All			
	Regular*			
10	All			
	Regular*			
11	All	114 (15.3%)	77.3%**	212 (28.4%)
	Regular*	64 (16.9%)		97 (35.7%)
12	All			
	Regular*			

*Regular Attendees have attended the program for 30 or more days.

**FRPL data only available at the aggregate level

Attendance Discussion.

Attendance Discussion Required Elements	Complete?
General discussion on attendance including	
• Percentage of 21 st CCLC attendance compared to total population.	X
• Percentage of attendees who are FRPL.	X
• Efforts to increase and keep attendance high.	X

• Recruitment efforts.	X
• Discussion on how contact hours requirement is being met. <i>60 hours per month (3 hours per day x 5 days a week) during weeks when school is in session (not counting Christmas or Spring Break)</i>	X

Kids on Course University's 2017 summer program was 33 days in duration and had a large number of student participants (746). According to the Department of Education, only those with 30 or more days of attendance (378) are considered regular attendees, which is about half (50.7%) of the total group. Among these regular attendees, 55.6% were male and 46.4% were female. Among all 746 attendees, the relative proportions by gender were roughly the same: 56.2% male and 43.8% female.

With regard to race and ethnicity among regular attendees, 57.4% were White, 26.7% Black, 11.4% Hispanic, 4.0% Asian and .5% Native American. The results were a little different among all attendees, 52.4% were White, 35.4% Black, 8.6% Hispanic, 3.1% Asian, and .4% Native Americans. These data indicate that regular attendance was a little higher among White and Hispanic students and a little lower among Black participants.

In terms of regular attendees, 16.9% were English language learners and 35.7% had special learning needs. Among all attendees, 15.3% were English language learners and 28.4% had special learning needs. Free and reduced price data are only available at the aggregate level: among all participants, 77.3% were eligible for FRPL.

About 4,000 elementary aged students would qualify for Kids on Course University and currently it serves about 18% of that need. Recruitment is done through the individual schools. Classroom teachers identify students who qualify based on their reading scores and reach out to families through parent-teacher conferences, fliers, phone calls, texts, emails and informal discussions. This strategy has proven very effective.

Partnerships Table. *Enter data in the appropriate fields in the table below. Add rows as needed. In-kind value must be reported as a monetary value (i.e. \$1,200). Contribution type must be one of the following eight items. The number of each item may be used in the table (i.e. 4 in place of Provide Food). If a partner has more than one contribution type, enter all of them in the Contribution Type cell.*

1. *Provide Evaluation Services*
2. *Raise Funds*
3. *Provide Programming / Activity-Related Services*
4. *Provide Food*
5. *Provide Goods*
6. *Provide Volunteer Staffing*
7. *Provide Paid Staffing*
8. *Other*

21 st CCLC Program 2017-2018 Partnerships Table					
Name of Partner <i>(Enter name of Partner)</i>	Paid/ Unpaid	Contribution Type <i>(From list above)</i>	Staff Provided <i>(Describe if applicable)</i>	In-kind Value <i>(Monetary Value if unpaid partner)</i>	Number of Centers Served <i>(Input the number of centers this partner served)</i>
Dr. Miriam Landsman	Paid	Provide Evaluation Services			5
Zach Johnson Foundation	Unpaid	Raise Funds, Provide Volunteer Staffing	Site Managers from Kids on Course (3 FTE for summer)	\$30,000	1
Kirkwood Community College	Unpaid	Other		\$24,000	5
United Way of East Central Iowa	Unpaid	Volunteer Staffing	AmeriCorps Members	\$16,000	5
Greater Cedar Rapids Community Foundation	Unpaid	Raise Funds			5
Cedar Rapids Kernels baseball team	Unpaid	Provide Goods		\$10,000	5
HACAP	Paid	Provide Goods			5
Cedar Rapids Schools Foundation	Unpaid	Raise Funds			5

Partnerships Discussion.

Partnerships Discussion Required Elements	Complete?
General discussion on Partnerships including	X
• Summary of partnerships table.	X
• Total unpaid and paid partners.	X
• Efforts to recruit partners.	X
• Highlights of partnerships.	X
• How partnerships help program serve students.	X

Partnerships allowed students in the summer program, Kids on Course University, to have high quality mentors, learn about adult education opportunities, have food bags to address over the weekend and receive incentive rewards for attendance. The Zach Johnson Foundation recruits partners through its vast network of connections.

Kirkwood Community College brought adult educational opportunities to the families of Kids on Course University through the Parent Night. Each site held a parent/family night where Kirkwood had navigators discussing GED completion, English as a Second Language classes, K-PACE program details and other adult education opportunities.

The United of East Central Iowa partnered with Kids on Course University in two distinct ways: RSVP Pen Pals and AmeriCorps Members. The RSVP Pen Pals are retired members of the community who volunteer with United Way. In the summer of 2016 they wrote letters to third graders who responded during Kids on Course University. This authentic writing exercise supported students' skills while also teaching them how to address and envelope and communicate effectively with people from a different generation. AmeriCorps Members worked at each site and helped coordinate meals and worked with students in their learning and playing. One AmeriCorps Member recruited volunteers and supervised their efforts in creating weekend food bags. That AmeriCorps Member was responsible for distributing more than 3,000 food bags.

The Zach Johnson Foundation and the Greater Cedar Rapids Community Foundation did the heavy lifting in fundraising for Kids on Course University. The federal grant, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, provides about one third of the funding for Kids on Course University. The rest was raised privately or funded through in kind donation. Without additional grants and fundraising through the Zach Johnson Foundation and the Greater Cedar Rapids Community Foundation this program would not have happened.

The Cedar Rapids Public Library provided programming during Kids on Course University's field trips. The Cedar Rapids Kernels local baseball team enrolled students in their reading challenge program and rewarded students with game tickets, hats, t-shirts and other goodies for reaching attendance goals. The Cedar Rapids Schools Foundation funded the librarians who staffed each Kids on Course University site. These librarians allowed students to check out the school's inventory over the summer and have an additional literacy-focused enrichment class each week.

Parent Involvement Information and Discussion.

Parent Involvement Information and Discussion Required Elements	Complete?
Number and description of parent meetings and/or events.	X
Number of parents at each meeting and/or event.	X
Description of communication with parents (flyers, letters, phone calls, personal contact, etc.)	X
Efforts to increase parental involvement.	X

During the seven week Kids on Course University program parents are invited to attend a parent/family night during the evening. Each of these events included opportunities to talk with Kids on Course University staff, learn about adult education programs from Kirkwood Community College, and see where the students is spending the day. Some sites also created weekly newsletters for parents which outlined the weeks' activities. At the end of the program each parent received a sort of report card sharing the change in scores from the beginning and end of Kids on Course University in the subjects of math, reading and writing

With respect to parent participation, across all supersites and grades more than 35% of parents attended Parent Night. This exceeded KCU's goal of 20% participation.

GPRA Measures

For 2017-2018, the US DOE has indicated that 21st CCLC Programs should measure 14 performance indicators that follow the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Please note the GPRA data intends to measure student improvement based on how many regular attendees needed improvement. If you do not have this number, then enter the total number of Regular Attendees for each grade level instead. Also note that reading scores can be used for GPRA Measures 4-6 – Improvement in English. This is the same data reported online to the APR Data System.

GPRA Measures Required Elements	Complete?
GPRA Measures Data Table	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Name of Assessment Tools Used for Each Measure. 	X
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data Entered for all Applicable Measures. 	X
GPRA Measures Discussion	X

GPRA Measures Data Table.

GPRA Measures	Number of Regular Student Attendees Needing Improvement	Number of Students Who Improved	Percentage of Students Who Improved
GPRA Measures 1-3 – Improvement in Mathematics			
Assessment Tool Used:			
1. The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improved in mathematics from fall to spring.			
2. The number of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants who improved in mathematics from fall to spring.			

GPRA Measures	Number of Regular Student Attendees Needing Improvement	Number of Students Who Improved	Percentage of Students Who Improved
3. The number of all 21st Century regular program participants who improved in mathematics from fall to spring.			
GPRA Measures 4-6 – Improvement in English Assessment Tool Used: FAST assessment			
4. The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improved in English from fall to spring.	235	121	51.5%
5. The number of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants who improved in English from fall to spring.			
6. The number of all 21st Century regular program participants who improved in English from fall to spring.	235	121	51.5%
GPRA Measures 7-8 – Improvement in Proficiency Assessment Tool Used: FAST assessment			
7. The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in reading.	178	24	13.5%
8. The number of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in mathematics.			
GPRA Measures 9-11 – Homework and Class Participation Assessment Tool Used:			
9. The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.			
10. The number of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.			

GPRC Measures	Number of Regular Student Attendees Needing Improvement	Number of Students Who Improved	Percentage of Students Who Improved
11. The number of all 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation.			
GPRC Measures 12-14 – Student Behavior			
Assessment Tool Used:			
12. The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.			
13. The number of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.			
14. The number of all 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.			

GPRC Measures Discussion.

GPRC Measures Discussion Required Elements	Complete?
Total or Regular Attendance Used?	
Discussion of high performing and low performing areas.	
Description of data collecting instrument.	
Discussion of difficulties on any GPRC Measure.	
Assessment of 21st CCLC Program based solely on GPRC Measures.	

Since Kids on Course University (KCU) is a summer-only program, most of the GPRC measures are not applicable. The one item for which data are available concerns proficiency in reading. This was measured with the FAST reading assessment. Among the 235 regular attendees for whom both spring and fall reading data were available, 121 students (51.5%) improved in reading over the summer. Among the 178 regular attendees who were not proficient in reading based on not achieving the spring benchmark, 24 (13.5%) improved to proficiency based on the fall reading measure.

3. Local Objectives

STARTING JULY 1, 2017, GPRC MEASURES WERE THE OFFICIAL OBJECTIVES. Additional local objectives should be added to help your local organizations better serve your community. However, these local objectives will be considered as additional information since the GPRC Measures will always serve as the official objectives. Data will be from the Summer and Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2018.

Local Objectives Required Elements	Complete?
Local Objectives Data Tables	
• Rating of each Objective as listed below.	X
• Full Methodology used for measurement.	X
• Justification for Rating	X
Local Objectives Discussion	

Local Objectives Data Tables.

For each cohort table, enter the appropriate data. If a Grantee did not participate in a cohort, that cohort table will be left blank. Rows may be added as needed. If desired, all cohorts may be combined into one table (especially helpful if all objectives are the same). If this is done, in the objectives discussion section, note that the table combines more than one cohort. Objectives will be rated as one of four ways:

- Met the stated objective. *Must provide methodology on how the objective was measured and justification for meeting the objective.*
- Did not meet but made progress toward the stated objective. *Must provide methodology on how the objective was measured and what criteria was used to determine that progress was made.*
- Did not meet and no progress was made toward the stated objective. *Must provide methodology on how the objective was measured and what criteria was used to determine that no progress was made.*
- Unable to measure the stated objective. *All objectives should be measured unless extraordinary circumstances prevent doing so. If an objective cannot be measured, complete details on these circumstances must be provided in the Methodology/Justification column.*

Cohort 11 Table

Cohort 11 Objectives	Objective Rating	Methodology/Justification for Rating
40% of KCU students will start the next school year closer to grade level in reading based on FAST CBM scores comparing spring to fall scores	Met the stated objective	Reading skills were measured with FAST CBM scores administered in Spring 2017 and Fall 2017. Results showed that 49.9% of KCU students increased reading scores, exceeding the objective of 40%.
100% of students will have access to the school's library materials weekly	Met the stated objective	Access to school library materials was assessed through a review of the KCU weekly school schedules. All students had weekly access to their library.

Cohort 11 Objectives	Objective Rating	Methodology/Justification for Rating
70% of students will increase their math scores from the pre assessment in week one of KCU to the post assessment in week seven	Met the stated objective	Math skills were evaluated by comparing scores on a pre-assessment in week one of KCU to the post assessment in week six. Results showed that 80.0% of students increased their math scores, exceeding the 70% objective.
100% of KCU students will engage in organized physical fitness at least 200 minutes a week	Met the stated objective	The physical fitness objective was assessed through a review of the KCU weekly school schedules. All students participated in organized physical fitness for at least 200 minutes per week.
100% will attend field trips	Met the stated objective	The field trip objective was assessed through a review of the KCU weekly school schedules. All students in attendance participated in field trips.
100% of KCU parents will receive student report cards	Met the stated objective	All parents were provided a report card at the conclusion of the summer – this was assessed through a review of program procedures. Additionally, parents' receipt of report cards was measured through the parent survey. The majority of parents (91.9%) agreed or somewhat agreed that the report card provided useful information about their child's academic progress.
20% of KCU parents/guardians will attend Family Night	Met the stated objective	Parent/guardian attendance at Parent Night was assessed through attendance records. Overall more than 35% of parents/guardians attended, exceeding the 20% objective. Some variation in parent participation across supersites was identified.

Local Objectives Discussion.

Local Objectives Discussion Required Elements	Complete?
• Statistical Analysis as Applicable.	X
• Improvement over more than one year as observed.	X
• Applicable graphs, tables, and/or charts.	
• Details on methodology and ratings as needed.	X
• Clarification for objectives not met.	NA
• Clarification for objectives not measured.	NA

All of Kids on Course University's stated objectives were met. Several objectives pertained to academic growth in reading and math. With regard to reading skills, the stated objective was that 40% of KCU students improve reading skills over the summer. Based on the Reading test administered in Spring 2017 and Fall 2017, results showed that roughly half (49.9%) of KCU students increased reading scores, exceeding the objective of 40%. When we examined supersites individually, all achieved or exceeded the 40% goal. In math, overall 80% of students increased math scores from the summer pretest to posttest, exceeding KCU's goal of 70%.

We examined academic outcomes in relation to KCU attendance. Students who improved their reading scores from spring to fall had a slightly higher (but statistically significant) average attendance of 28.6 days compared with 27.4 days for students whose reading scores did not improve at all. Attendance was not related to improvement in math.

To further examine KCU's impact on academic performance, we compared reading improvement between KCU attendees and students who were eligible and invited to participate in KCU but who did not. Among KCU attendees, 49.9% improved reading scores from Spring 2017 to Fall 2017. Among the comparison group, 22% improved reading scores over the same time period. When we looked at the *amount* of change in reading scores, KCU attendees gained an average of .79 (percent of benchmark), but the comparison group lost an average of 5.79 (percent of benchmark). These were statistically significant differences, not likely due to chance. KCU attendees were more likely to improve in reading than their non-participating peers.

Several project objectives were related to provision of specific types of programming. One objective was that 100% of students will have access to the school's library materials. Progress was assessed through a review of the KCU weekly school schedules. All students had weekly access to their library. A second program objective was that 100% of KCU students will engage in organized physical fitness at least 200 minutes a week. The physical fitness objective was also assessed through a review of the KCU weekly school schedules. All students participated in organized physical fitness for at least 200 minutes per week. A third programming objective pertained to student field trips. The objective that 100% will attend field trips was assessed through a review of the KCU weekly school schedules. All students in attendance participated in field trips.

The other two objectives related to parental involvement in KCU. The first objective was that 100% of KCU parents will receive student report cards. All parents were provided with a report card at the conclusion of the summer program. Parents' receipt of report cards was also measured through the

parent survey. The majority of parents (91.9%) agreed or somewhat agreed that the report card provided useful information about their child's academic progress. The second objective related to parental involvement was 20% of KCU parents/guardians will attend Family Night. Parent/guardian attendance at Family Nights was assessed through attendance records maintained by KCU schools. Based on these attendance records, 35.0% of parents/guardians attended Parent Night. This exceeds the stated objective of 20%. Some variation in parent participation was identified across supersites.

4. Anecdotal Data

Anecdotal Data Required Elements	Complete?
Success Stories	X
Best Practices	X
Pictures	X
Student, teacher, parent, and stakeholder input.	X

Success Stories

Success Stories Required Elements	Complete?
Specific Examples.	X
Key People Involved	X
Quotes from participants, teachers, parents, etc.	X
Include objectives showing large increases.	NA

A third grader who struggled during the school year came to Kids on Course University with a sour disposition. His family was in flux and he struggled with making friends. Sometimes his anger got the best of him and some people weren't sure he'd be a good fit for Kids on Course University, given its emphasis on academics. But after the first day it was evident this student could thrive in a small classroom surrounded by students who also had barriers to success. At the end of the seven weeks this student had made two very close friends and was actually upset the program was over. His math grades grew tremendously and he didn't backslide at all in reading.

Best Practices

Best Practices Required Elements	Complete?
Description of the practice/activity.	X
Methodology of measuring success of best practice.	X
Information on why practice/activity was implemented.	X
Impact of practice/activity on attendance.	X
Impact of practice/activity on student achievement.	X

Kids on Course University uses best practices for recruitment of students and the high attendance is evidence this works. Rather than relying on families to find this opportunity, teachers work closely with families during the school year to increase the probability of families enrolling their children. Data shows student attendance in the seven-week summer program is excellent. In the summer of 2017 80.8% of Kids on Course University participants attended at least 75% of the program. And more than half of the students attended 30 or more days of the program, which is over 90% of the days offered. The instructional focus is equally split between reading and math (90 minutes for each content area). Teachers are certified classroom teachers with a wealth of experience and materials. Teachers are encouraged to use best practices from the Daily Five, Marzano’s work on effective classroom instruction and applying Hattie’s high impact, evidence-based teaching strategies in both reading and math. These strategies are utilized throughout our highly engaging biweekly science themes. Evidence of these strategies include our 40% improvement in reading and 70% improvement in math.

Pictures



Student, teacher, parent, and stakeholder input

Student, teacher, parent, and stakeholder input Required Elements	Complete?
Quotes from student, teacher, parent, and stakeholders.	X
Quotes from partners.	X
Quotes should be attributed (titles can be used but names only with permission).	NA

Showcase success of the program, especially for student attendance, behavior and academic success.	X
--	---

During Summer 2017 surveys were administered to students, parents, and teachers who participated in Kids of Course University. Surveys demonstrated largely positive views of the program. Students indicated that they enjoyed the activities and field trips. Parents agreed that their children enjoyed the program and would like to participate again, although they would like to see more communication and reporting in the future. Teachers believed that the program successfully improved student academic skills, the program had good community support, and that transportation was effective. Teachers requested improvement in professional development opportunities, increased communication opportunities with parents, and schedule changes to better accommodate school year preparation.

A complete report of survey results is posted on the program website. |

Student quotes

“It was so fun and educational”

“How they helped me with a whole bunch of work this year.”

“Being nice to people and having the great helpers at the library”

“I liked all of it”

“My favorite things about kids on course was enrichment, field trips, slime pool, and making new friends”

“Going on the field trips, games, and I liked the friends and teachers”

“The teachers are nice to all the kids at KCU”

“Playing, making new friends, and teachers were good”

“Math, Enrichment, and Writing”

“It wasn’t just regular school, you get to have fun. I loved field trips the most”

“The activities we did in class. I loved making slime”

“The field trips because I never went skating before I went with KCU, or a farm or a lot of things”

“We get to do fun things and do different stuff”

“Meeting new friends and playing all the fun games!!!!”

Parent quotes

“The teachers were amazing. My son loved it.”

“Child enjoyed going every day and looked forward to Friday fun”

“The whole process went well and smooth and there were not any issues. My daughter cried every day for a few weeks and there were teachers and staff that helped her feel comfortable.

“Hands on learning in all subject areas, lower student/teacher ratio, fun experiments/activities”

“The staff is amazing with the kids and with parent communication”

“My son enjoyed everything he did and learned. I hope he can come back again. All teachers were great. He is writing and reading better.”

“My child really enjoyed KCU. She was excited to go to school every day. Her teachers were very nice.”

“Positive interactions-learning made fun “

“They made learning more fun for my children making them actually wanting to go to school”

“Good organization, friendship with the staff communication”

“They kept me informed on ALL things that took place this summer. I loved each and every one of my kids’ teachers!”

“We liked the topic based education. Combining fun activities and education was a good blend for learning. Staff was very good and my child spoke highly of them.”

“I think everything went well with this program can't say anything was wrong”

“My son loved the hands on activities and was always coming home telling me about the things they got to make or the experiments they did.”

“Helped keep my son from losing everything he learned the school year prior.”

“Found the staff to be very friendly, supportive and caring to the students and their families.”

“The staff made learning and going to school so much fun at Truman that both my kids want to go there for their primary school so I'd like to say thanks for having such an amazing staff!”

“It's a great way for kids to learn and retain information over the summer months”

“This experience was much more positive than the school year. I'm glad we got the opportunity! Miss B forever changed my son and learning”

“Great program to keep the children engaged over the summer”

“This was a very nice program and we are thankful that she was able to attend. Thank you.”

“My child loved it! Thanks for making his first year enjoyable”

“Absolutely appreciate this program to the fullest. It's an awesome way for kids to stay going!”

“Thank you for everything, the children improved their learning”

“Staff, thanks for all of your hard work this summer, it is much appreciated!”

“A great program keep up the great work”

“We very much appreciate the support of this program. THANKS!”

“Staff, especially the principal, she was great! Our daughter was not excited to go to "summer school" but she said it was like going to camp every day. She really did enjoy the classes and the teachers.”

“We are fortunate to have such an amazing program available to our community.”

Teacher quotes

“Team teaching has been a wonderful experience for both teachers and the kids. I feel like the kids are supported 100% and always know someone is there to help them.”

“Working in smaller groups and having at least two teachers per grade has been helpful”

“I think having one teacher do math and one to do reading really worked well”

“A consistent schedule, routines, and procedures. Also including themes and positive behavior supports”

“Team teaching worked great with our mix of students. Gave all the students time to get to know each other and work together”

“Great philosophy regarding students—respectful and loving with high expectations, great mixture of learning and fun”

“Freedom to plan fun activities. Support from the site leader”

“Loved the schedule with starting earlier in June and ending earlier in August”

5. Sustainability Plans

Sustainability Plans Required Elements	Complete?
Original plan from grant application summary.	X
Discuss formal sustainability plan if applicable.	X
How program will continue without 21st CCLC grant funding.	X
How partnership contributions will help the program continue (refer to partnership table from section 3).	X

The multiple partners contributing more than 70% of the current budget for Kids on Course University is a strong demonstration of the long term sustainability of this program. While the loss of 21st Century Learning Grant dollars would have a significant impact, the program would survive in some form if Congress no longer supports this federal program. Program leaders intend to apply for future 21CCLC dollars to continue the program at its current high level of effectiveness. The Zach Johnson Foundation is committed to continuing fundraising and partnership building to maintain and grow the program to reach even more students who need summer academic and emotional support.

The outreach for continued financial and in-kind support includes collaborations with the Boys and Girls Club of Cedar Rapids, and other summer program partners who could round out the day for students in Kids on Course University. Other summer partners such as Kirkwood Community College and the Kernels Minor League Baseball team have already committed to larger roles in providing enrichment and attendance incentives for students. A new partnership with the Cedar Rapids Ice Arena and City of Cedar Rapids Pools also will hold costs steady will opening up fun opportunities for children with financial barriers to these outings.

6. Summary and Recommendations

Summary and Recommendations Required Elements	Complete?
Summary of program.	X
Dissemination of local evaluation.	X
Recommendations for local objectives.	X
Recommendations on future plans for change.	X

Summary of Program

Summary of Program Required Elements	Complete?
Reference introduction section.	X
Showcase successes of program.	X
Highlight items contributing to program success.	X
Include exemplary contributions from staff, teachers, volunteers and/or partners.	X

Kids on Course University is a no-cost opportunity for families who want to be sure their children are prepared to start the next year stronger than ever. Summer should be a time of exploration, friendship and swimming, in addition to learning new skills and trying new things. Kids on Course University combines all of the fun and freedom that summer entails and combines it with high quality math, writing and reading instruction in a caring and safe environment. Results of the program demonstrate its effectiveness in eliminating the summer slide for at-risk students in reading in math, while also nurturing their social-emotional and nutritional needs. The high attendance rates of this program, especially for students of color, living in or near poverty, and who are still mastering the English language, proves KCU is utilizing public and private dollars with maximum impact.

Dissemination of Local Evaluation.

Dissemination of Local Evaluation Required Elements	Complete?
Exact url where local evaluation is posted (required by US DOE).	X
Discussion of other methods of Dissemination (Board reports, community meetings, person to person, e-mail, etc.)	X

Two reports from Summer 2017, *Results of Student, Parent, and Teacher Surveys* and *Kids on Course University Demographics, Academics, and Attendance*, were prepared by the local evaluator and shared with program staff. These local evaluation results have been disseminated by posting results from Summer 2017 on the program website and through presentations at stakeholder meetings, including Cedar Rapids School Board meetings. The local evaluation can be found here:

http://www.cr.k12.ia.us/assets/1/6/Kids_on_Course_University_2016_Local_Evaluation.pdf

Recommendations for Local Objectives.

Recommendations for Local Objectives Required Elements	Complete?
Objectives to be changed and reasons why.	NA
Objectives to be added.	NA
Include objectives not met.	NA

Kids on Course University met all of its stated objectives in Summer 2017. No new objectives are recommended for Summer 2018.

Recommendations on Future Plans for Change.

Recommendations on Future Plans for Changing Required Elements	Complete?
Changes in activities.	X
Changes in recruitment efforts.	X
Changes in partnerships.	X
Changes for sustainability plans.	X
Other changes as suggested by governing body.	X

Type or copy and paste Recommendations on Future Plans for Change here.

Based on findings from Summer 2017 data, the following recommendations were offered:

1. Hispanic ethnicity should be a separate variable from race. Classifying Hispanic as a racial category continues to pose problems in accurately documenting the racial composition of KCU students. The evaluators suggested that the race variable should not include Hispanic as a category. However, this may not be changeable because the Department of Education uses this classification system.
2. Parent night participation clearly improved from the previous summer. Whereas in 2016 it fell short of the target goal of 20%, in 2017 parent participation was 35% across supersites. Since parent participation varied across supersites, the evaluators recommended identifying and expanding approaches that successfully engaged parents.
3. Overall the outcomes for academic improvement demonstrate growth in reading and math among participating KCU students. KCU exceeded its stated goals of 40% improvement in reading and 70% improvement in math. The evaluators were hesitant regarding findings for reading at the 1st grade level because the lower achievement might be related to the different assessment methods for kindergarten and first grade. The detailed data by supersite and grade indicated where individual supersites/grades fell short of the target goals and can be used for ongoing improvement in instructional methods.
4. The evaluators recommended maintaining 33 days of summer programming. The increase of three days of programming from the previous year is useful for federal and state reporting, because only students who attend at least 30 days are considered “regular” attendees. For Summer 2017, slightly over half of the participants were considered regular attendees. In contrast, in Summer 2016, when KCU had 30 days of programming, 16% of KCU students were able to be classified as “regular” attendees.
5. Compared with Summer 2016, in Summer 2017 fewer demographic factors were related to outcomes, suggesting fewer disparities. In Summer 2017, English language learners were less likely to demonstrate improvement in reading, but no other differences were found related to learning outcomes. The evaluators recommended that KCU consider whether additional learning supports would be helpful for students whose native language is not English.