



21st Century Community Learning Center Grant

Evaluation Summary 2016-2017

Sherry L. Huffman, Ed.S.

External Evaluator

Shuffman@GHAEA.org

402.657.5194



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview & Explanation of Data	Page 2
Government Performance and Results Act Measures	Page 3
Local Report on Objectives	Page 12
Summary of Objectives	Page 23
Recommendations	Page 30

Overview

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program in Iowa implements before and after school enrichment opportunities designed to positively impact the academic and behavioral development of students, especially for those identified as being at risk. The Council Bluffs School District partners with its community to provide diverse activities from interest-based clubs, career exploration, and academic assistance to field trips, sports and family events. As of 2016-17, CCLC programming is available at all grade levels.

At the Elementary, SUPER Kids (Student University Promoting Education and Recreation) includes the Franklin, Longfellow and Rue buildings (Cohort 10).

CB D.R.E.A.M.S (Developing Relationships Engaging All Middle Schoolers) includes both Kirn and Wilson Middle Schools (Cohort 9).

The most recent addition to the CCLC grant involvement includes Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson High Schools titled Ready by 21 (Cohort 11).

This evaluation includes a summary of findings for each of the three cohorts as outlined by the required Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures. Additionally, a local report on objectives has been included to assist in decision-making for CCLC teams.

Data Analysis

Council Bluffs School District provided multiple sources of data for analysis: program participant information and demographics, attendance rate, English and Mathematics grades, Iowa Assessment scores and parent and staff survey responses.

Results are reported for students in two categories. Students participating in CCLC programming 30 or more days in the 2016-17 school year are considered Regular Attendees. Students participating from one to 29 days in the 2016-17 school year are considered Occasional Attendees.

GPRA Measure results consist of frequency counts and percentages to meet reporting requirements. In the Local Report on Objectives, outcomes for Regular Attendees and Occasional Attendees are compared statistically to identify any significant differences.

Government Performance and Results Act Measures

The total number of regular attendees in the elementary program

Attendance records for Cohort 10

	Pre-K 3	Prek-K 4	K	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade	Total
Regular Attendees	2	12	38	65	64	65	57	44	347
Occasional Attendees	10	18	54	58	75	62	65	77	419

	Male	Female	Free/Reduced Lunch	Not Free/Reduced Lunch
Regular Attendees	52.45%	47.26%	62.82%	36.89%
Occasional Attendees	46.81%	53.19%	74.23%	25.77%

In 2016-17, a total of 347 Elementary students participated in CCLC programs 30 days or more; approximately two-thirds of these students receive Free/ Reduced Lunch. The number of students participating for 29 or fewer days was 419.

The total number of regular attendees in the middle/ high school program

Attendance records for Cohorts 9 and 11

	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Total
Regular Attendee	119	90	68	21	20	34	17	369
Occasional Attendee	401	276	261	294	262	271	242	2007

	Male	Female	Free/Reduced Lunch	Not Free/Reduced Lunch
Regular Attendee	54.47%	45.53%	64.23%	35.77%
Occasional Attendee	48.41%	51.59%	66.82%	33.18%

In 2016-17, a total of 369 middle and high school students participated in CCLC programs 30 days or more; approximately two-thirds of these students receive Free/ Reduced Lunch. The number of students participating for 29 or fewer days was 2007.

Total number of regular attendees for Council Bluffs District

	Totals	Male	Female	Free/Reduced Lunch	Not Free/Reduced Lunch
Regular Attendee	716	53.57%	46.43%	63.64%	36.36%
Occasional Attendee	2426	49.24%	50.76%	68.10%	31.90%

In total, 716 students in the Council Bluffs District participated in CCLC programs for 30 or more days.

The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring

GPRA Measure 1: Grade reports for Cohort 10

Needing Improvement in Math	Demonstrating Improvement from Fall to Spring
24	13
7.38%	54.17%

Data is based on 325 matched pairs where both fall and spring Mathematics grades were available; representing 93.95% of all regular attendees. Students with a grade of "1" in the fall were considered to be needing improvement and 54.17% of those students improved their grade.

The following information is provided for additional perspective about all regular program participants with fall and spring scores available.

Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
176	30	120
53.99%	9.20%	36.81%

The number of middle/high school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring

GPRA Measure 2: Grade reports for Cohorts 9 and 11

Needing Improvement in Math	Demonstrating Improvement from Fall to Spring
4	2
1.42%	50.00%

Data is based on 281 matched pairs where both fall and spring Mathematics grades were available; representing 76.15% of regular attendees. Students with a grade of “F” in the fall were considered to be needing improvement and 50.00% of those students improved their grade. The following information is provided for additional perspective about all regular program participants with fall and spring scores available.

Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
168	79	34
59.79%	28.11%	12.10%

The number of all 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring

GPRA Measure 3: Grade reports for Cohorts 9, 10, 11

Needing Improvement in Math	Demonstrating Improvement from Fall to Spring
28	15
4.62%	53.57%

Data is based on 606 matched pairs where both fall and spring Mathematics grades were available; representing 84.64% of regular attendees. Students with a grade of “1” or “F” in the fall were considered to be needing improvement; 53.57% of those students improved their grade. The following information is provided for additional perspective about all regular program participants with fall and spring scores available.

Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
344	109	154
56.77%	17.99%	25.41%

The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring

GPRA Measure 4: Cohort 10

Needing Improvement in English	Demonstrating Improvement from Fall to Spring
24	15
8.48%	62.50%

Data is based on 283 matched pairs where both fall and spring grades in English were available; representing 81.56% of regular attendees. Students with a grade of "1" in the fall were considered to be needing improvement and 62.50% of those students improved their grade. The following information is provided for additional perspective about all regular program participants with fall and spring scores available.

Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
137	53	93
48.41%	18.73%	32.86%

The number of middle/ high school 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring

GPRA Measure 5: Cohorts 9 and 11

Needing Improvement in English	Demonstrating Improvement from Fall to Spring
15	10
4.95%	66.67%

Data is based on 303 matched pairs where both fall and spring English grades were available; representing 82.11% of regular attendees. Students with a grade of "F" in the fall were considered to be needing improvement and 66.67% of those students improved their grade. The following information is provided for additional perspective about all regular program participants with fall and spring scores available.

Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
164	105	83
54.13%	34.65%	27.39%

The number of all 21st Century regular program participants whose English grades improved from fall to spring

GPRA Measure 6: Cohorts 9, 10, 11

Needing Improvement in English	Demonstrating Improvement from Fall to Spring
39	25
6.66%	64.10%

Data based on 586 matched pairs where both fall and spring English grades were available; representing 81.84% of regular attendees. Students with a grade of "1" or "F" in the fall were considered to be needing improvement; 64.10% of those students improved their grade.

The following information is provided for additional perspective about all regular program participants with fall and spring scores available.

Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
301	158	176
51.37%	26.96%	30.03%

The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in Reading on state assessments

GPRA Measure 7: Iowa Assessment results for Cohort 10

Needing Improvement	Move from Not Proficient to Proficient	Proficiency Maintained	Non Proficient Both Years	Move from Proficient to Not Proficient
47	16	94	31	12
30.72%	10.46%	61.44%	20.26%	7.84%

Data based on 153 matched pairs where Iowa Assessment Reading data was present for both 2015-16 and 2016-17. In 2015-16, 30.72% students were not proficient, therefore needing improvement. 71.90% of regular attendees either maintained proficiency in Reading or improved from not proficient to proficient.

Council Bluffs District administers the Iowa Assessment to students in grades 2 through 11. A total of 117 students in the regularly attending group would not have scores for 2015-16, because they were in a grade not assessed. The following proficiency count is provided for additional perspective.

Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
108	158
68.79%	69.91%

Data based on 157 students assessed in 2015-16 and 226 assessed in 2016-17.

The number of middle/ high school 21st Century regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above in Mathematics on state assessments

GPRA Measure 8: Iowa Assessment results for Cohorts 9 and 11

Needing Improvement	Move from Not Proficient to Proficient	Proficiency Maintained	Non Proficient Both Years	Move from Proficient to Not Proficient
60	17	228	43	31
18.81%	5.33%	71.49%	13.48%	9.72%

Data based on 319 matched pairs where Iowa Assessment Reading data was present for both 2015-16 and 2016-17. In 2015-16, 18.81% of students were not proficient, therefore needing improvement. 76.80% of regular attendees either maintained proficiency in Reading or improved from not proficient to proficient.

The following proficiency count is provided for additional perspective.

Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
271	261
80.90%	76.09%

Data based on 335 students assessed in 2015-16 and 343 assessed in 2016-17.

The number of elementary 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation

GPRA Measure 9: Survey results for Cohort 10

Survey Item	Teachers indicating Improvement Warranted		Teachers indicating Significant, Moderate or Slight Improvement made	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Completing homework assignments at least 80% of the time	31	46.27%	22	70.97%

Participating in class	41	61.19%	30	73.17%
Totals	72	53.73%	52	72.22%

Data is based 67 surveys returned for 247 regular attending students (19% return rate). Number of teacher responses indicating Significant Improvement, Moderate Improvement or Slight Improvement made divided by number of teacher responses indicating Improvement Warranted.

The number of middle/ high school 21st Century program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation

GPRA Measure 10: Survey results for Cohorts 9 and 11

Survey Item	Teachers indicating Improvement Warranted		Teachers indicating Significant, Moderate or Slight Improvement made	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Completing homework to your satisfaction	39	45.35%	30	76.92%
Participating in class	43	50.00%	32	74.42%
Totals	82	47.67%	62	75.61%

Data is based on 86 surveys returned for 369 regular attending students (23% return rate). Number of teacher responses indicating Significant Improvement, Moderate Improvement or Slight Improvement made divided by number of teacher responses indicating Improvement Warranted.

The number of all 21st Century regular program participants with teacher-reported improvement in homework completion and class participation

GPRA measure 11: Survey results for Cohorts 9, 10 and 11

Survey Item	Teachers indicating Improvement Warranted		Teachers indicating Significant, Moderate or Slight Improvement made	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Completing homework assignments at least 80% of the time/ Completing homework to your satisfaction	70	45.75%	52	74.29%
Participating in class	84	54.90%	62	73.81%
Totals	154	50.33%	114	74.03%

Data based on a combined total of 153 survey responses. Number of teacher responses indicating Significant Improvement, Moderate Improvement or Slight Improvement made divided by number of teacher responses indicating Improvement Warranted.

The number of elementary 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior

GPRA measure 12: Survey results for Cohort 10

Survey Item	Teachers indicating Improvement Warranted		Teachers indicating Significant, Moderate or Slight Improvement made	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Behaving well in class	34	50.75%	27	79.41%

Data is based on information from 67 survey responses. Number of teacher responses indicating Significant Improvement, Moderate Improvement or Slight Improvement made divided by number of teacher responses indicating Improvement Warranted.

The number of middle/ high school 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior

GPRA measure 13: Survey results for Cohorts 9 and 11

Survey Item	Teachers indicating Improvement Warranted		Teachers indicating Significant, Moderate or Slight Improvement made	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Behaving well in class	34	39.53%	26	76.47%

Data is based on information from 86 survey responses. Number of teacher responses indicating Significant Improvement, Moderate Improvement or Slight Improvement made divided by number of teacher responses indicating Improvement Warranted.

The number of all 21st Century participants with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior

GPRA measure 14: Survey results for Cohorts 9, 10 and 11

Survey Item	Teachers indicating Improvement Warranted		Teachers indicating Significant, Moderate or Slight Improvement made	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Behaving well in class	68	44.44%	53	77.94%

Data is based on information from 153 survey responses. Number of teacher responses indicating Significant Improvement, Moderate Improvement or Slight Improvement made divided by number of teacher responses indicating Improvement Warranted.

LOCAL REPORT ON OBJECTIVES

Data Analysis || Mathematics Grades

Elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants

	Matched Pairs (Fall to Spring)	Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
Regular Attendees	325	176	30	119
		53.99%	9.20%	36.81%
Occasional Attendees	373	209	41	123
		56.03%	10.99%	32.62%

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare mathematics grades of regular attendees in the fall (prior to participation in afterschool programs) and in the spring (after participating in afterschool programs). There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.76$, $SD=.84$) and grades for spring ($M= 3.06$, $SD=.80$); $t(324)= -7.73$, $p= .000$

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare mathematics grades of occasional attendees in the fall and in the spring. There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.63$, $SD= .96$) and grades for spring ($M= 2.89$, $SD=.90$); $t(372)= -7.15$, $p= .000$

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in mathematics grades from fall to spring for regular attendees and the change in mathematics grades for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in mathematics grades for regular attendees ($M= .30$, $SD= .69$) and occasional attendees ($M= .26$, $SD= .70$); $t(696)= .67$, $p= .50$

Middle school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants

	Matched Pairs (Fall to Spring)	Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
Regular Attendees	251	153	70	31
		60.96%	27.89%	12.35%
Occasional Attendees	850	495	221	134
		58.24%	26%	15.76%

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare mathematics grades of regular attendees in the fall (prior to participation in afterschool programs) and in the spring (after participating in afterschool programs). There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=3.08$, $SD=.83$) and grades for spring ($M=2.89$, $SD=.97$); $t(250)=4.39$, $p=.000$

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare mathematics grades of occasional attendees in the fall and in the spring. There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.94$, $SD=.82$) and grades for spring ($M=2.82$, $SD=.94$); $t(849)=4.88$, $p=.000$

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in mathematics grades from fall to spring for regular attendees and the change in mathematics grades for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in mathematics grades for regular attendees ($M=-.19$, $SD=.68$) and occasional attendees ($M=-.12$, $SD=.72$); $t(1099)=-1.32$, $p=.19$

High school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants

	Matched Pairs (Fall to Spring)	Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
Regular Attendees	30	16	9	5
		53.33%	30.00%	16.67%
Occasional Attendees	352	180	110	62
		51.14%	31.25%	31.25%

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare mathematics grades of regular attendees in the fall (prior to participation in afterschool programs) and in the spring (after participating in afterschool programs). There was not a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.37$, $SD=1.47$) and grades for spring ($M=2.27$, $SD=1.39$); $t(29)=.55$, $p=.59$

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare mathematics grades of occasional attendees in the fall and in the spring. There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.39$, $SD=1.23$) and grades for spring ($M=2.24$, $SD=1.28$); $t(351)=3.00$, $p=.002$

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in mathematics grades from fall to spring for regular attendees and the change in mathematics grades from fall to spring for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in mathematics grades for regular attendees ($M=-0.1$, $SD=.99$) and occasional attendees ($M=-0.15$, $SD=.94$); $t(380)=.28$, $p=.78$

Data Analysis || English Grades

Elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose english grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants

	Matched Pairs (Fall to Spring)	Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
Regular Attendees	283	137	53	93
		48.41%	18.73%	32.86%
Occasional Attendees	299	146	65	89
		48.67%	21.67%	29.67%

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare English grades of regular attendees in the fall (prior to participation in afterschool programs) and in the spring (after participating in afterschool programs). There was a significant difference in the scores for fall grades ($M=2.71$, $SD=.85$) and spring grades ($M=2.88$, $SD=.84$); $t(282)=-3.50$, $p=.000$

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare English grades of occasional attendees in the fall and in the spring. There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.63$, $SD=.99$) and grades for spring ($M=2.75$, $SD=.95$); $t(298)=-2.32$, $p=.02$

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in English grades from fall to spring for regular attendees and the change in English grades from fall to spring for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in mathematics grades for regular attendees ($M=.17$, $SD=.80$) and occasional attendees ($M=.12$, $SD=.87$); $t(580)=.71$, $p=.48$

Middle school 21st Century regular program participants whose english grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants

	Matched Pairs (Fall to Spring)	Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
Regular Attendees	257	139	74	49
		54.09%	28.79%	19.01%
Occasional Attendees	855	478	262	115
		55.91%	30.64%	13.45%

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare English grades of regular attendees in the fall (prior to participation in afterschool programs) and in the spring (after participating in afterschool

programs). There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.82$, $SD=.90$) and grades for spring ($M=2.69$, $SD=.98$); $t(256)=2.76$, $p=.006$

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare English grades of occasional attendees in the fall and in the spring. There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.78$, $SD=.85$) and grades for spring ($M=2.57$, $SD=.97$); $t(854)=8.20$, $p=.000$

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in English grades from fall to spring for regular attendees and the change in English grades from fall to spring for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in mathematics grades for regular attendees ($M=-.13$, $SD=.77$) and occasional attendees ($M=-.21$, $SD=.75$); $t(1110)=1.44$, $p=.15$

High school 21st Century regular program participants whose english grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants

	Matched Pairs (Fall to Spring)	Grade Maintained	Decreased Grade	Increased Grade
Regular Attendees	46	19	10	17
		41.3%	21.74%	36.96%
Occasional Attendees	484	227	145	110
		46.90%	29.96%	22.73%

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare English grades of regular attendees in the fall (prior to participation in afterschool programs) and in the spring (after participating in afterschool programs). There was not a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=1.98$, $SD=1.44$) and grades for spring ($M=2.30$, $SD=1.36$); $t(45)=-1.82$, $p=.07$

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare English grades of occasional attendees in the fall and in the spring. There was a significant difference in the grades for fall ($M=2.39$, $SD=1.20$) and grades for spring ($M=2.27$, $SD=1.23$); $t(483)=2.67$, $p=.01$

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in English grades from fall to spring for regular attendees and the change in English grades from fall to spring for occasional attendees. There was a significant difference in the change in English grades for regular attendees ($M=.33$, $SD=1.21$) and occasional attendees ($M=-.12$, $SD=1.0$); $t(51)=2.43$, $p=.018$

Data Analysis || Iowa Assessment Reading Scores

Elementary 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in reading on state assessments compared to occasional participants

Council Bluffs administers the Iowa Assessment to students in grades 2 through 11. A total of 117 students in the regularly attending group would not have scores for last year, because they were in a grade not assessed.

Elementary	Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
Regular Attendee 157 assessed in 2015-16 226 assessed in 2016-17	108	158
	68.79%	69.91%
Occasional Attendee 192 assessed in 2015-16 267 assessed in 2016-17	119	171
	61.98%	64.04%

Elementary	Average NSS 2015-16	Average NSS 2016-17	Average NSS change
Regular Attendee	188.84	199.57	10.73
Occasional Attendee	188.66	197.33	8.66

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in Reading scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for regular attendees and the change in Reading scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in Reading scores for regular attendees ($M=20.91$ $SD= 19.32$) and occasional attendees ($M=19.68$, $SD=22.95$); $t(307)= .511$, $p= .61$

Middle school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in reading on state assessments compared to occasional participants

Middle School	Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
Regular Attendee 258 assessed in 2015-16 269 assessed in 2016-17	194	191
	75.19%	71%
Occasional Attendee 865 assessed in 2015-16 898 assessed in 2016-17	603	619
	69.71%	68.93%

Middle School	Average NSS 2015-16	Average NSS 2016-17	Average NSS change
Regular Attendee	238.98	248.93	9.96
Occasional Attendee	233.59	246.03	12.46

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in Reading scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for regular attendees and the change in Reading scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in Reading scores for regular attendees (M=8.5, SD= 25.17) and occasional attendees (M=12.43, SD=23.3); $t(1092) = -1.66$, $p = .09$

Iowa Assessment Reading Growth	5th to 6th Grade	6th to 7th Grade	7th to 8th Grade
Average Expected Growth (Iowa Testing)	13	12	11
Median Observed Growth for Regular Attendees	9	10	12

Iowa Testing provides average expected growth targets represented in National Standard Score gains. Median observed growth is provided (as opposed to mean) to eliminate skew from outliers.

High school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in reading on state assessments compared to occasional participants

High School	Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
Regular Attendee 77 assessed in 2015-16 74 assessed in 2016-17	60	48
	77.92%	64.86%
Occasional Attendee 963 assessed in 2015-16 773 assessed in 2016-17	730	574
	75.8%	74.26%

High School	Average NSS 2015-16	Average NSS 2016-17	Average NSS change
Regular Attendee	278.78	279	.22
Occasional Attendee	275.51	278.62	3.11

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in Reading scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for regular attendees and the change in Reading scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in Reading scores for regular attendees (M=-1.41, SD= 32.92) and occasional attendees (M=2.95, SD=26.48); $t(69) = -1.02$, $p = .31$

Iowa Assessment Reading Growth	8th to 9th Grade	9th to 10th Grade	10th to 11th Grade
Average Expected Growth (Iowa Testing)	10	8	7
Median Observed Growth for Regular Attendees	11	10	-24

Iowa Testing provides average expected growth targets represented in National Standard Score gains. Median observed growth is provided (as opposed to mean) to eliminate skew from outliers.

Data Analysis || Iowa Assessment Mathematics Scores

Elementary 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in mathematics on state assessments compared to occasional participants

Council Bluffs administers the Iowa Assessment to students in grades 2 through 11. A total of 117 students in the regularly attending group would not have scores for last year, because they were in a grade not assessed.

Elementary	Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
Regular Attendee 157 assessed in 2015-16 226 assessed in 2016-17	117	171
	74.52%	75.66%
Occasional Attendee 192 assessed in 2015-16 267 assessed in 2016-17	124	162
	64.58%	60.67%

Elementary	Average NSS 2015-16	Average NSS 2016-17	Average NSS change
Regular Attendee	185.44	199.58	14.14
Occasional Attendee	186.58	191.39	4.81

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in Mathematics scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for regular attendees and the change in Mathematics scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for occasional attendees. There was a significant difference in the change in Mathematics scores for regular attendees ($M=22.21$, $SD=24.43$) and occasional attendees ($M=13.04$, $SD=14.58$); $t(212)= 3.87$, $p= .000$

Middle school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in mathematics on state assessments compared to occasional participants

Middle School	Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
Regular Attendee 258 assessed in 2015-16 269 assessed in 2016-17	214	208
	82.95%	77.32%
Occasional Attendee 865 assessed in 2015-16 898 assessed in 2016-17	611	611
	70.64%	68.04%

Middle School	Average NSS 2015-16	Average NSS 2016-17	Average NSS change
Regular Attendee	234.91	248.93	14.02
Occasional Attendee	227.77	246.03	18.26

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in Mathematics scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for regular attendees and the change in Mathematics scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for occasional attendees. There was a significant difference in the change in Mathematics scores for regular attendees ($M=14.41$, $SD=26.94$) and occasional attendees ($M=18.72$, $SD=27.96$); $t(1095) = -2.17$, $p = .03$

Iowa Assessment Mathematics Growth	5th to 6th Grade	6th to 7th Grade	7th to 8th Grade
Average Expected Growth (Iowa Testing)	13	12	11
Median Observed Growth for Regular Attendees	13.5	9.5	15

Iowa Testing provides average expected growth targets represented in National Standard Score gains. Median observed growth is provided (as opposed to mean) to eliminate skew from outliers.

High school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in mathematics on state assessments compared to occasional participants.

High School	Proficient in 2015-2016	Proficient in 2016-2017
Regular Attendee 77 assessed in 2015-16 74 assessed in 2016-17	57	53
	74.03%	71.62%
Occasional Attendee 963 assessed in 2015-16 773 assessed in 2016-17	681	543
	70.72%	70.25%

High School	Average NSS 2015-16	Average NSS 2016-17	Average NSS change
Regular Attendee	272.79	279	6.21
Occasional Attendee	268.64	278.62	9.98

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the change in Mathematics scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for regular attendees and the change in Mathematics scores from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the change in Mathematics scores for regular attendees ($M=11.09$, $SD=31.56$) and occasional attendees ($M=13.14$, $SD=31.28$); $t(779) = -.50$, $p = .62$

Iowa Assessment Mathematics Growth	8th to 9th Grade	9th to 10th Grade	10th to 11th Grade
Average Expected Growth (Iowa Testing)	10	8	7
Median Observed Growth for Regular Attendees	19	18	5

Iowa Testing provides average expected growth targets represented in National Standard Score gains. Median observed growth is provided (as opposed to mean) to eliminate skew from outliers.

Data Analysis || Attendance Rate

By June of each year, participants will show a greater annual school attendance rate than non-participants

Elementary	Median Annual School Attendance Rate
Regular Attendees	97.19%
Occasional Attendees	96.91%

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare attendance rates for regular attendees and attendance rates for occasional attendees. There was a significant difference in the average daily attendance for regular attendees ($M=.97$, $SD=.02$) and occasional attendees ($M=.96$, $SD=.03$); $t(747) = 4.01$, $p = .000$

Middle School	Median Annual School Attendance Rate
Regular Attendees	97.75%
Occasional Attendees	96.07%

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare attendance rates for regular attendees and attendance rates for occasional attendees. There was a significant difference in the average daily attendance for regular attendees ($M=.96$, $SD=.05$) and occasional attendees ($M=.95$, $SD=.05$); $t(1178)= 3.03$, $p= .003$

High School	Median Annual School Attendance Rate
Regular Attendees	96.63%
Occasional Attendees	96.63%

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare attendance rates for regular attendees and attendance rates for occasional attendees. There was not a significant difference in the average daily attendance for regular attendees ($M=.94$, $SD=.11$) and occasional attendees ($M=.94$, $SD=.09$); $t(102)= -.24$, $p= .81$

	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12
Average Daily Attendance	96.5%	90.5%	93.5%	93%
Number of Regular Attendees with attendance records	21	20	34	16

Attendance records disaggregated by grade.

By June of each year, at least 80% of regular attendees will demonstrate increased school engagement with fewer disciplinary incidents (on average) than students attending fewer than 30 days.

	Elementary	Middle School	High School
Regular Attendees	1.79	1.77	1.11
Occasional Attendees	2.03	1.3	.97
Students Not Attending	6.97	3.88	3.22

Average number of disciplinary incidents for each cohort.

	Elementary	Middle School	High School
Percent of Regular Attendees with Fewer Disciplinary Incidents than Occasional Attendees	86.74%	76.17%	65.22%

Percent of Regular Attendees with Fewer Disciplinary Incidents than Non Attendees	95.51%	85.92%	89.13%
--	--------	--------	--------

Based on 347 regular attendees at the elementary, 277 regular attendees at the middle school, and 92 regular attendees at the high school.

Data Analysis || College and Career Readiness

By June of each year, at least 90% of regular attendees will demonstrate improved proficiency in college and career readiness as compared to the previous year/ baseline (measured by the CBCSD Proficiency and College and Career Ready Growth Report)

Outcome not measured in 2016-17. Instead, information from the Postsecondary Enrollment Report provided to Council Bluffs Community School District by the Iowa Department of Education. The report uses National Student Clearinghouse's StudentTracker service and reports on the percent of students enrolled in a postsecondary institution the fall immediately after high school, any time during the first year after high school, any time during the first two years after high school.

Additionally, it tracks students enrolled in a postsecondary institution the first year after high school who return for a second year and the percent of the high school class who complete a degree within six years.

The 2016 information provided in the Postsecondary Enrollment Report can serve as baseline for future CCLC College and Career Readiness objectives.

Annually, at least 95% of regular attendees will graduate with their 4-year cohort

High School	Number	Percent
Regular Attendee	11	64.71%
Occasional Attendee	189	78.10%

Data based on 17 regular attending seniors and 242 occasionally attending seniors.

Summary of Objectives

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
Elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants.	<p>Met stated objective</p> <p>Paired two sample t-test to compare pre- and post-test means</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p>	<p>There was a significant difference between Mathematics grades of Elementary regular attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring.</p> <p>There was a significant difference between Mathematics grades of occasional attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring.</p> <p>Both groups demonstrated similar changes in Mathematics grades from fall to spring.</p>
Middle school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants.	<p>Met stated objective</p> <p>Paired two sample t-test to compare pre- and post-test means</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p>	<p>There was a significant difference between Mathematics grades of Middle School regular attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring.</p> <p>There was a significant difference between Mathematics grades of occasional attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring.</p> <p>Both groups demonstrated similar changes in Mathematics grades from fall to spring.</p>
High school 21st Century regular program participants whose mathematics grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Paired two sample t-test to compare pre- and post-test means</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p>	<p>While there was no significant difference between Mathematics grades of High School regular attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring, 53% of student maintained grades and 17% increased grades.</p> <p>There was a significant difference between grades of occasional attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring.</p> <p>Both groups demonstrated similar changes in Mathematics grades.</p>

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
Elementary 21st Century regular program participants whose english grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants.	Met stated objective Paired two sample t-test to compare pre- and post-test means Independent samples t-test to compare means	There was a significant difference between English grades of Elementary regular attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring. There was a significant difference between grades of occasional attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring. Both groups demonstrated similar changes in grades from fall to spring.
Middle school 21st Century regular program participants whose english grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants.	Met stated objective Paired two sample t-test to compare pre- and post-test means Independent samples t-test to compare means	There was a significant difference between English grades of Middle School regular attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring. There was a significant difference between English grades of occasional attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring. Both groups demonstrated similar changes in English grades from fall to spring.
High school 21st Century regular program participants whose english grades improved from fall to spring compared to occasional participants.	Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective Paired two sample t-test to compare pre- and post-test means Independent samples t-test to compare means	While there was no significant difference between English grades of High School regular attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring, 41% of student maintained grades and 37% increased grades. There was a significant difference between English grades of occasional attendees in the fall compared to grades in the spring. The mean change in English grades for regular attendees from fall to spring was significantly different than the mean change in English grades for occasional attendees.

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
Elementary 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in reading on state assessments compared to occasional participants.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p> <p>Frequency count of students meeting cut score for proficiency divided by total number assessed</p>	<p>While there was no significant difference in the change in reading scores for elementary regular attendees and occasional attendees, the percent of students proficient in reading as measured by Iowa Assessments improved from 69% in 2015-16 to 70% in 2016-17 for regular attendees.</p> <p>Occasional attendees also demonstrated a growth in percent of elementary students proficient in reading from 62% to 64%.</p>
Middle school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in reading on state assessments compared to occasional participants.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p> <p>Frequency count of students meeting cut score for proficiency divided by total number assessed</p> <p>Change in national standard scores compared to Iowa Testing expected growth tables</p>	<p>There was no significant difference in the change in reading scores for middle school regular attendees and occasional attendees as measured by Iowa Assessments.</p> <p>The percent of middle school regular attendees proficient in reading did not increase from 2015-16 to 2016-17.</p> <p>Compared to the average expected growth as defined by Iowa Testing, 45.7% of middle school regular attendees made more than expected growth in reading from 2015-16 to 2016-17.</p> <p>National standard score growth from 5th to 6th grade was farthest from the expected target.</p>
High school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in reading on state assessments compared to occasional participants.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p> <p>Frequency count of students meeting cut score for proficiency divided by total number assessed</p>	<p>There was no significant difference in the change in reading scores for high school regular attendees and occasional attendees as measured by Iowa Assessments.</p> <p>The percent of high school regular attendees proficient in reading did not increase from 2015-16 to 2016-17.</p> <p>Compared to the average expected growth as defined by Iowa Testing, 38.1% of high school regular attendees made more than expected growth in</p>

	Change in national standard scores compared to Iowa Testing expected growth tables	reading from 2015-16 to 2016-17. National standard score growth from 10th to 11th grade was farthest from the expected target.
--	--	---

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
Elementary 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in mathematics on state assessments compared to occasional participants.	<p>Met stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p> <p>Frequency count of students meeting cut score for proficiency divided by total number assessed</p>	<p>There is a significant difference in the mathematics growth of elementary regular attendees compared to occasional attendees as measured by Iowa Assessments.</p> <p>Additionally, the percent of elementary regular attendees proficient in mathematics increased from 75% in 2015-16 to 76% in 2016-17.</p>
Middle school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in mathematics on state assessments compared to occasional participants.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p> <p>Frequency count of students meeting cut score for proficiency divided by total number assessed</p> <p>Change in national standard scores compared to Iowa Testing expected growth tables</p>	<p>While there was a positive change in average national standard score for regular attendees and occasional attendees, the growth of occasional attendees was significantly greater compared to the growth of regular attendees in mathematics as measured by Iowa Assessments.</p> <p>The percent of middle school regular attendees proficient in mathematics decreased from 83% in 2015-16 to 77% in 2016-17.</p> <p>The percent of middle school occasional attendees proficient in mathematics also decreased from 71% in 2015-16 to 68% in 2016-17.</p> <p>Compared to the average expected growth as defined by Iowa Testing, 52.9% of middle school regular attendees made more than expected growth from in mathematics 2015-16 to 2016-17.</p> <p>National standard score growth from 6th to 7th grade was farthest from the expected target.</p>

High school 21st Century regular program participants who demonstrate growth in mathematics on state assessments compared to occasional participants.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p> <p>Frequency count of students meeting cut score for proficiency divided by total number assessed</p> <p>Change in national standard scores compared to Iowa Testing expected growth tables</p>	<p>There is no significant difference in the mathematics growth of high school regular attendees compared to occasional attendees as measured by Iowa Assessments.</p> <p>The percent of high school occasional attendees proficient in mathematics decreased from 74% in 2015-16 to 72% in 2016-17.</p> <p>The percent of high school occasional attendees proficient in mathematics also decreased from 71% in 2015-16 to 70% in 2016-17.</p> <p>Compared to the average expected growth as defined by Iowa Testing, 57.8% of high school regular attendees made more than expected growth from in mathematics 2015-16 to 2016-17.</p> <p>National standard score growth from 10th to 11th grade was farthest from the expected target.</p>
---	---	---

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
By June of each year, elementary participants will show a greater annual school attendance rate than non-participants.	<p>Met stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p>	There is a significant difference in the average daily attendance for elementary regular attendees compared to occasional attendees.
By June of each year, middle school participants will show a greater annual school attendance rate than non-participants.	<p>Met stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p>	There is a significant difference in the average daily attendance for middle school regular attendees compared to occasional attendees.
By June of each year, high school participants will show a greater annual school attendance rate than non-participants.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Independent samples t-test to compare means</p>	<p>There is no significant difference in the average daily attendance for high school regular attendees compared to occasional attendees.</p> <p>Disaggregation of data by grade suggests that 10th graders in 2016-17 had lowest average attendance. With</p>

		<p>limited number of regular attendees at the high school, however, generalization of these findings to the general population would not be appropriate.</p> <p>This was the first year of CCLC programming for the high school cohort. A larger impact on attendance rates is expected moving forward.</p>
--	--	---

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
By June of each year, at least 80% of regular attendees will demonstrate increased school engagement with fewer disciplinary incidents (on average) than students attending fewer than 30 days.	<p>Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective</p> <p>Frequency count of regularly attending students with fewer disciplinary incidents than occasional and non attendees divided by total number of regular attendees.</p>	<p>At the elementary, 96% of regular attendees had fewer disciplinary incidents than non attendees. 87% had fewer disciplinary incidents than occasional attendees.</p> <p>At the middle school, 86% of regular attendees had fewer disciplinary incidents than non attendees. 76% had fewer disciplinary incidents than occasional attendees.</p> <p>At the high school, 89% of regular attendees had fewer disciplinary incidents than non attendees. 65% had fewer disciplinary incidents than occasional attendees.</p>

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
By June of each year, at least 90% of regular attendees will demonstrate improved proficiency in college and career readiness as compared to the previous year/ baseline (measured by the CBCSD Proficiency and College and Career Ready Growth Report).	Objective not measured	Moving forward, the college and career readiness objective will target enrollment of students in postsecondary institutions and be tracked via the National Student Clearinghouse. Results will be pulled from the Postsecondary Enrollment Report provided by the Department of Education.

Objective	Objective Rating/ Methodology	Justification for Rating
Annually, at least 95% of regular attendees will graduate with their 4-year cohort.	Objective not met, progress made toward stated objective Frequency count of students graduating with their 4-year cohort divided by the total number of seniors graduating in 2016-17	65% of regular attending seniors are graduated with their 4-year cohort. 78% of occasional attending seniors graduated with their 4-year cohort in 2016-17. This was the first year of CCLC programming for the high school cohort. A larger impact on 4-year cohort graduation is expected moving forward.



Recommendations

Consider the possibility of CCLC facilitators monitoring short-term indicators on an ongoing basis. Daily attendance rates, grades or behavior referrals be key in decision-making on a quarterly basis.

Considering the differences in grading scales across grades, GPA might be a more consistent indicator for goal setting.

Considering that Iowa Assessments are most frequently administered at grades 3 through 11, other measures such as district-wide universal screeners might capture math and reading achievement for more grades in elementary cohorts.

Cohort 11 is in first year of implementation of CCLC programming in 2016-17. The grant may observe a larger impact on the graduation indicator after several years of implementation. Strategies such as peer recruitment might increase attendance in CCLC programming at the high school level and ensure maximized impact of the program on attendance and graduation rates. Consider an examination of common characteristics of students who do not graduate with their 4-year cohort peers and common characteristics of students who have lowest average daily attendance rates in order to best target CCLC opportunities.

It is recommended that student and staff survey items be evaluated in regard to their role in program adjustment and outcome determinations. Modifying the survey or its presentation that might increase the response rate to provide the most valuable input.

Consider surveying occasional attendees to identify what barriers exist that may be preventing more frequent attendance in CCLC opportunities.

Students engaging in goal setting prior to taking district-wide assessment can have a positive impact on scores; ensuring that they are aware of their current scores and expected growth. Consider how goal setting might impact student scores on district-wide assessment.



Appendix D - Staff Professional Development Plan

**21st Century Community Learning Centers
Council Bluffs Community School District
Cohorts IX, X, XI, XI
2017-2108**

* Categories outlined in order of priority

This chart is updated monthly

Categories of Professional Development	Number of Staff Trained	Hours (length of professional development)	Date	Who facilitated the professional development?	Additional Information
1. Required Professional Development (required by local district or law, such as blood borne pathogens, etc., as well as logistics/operations/administration of programs type of professional development)	A. Ten	<p>9 staff X 1hr = 12hrs on-line (108 hours). Topics included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 103 (Custom) • Sexual Harassment: Policy and Prevention (Full Course) • Policy Acknowledgement. (Custom) • FERPA: Confidentiality of 	8/15/17	SafeSchools^T_M	All Staff were required to complete these modules on-line before the November 2017 deadline.

	B. Ten	<p>Records (Full Course)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazard Communication: Right to Understand (GHS) (Full Course) • Bloodborne Pathogen Exposure Prevention (Full Course) • Fire Extinguisher Safety (Full Course) <p>We are technically good until 2018, but I am looking for a “brush-up.” I feel rusty.</p> <p><u>This might do it.</u> What say you?</p>		<p>Red Cross “Adult & Pediatric First Aid/CPR/AED”</p>	<p>In a spring of 2016 21st CCLC staff meeting, we determined that it would be a good policy and practice to have all 21st CCLC trained in First Aid/CPR/AED since all of the school health aids/nurses are not on site at school after hours.</p>
--	--------	---	--	--	--

	C. Nine	9 X 2.5 hours - 22.5 Hours	8/17/17 @ MAC	CBCSD Summer Teaching Academy	Our 21st CCLC Team was able to present information to (26 registered) 13 participants of the Summer Academy about our out-of school offerings at the 7 schools. Here is a link to our lesson plan.
2. Whole Child Professional Development (social, emotional, mental, dental, medical, behavior management, etc.)	7	You for Youth website	Throughout the year information shared at Team meetings	Team participation of modules	Topics to focus on: Literacy, STEM, Citizen Science, Project-based Learning and Family Engagement
3. Family Engagement (such as the Parenting Way, Inc., ways of supporting the family)		Link to updated Parent Engagement Plan			
4. Academic Professional Development (such as literacy, math, STEM, etc.)	1	4 hours	10/12/17	Governor's STEM Advisory Council - Active Learning After School (IAA, Science Center of IA, Iowa Children's Museum, State Hygienic Lab, Metro Waste Authority)	Dimensions of Success resource provided and used during session. Training also given as part of the PD.

Categories of Professional Development	Number of Staff Trained	Hours (length of professional development)	Date	Who facilitated the professional development?	Additional Information
5. Enrichment Professional Development (physical education, art, music, chess, or other enrichment)	1	30 hours (2hr session twice a week)	7/17 - current	Spanish Immersion Language House	Spanish language learning to better assist our hispanic population. (Elana Zalar)
6. 21CCLC Committee Participation (counts as professional development)	A. 7 Full - 21st CCLC time staff serve on at least one Committee	Monthly - 1 hour	Varies	Vic Jaras and Iowa Afterschool Alliance, Rhonda Calderon	Darcie Capo - Support Jess Clark - Support Nikki Clausen - Family Engagement Sandy Day - Communications Julia Hartnett - Communications Jessie Stoffel - Evaluation Elana Zalar - Conference
7. Statewide Professional Development (state conferences, workshops, webinars) – Impact After School, Best Practice Webinars, Fall Professional	A.7 (All staff)	7.5 (8:30 a - 4 p)	8/9/17	Iowa Afterschool Alliance, State DOE, CBCSD, Beyond the Bell Same as above	Darcie Capo, Jess Clark, Nikki Clausen, Sandy Day, Julia Hartnett, Jessie Stoffel, Elana Zalar

Development Workshop, state PD provided by other providers.	B. All FTE	24 hours	4/25-27/18		Same as above
8. Out-of-State Professional Development (optional – if progress is being made in other categories)	A. One	24 hours	10/23 though 25/17	National Summer Learning Association (NSLA)	Please note that expenses for this conference we re paid by the school district through the IWF grant. Click here for notes

21st CCLC Staff:

1. *Darcie Capo, Thomas Jefferson Site Facilitator
2. Nichol Cason, Carter Lake Site Facilitator
3. *Jess Clark, Wilson Site Facilitator
4. *Nikki Clausen, Elementary Coordinator
5. *Sandy Day, Director (Paid by SB Schools)
6. Ann Goldapp, Roosevelt Site Facilitator
7. *Julia Hartnett, Abraham Lincoln Site Facilitator
8. Tondi Ronk, Rue Site Facilitator
9. Kelly Keller, Longfellow Site Facilitator
10. Christina Larney, Franklin Site Facilitator
11. *Jessie Stoffel, Assistant Program Director
12. *Elana Zalar, Kirn, Site Facilitator

* = full time staff

21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) Annual Evaluation

2016-2017 – Executive Summary

Sandra Day, Ed.D. Director, 21st CCLC Programs

Council Bluffs Community Schools received its first 21st CCLC grant in the 2014-2015 school year when Kirn and Wilson Middle Schools were awarded. Since then, the Iowa Department of Education has awarded CB Schools three more grants, serving a total of nine (9) schools.*



This federal grant is part of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Its funding is outlined in Title IV Part B. And, very much like Title 1 program funding seeks to assist schools serving at-risk students who participate in the federal school lunch program and those who are not proficient in the areas of math and/or reading. Unlike Title 1, these funds are to be used in out-of-school time such as before, after, and summer school programming.

The Wallace Foundation (www.wallacefoundation.org) has been following research trends on 21st CCLC since the program began 23 years ago. They have found that students who participate in out-of-school programming for 30 days or more will see increased in-school attendance, grades, and a decrease in discipline incidents. What's more, we have recently learned that juvenile arrests in our city have decreased. This mirrors a national trend that sits at a 30% decrease in juvenile crime.

Each year, we are required to provide the Department of Education an external evaluation of our programs. This year our evaluator, Sherry Huffman, Ed.S., completed our evaluation and we provide you a copy along with this summary.

Four Most Important Points:

1. Regular Attendees at the elementary and middle school showed a statistically significant higher in-school attendance rate than occasional attendees. What's more, regular attendees at all levels have a higher attendance rate than the 2015-16 state average of 95.7%.
2. In reading, while there was no significant difference in growth between regular attendees and occasional attendees on the state test, the percent of students proficient at the elementary increased from last year. Additionally, 46% of middle school regular attendees and 38% of high school regular attendees made more than expected growth in reading.
3. Elementary regular attendees demonstrated statistically significant growth in Math compared to occasional attendees. The percent of regular attendees proficient also increased. 53% of middle school regular attendees and 58% of high school regular attendees made more than expected growth in the state assessment in Math.
4. When it comes to discipline incidents, more than 85% of regular attendees at all levels had fewer disciplinary incidents than students not participating in CCLC programming. Our goal is that at least 80% of the regular attendees will have fewer discipline incidents than occasional attendees.

Our students' growth is evident in attendance, grades, test scores, and school engagement. We are confident that the needle is moving in the right direction.

Data courtesy of Council Bluffs Police Department

*21st CCLC Grant Awards

- 2014 – Kirn & Wilson
- 2015- Franklin, Longfellow, & Rue
- 2016 – Abraham Lincoln & Thomas Jefferson
- 2017 – Carter Lake and Roosevelt

Time of Day	2014	2015	2016	Total per Time
2:00 PM	63	61	74	475
3:00 PM	70	59	61	434
4:00 PM	59	56	39	317
5:00 PM	73	57	41	327
Total per Year	265	233	215	1553

Start		Community Partner			Contribution (detail)								Staff Provided	In-kind value		Sites Served									
Season (Summer, Fall or Spring)	Year	Organization	Contact Name	Contact Email	Evaluation Services	Raise Funds	Programming / Activity Related Services	Provide Food	Goods	Volunteer Staff	Paid Staff	Other	Give details if staff was provided. Leave blank if non- applicable	Enter monetary value. Leave blank if non-applicable.	ALHS	TJHS	Kim MS	Wils n MS	Carte r Lake ES	Frank lin ES	Longf ellow ES	Roos evett ES	Rue ES		
Fall	2014	Advanced Air, Inc	Lisa LeMantia	advancedaircb@yahoo.com			1											1	1		1	1		1	
Fall	2014	AIM Institute	Elody Kiser	ekiser@cbcsd.org																					
Spring	2015	American Red Cross	Micheal Coleman	Richard.coleman@redcross.org			1				1					1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fall	2014	Barnes & Noble	Asure	CRM2836@bn.com																					
Spring	2015	Bent Tree Golf Course	Tony Driscoll	BTproshop@msn.com										\$2,500				1	1						
Fall	2015	Boy Scouts of America	Amanda Barrett	amanda.barrett@scouting.org		1			1	1								1	1	1		1	1	1	
Spring	2017	Boystown Iowa Buena Vista University	Patrick Garcia	patrick.garcia@boystown.org			1				1			\$15,000	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	
Fall	2015	Camp Kitaki	Mike Jensen	MJensen@ymcalincoln.org			1											1	1						
Spring	2017	Canvas Concoctions	Stephanie Keneally	skenealy@cbcsd.org			1		1								1								
Spring	2017	Capitol School of Hairstling & Esthetics	Skylar McCaig	skylar@capitollook.com			1										1								
Spring	2017	Carpenter's Union	Chris Merk	cmerk@ncsrc.org																					
Fall	2015	CBSC (CB Soccer Club)	Eric Hayes	doc@cbssoccerclub.org																	1	1		1	
Spring	2017	Common Sense Parenting	Sonya Fittie	Sonya.Fittie@boystown.org			1				1			\$10,000	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	
Fall	2017	Community Education Foundation	Chris LaFerla	claferla@cb-cef.org			1				1										1	1	1	1	
Summer	2017	ConAgra															1	1							
Fall	2016	Consultant	Sherry Huffman	shuffman@ghaea.org	1						1		Externa Evaluato			1	1	1	1		1	1		1	
Fall	2016	Council Bluffs Chamber of Commerce	Lori Shields	lori@councilbluffs-iowa.com			1										1	1							
Fall	2014	Council Bluffs Community Schools	Vickie Murillo	vmurillo@cbcsd.org			1		1	1	1						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fall	2017	Council Bluffs Community Schools - Nutrition Services	Lisa Stewart	lstewart@cbcsd.org				1																	
Fall	2016	Council Bluffs CSD & Iowa West Foundation	Corey Vorthmann	cvorthmann@cbcsd.org			1	1	1		1		Site Supervisors	\$750,000	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	
Fall	2014	Council Bluffs Fire Department	Rick Bradshaw	rbradshaw@councilbluffs-ia.gov			1											1	1						
Fall	2014	Council Bluffs Police Department	Dave Burns	dmburns@councilbluffs-ia.gov			1				1						1	1	1	1					
Summer	2014	Council Bluffs Public Library	Anna Hartmann	ahartmann@councilbluffslibrary.org			1		1	1		1					1	1	1	1		1	1	1	
Fall	2017	CountryHouse Residence	Ashley Rutan	arutan@countryhouse.net			1		1	1		1	Activity Leaders	\$5,000	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	
Summer	2017	Creighton University - Career Exploration	D'Lynn Buck	dlynnbuck@creighton.edu																					
Spring	2017	Creighton University - School of Pharmacy																							
Fall	2015	Diltmar's Orchard	Ashley Stange	info@diltmarsorchard.com			1							\$900				1			1	1		1	
Fall	2016	Durham Museum	Grace Sullivan	gsullivan@durhammuseum.org			1					1								1	1	1	1	1	
Fall	2016	Exploring	Tara Lopez	tara.lopez@fllmail.org			1	1		1			Career Experts			1	1								
Spring	2016	Fontenelle Forest	Kathy Fischer	KFischer@fontenelleforest.org			1			1	1	1				1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fall	2017	Food Bank for the Heartland	Michelle Sause	msause@foodbankheartland.org					1											1	1	1	1	1	
Spring	2017	GenCyber	Therese Laux	therese.laux@unl.edu			1		1		1		Lead Teacher	\$99,747				1	1						
Fall	2016	Girl Scouts of America	Ngan Hoag	nhoang@gsiowa.org			1			1												1			
Spring	2017	Girls Who Code	Jackson Thomas	jackson@girlswhocode.com			1		1			1		\$85,000	1	1	1	1	1						
Spring	2017	Google - Fashionology	Allie Hopkins	kitsune@google.com			1		1	1			Google Coder	\$25,000	1	1	1	1	1						
Summer	2017	Grief's Journey	Rebecca Turner	rtturner@griefsjourney.org			1								1	1									
Summer	2017	Habitat for Humanity of Omaha	Turner Morgan	tmorgan@habitatomaha.org			1								1	1									
Fall	2016	Habitat ReStore	Glennay Jundt	glennay@habitatcb.org			1		1	1				\$5,000				1	1						
Spring	2015	Hitchcock Nature Center	Rene Stroud	rene.stroud@pottcounty-ia.gov			1											1	1						
Summer	2017	Hot Shops Art Studio - Camp Summer Explore	Tim Barry	timbpottery@gmail.com			1											1	1						
Fall	2015	HyVee - Broadway	Catering Mgr & Dietican				1	1		1							1	1	1						
Fall	2015	HyVee - Madison	Catering Mgr & Dietican				1	1		1							1	1	1						
		Iowa College Access Network					1																		
Spring	2017	Iowa School for the Deaf	Cynthia Angeroth	cangeroth@iowaschoolforthe deaf.org														1							
Fall	2017	Iowa State University Extension Office	Todd Stevens	todds1@iastate.edu																					
Fall	2016	IWCC - Adult Education	Teresa Cooley-Daniels	tcooleydaniel@iwcc.edu			1			1		1		\$12,500	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	
Summer	2016	IWCC - Career Exploration	Natalie Harris	nharris@iwcc.edu																					
Spring	2017	IWCC - Construction Technology	David Hazlewood	dhazlewood@iwcc.edu																					
Fall	2016	IWCC - Nursing Department	Bailey McQueen	bmcqueen@iwcc.edu			1											1	1						
Summer	2017	Joslyn Art Museum	Karla Lechtenberger	klechtenberger@joslyn.org			1			1								1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fall	2016	KANEKO	Michael Hollins	michael@thekaneke.org			1				1						1	1	1	1					
Fall	2015	Kids & Company	Greg Smith	gsmith2@cb-cef.org			1														1	1		1	
Fall	2016	Lauritzen Gardens	Alison Dush	omahabotanicalgarden.org			1											1	1		1	1			
Fall	2016	Legislative Aides: Senator Ernst, Senator Grassley, State Rep. Charlie McConkey	Various									1					1	1	1	1		1	1	1	
Fall	2016	Midlands Humane Society	Teri	tagmils@aol.com			1			1							1					1			
Fall	2016	Mobile Gaming Experience	David Beck	mgcomaha@gmail.com			1							\$100 discount				1	1						
	016-201	Omaha Chess	Jon Mayo	jon.mayo@brownell.edu			1										1								
Fall	2016	Omaha Children's Museum	Kelsey McLaughlin	kmclaughlin@ocm.org			1				1	1		\$1,000						1	1	1	1	1	
Spring	2017	Omaha Exploring - Creighton Pharmacy Event	Tara Lopez	tara.lopez@scouting.org			1										1	1							
Summer	2017	Omaha Henry Doorly Zoo - Camp Summer Explore	Emily Brown	emily.brown@omahazoo.com																					
Summer	2015	Omaha Henry Doorly Zoo - Clubs	Peter Brunette	peter.brunette@omahazoo.com			1							\$100/per session						1	1			1	
Fall	2017	Omaha Henry Doorly Zoo - Family Events	Angela Bobbett	angela.bobbett@omahazoo.com			1	1	1					\$105						1					
Spring	2017	Omaha Storm Chasers	Alex Beck	AlexB@omahastormchasers.com			1					1		\$900						1	1	1	1	1	

Start		Community Partner			Contribution (detail)								Staff Provided	In-kind value	Sites Served								
Season (Summer, Fall or Spring)	Year	Organization	Contact Name	Contact Email	Evaluation Services	Raise Funds	Programming / Activity Related Services	Provide Food	Goods	Volunteer Staff	Paid Staff	Other	Give details if staff was provided. Leave blank if non- applicable	Enter monetary value. Leave blank if non-applicable.	ALHS	TJHS	Kim MS	Wilso n MS	Carte r Lake ES	Frank lin ES	Longf ellow ES	Roos velt ES	Rue ES
Fall	2016	Omaha Symphony	Joanie Mathis	jmathis@omahasymphony.org			1							\$1,120						1	1		1
Fall	2016	Papa Johns						1						\$500			1	1					
		Pottwattamie County Department of Natural Resources																					
Spring	2017	Raising Canes						1						\$75			1						
Fall	2016	Sanders Martial Arts	Shane Sanders	sandersata@aol.com										\$450 per 8 wks				1			1		1
Fall	2016	Seefus Riding Stables	Pam Seefus	seefusridingstable@yahoo.com			1										1	1					
Fall	2016	Shady Lane Ranch	Karen Nielson	ksnjump@hotmail.com			1								1								
Summer	2017	Squirrel Cage Jail																					
Fall	2016	The 712 Initiative	Morgan Wade	mwade@the712initiative.org					1							1							
Fall	2016	The Block	Alexander Hifferman	chifferman@gmail.com			1				1												
Fall	2017	The Daily Nonpareil Newspaper	Tim Johnson	tjohnson@nonpareilonline.com									Communication		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Fall	2017	The Rose Theater	Melissa Richter	melissar@rosetheater.org			1				1												1
Fall	2015	Thunderbowl	Angie Slaughter	angie@thunderbowl.com			1				1				1	1	1			1	1		1
Summer	2014	Treyner State Bank	Kyle Osborne	kyle.osborne@tsinstitute.org			1	1	1	1										1			1
Fall	2016	UMBA Hall	Linda Scott	lindabrock@hotmail.com			1										1	1					
Spring	2017	UNL - Construction Management (Omaha)	Stuart Bernstein	sbernstein2@unl.edu																			
Summer	2017	UNO - Career Exploration	Heather Mangiameli	hmangiameli@unomaha.edu																			
Fall	2017	UNO - Planetarium	Krista Testin	unoplanetarium@unomaha.edu			1										1	1					
Fall	2017	Visiting Nurses Association	Anna Curry	acurry@vnatoday.org			1	1		1	1							1					
Fall	2016	Whispering Roots	Greg Fripps	gfripp@whisperingroots.org			1		1							1							
Summer	2014	YMCA	Leo McIntosh	lmcintosh@metroymca.org			1				1							1	1				
															1	1							