




La Vina Elementary

After School Program Report Card for 2016-2017

This report describes the participants, participation levels, and outcomes of the 2016-2017 after school program at La Vina Elementary. Participant data includes the gender, ethnicity, English Learner (EL) status, and grade level of students. Outcomes measured include **regular school day attendance**, performance on the English-Language Arts (ELA) and Math portions of the **California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP)**, performance on the **California English Language Development Test (CELDT)**, and percentages of students **Redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (RFEF)**. The relationship between after school program attendance and these key outcomes were examined.



Section 1

Participation Demographics

During the 2016-2017 school year, a total of 103 students attended the after school program for at least one day¹. Participation levels are reported and compared by grade level in the next sections of this report.

Section 1.1 – Gender and Ethnicity




Figure 1




Figure 2

Section 1.2 – Grade Level and English Learner (EL) Status




Figure 3




Figure 4

Section 2

After School Program Attendance

Section 2.1 – Program Attendance Categories

For purposes of comparison in this report, students are grouped into four attendance categories (non-attenders, low attenders, medium attenders, and high attenders) based on the number of days they participated in the after school program during the school year¹. Low attenders participated between 1-29 days. Medium attenders participated between 30-89 days. High attenders participated for at least 90 days. These program attendance categories are used in the analysis of measurable outcomes throughout this report³.


Student Totals

❖ After School Attenders	103
❖ Total Student Population (from CBEDS) ⁹	266
❖ After School % of School(s) Population	38.7%

Attender Composition

Gender		EL Status	
❖ Male	54	❖ EL	53
❖ Female	49	❖ Non-EL	43
❖ No Data	0	❖ No Data	7

Grade		Days Attended	
❖ K-3 rd	33	❖ 1-29	4
❖ 4 th -6 th	48	❖ 30-89	20
❖ 7 th -8 th	22	❖ 90+	79
❖ No Data	0		



Section 2.2 – Number of Days Students Attended the After School Program

The average after school attender participated in the program for 131.13 days. The mean number of days that students attended the after school program is disaggregated by grade span in Figure 5.

The average after school attender participated in the program for approximately 4.32 days per week (during the weeks in which they participated at least one day)². The mean number of days per week that students attended the after school program is disaggregated by grade level in Figure 6.




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7

Section 2.3 –After School Program Retention

Figure 8 shows the percentage of students whose date of intake (e.g. first date of attendance) in 2016-2017 fell in each month of the fiscal year. The average shown below each month is the average number of days each student in the group attended the program for the entire year.




Figure 8

Section 3

Regular School Day Attendance

Section 3.1 – Mean Change in Regular Day Attendance by After School Attendance Category

Figure 9 shows the relationship between change in regular school day attendance and attending the after school program. Changes in attendance from the previous year are shown for each of four attendance categories. Changes represent the difference (+ or -) in the mean number of regular school days after school students attended in the target year when compared with the previous year⁴.




Figure 9

Figure 10 shows the relationship between change in regular school day attendance and attending the after school program **by grade level**. Changes in attendance from the previous year are shown for each of four attendance categories. Changes represent the difference (+ or -) in the mean number of regular school days after school students attended in the target year when compared with the previous year⁴.

	Non-Attenders	Low Attenders	Medium Attenders	High Attenders
Kindergarten	0.880			
1 st Grade	2.933		7.999	2.378
2 nd Grade	-0.664			-1.874
3 rd Grade	2.681	1.023	-0.667	0.967
4 th Grade	-0.353			-0.582
5 th Grade	0.706		-2.000	2.330
6 th Grade	-1.100		0.017	-1.153
7 th Grade	0.424	6.000	-0.851	-0.102
8 th Grade	-0.883		-6.000	-1.187
Overall	0.226	2.682	-0.085	0.132

Figure 10

Section 3.2 – Percentage of Students with 96% School Attendance

Figure 11 shows the relationship between attending the after school program and meeting the 96% attendance benchmark for the regular school day. Percentages of low, medium, and high attending students with a 96% attendance rate¹⁰ are compared with non-attenders.




Figure 11

Figure 12 shows the relationship between attending the after school program and meeting the 96% attendance benchmark for the regular school day over by grade level. Percentages of low, medium, and high attending students with a 96% attendance rate¹⁰ are compared with non-attenders.

	Non-Attenders	Low Attenders	Medium Attenders	High Attenders
<i>Kindergarten</i>	53.6 %			
<i>1st Grade</i>	50.0 %		0.0 %	62.5 %
<i>2nd Grade</i>	47.8 %			55.6 %
<i>3rd Grade</i>	66.7 %	100.0 %	66.7 %	71.4 %
<i>4th Grade</i>	73.7 %			70.6 %
<i>5th Grade</i>	41.2 %		66.7 %	75.0 %
<i>6th Grade</i>	80.0 %		33.3 %	100.0 %
<i>7th Grade</i>	65.0 %	100.0 %	75.0 %	100.0 %
<i>8th Grade</i>	60.0 %		0.0 %	66.7 %
<i>Overall</i>	61.5 %	100.0 %	50.0 %	75.3 %

Figure 12

Section 4

Academic Achievement

The relationship between after school program participation and performance on state standardized tests in core subjects was analyzed using the California Assessment of Student Progress and Performance (CAASPP) in English-Language Arts (ELA) and Math.

Section 4.1 – CAASPP Performance in English-Language Arts (ELA)

Figure 13 compares the percentages of students (in eligible grade levels¹¹) who met or exceeded the standard in ELA among non-, low, medium, and high attenders.




Figure 13

Section 4.2 – CAASPP Performance in Math

Figure 14 compares the percentages of students (in all eligible grade levels¹¹) who met or exceeded the standard in Math among non-, low, medium, and high attenders.




Figure 14

Section 5

Language Development

The relationship between after school participation and language development for English Learners (EL) was analyzed using the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). Since the administration of the CELDT begins in the fall of each school year, performance on this test is considered an outcome of the previous year⁵.

Section 5.1 –California English Language Development Test (CELDT)

Figure 15 compares the percentages of EL students (in all grade levels) scoring Early Advanced or Advanced among non-, low, medium, and high attenders⁶.

Percentage Of Students Advanced/Early Advanced
California English Language Development Test, 2016-2017




Figure 15

Section 5.2 –Percentage of Students Redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)

Figure 16 compares the percentages of students who were Redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) in 2016-2017 among non-, low, medium, and high attenders⁷.

Percentage Of EL Students Redesignated As Fluent English Proficient
RFEP, 2016-2017




Figure 16

Section 6

Endnotes

¹ Summer attendance is ignored for the sake of determining dosage (in order to base dosage on a 180 day school year). In addition, students considered as "Summer Only" are not included in either the after school or non-after school populations.

² The mean number of days attended per week is based on the ratio of the number days each student participated in the after school program to the number of weeks where the student had at least one day of attendance.

³ A quantile is defined as class of values of a variate that divides the total frequency of a sample or population into a given number of equal proportions. Specialized quantiles, those that split the sample or population into a specific number of groups, are given special names such as tertiles (3 groups), quartile (4 groups), and deciles (10 groups). This report utilizes deciles.

Decile ranges are determined by assigning each after school participant a percentile rank based on the number of days they attended the program and dividing them into ten equal percentile groups (0th-9th, 10th-19th, 20th-29th, ... , 90th-99th). For this reason, the number of students in each decile group may not be equal. In other words, if you have a very large number of students with 3 days of attendance in the first decile and a very small number of students with 4 days of attendance in the second decile you cannot randomly choose some 3-day students to move over to the second decile to make the groups equally sized.

These attendance groupings were determined by assigning each after school attendee a percentile rank and dividing them into ten equal decile groups (see Figure 6). Low attenders represent the lowest five deciles (1st-49th percentile). Medium attenders represent the sixth through eighth deciles (50th-79th percentile). High attenders represent the ninth and tenth decile (80th-99th percentile), which is the top 20% of program attenders.

⁴ The algorithm for calculating mean change in regular school days attended over the previous year takes into account school years with differing days of operation, such as years with furlough days.

Only students for whom 2 years of attendance data was available are included in the sample for this chart.

⁵ Because the CELDT exam is given early in the school year it cannot be used as an outcome of that year. Therefore, for any given school year, the following year's CELDT outcomes are used to determine CELDT and RFEP gains.

⁶ This data is based on the 'Overall' CELDT proficiency and scaled scores. Only students with a classification in our data set (non-empty, non-null) are included in the sample.

⁷ Only students with a classification in our data set (non-empty, non-null) are included in the sample. Percentage reclassified is the percent of students who were classified as English Learners (EL) in the baseline year then Reclassified as Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) in the target year.

⁸ Students are actually only allowed one attempt in 10th grade, however this statement is included for clarity.

⁹ CBEDS data is collected as a "point in time" during the school year. In rare cases the number of after school students may exceed the number of CBEDS reported enrollment resulting in a percentage over 100%.

¹⁰ The percentage of school attendance is a ratio of regular school days attended to regular school days enrolled. Therefore, this figure and its 96% goal is automatically adjusted for school years with differing calendars, days of operation, and student enrollment patterns.

¹¹ The California Assessment of Student Progress and Performance (CAASPP) is given only to students in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11.

¹² The data represented is based on the number of credits attempted and completed in the target school year. In rare cases where the school or district was only able to provide cumulative totals, cumulative credits attempted and earned were used in the ratio.

Program Highlights

Mean Number of Days Students Attended the After School Program (Figure 5)

- ❖ After school attenders attended the program for an average of **135.8** days.

Mean Number of Days Per Week Students Attended the After School Program (Figure 6)

- ❖ After school attenders attended the program for an average of **4.3** days per week.

Percentage of Students Attending 96% of Regular School Days (Figure 11)

- ❖ The percentage of high attenders attending 96% of Regular School Days or higher was **13.8%** greater than non-attenders.

Percentage of Students Advanced/Early Advanced on the CELDT (Figure 16)

- ❖ The percentage of high attenders scoring Advanced or Early Advanced on the CELDT was **26.7%** greater than non-attenders.

Percentage of EL Students Redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (Figure 17)

- ❖ The percentage of high attenders Reclassified as Fluent English Proficient was **4.3%** greater than low attenders.
- ❖ The percentage of high attenders Reclassified as Fluent English Proficient was **3.3%** greater than non-attenders.