




Cooper Middle School

After School Program Report Card for 2018-2019

This report describes the participants, participation levels, and outcomes of the 2018-2019 after school program at Cooper Middle School. Participant data includes the gender, ethnicity, English Learner (EL) status, and grade level of students. Outcomes measured include **regular school day attendance and absences**, performance on the English-Language Arts (ELA) and Math portions of the **California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP)**, performance on the **English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)**, percentages of students **Redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (RFEP)**, and **suspension rates**. The relationship between after school program attendance and these key outcomes were examined.



Section
01

Participant Demographics

During the 2018-2019 school year, a total of 544 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 1.3 – Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Indicators

Low attenders participated between 1-29 days. Medium attenders participated between 30-89 days. High attenders participated for at least 90 days.

	Non-Attenders	Low Attenders	Medium Attenders	High Attenders
Special Education	9.7% n=31	2.8% n=254	0.6% n=166	2.1% n=96
G.A.T.E.	0.0% n=31	0.0% n=254	0.0% n=166	0.0% n=96
Homeless	0.0% n=31	0.4% n=254	0.6% n=166	0.0% n=96
Foster Youth	0.0% n=31	0.4% n=254	0.6% n=166	2.1% n=96
Chronic Absentee	22.6% n=31	11.4% n=254	3.6% n=166	1.0% n=96

Figure 5

Section 1.4 – Numeric Demographics

	Non-Attenders	After School Attenders	Total
Male	20	254	274
Female	11	290	301
No Data			

	Non-Attenders	After School Attenders	Total
EL	2	37	39
Non-EL	29	479	508
No Data		28	28

	Non-Attenders	After School Attenders	Total
Asian	1	20	21
Black	2	41	43
Hispanic	27	408	435
White	1	53	54
Other		6	6

	Non-Attenders	After School Attenders	Total
6th	4	148	152
7th	18	201	219
8th	9	195	204
Other			



Figure 6

Section
02

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.



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

The average after school attender participated in the program for **45.40** days. The mean number of days that students attended the after school program is disaggregated by grade level in figure to the right.

The average after school attender participated in the program for approximately **2.79** 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 the figure below.




Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9

Section 2.3 –After School Program Retention

The figure below shows the number of students whose date of intake (e.g. first date of attendance) in 2018-2019 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 10

Section
03

Regular School Day Attendance

Section 3.1 – Percentage of School Days Attended

The figure below shows the relationship between attending the after school program and attendance for the regular school day. Percentage of school days attended of low, medium, and high attending students are compared with non-attenders¹⁰.




Figure 11

Section 3.2 – Mean Number of School Days

The figure below shows the relationship between attending the after school program and attendance for the regular school day. Mean number of school days attended of low, medium, and high attending students are compared with non-attenders¹⁰. This figure is automatically adjusted for school years with differing calendars, days of operation, and student enrollment patterns.




Figure 12

Section 3.3 – Mean Number of Unexcused Absences

The figure below shows the relationship between attending the after school program and absences for the regular school day. Mean number of unexcused absences of low, medium, and high attending students are compared with non-attenders¹⁰. This figure is automatically adjusted for school years with differing calendars, days of operation, and student enrollment patterns.




Figure 13

Section
04

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)

The figure below 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 14

Section 4.2 – CAASPP Performance in Math

The figure below 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 15

Section
05

Language Development

The relationship between after school participation and language development for English Learners (EL) was analyzed using the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC).

Section 5.1 – English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)

The figure below compares the percentages of EL students (in all grade levels) scoring Moderately Developed or Well Developed among non-, low, medium, and high attenders⁶.




Figure 16

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

The figure below compares the percentages of students who were Redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) in among non-, low, medium, and high attenders⁷.




Figure 17

Discipline

Section 6.1 – Percentage of Students Suspended

The figure below shows the relationship between attending the after school program and the percentage of students suspended for the regular school day. Percentages of students suspended of low, medium, and high attending students are compared with non-attenders.




Figure 18

Section 6.2 – Mean Number of Suspension Days

The figure below shows the relationship between attending the after school program and the number of suspensions⁵ for the regular school day. Mean number of suspensions of low, medium, and high attending students are compared with non-attenders.




Figure 19

End Notes

- 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 The number of suspension "occurrences", or incidences of suspension, differs from the number of days suspended in that a single suspension occurrence may account for multiple days of suspension. For example, a student may be suspended once (one occurrence) for 5 days. Only students with at least one suspension are included.
- ⁶ This data is based on the 'Overall' ELPAC 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 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 (English)

Percent of School Days Attended (Figure 11)

- ❖ The percentage of regular school days attended for high attenders was 2.1% greater than low attenders.
- ❖ The percentage of regular school days attended for high attenders was 4.1% greater than non-attenders.

Mean Number of School Days Attended (Figure 12)

- ❖ The mean number of school days attended for high attenders was 3.8 greater than low attenders.
- ❖ The mean number of school days attended for high attenders was 7.4 greater than non-attenders.

Mean Number of Unexcused Absences (Figure 13)

- ❖ The mean number of unexcused absences for high attenders was 0.97 less than low attenders.
- ❖ The mean number of unexcused absences for high attenders was 1.93 less than non-attenders.

Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard in Math (Figure 15)

- ❖ The percentage of high attenders who met or exceeded the standard on the CAASPP was 6.2% greater than low attenders.
- ❖ The percentage of high attenders who met or exceeded the standard on the CAASPP was 14.9% greater than non-attenders.

Percentage of Students Moderately Developed/Well Developed on the ELPAC (Figure 16)

- ❖ The percentage of high attenders scoring Moderately Developed or Well Developed on the ELPAC was 14.3% greater than low attenders.
- ❖ The percentage of high attenders scoring Moderately Developed or Well Developed on the ELPAC was 50.0% greater than non-attenders.

Percentage of Student Suspended (Figure 18)

- ❖ The percentage of students suspended for high attenders was 1.24% lower than non-attenders.

Mean Number of Suspension Days (Figure 19)

- ❖ The mean number of suspension days for high attenders was 0.38 less than low attenders.
- ❖ The mean number of suspension days for high attenders was 1.20 less than non-attenders.

Program Highlights (Spanish)

Porcentaje de días escolares atendidos (Figura 11)

- ❖ El porcentaje de días escolares regulares atendidos para personas de alta asistencia fue **2.1%** mayor que el de personas de baja asistencia.
- ❖ El porcentaje de días escolares regulares atendidos para personas de alta asistencia fue **4.1%** mayor que los que no asistieron.

Número medio de días escolares atendidos (Figura 12)

- ❖ El número promedio de días de escuela atendidos para personas de alta asistencia fue **3.8** mayor que los de baja asistencia.
- ❖ El número promedio de días escolares atendidos para personas con alta asistencia fue **7.4** mayor que los que no asistieron.

Número medio de ausencias injustificadas (Figura 13)

- ❖ El número medio de ausencias injustificadas para personas con alta asistencia fue de **0.97** menos que las personas con baja asistencia.
- ❖ El número medio de ausencias injustificadas para personas con alta asistencia fue de **1.93** menos que las personas sin asistencia.

Porcentaje de estudiantes que cumplen o exceden el estándar en matemáticas (Figura 15)

- ❖ El porcentaje de asistentes altos que cumplieron o excedieron el estándar en el CAASPP fue **6.2%** mayor que los asistentes bajos.
- ❖ El porcentaje de asistentes altos que cumplieron o excedieron el estándar en el CAASPP fue **14.9%** mayor que los que no asistieron.

Porcentaje de estudiantes moderadamente desarrollados / bien desarrollados en el ELPAC (Figura 16)

- ❖ El porcentaje de personas con alta asistencia que obtuvieron puntajes moderadamente desarrollados o bien desarrollados en el ELPAC fue **14.3%** mayor que los de baja asistencia.
- ❖ El porcentaje de personas con alta asistencia que obtuvieron puntajes moderadamente desarrollados o bien desarrollados en el ELPAC fue **50.0%** mayor que los que no asistieron.

Porcentaje de estudiantes suspendidos (Figura 18)

- ❖ El porcentaje de estudiantes suspendidos por personas con alta asistencia fue **1.24%** menor que los que no asistieron.

Número medio de días de suspensión (Figura 19)

- ❖ El número medio de días de suspensión para los asistentes altos fue **0.38** menos que los asistentes bajos.
- ❖ El número medio de días de suspensión para los que asistieron mucho fue **1.20** menos que los que no asistieron.

Program Highlights (Hmong)

Feem Pua ntawm Hnub Kawm Ntawv Koom Tes (Daim Duab 11)

- ❖ Qhov feem pua ntawm cov hnub kawm ntawv rau cov tuaj koom siab yog **2.1%** ntau dua cov neeg tuaj kawm tsawg.
- ❖ Qhov feem pua ntawm cov hnub kawm ntawv rau cov tuaj koom siab yog **4.1%** ntau dua qhov tsis tuaj koom.

Qhov Tseem Ceeb Ntawm Cov Hnub Kawm Ntawv Tau Kawm (Daim Duab 12)

- ❖ Qhov naj npawb pes tsawg ntawm cov hnub kawm ntawv rau cov neeg tuaj koom siab yog **3.8** ntau dua cov neeg tuaj kawm tsawg.
- ❖ Qhov naj npawb pes tsawg ntawm hnub kawm ntawv rau cov neeg tuaj koom siab yog **7.4** ntau dua qhov tsis tuaj koom.

Qhov Tseem Ceeb Ntawm Cov Kev Ncuu Qhaj uas Tsis Zam Txim (Daim Duab 13)

- ❖ Qhov txhais tau tsawg ntawm cov tsis tuaj kawm ntawv rau qhov kev tuaj koom siab yog **0.97** tsawg dua kev tuaj koom.
- ❖ Qhov txhais tau tsawg ntawm cov tsis tuaj kawm ntawv rau qhov kev tuaj koom siab yog **1.93** tsawg dua tsis tuaj koom.

Feem pua ntawm Cov Tub Ntxhais Kawm Sib Tham los yog Ua Tau Zoo Tshaj Lij Hauv Lej (Daim Duab 15)

- ❖ Qhov feem pua ntawm cov neeg tuaj koom siab uas tau ntsib lossis tshaj tus qauv ntawm CAASPP tau **6.2%** ntau dua li cov tuaj koom qis.
- ❖ Qhov feem pua ntawm cov neeg tuaj koom siab uas tau ntsib lossis tshaj tus qauv ntawm CAASPP tau **14.9%** siab tshaj li tsis tuaj koom.

Qhov Feem Pua ntawm Cov Tub Ntxhais Kawm Tsim Tau Zoo / Tsim Tau Zoo ntawm ELPAC (Daim Duab 16)

- ❖ Qhov feem pua ntawm cov neeg tuaj kawm ntawv qhov nruab nrab Kev Kawm Tsim Kho Zoo lossis Tsim Tau Zoo ntawm ELPAC tau **14.3%** ntau dua li cov tuaj koom tsawg.
- ❖ Qhov feem pua ntawm cov neeg tuaj koom siab qhov nruab nrab Kev Tsim Kho Zoo lossis Tsim Tau Zoo ntawm ELPAC tau **50.0%** siab dua tsis tuaj koom.

Feem pua ntawm Cov Tub Ntxhais Kawm Raug Tshem Tawm (Daim Duab 18)

- ❖ Qhov feem pua ntawm cov tub ntxhais kawm raug ncuu rau cov neeg tuaj kawm siab yog **1.24%** qis dua tsis tuaj koom.

Txhais Tau Npaum Li Cas Hnub Rau Kev ncuu (Daim Duab 19)

- ❖ Qhov txhais tau tsawg ntawm cov hnub raug ncuu rau cov tuaj koom siab yog **0.38** tsawg dua cov neeg tuaj koom tsawg.
- ❖ Qhov txhais tau tsawg ntawm cov hnub raug ncuu rau cov tuaj koom siab yog **1.20** tsawg dua tus tsis tuaj koom.

Program Highlights (Punjabi)

Śāmala hō'ē sakūla dinām dā pratīśata (citara 11)

- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī niyamita sakūla dinām dī pratīśatatā ghaṭa hāzarīna nālōm 2.1% Vadhērē sī.
- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī niyamata sakūla dinām dī pratīśatatā gaira-hāzarīna nālōm 4.1% Vadhērē sī.

Sakūla jāna vālē baci'ām dē dina dī ginatī (citara 12)

- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī hāzara sakūla dē dina dī numbersata giṇatī ghaṭa hāzarīna nālōm 3.8 Vadhērē sī.
- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī hāzara sakūla dē dina dī numbersata giṇatī gaira-hāzarīna nālōm 7.4 Vadhērē sī.

Ana-gujhaladāra gairahāzarī'ām dī mātārā (citara 13)

- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī bē'arāmī gairahāzarī dī numbersata giṇatī ghaṭa hāzarīna nālōm 0.97 Ghaṭa sī.
- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī bēhisābī gairahāzarī dī numbersata giṇatī gaira-hāzarīna nālōm 1.93 Ghaṭa sī.

Vidi'ārathī'ām dī baiṭhaka jāṁ maitha vica agē vadhaṇa dā pratīśata (citara 15)

- ❖ CAASPP dē mi'āra nū pūrā karana jāṁ isa tōm vadha jāṇa vālē uca sēvādārām dī pratīśatatā ghaṭa hāzarīna nālōm 6.2% Vadhērē sī.
- ❖ CAASPP dē mi'āra nū pūrā karana jāṁ isa tōm vadha jāṇa vālē uca sēvādārām dī pratīśatatā gaira-hāzara lōkām nālōm 14.9% Vadhērē sī.

ELPAC'tē vikasata/ cagī tar'hām vikasata vidi'ārathī'ām dī pratīśatatā (citara 16)

- ❖ ELPAC'tē Modesatana vikasata jāṁ cagī tar'hām vikasata kitē uca hāzarīna dī pratīśatatā ghaṭa hāzarīna nālōm 14.3% Vadhērē sī.
- ❖ ELPAC'tē darami'ānī taura' tē vikasata jāṁ cagī tar'hām vikasata karana vālē uca hāzarīna dī pratīśatatā gaira-hāzarīna nālōm 50.0% Vadhērē sī.

Mu'atala hō'ē vidi'ārathī'ām dī pratīśatatā (citara 18)

- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī mu'atala kitē vidi'ārathī'ām dī pratīśatatā gaira-hāzarīna nālōm 1.24% Ghaṭa sī.

Mu'atala dinām dī ginatī (citara 19)

- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī mu'atala dinām dī numbersatana giṇatī ghaṭa hāzarīna nālōm 0.38 Ghaṭa sī.
- ❖ Uca hāzarīna la'ī mu'atala dinām dī numbersata giṇatī gaira-hāzarīna nālōm 1.20 Ghaṭa sī.