COLORADO GRADUATION PATHWAYS	YEAR 3 PROGRESS REPORT

Adams-Arapahoe 28J, Rangeview HS
System Change Site
Rich Patterson-rrpatterson@aps.k12.co.us

STAFFING/RESOURCES:	SUSTAINABILITY	
Staff Members used to support CGP activities: , Evaluator/Supervisor, Administrative Assistant, School Administrator, School Counselor, Teacher, Para Professional, Social Worker, , Attendance Coordinator, Fiscal Support for Grantees, **Partners/Vendors/Collaborators:** Colllege Track, GEAR UP, Colorado Youth for Change, Aurora Mwntal health, Pre- Collegiate through UCD, McKminney Vento and Coordinators	Building capacity through professional development Board member presentation on CGP results Secured community partnerships for dropout prevention and re-engagement services	Linking CGP work to outside financial support/resources coming to the district Shared CGP results with district administrators Training related to CGP strategies have been institutionalized

DROPOUT PREVENTION ELEMENTS, METHODS & TATICS		
IDENTIFICATION	Data Analysis:	Student Demographic Data: ethnicity, gender, grade level, age…, Student Enrollment Data: attendance rates, mobility, dates of enrollment and exit, pupil membership compared to prior years…, Educational Outcomes: dropout rates, graduation rates, completion rates, percent of students completing the year, percent of students earning a certain number of credits per year, etc., Perceptual data (Student or parent perceptions of learning environment, values and beliefs, attitudes, observations), Measures of Student Learning (standardized tests, norm/criterion-referenced tests, teacher observations of abilities, authentic assessments), School Processes (evaluation of school programs and processes), , , , , Truancy Rates, , Attendance, Behavioral Data (in-school suspension rate, expulsion rates, discipline referral rate, types, etc.), Course Completion (On track to graduation), , , , , , , ,
	Early Warning Systems:	, , Implemented an EWS for the first time, Conducted data analysis to determine measures of potential dropout risk to be used in the EWS (e.g. attendance, discipline referrals, course completion, etc), , , Tested the "accuracy" of existing EWS by investigating outcomes of students identified as at-risk and not at-risk during previous years., , ,
INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE		
INTERVENTIONS & SUPPORTS		
	Enhanced Counseling and Mentoring:	, Utilization of Response to Intervention (RtI) model, , Development of partnerships with outside organizations that meet the mental health and counseling needs of students, In-school mentoring program, Reformed and enhanced the ICAP implementation process,
	Transition/Orientation Programs:	Developed program that focuses on 8th to 9th grade transition, , , , Creation of a transitions toolkit, Protocol for teachers to use in working with their most at-risk 9th graders, , , Completion of ICAP (Individual Career and Academic Plan),
	Credit Recovery Options:	, Course based , , During the summer, , After school, , During the school day Edgenuity (ED2020) , Number of "F" grades, On-time/On-track to graduation, , , , , ,
	Multiple Pathways to Graduation:	, ASCENT/Concurrent Enrollment, Reforming scheduling, grading, standards, assessment, retention, class assignment, course content and/or instructional practices, policies and procedures, Offer accelerated and/or credit recovery programs, ,

TARGET POPULATIONS		
ALL STUDENTS: No, our CGP programs are designed to serve specific, targeted population(s) **SECONDARY POPULATION:** No **TERTIARY POPULATION:**		
PRIMARY	**SECONDARY**	**TERTIARY**
GRADE LEVEL: , , , 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, Rangeview HS, **RISK FACTORS:** Low Attendance, Course Failure, High Mobility, Poor Behavior, Insufficient Credit Accrual (e.g. over age/under credit), , **RACE/ETHNICITY:** , , , , , , , Race/Ethnicity is not a consideration in defining our target population **INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM SERVICE TYPE (IPST):** , , , , , , , Our primary audience is all students in grades 9-12	**GRADE LEVEL:** , , , , , , , , **RISK FACTORS:** , , , , , Rangeview HS, **RACE/ETHNICITY:** , , , , , , , **INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM SERVICE TYPE (IPST):** , , , , , , ,	**GRADE LEVEL:** , , , , , , , **RISK FACTORS:** , , , , , Rangeview HS, **RACE/ETHNICITY:** , , , , , , , **IPST:** , , , , , , ,

OUTCOMES RELATED TO KEY PROGRAM GOALS		
ATTENDANCE	**BEHAVIOR**	**CREDIT ACCUMULATION**
OVERALL ATTENDANCE RATE FROM YR2 TO YR 3: Yes – substantial decrease in attendance **TO WHAT DO YOU ATTRIBUTE THIS CHANGE IN ATTENDANCE RATE?** Rangeview High School Truancy Rate Changes / 2011 2012 2012 / 2013 Percentage Point Change Percent Change Increase/ Decrease / Truancy Rates 2.20 5.27 3.07 58% Increase / Attendance Rates 95.14 89.43 5.71 6% Decrease /	**OVERALL BEHAVIOR (SUSPENSIONS OR EXPLULSIONS) FROM YR2 TO Y3:** No substantial change in the number or rate of suspensions and expulsions **TRENDS:** Rangeview High School Disciplinary Data (Duplicates) / Disciplinary Resolution 2011-2012 2012-2013 % Change Inc/Dec / Assigned school detention 0 250 100% Inc / Expulsion & Referred to Alternative Program 17 12 29% Dec / Extended suspension (5+ days) 0 3 100% Inc / In School Suspension 483 387 51% Dec / Out of school suspension 268 197 26% Dec / Referred to Law Enforcement 49 43 12% Dec / Restorative Justice 0 0 0 None / Suspension with expulsion recommendation 0 0 0 None / Overall 817 892 8% Inc / / Rangeview High School Disciplinary Data (Unduplicated) / Disciplinary Resolution 2011-2012 2012-2013 % Change Inc/Dec / Assigned school detention 0 250 100% Inc / Expulsion & Referred to Alternative Program 17 7 59% Dec / Extended suspension (5+ days) 0 1 100% Inc / In School Suspension 473 268 43% Dec / Out of school suspension 95 60 37% Dec / Referred to Law Enforcement 0 0 0 None / Restorative Justice 0 0 0 None / Suspension with expulsion recommendation 0 0 0 None / Overall 585 586 < .001 Inc / There was a substantial increase in the number of students who were assigned school detention. This number increased while the numbers of students who were expelled, suspended, or referred to law enforcement decreased. The only other increase was seen in the number of students who received an extended suspension. / / **TO WHAT DO YOU ATTRIBUTE THIS CHANGE IN BEHAVIOR?**	
GRADUATION	**DROPOUT**	**DROPOUT RECOVERY**

REFLECTING ON PROGRAM OUTCOMES	
GRANT GOALS	**2012-13 CGP EFFORTS**
DECREASE AT-RISK BEHAVIOR	Directly Impacts
INCREASE ATTENDANCE	Directly Impacts
INCREASE COURSE COMPLETION	Directly Impacts
INCREASE GRADUATION RATE	Directly Impacts
INCREASE RE-ENGAGEMENT RATE	Indirectly Impacts
DECREASE DROPOUT RATE	Directly Impacts

WHAT WORKED WELL (2012-13) TO MAKE PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING THE GRANT GOALS
Credit recovery did get students on track and helped grad rates / Working with staff and principal put in place mornitors and mentors

BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION
options to place students in alterative settings / only using ED2020 for recovey of credits / drop-out outreach could be stronger

STUDENT SUCCESS STORY

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAININGS ATTENDED
3rd Annual Dropout Prevention and Student Engagement Summit: (March 14, 2013) Eight workshops and training sessions were offered on topics such as assessing and enhancing school climate, making optimal use of early warning systems data, developing and maintaining school-family partnerships, creating multiple pathways and evaluating program effectiveness and implementation fidelity.
Colorado Graduation Pathways: Unified Improvement Planning/Postsecondary Workforce Readiness Workshop (September 11, 2013) A one-day workshop to assist in developing the Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness (PWR) section of the Unified Improvement Plan. Attendees were provided, supplemental data, new and updated analytic tools, methodologies for setting PWR performance targets, strategies for integrating existing CGP initiatives into the UIP, and technical assistance.