

Colorado Graduation Pathways: Unified Improvement Planning Workshop Tools



Topic	Tools	Description	Page
Introduction	Norms	Standards of behavior	1
	Data Narrative Outline	Outline of the data narrative	3
Analyzing Data	SPF Scoring Guides and Reference Data	Excerpt from the SPF reports	5
	DropOut Data Analysis Display (DODAD) Description	Table describing the data reports/views available through the DODAD tool, including: metrics, comparison points and questions to guide analysis	11
	Graduation Rate Data Description	Table describing the data reports/views available through the Graduation Rate Data Report, including: metrics, comparison points and questions to guide analysis	17
	PWR Other Data Sources	A table describing other state and locally-available data resources related to postsecondary and workforce readiness including metrics and questions to guide analysis	21
	Dropout Prevention Framework Data Sources	Tool for inquiring about the process data teams should consider related to the Framework for Dropout Prevention	29
	Mapping resources to dropout problem types	Identifies drop-out performance challenges and resources that related to different performance challenges	31
	Criteria for Narrowing Explanations	A list of criteria to apply to explanations to narrow and refine them	35
	The Five Why's: Root Cause Identification Form	A form to use while engaging in the Five Why's to deepen thinking to get to root causes	37
	Validate Root Causes	A form that structures thinking about what data to use to validate root cause explanations	39
Action Planning	Framework for Dropout Prevention	The essential elements and methods & tactics Colorado Graduation Pathways has identified to support dropout prevention	41



Norms of Participation

The following statements describe agreements for participation in learning experiences provided by CTLT and are intended to allow all participants to make the most of their time.

- Be present, participate, and engage fully.
- Listen to learn, limit side conversations.
- Monitor personal technology (turn cell phones off or on vibrate, close laptops during group activities).
- Pay attention to signals to rejoin the whole group – hand-raising.
- Move and engage as a key learning strategy.
- Practice and self-organize table groups; name a facilitator, recorder, reporter and time keeper.
- Use effective communication and exploratory language: paraphrase, clarify, summarize, question, and invite thinking.
- Suspend judgment, live in curiosity.
- Reflect continuously, complete evaluations and reflection logs.
- Provide feedback and post questions on the “Parking Lot.”
- Pay attention to what has meaning for you.
- Commit to follow-through.

Data Narrative Outline

Data Narrative Elements

Description of School and Process for Data Analysis	• A brief description of the school to set the context • The general process for developing the UIP • A description of who participated in the analysis of the school's performance data.
Review of Current Performance	• The school accountability status (plan type assignment) Indicators and sub-indicators where school performance did not meet state and federal expectations Indicators and sub-indicators where school performance did not meet local expectations • Magnitude of over-all school performance challenge
Prior year's performance Targets	• Reflection on how current performance compares to the targets established in the prior year's plan and why (also captured in the Progress Monitoring of Prior Year's Performance Targets worksheet)
Trend Analysis:	• Description of the data that was analyzed (including local data sources, metrics and measures) in identifying performance trends • Notable performance trends (also captured in the Data Analysis Worksheet) • How the team determined which trends were notable (e.g. To what were each of the school performance trends compared?)
Priority Performance Challenges	• The performance challenges that are the highest priority to address immediately • For each priority, what makes it important to address immediately. • The process that was used to prioritize the performance challenges
Root Cause Analysis	• Root cause(s) associated with each priority performance challenge (also captured in the Data Analysis Worksheet). • How the root causes were identified • The additional data that was reviewed to validate the root causes

School Performance Framework Scoring Guides & Reference Data

Graduation and Disaggregated Graduation Rates

The School Performance Framework reports use the 4-, 5-, 6- and 7-year graduation rates for the school and disaggregated student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities and English learners).

This School's Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate:

Overall Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	68.1	74.2	75.1	76.4
	2010	69	74.4	77.1	
	2011	75.6	81.4		
	2012	78.6			

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	61	69	71	73
	2010	66.1	74.4	78.5	
	2011	75.9	83.6		
	2012	79.9			

Minority Student Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	66.2	73.7	75.3	76.1
	2010	67.5	74.3	76.8	
	2011	74.5	80.9		
	2012	78.6			

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	39.3	56.1	62.5	71.4
	2010	42.3	52.8	69.2	
	2011	32.7	50.9		
	2012	60.3			

English Learners Graduation Rate (1-year)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	55.2	64.3	64.3	64.3
	2010	60.4	72.9	75	
	2011	75.9	85.5		
	2012	74.4			

Overall Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	68.1	74.2	75.1	76.4
	2010	69	74.4	77.1	
	2011	75.6	81.4		
	2012	78.6			
Aggregated		72.8	76.7	76.1	76.4

Free/Reduced Lunch Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	61	69	71	73
	2010	66.1	74.4	78.5	
	2011	75.9	83.6		
	2012	79.9			
Aggregated		71.6	76	74.8	73

Minority Student Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	66.2	73.7	75.3	76.1
	2010	67.5	74.3	76.8	
	2011	74.5	80.9		
	2012	78.6			
Aggregated		71.9	76.3	76.1	76.1

Students with Disabilities Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	39.3	56.1	62.5	71.4
	2010	42.3	52.8	69.2	
	2011	32.7	50.9		
	2012	60.3			
Aggregated		44.2	53.4	65.7	71.4

English Learners Graduation Rate (3-year aggregate)

		4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Anticipated Year of Graduation	2009	55.2	64.3	64.3	64.3
	2010	60.4	72.9	75	
	2011	75.9	85.5		
	2012	74.4			
Aggregated		66	74.2	69.2	64.3

Colorado calculates "on-time" graduation as the percent of students who graduate from high school four years after entering ninth grade. A student is assigned a graduating class when they enter ninth grade by adding four years to the year the student enters ninth grade. The formula anticipates, for example, that a student who entered ninth grade in fall 2006 would graduate with the Class of 2010.

For the 1-year SPF, schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: 2012 4-year graduation rate, 2011 5-year graduation rate, 2010 6-year graduation rate and 2009 7-year graduation rate (the shaded cells in the tables on the left). For the 3-year SPF, schools earn points based on the highest value among the following: aggregated 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 4-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009, 2010 and 2011 5-year graduation rate, aggregated 2009 and 2010 6-year graduation rate, or 2009 7-year graduation rate. For each of these rates, the aggregation is the result of adding the graduation totals for all available years and dividing by the sum of the graduation bases across all available years. For both 1-year and 3-year SPFs, the "best of" graduation rate is bolded and italicized here and on the Performance Indicators detail page.

Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report

Performance Indicator	Scoring Guide			Rating	Point Value		Total Possible Points per EMH Level	Framework Points
Academic Achievement	The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:				TCAP		16 (4 for each subject area)	15
	• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			Exceeds	4			
	• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3			
	• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2			
	• below the 15th percentile of all schools (using 2009-10 baseline).			Does Not Meet	1			
Academic Growth	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP	No AGP		TCAP	ACCESS	14 (4 for each subject area and 2 for English language proficiency)	35
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.	• at or above 65.	Exceeds	4	2		
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.	• below 65 but at or above 50.	Meets	3	1.5		
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.	• below 50 but at or above 35.	Approaching	2	1		
	• below 30.	• below 40.	• below 35.	Does Not Meet	1	0.5		
Academic Growth Gaps	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP			TCAP		60 (4 for each of 5 subgroups in 3 subject areas)	15
	• at or above 60.	• at or above 70.		Exceeds	4			
	• below 60 but at or above 45.	• below 70 but at or above 55.		Meets	3			
	• below 45 but at or above 30.	• below 55 but at or above 40.		Approaching	2			
	• below 30.	• below 40.		Does Not Meet	1			
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate: The school's graduation rate/disaggregated graduation rate was:				Overall	Disaggr.	16 (4 for each sub-indicator)	35
	• at or above 90%.			Exceeds	4	1		
	• at or above 80% but below 90%.			Meets	3	0.75		
	• at or above 65% but below 80%.			Approaching	2	0.5		
	• below 65%.			Does Not Meet	1	0.25		
	Dropout Rate: The school's dropout rate was:							
	• at or below 1%.			Exceeds	4			
	• at or below the state average but above 1% (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3			
	• at or below 10% but above the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2			
	• above 10%.			Does Not Meet	1			
	Colorado ACT Composite Score: The school's average Colorado ACT composite score was:							
	• at or above 22.			Exceeds	4			
	• at or above the state average but below 22 (using 2009-10 baseline).			Meets	3			
	• at or above 17 but below the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).			Approaching	2			
	• below 17.			Does Not Meet	1			

Cut-Points for Each Performance Indicator

	Cut Point: The school earned ... of the points eligible on this Indicator.			Cut-Points for Plan Type Assignment	
Achievement; Growth; Growth Gaps; Postsecondary Readiness	• at or above 87.5%		Exceeds	Total Framework Points	Cut Point: The school earned ... of the total framework points eligible.
	• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%		Meets		• at or above 60%
	• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%		Approaching		• at or above 47% - below 60%
	• below 37.5%		Does Not Meet		• at or above 33% - below 47%
					• below 33%
					Performance
					Improvement
					Priority Improvement
					Turnaround

School Plan Type Assignments

	Plan description	
Performance Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.	A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school. The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.
Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.	
Priority Improvement Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.	
Turnaround Plan	The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.	

1-year vs. 3-year Report

Schools receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated School Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more schools to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small schools may not have public data on the basis of a single year because of small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count. Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) will be the official plan type category for the school: the one under which the school has ratings on a greater number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it earned a higher total percent of points. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available.

Reference Data for Key Performance Indicators

Academic Achievement

The Academic Achievement Indicator reflects a school's proficiency rate: the percentage of students proficient or advanced on Colorado's standardized assessments. This includes results from CSAP/TCAP and CSAPA/CoAlt in reading, mathematics, writing, and science, and results from Lectura and Escritura.

Data for all indicators are compared to baselines from the first year the performance framework reports were released.

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2009-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1008	479	327	1007	480	327	1007	480	327	912	407	286
15th percentile	49.18	50.44	54.92	48.60	29.72	15.97	32.48	34.96	30.95	19.67	23.85	27.50
50th percentile	71.65	71.43	73.33	70.89	52.48	33.52	53.52	57.77	50.00	47.53	48.00	50.00
90th percentile	89.10	88.24	87.23	89.34	75.00	54.79	76.83	79.67	72.24	75.96	75.11	72.41

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregate (2008-10 baseline)

	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High	Elem	Middle	High
N of Schools	1032	507	362	1032	507	361	1032	507	362	972	469	347
15th percentile	50.00	50.56	53.34	48.73	29.69	13.49	32.56	36.84	30.00	20.46	25.00	27.93
50th percentile	72.05	71.35	72.21	70.11	51.63	30.53	54.84	58.34	49.57	45.36	48.72	50.00
90th percentile	88.21	87.40	86.17	87.48	74.41	52.19	76.51	79.17	71.00	72.65	71.26	71.45

Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

The Academic Growth Indicator measures academic progress using the Colorado Growth Model. This indicator reflects 1) normative (median) growth: how the academic progress of the students in this school compared to that of other students statewide with a similar content proficiency (CSAP/TCAP) score history or a similar English language proficiency (ACCESS) score history, and 2) criterion referenced (adequate) growth: whether this level of growth was sufficient for the typical (median) student in the school to reach or maintain a specified level of proficiency within a given length of time. For CSAP/TCAP, students are expected to score proficient or advanced within three years or by 10th grade, whichever comes first. The median growth percentile required to earn each rating depends on whether or not the school met adequate growth (AGP). For 2012-13, Adequate Growth cannot be calculated for English language proficiency therefore English language proficiency growth is determined only by the median growth percentile.

	Made AGP	Did Not Make AGP	No AGP
Exceeds	60-99	70-99	65-99
Meets	45-59	55-69	50-64
Approaching	30-44	40-54	35-49
Does Not Meet	1-29	1-39	1-34

The Academic Growth Gaps Indicator disaggregates the results of the Academic Growth Indicator, measuring the academic progress of historically disadvantaged student groups (students eligible for free/reduced lunch, minority students, students with disabilities, English learners) and students needing to catch up.

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

The Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Indicator measures the preparedness of students for college or careers upon completing high school. This indicator reflects student graduation rates, disaggregated graduation rates, dropout rates, and mean Colorado ACT (COACT) composite scores.

State Mean Dropout Rate (2009-10 baseline)

	N of Students	Mean Rate
1-year (2009)	416,953	3.6
3-year (2007-09)	1,238,096	3.9

State Mean COACT Composite Score (2009-10 baseline)

	N of Students	Mean Score
1-year (2010)	51,438	20.0
3-year (2008-10)	151,439	20.1

State Level Graduation Rates and Disaggregated Graduation Rates

2009-2010

Overall

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2007	68.1	71.1	72.1	72.8
2008	70.2	73.7	74.7	
2009	70.7	74.4		
2010	72.4			

Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2007	52.2	56.9	58.8	59.7
2008	54	59.8	61.4	
2009	55.3	61.8		
2010	58.9			

Minority Student

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2007	51.1	55.3	56.9	57.8
2008	53.6	59.1	60.6	
2009	55.7	61.5		
2010	59.1			

Students with Disabilities

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2007	48.6	55.5	59.9	62.6
2008	50.5	58.1	62.8	
2009	50.5	58.2		
2010	52			

English Language Learners

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2007	44.1	50.6	53.0	54.0
2008	46.2	54.6	56.7	
2009	47.1	55.3		
2010	49.2			

2010-2011

Overall

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2008	70.2	73.7	74.7	75.7
2009	70.7	74.4	76.2	
2010	72.4	77.1		
2011	73.9			

Free/Reduced Lunch Eligible

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2008	54.0	59.8	61.4	62.9
2009	55.3	61.8	64.9	
2010	58.9	66.1		
2011	62.2			

Minority Student

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2008	53.6	59.1	60.6	62.2
2009	55.7	61.5	64.1	
2010	59.1	66.0		
2011	63.1			

Students with Disabilities

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2008	50.5	58.1	62.8	67.0
2009	50.5	58.2	65.2	
2010	52.0	61.4		
2011	53.5			

English Language Learners

	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
2008	46.2	54.6	56.7	58.7
2009	47.1	55.3	58.5	
2010	49.2	58.8		
2011	52.8			

DropOut Data Analysis Display DODAD

High Level Description/Definition

The DropOut Data Analysis Display (DODAD) tool was developed in Excel to provide schools with quick and specific displays of their drop-out data. It includes trends over-time, drop-out information for disaggregated student groups and comparisons to the rates of a group of similar high schools. One of the primary purposes of the DropOut Data Analysis Display (DODAD) is to provide context for the dropout rates of each individual high school. To that end, two groups of comparison high schools were created – one for schools designated as an Alternative Education Campus in the 2011-12 academic year and one for all other high schools. In an attempt to generate dropout rates that are meaningful and genuinely comparable, roughly 20 percent of the currently operational high schools in Colorado were removed from these comparison groups. Examples of schools that were removed in order to ensure comparability include: detention centers, schools listed in the CDE School Directory as high schools but which do not serve 12th graders, and high schools that have been open less than three years.

The DODAD cover page includes instructions regarding how to use the tool and allows users to select the school for which data will be displayed. The following table includes a description of each chart included in the DODAD tool.

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions
1. Dropout Rate - 5 years	- Annual Dropout Rate for all students in 9th through 12th grade for the most recent 5 years (2007-08 through 2011-12) - Annual drop-out count for 2007-8 through 2011-12 - Five-year total drop-out count	- Longitudinal comparison of the school's dropout rate across years - Annual dropout rate for 9th through 12th grade among a comparison group of high schools (non-AECs or AECs), for the 2007-08 through 2011-12 school years	- What has been the trend in drop-out rates for the school over the last 5 years? - How does the school's drop-out rate compare to drop-out rates for the comparison group? - If the dropout rate for the school in 2011-12 is higher than the comparison group's dropout rate, how many fewer dropouts would the school have needed in order to match the rate for the comparison group?
2. Percent of Drops by Grade	Percent of Total Dropouts by Grade Level	Percent of total dropouts by grade level for comparison group (non-AECs or AECs)	For the most recent three years for which drop-out data are available, in which grade levels did students drop out the

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions
			most? the least? Were there differences across grade levels? • Were dropouts “clustered” in the early grades or the later grades? • How was our pattern by grade level similar to and different from the comparison group? • How does the percent of dropouts by grade match with the percent of our students enrolled in each grade? (eg. school may show 80% of its dropouts are seniors, but this may be expected if 80% of its enrollment is made up of seniors.
3. Dropout Rate by Grade	• Annual Dropout Rate for Each Grade Level 9-12 from past three academic years	• Comparison Group Average (non-AECs or AECs)	• What has been the pattern in drop-out rates by grade level (aggregated over the last three years)? In general, which of our grade levels had higher and lower dropout rates? • How was our pattern by grade level similar to and different from the comparison group?
4. Drops by age-%	• Percent of All Dropouts, Age outs and GED Transfers by Student's Age on the reported date of dropout, Ages 14-22	• Percent of All Dropouts, Age outs and GED Transfers by Student's Age on the Reported Date of Dropout, Ages 14-22 for comparison group (non-AECs or AECs)	• Are students dropping out at earlier or later ages in our school than in the comparison group? • Are students dropping out when they are older or younger than typical secondary students?
4a. Drops by age-count	• Number of Dropouts and GED Transfers by Student's Age at Reported Time of Dropout (total number by age)		• At what ages are students dropping out or electing to get a GED? • Are a large number of students dropping out at or near the compulsory attendance age of 17? at or near the maximum age for funded education services of 21?

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions
5. Drops by Month	Percent of Annually Reported Dropouts by Month	Percent of Annually Reported Dropouts by Month for schools in the comparison group	- During what months do most of our students drop out? - To what degree are students dropping out during the school year (not in the June-September window) vs. between school years (June, July, August and potentially September) - Do we have more or less students dropping out mid-year than the comparison group? - How accurate does our school/district appear to be in reporting the actual last date of attendance for students who drop out or transfer to a GED preparation program?
6. Drop Rates by Race	- Dropout Rate by Race/Ethnicity Category (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, White and Two or More Races) - Racial/Ethnic Makeup of This School	- Average dropout rate for the comparison group by race/ethnicity category (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White) - Racial/Ethnic Makeup of All 9th-12th Graders in the comparison group	- Which groups of students (by race/ethnicity) have the highest/lowest drop-out rates? - What percentage of students in the overall student population come from groups of students with the highest drop-out rates? - How do our school's drop-out rates by race/ethnicity compare to the comparison group averages for the same groups?
6a. Dropout Rate Gap between Minority Students Groups and White Students	- Difference in dropout rate between white students and: - American Indian - Asian - Black - Hispanic - Two or More Races - Aggregated over three years	- Dropout rate for white students at the school. - Difference in dropout rate at comparison group schools between white students and: - American Indian - Asian - Black - Hispanic	- For which group of students disaggregated by race/ethnicity is the gap between that group and white students positive (i.e. the group has a higher dropout rate than white students)? - For which group of students is the gap between that group and white students the greatest? - How do the gaps in dropout rates by

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions
		o Two or More Races Aggregated over three years	race/ethnicity at this school compare to the gaps for the same groups for the comparison group?
7. Drop Rates by Instructional Program/Service Type (IPST)	• Cumulative Dropout Rate for the Past 3 Years by Instructional Program/Service Type (IPST): - o Students with Disabilities - o Limited English Proficiency - o Economically Disadvantaged - o Migrant - o Title I - o Homeless - o Gifted/Talented	• IPST group dropout rates compared to overall dropout rate for all students at the school. • Cumulative Dropout Rate for a comparison group (non-AEC or AEC) for the Past 3 Years by Instructional Program/Service Type: - o Students with Disabilities - o Limited English Proficiency - o Economically Disadvantaged - o Migrant - o Title I - o Homeless - o Gifted/Talented	• Which IPST groups have the highest/lowest drop-out rates? • How does our school's drop-out rates by instructional program/service type compare to the state averages for the same groups?
7a. Dropout rate gaps between IPST groups and all students	• Difference in drop-out rate for students in each IPTS group and all students in the school, for the following groups: - o Students with Disabilities - o Limited English Proficient - o Economically Disadvantaged - o Migrant - o Title I	• Difference in drop-out rate for students in each IPTS group and all students in the school, for the following groups: - o Students with Disabilities - o Limited English Proficient - o Economically Disadvantaged - o Migrant - o Title I	• For which IPST group is the gap between that group and students in the comparison schools group positive (i.e. the group has a higher dropout rate than for the school overall)? • For which IPST group is the gap between that group and all students the greatest? • How do the gaps in dropout rates by instructional program/service type at this school compare to the gaps for the same groups for the comparison group over-all?

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions
	- o Homeless - o Gifted/Talented Aggregated across three years	- o Homeless - o Gifted/Talented Aggregated across three years	
8. Dropout Rates by Gender	• Aggregated three-year dropout rate for females and males at the school	• Rates of females vs. males • Aggregated state average three-year dropout rate for females and males	• Do females or males have a higher dropout rate at our school? • What is the size of the gap (in percentage points) between female and male students at our school? How does the size of this gap compare to the gap for the comparison group? • How do our dropout rates for females compare to the comparison group average? • • How do our dropout rates for males compare to the state average?
9. Students reported with school exit types which are likely to count against the graduation rate	• Percentage of total 9th-12th grade student membership aggregated over three years reported as: - o Dropouts - o Expulsions - o GED Prep. Transfers - o GED Recipients • Three year aggregate total counts of 9th-12th grade students reported as - o Dropouts - o Expulsions - o GED Preparation - o GED Recipients	• State average percentage of total 9th-12th grade student membership aggregated over three years reported as: - o Dropouts - o Expulsions - o GED Prep. Transfers - o GED Recipients • Comparison group three year aggregate total counts of 9th-12th grade students reported as - o Dropouts - o Expulsions - o GED Preparation - o GED Recipients	• What percentage of our students are reported as expelled each year? reported as preparing for GED? Receiving a GED certificate? • How many of our students have been counted as drop-outs are expulsions? preparing for GED? GED Recipients? • Do we have a lower or higher percent of students counted in these categories than the comparison group average?

A Note Regarding the Aggregated Dropout Rates and/or Graduation Rates:

Most charts in the DODAD workbook make use of “aggregated” rates – either combined from three or more years of data or combined from all the high schools belonging to a certain group (e.g. “all Colorado Graduation Pathways schools” or “all schools in the AEC comparison group”). The use of aggregated rates provides two important benefits: 1) It can help overcome issues with groups of students that might have a single year sample size that is too small to yield meaningful analysis (e.g. American Indian students or students with disabilities at a single high school in a single year) and issues with schools with small student populations overall, and 2) Aggregating data across years can compensate for single year “anomalies” – either positive or negative.

The methodology employed to calculate aggregated includes the following:

1. Add up the total number of students that will be placed in the numerator for the group (e.g. all on-time graduates from the class of 2012 for every school in the AEC comparison group)
2. Add up the total number of students that will be placed in the denominator for the group (e.g. all students who are counted in the graduation membership base for the class of 2012 for every school in the AEC comparison group)
3. Divide the numerator by the denominator and present the result as a percentage.

The benefit of this method vs. taking an average of the already-calculated rates for a group of schools can be seen in an example using two schools of extremely different size:

- School A had **390 graduates** in 2012 out of a graduation **membership base of 460** students. School A’s on-time graduation rate for the class of 2012 is therefore **85%**
- School B had **3 graduates** in 2012 out of a graduation **membership base of 11** students. School B’s on-time graduation rate for the class of 2012 is therefore **27.3%**

If the overall graduation rate for this “group” of two schools was calculated by averaging the graduation rates for the two schools the result would be **56.2%**. This process of taking the average of calculated rates often yields inaccurate overall rates for the group because it assigns equal weight to every school – regardless of the size of the school.

In contrast, adding the total number of graduates from both schools (393) and dividing this number by the total number of students in the graduation membership base for both schools (471) yields a much more accurate and representative aggregated graduation rate for this group of two schools of **83.4%**

CGP Graduation Rate Tables

High Level Description/Definition

The Graduation Rate Tables are adapted from the Annual Performance Report sent from the CDE to the US Department of Education as a requirement of the High School Graduation Initiative (HSGI) grant. These tables provide information regarding graduation rates including trends over-time, comparisons between overall graduation rates and the rates for disaggregated student groups and comparisons to the individual and collective rates of other high schools funded under the HSGI grant via the Colorado Graduation Pathways program.

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions to Guide Analysis
2 - Grad Rates by Race/Ethnicity	The following metrics are provided overall and for the following student groups; White, American Indian, Asian, Black, and Hispanic. - o 2012 Graduation Membership Base (the grad rate denominator) - o Count of on-time graduates from the class of 2012 - o On-Time Graduation Rate	• Graduation rate overall for each Colorado Graduation Pathways school and for the CGP cohort as a whole • Graduation rate for the five race/ethnicity groups for: - o All CGP schools - o All CGP Systems Change Schools - o All CGP Capacity Building schools - o All non-CGP high schools in Colorado • Percentage point difference between the graduation rate for White students and students reporting as: - o American Indian - o Asian - o Black - o Hispanic	• How does the overall 2012 on-time graduation rate for your school compare to the graduation rates for other schools participating in the CGP program (those most similar to your school)? To the CGP cohort overall? To the Non-CGP Schools in the state? • Is the number of students in the graduation membership base fewer than 15 for any of the race/ethnicity groups listed for your school and therefore too small to form meaningful analysis and findings? • How does the percentage point difference between the various race/ethnicity groups for your school compare to the CGP cohort as a whole? To the Systems Change schools? To the Capacity Building schools? To the Non-CGP Schools in the state? • For race/ethnicity groups with graduation rates significantly lower than for the school overall, what number of additional graduates from that group that would have been needed make the graduation rate for that group equal to the school's overall graduation rate?

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions to Guide Analysis
2a - Grad Rates by Race/Ethnicity Year to Year (Y2Y)	The following metrics, are provided overall and for the following student groups; White, American Indian, Asian, Black, and Hispanic. • Class of 2011 On-time Grad. Rate • Class of 2012 On-time Grad. Rate • Percentage Point Change - '11 to '12	• Change in school's overall graduation rate from year 1 of the CGP program to year 2 • Change in Aggregated Graduation rate for the five race/ethnicity groups for : - o All CGP schools - o All CGP Systems Change Schools - o All CGP Capacity Building schools - o All non-CGP high schools in Colorado	• To what degree did the overall on-time graduation rate for your school improve or decline between the Class of 2011 and the Class of 2012? How does this change compare to the percentage point change in graduation rate for other schools participating in the CGP program (especially those most similar to your school)? To the CGP cohort overall? To the Non-CGP Schools in the state? • Did the graduation rates for any of your school's race/ethnicity groups (with >15 students) change at a much higher or lower rate than did the school's overall rate – either positive or negative?
3 - Grad Rates by Instructional Program Service Type (IPST)	The following metrics are provided overall and for the following student groups: Students w/ Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Economically Disadvantaged. • 2012 Graduation Membership Base • Count of on-time graduates from the class of 2012 • On-Time Graduation Rate	• Graduation rate for all students for: - o All CGP schools - o All CGP Systems Change Schools - o All CGP Capacity Building schools - o All non-CGP high schools in Colorado • Graduation rate for Students w/ Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Economically Disadvantaged students for: - o All CGP schools - o All CGP Systems Change Schools - o All CGP Capacity Building schools - o All non-CGP high schools	• Is the number of students in the graduation membership base fewer than 15 for any of the IPST groups listed for your school and therefore too small to form meaningful analysis and findings? • How does the percentage point difference between the various IPST groups for your school compare to the CGP cohort as a whole? to the Systems Change schools? to the Capacity Building schools? to the Non-CGP Schools in the state? • For race/ethnicity groups with graduation rates significantly lower than for the overall graduation rate for your school, what is the number of additional graduates from that group that would have been needed make the graduation rate for that group equal to the school's overall graduation rate? • How do the on-time (4 years or less) graduation rates listed on this table compare

Worksheet/ Chart Title	Metrics	Comparison Points	Questions to Guide Analysis
		in Colorado • Difference (in percentage points) between the graduation rate for the school overall and for Students w/ Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Economically Disadvantaged students	to the 5-, 6- and 7-year graduation rates for prior graduation cohorts listed in your School Performance Framework? • Do any of the select IPST groups listed on this table represent a notably large percentage of your overall Class of 2012 graduation membership base?
3a - Grad Rates by IPST Year to Year (Y2Y)	The following metrics are provided overall and for the following student groups: Students w/ Disabilities, Limited English Proficient, and Economically Disadvantaged. • Class of 2011 On-time Grad. Rate • Class of 2012 On-time Grad. Rate • Percentage Point Change - '11 to '12	• Change in school's overall graduation rate from year 1 of the CGP program to year 2 • Change in Aggregated Graduation rate for: - o All CGP schools - o All CGP Systems Change Schools - o All CGP Capacity Building schools - o All non-CGP high schools in Colorado	• Did the graduation rates for any of your school's IPST groups (with >15 students) change at a much higher or lower rate than did the school's overall rate – either positive or negative? • How does the change in graduation rate for each IPST group at your school compare to other schools in the CGP cohort? To the cohort as a whole? To the non-CGP high schools in the state?

Post Secondary and Workforce Data Sources

Data Report (frequency)	Description	Metrics	Questions
Post-secondary Readiness School Report (CDHE) (annual)	Historical trends in for the last three years for school and the District as a whole http://highered.colorado.gov/Publications/districtataglace/districtglancedefault.html	• Graduation Rates (on-time and 5-year, 6-year, and 7-year) • Completing rates • Drop-out Rates • College Enrollment Rate (immediately following graduation) • College Remediation Rate	How would you describe the trend in on-time graduation rates for the school over the last three years? How does this compare to the district trend in on-time graduation rates for the same time period? To what degree is there a difference between 4-year (on-time) graduation rate and the 5-, 6-, and 7-year rates for the same base year? What has been the trend in 5-year graduation rates over the latest three years (the latest year for which 5-year rates are available)? How does this compare to the district trend in 5-year graduation rates for the same time period? How does this compare to minimum state expectations for graduation rates? How would you describe the trend in drop-out rates for the school between over the last three years? How does this compare to the district trend in drop-out rates for the same time period? How does this compare to minimum state expectations for graduation rates? What has been the school's trend in college enrollment immediately following graduation over the last three years? How does this compare to the district trend in college enrollment immediately following graduation for the last three years? What percent of the schools' students enrolling in college immediately following graduation required remediation in

Data Report (frequency)	Description	Metrics	Questions
			2009? In 2010 (the most recent year for which data is available)? How did the school's rates compare to the district's rates for the same time period?
Completion Rates	The completion counts and rates include all students who graduate on-time with a regular diploma plus students who complete on-time with a GED or non-diploma certificate. Note: graduates are included in the completer count and rate, completion counts and rates for any school or district will be greater than or equal to the graduation rate. http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/gradcurrent	• Counts of completion • Counts of graduation • Disaggregated by: ○ Gender ○ Ethnicity	What is the school's completion rate? How does the completion rate compare to the graduation rate? In what programs are "completing" students participating than "graduating" students?
Concurrent Enrollment, ASCENT Participation	Report of students enrolled in a local education provider and in an institute of higher education or career and technical courses, participating	Number of students participating in dual enrollment in high school and an institution of higher education • ASCENT • Concurrent Enrollment • CTE	Which students are participating in dual enrollment in institutions of higher education? Are the demographics of participating students representative of the school overall? Which if any students are participating in the ASCENT program?

Data Report (frequency)	Description	Metrics	Questions
	in the ASCENT program		
Student Mobility/ Stability Rate	Rates of students that are staying in the school Rates of students that are moving http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/mobility-stabilitycurrent	• Instances/Rates of Mobility • Instances/Rates of Stability • Disaggregation by: - o Gender - o Ethnicity	What is the stability rate for the school? Has the stability rate been increasing or decreasing? How does the stability rate compare to the state average?
Truancy	Total Student Days Unexcused divided by Total Student Days Possible http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/truancystatistics	• Student Fall Enrollment • Total Days Possible Attendance for all Students • Total Days Attended for all Students • Total Student Days Excused Absences for all Students • Total Student Days Unexcused Absences for all Students • Attendance Rate (Total Student Days Attended/Total Days Possible) • Truancy Rate (Total Student Days Unexcused Absent/Total days Possible)	What is the truancy rate for the school? How do the excused absences compare to unexcused absences?
FAFSA Completion	FAFSA Completion Report http://highereducation.state.gov/fafsa/Default.aspx	• Number of Seniors • Number of FAFSA • Percent Completed	What percentage of seniors completed the FAFSA? What percentage of seniors who initiated a FAFSA completed the form?

Data Report (frequency)	Description	Metrics	Questions
Attendance	Report collecting attendance and tardy information	• Students that fall below 90% average daily attendance • Repeated Absences • Habitually absent • Period attendance	Which students are falling below 90% average daily attendance rate? Which students are having repeated absences? Which students are habitually absent? Are there particular periods that have higher absence/tardy rates?
Behavior Data	Description of behavior violations and actions occurring throughout the school year	• In-school suspension rate • Out-of-School suspension rate • Expulsion rates • Discipline Referral Rates • Discipline Referral Types • Discipline Referral locations	Which students are being suspended? Which students are being expelled? What are the types of violations for which students are being suspended/expelled? Are there high-frequency locations for discipline referrals?
Course Completion (On track to graduation)	Locally Defined	• Number of students on track towards graduation • Number of students off track towards graduation, including how far off track as defined locally	What percent of students are on track to graduating within four years? What percent of students are on track to graduating within five years? More? What percent of students are off track to the point that they will not be able to participate in a traditional high school program and graduate before aging out?
CTE Participation	Number and Percent of students who participate (as defined by the school) in Career and Technical Education courses	• Number of participating students • Percent of participating students	What is the participation rate of students participating in CTE courses? What is the demographic make-up of participating students? Is the demographic of participating students representative of the school overall?
IB/AP Participation	Number and percent of students who participate (as defined by school) in IB and/or AP classes	• Number of participating students • Percent of participating students	What is the participation rate for IB and/or AP courses? What is the demographic make-up of the students who participate in IB and/or AP courses? Does the demographic make-up of participating students mirror the demographic make-up of the school?

Data Report (frequency)	Description	Metrics	Questions
Credit Recovery	Number and percent of students who participate (as defined by school) in credit recovery	• Number of participating students • Percent of participating students • Percent of credit recovery courses passed vs. attempted • Average number of courses taken by one student at a time • Average length of time to complete a course	What percent of students are participating in credit recovery? What is the threshold needed for students to be referred to credit recovery? What characteristics do students who successfully complete credit recovery have in common?
ICAP Participation /Completion	Number and percent of students who fully complete ICAP requirements (as defined by school)	• Number of students completing ICAP requirements • Percent of students completing ICAP requirements	What percent of students fully complete ICAP requirements? What characteristics do students who successfully complete ICAPs have in common? Which subgroups of students have the lowest ICAP completion rates?
College Application Rates	Number and percent of students who complete and submit postsecondary applications	• Number of students submitting postsecondary applications • Percent of students submitting postsecondary applications	What percent of students submit at least one complete postsecondary application? Which subgroups of students have the lowest postsecondary application submission rates?
College Enrollment	Number and rate of students enrolling in post-secondary institutions	• Number of students pursuing post-secondary education • Percent of students pursuing post-secondary education • Types of post-secondary institutions students are enrolling (2 year, 4 year, private, public)	What is the schools' college enrollment rate? What has been the school's trend in college enrollment immediately following graduation over the last three years? How does this compare to the district trend in college enrollment immediately following graduation for the last three years? To what types of institutions are students enrolling (2 year, 4 year, public, private)?
ACT Prep Participation	Number and percent of students who participate in ACT preparation programs (as defined	• Number of students participating in ACT preparation programs • Percent of students participating in ACT preparation programs	What percent of students complete an ACT preparation program? What is the demographic make-up of the students who complete ACT preparation programs? Does the demographic make-up of participating students mirror the demographic make-up of the school? What are the

Data Report (frequency)	Description	Metrics	Questions
	by school)		differences in Colorado ACT scores for students completing ACT preparation programs compared to students who do not?
Internship participation	Number and percent of students participating in a career internship program (as defined by school)	• Number of students participating in career internship programs • Percent of students participating in career internship programs	What percent of students complete a career internship program? What is the demographic make-up of the students who complete career internship programs? Does the demographic make-up of participating students mirror the demographic make-up of the school? What are the differences in graduation rates for students completing career internship programs compared to students who do not?
Counselor Support	Presence of comprehensive School Counseling program as determined by national best practices	• Percent of counselors' time spent in direct student service as determined through use of time assessments • Presence of indicators of national best practice school counseling programs, including standards-based curricula, annual agreements, results reports, calendars and advisory councils.	What is the average percent of time that counselors spend in direct student services? How have counselors demonstrated an impact on student achievement and/or achievement-related data through program services?
Pre-Collegiate Partnerships	Presence of intentionally selected pre-collegiate partner(s)	Presence of indicators of intentional pre-collegiate partner(s), including: • written school pre-collegiate program agreement(s), • regular two-way informational communications on partnership status • data reports demonstrating impact of pre-collegiate partnership on achievement	How was/were the pre-collegiate partner(s) selected for the school over other pre-collegiate organizations? How many and what percent of students participate in the pre-collegiate partnership programming? How were students selected to participate in the programming? Are students with the highest need involved in pre-collegiate programming? How have the pre-collegiate partner(s) demonstrated an impact on student achievement?

Data Report (frequency)	Description	Metrics	Questions
		and/or achievement-related data.	
Co- Curricular Participation	Number and percent of students participating in co-curricular activities (as defined by school)	• Number of students participating in co-curricular activities • Percent of students participating in co-curricular activities • Amount and type of co-curricular activities available	What percent of students participate in co-curricular activities? Do the demographics of students participating in co-curricular activities mirror the school demographics? Are co-curricular activities developed based on student interests? Are co-curricular activities available on days and times that students are able to participate?

Dropout Prevention Framework Data Sources

<i>Data Source</i>	What are we doing in this area?	How do we know? What data do we have about this?	What do we need to do in this area?
Do we collect, interpret and analyze dropout data?			
What Early Warning Systems do we have in place/use?			
Are we tracking Out-of-School Youth? How?			
Have we assessed our school climate? What have we done to enhance the school climate?			
Have we conducted a review of our policies and practices?			
How engaged is our community? How have we worked to engage our community?			

Dropout Prevention Framework Data Sources

<i>Data Source</i>	What are we doing in this area?	How do we know? What data do we have about this?	What do we need to do in this area?
How do we involve our families?			
Do we have a transition program? Is it effective?			
Do we have alternative pathways to graduation? What are they?			
Do we reengage our out-of-school youth? How?			
Have we enhanced our counseling and mentoring services? How?			
Do we have credit recovery options? What are they?			

Mapping resources to dropout problem “types”

	Large percentage of dropouts are 9 th /10 th grade	Large percentage of dropouts are 11 th /12 th grade	Large percentage of dropouts occur over summer	High dropout rate for minority group(s)	High dropout rate for IPST group(s)	Large number of expulsions	Large number of GED transfers or GED recipients
Transition and Orientation Programs	✓			✓	✓		
Summer Programs/ Summer Outreach	✓	✓	✓				
Review Assignment of Most Experienced/Effective Teachers	✓				✓		
Review Grade Promotion Practices in middle schools	✓						
Review Grade Promotion Practices in the high school		✓					
Policy and Practice Review	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	

	Large percentage of dropouts are 9 th /10 th grade	Large percentage of dropouts are 11 th /12 th grade	Large percentage of dropouts occur over summer	High dropout rate for minority group(s)	High dropout rate for IPST group(s)	Large number of expulsions	Large number of GED transfers or GED recipients	
After-School Programs					☒			
Review Assignment of Teachers and Resources to IPST groups					☒			
Early Warning System	☒	☒			☒		☒	
Review Curriculum Sequencing	☒							
Enhanced Counseling Services (CCC, ICAP, etc)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒			
School-community partnerships	☒	☒	☒	☒		☒		
School-parent partnerships	☒	☒	☒	☒		☒		

	Large percentage of dropouts are 9 th /10 th grade	Large percentage of dropouts are 11 th /12 th grade	Large percentage of dropouts occur over summer	High dropout rate for minority group(s)	High dropout rate for IPST group(s)	Large number of expulsions	Large number of GED transfers or GED recipients
Equity Toolkit							
Service Learning Opportunities							
Alternative Education Options							
Credit Recovery Programs							
District-Run GED Prep. Program							
Dropout Recovery and Reengagement Efforts							



Criteria for Narrowing Explanations

After your planning team has generated explanations of the performance data, and before you begin planning next steps, it's a good idea to check your thinking again. Below are indicators and critical questions to help you get to the best possible explanations.

Step 1: Eliminate explanations that are not within our control

First, your team needs to eliminate explanations that do not lie within the control of the school/district and put these explanations aside. The following questions could help with this process.

- ✓ Over what do we believe we have control (e.g., students completing homework, parents supporting their students, etc.)?
- ✓ What factors are beyond our influence?
- ✓ Would others agree? Are we thinking too broadly, too narrowly, or accurately?

Step 2: Evaluate the quality of your explanations (reach consensus on which ones to keep)

The following criteria can be applied by your team to evaluate the current list of explanations and to whittle your list down to the “best” thinking available across the team. Use the questions below each criteria to help check the thinking of your team. Eliminate explanations that fail to meet these criteria.

Criteria: The explanation derives logically from the data

- ✓ Can we articulate the connection(s) we see between the data and our explanation(s)?
- ✓ Does our explanation reflect a genuine situation, but one that is not related to this data?
- ✓ Can we tell the story of how our explanation could lead to the patterns we see in our data?

Criteria: The explanation is specific enough to be testable

- ✓ Is the language specific enough to be clear to someone who was not part of our discussion?
- ✓ Are there any vague terms?
- ✓ Can we describe how we would test the explanation?

Criteria: The explanation is plausible

- ✓ Does any research support this thinking?
- ✓ If we base any planning steps on this explanation, do we anticipate meaningful results?

Step 3: Clarify the language used in your explanations

Consider the following questions to clarify remaining explanations.

- ✓ Do our explanations make sense to someone else reading or hearing them for the first time?
- ✓ Is our explanation complex enough to help us to better understand a complex situation?
- ✓ What other questions do our explanations lead us to in order to make the picture more complete?
- ✓ Does this explanation identify an area of concern?

The Five Whys: Root Cause Identification

For each explanation, ask the question “Why?” and answer, “Because ____.” Repeat this five times, asking why of whatever the “because” answer is. Stop asking “Why?” when you reach consensus on the root cause of the issue.

Explanation

1. *Why?*

Because:

4. *Why?*

Because:

2. *Why?*

Because:

5. *Why?*

Because:

3. *Why?*

Because:



Validate Root Causes

Performance Challenge: _____

Possible Root Cause(s)	Questions to Explore	Data Sources 	Validation

The Colorado Graduation Pathways research-based framework for dropout prevention

Essential Elements

Identification

Institutional
Change

Intervention
& Support

Methods & Tactics

1. Data Analysis
2. Early Warning Systems
3. Tracking Out-of-School Youth
4. Assess and Enhance School Climate
5. Policy and Practices Review
6. Community Engagement
7. Family Involvement
8. Transition Programs (middle school to high school, high school to postsecondary)
9. Alternative Pathways to Graduation (expanded curriculum, CTE, concurrent enrollment, etc)
10. Reengagement of Out-of-School Youth
11. Enhanced Counseling and Mentoring
12. Credit Recovery Options