

Developing Trend Statements Examples

Performance Indicator	What measure/ data source?	What content area?	Which metric(s)?	Which students? (grade level, disaggregated groups)	Direction of trend? Comparison?	Amount?	Over what time period?	What makes this trend notable?	Trend Statement
<i>Academic Growth Gaps</i>	Colorado Growth Model (CSAP/TCAP)	Reading	Median Growth Percentile and Median Adequate Growth Percentile	9th and 10th graders on an IEP	decreasing	MGP: 55 to 35 AGP: 70 to 71	2009-10 to 2011-12 2010-11	For this disaggregated group, the median growth percentile was below the median adequate growth percentile and decreased 20 percentile points to a level below the minimum state expectation of 55.	The median student growth percentile in reading for 9th and 10th graders on an IEP decreased from 55 to 35 between the 2008-09 and 2010-11 school years, which was below the median adequate growth percentile of 70 and a 20 point decrease to a level below the minimum state expectation of 55.
<i>Academic Growth</i>	Colorado Growth Model (TCAP)	Math	Median Growth Percentile	6th graders	increasing	38 to 46	2009-10 to 2011-12 2010-11	The median growth percentile increased to a level above the adequate growth percentile for this group and above the minimum state expectation of 45.	The median student growth percentile in math for 6th graders increased from 38 to 46 between 2008-09 and the 2010-11 school years to a level above the adequate growth percentile for this group of students and above the minimum state expectation of 45.
<i>Academic Growth (English Language Development)</i>	Colorado Growth Model (CELAPro)	English Language Proficiency	Median Growth Percentile and Median Adequate Growth Percentile	9th and 10th graders English Learner	increasing	MGP: 20 to 35 AGP: 60, 55	2009-10 to 2011-12	The median growth percentile for CELAPro was below the minimum state expectation of 55 because the median growth percentiles were below the median adequate growth percentiles.	The median student growth percentile for English language proficiency among ELLs increased from 20 to 35 between 2009-10 and 2011-12, but remained below the state minimum expectation of 55 and below the median adequate growth percentile for the same time period.
<i>Achievement</i>	CSAP	Science	Percent proficient and advanced	5th graders qualifying for F/R lunch	stable	40%, 43%, 42%	2009-10 to 2011-12	The percent of students qualifying for free/reduced lunch who were proficient or advanced was substantially below the % of all students in the school who were proficient or advanced (70%, 72%, 68%).	The percent of 5th graders who were proficient or advanced and who qualify for free or reduced lunch was stable (40%, 43%, 42%) between 2010 and 2012 and substantially below the % of students in the school who were proficient or advanced (70%, 72%, 68%) during the same time period.
<i>Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness</i>	Graduation	NA	Disaggregated 4 and 5 year graduation rates	English Learners	decreasing	4 year: 75%, 70%, 62%	2008-9 to 2010-11	The 4 and 5 year graduation rates for English Language Learners was below the minimum state expectation of 80% for each of the last three years.	The percent of ELLs graduating within 4 or 5 years decreased from 75% to 62% between 2009 and 2011, a rate substantially below the minimum state expectation of 80%.
<i>Academic Growth</i>	Colorado Growth Model (TCAP)	Reading	% Catch-up Growth	4th and 5th graders	increasing	5%, 8%, 20%	2009-10 to 2011-12	The percent of students making catch-up growth in the school is significantly below both the state and district rates across the same timeframe.	The percent of 4th and 5th grade students who made catch-up growth increased from 5% to 20% between 2010 and 2012; a 15% point increase, but still substantially below the % catch-up growth for the state overall for this grade-level and content area during the same time period.