Delivering Success:
The GRAD Partnership Year Two Impact Results

Appendices

APPENDIX I: COURSE FAILURE AND CHRONIC ABSENCE DATA

All schools participating in the GRAD Partnership were asked to report on-track data for their students, consisting of an enrollment count, the number of students failing one or more courses, and the number of students chronically absent (missing 10% or more of school days). Schools were asked to report grade-level on-track data for each year that they participated in the program, as well as for the year before program implementation (to serve as a baseline measurement), so that any changes from before to after program implementation could be taken as a measure of program impact. Some schools reported percentages rather than counts, in which case the percent was used as reported rather than calculated.

In total, 115 observations/records were collected from 69 unique schools. Records for seven schools were not included in the analysis due to data quality issues such as out-of-bounds values, missing data and inconsistencies across years that raised concerns about the reliability and validity of their data. This left a total of 95 records from 62 schools in the final analytic sample; not all records included both course failure and chronic absence data. Baseline to year one (B-Y1) comparisons of course failures include 84 records from

55 schools and baseline to year one (B-Y1) comparisons of chronic absenteeism include 71 records from 49 schools. Baseline to year two (B-Y2) comparisons of course failures include 45 records from 36 schools, and baseline to year two (B-Y2) comparisons of chronic absenteeism include 33 records from 30 schools.

Some schools reported data for all their implementing grades combined and others reported data for individual grades. The table below shows the number of records included in Tables 1 (Course Failures) and Table 3 (Chronic Absenteeism) under "All Grades," by individual grade or combinations of grades reported by the schools.

Course failure records reported in Table 1 under "Multi-Grade" include schools that span elementary, middle and/or high school grades, for example, a K-12 school. The eight records reported in this category include two records from schools that reported grades 7-12 combined, one record from a school that reported grades 6-12 combined, and five separate records from a school that individually reported grades 7 through 11.

Grade Level	Course Failures		Chronic Absenteeism	
	B-Y1	B-Y2	B-Y1	B-Y2
5	0	0	1	1
6	7	1	8	2
7	7	2	6	1
8	11	6	9	4
9	32	20	27	14
10	7	3	5	2
11	6	3	4	1
12	5	2	4	1
6-12	1	0	1	0
7-12	3	2	1	1
9-12	3	4	3	4
10-12	1	1	1	1
11-12	1	1	1	1
Total	84	45	71	33

APPENDIX II: IMPLEMENTATION DATA

Implementation levels were determined using a survey of ten multiple choice questions which captured the core elements of student success systems. Coaches working with each GRAD Partnership school were asked to complete this survey at least once a year.

For analysis, each multiple choice answer was re-coded as missing (0), partial (1), solid (2) or strong (3) to determine level of implementation for each aspect of implementation. Overall implementation level was determined by taking the average value of all ten questions rounded to the nearest multiple of 1. The questions were also grouped to capture the key sub-domains of student success systems data, actions and relationships/mindsets.

Implementation Survey Questions and Coding
[Domain: Data]

What data do student success teams use?

a. Teams do not use predictive indicators at student level. [missing/0]

b. Teams use two or more predictive indicators e.g. the ABCs — attendance, behavior or course performance (at the student level) — to identify students who may need additional support. [partial/1]

c. Teams use multiple predictive indicators at student level, analyze their trends and distribution at school level and can look at aggregations by sub-groups. [solid/2]

d. In addition to c), teams use predictive indicators for post-secondary readiness and also look at school climate/survey data, plus data on agency, belonging and connectedness, to gain holistic understanding of student success and where support/improvements needed. [strong/3]

How frequently are student success data updated?

a. Annually [partial/1]

b. At least quarterly [solid/2]

c. At least monthly [solid/2]

d. At least bi-weekly [strong/3]

How frequently are student success data analyzed?

a. Infrequently and not consistently [missing/0]

b. At least quarterly [partial/1]

c. At least monthly [solid/2]

d. At least bi-weekly [strong/3]

How accessible and actionable are the data available to members of the student success team(s)?

a. Neither predictive or holistic data is regularly available to the team. [missing/0]

b. One person on the team or an administrator has to assemble the data from multiple sources, or make it user-friendly for others to use, and sometimes it is not available. [partial/1]

c. The school's student information system provides all student success team members with regular access to user-friendly data on attendance, behavior and course performance, which the team supplements with other data sources to create a holistic look at each student. [strong/3]

d. The team has regular access to an integrated data set, with ABC data, post-secondary preparation and outcome data, student survey results and other data e.g. school connectedness which provide holistic data on all students. Students and parents also have access to relevant data. [strong/3]

[Domain: Actions]

Do student success teams have a structure, on-going participation by team members, regular and frequent time to work together, and the authority to make decisions?

a. The team meets infrequently and team members' attendance is not consistent. [missing/0]

b. Most of the work is done by a small group of counselors or student support staff who meet regularly, sometimes supported by a teacher or administrator. [partial/1]

c. There is one or more student success teams, which includes teachers and other student support staff that meets regularly throughout the school year; all members contribute and team efforts are supported by administrators. [solid/2]

d. In addition to all the elements in c), teams regularly incorporate student, family and community insights into their efforts. [strong/3]

What steps are taken to understand what drives student actions?

a. Student success teams do not discuss the source of student actions and assign interventions based on pre-established data cut points. [partial/1]

b. Teachers and student support staff present at the meeting will briefly share what they know about the student(s) identified as needing additional support. [solid/2]

c. In addition to b), a student success team member who has a relationship with the student(s) will talk with them to better understand a root cause. [strong/3]

d. Team has established a process to solicit input from teachers, school staff, students, parents and community members to gain deeper understanding of a root cause. [strong/3]

How strategic are the interventions/actions taken by the student success team?

a. Teams have little or no ability to customize interventions/actions and for each ABC and level of need; there is a pre-set intervention. [partial/1]

b. Nearly all interventions/actions are customized to individual students. [partial/1]

c. Team tries to identify the most strategic point of intervention/action where the most students will be helped for a manageable level of effort — could be at individual, small group, classroom, grade or school level. [strong/3]

d. In addition to c), the team has an established process to engage administrators, teachers, students, parents and community members in the co-creation of solutions. [strong/3]

How do teams track the impact of their actions and make adjustments as needed?

a. Teams do not follow up to see if suggested actions are implemented or effective. [missing/0]

b. Teams follow the progress of students they have supported; if they do not improve, new interventions/actions are proposed. [solid/2]

c. Teams record the intervention/action suggested, check to see if it is implemented, and make adjustments as needed until improvement occurs. [strong/3]

d. In addition to c), teams analyze implementation and impact data of the interventions/actions at regular intervals to gain deeper understanding of which actions work for which students, and under what circumstances. [strong/3]

[Domain: Relationships/Mindset]

How do student success teams work to create supportive relationships?

a. Teams do not work to create supportive relationships. [missing/0]

b. Teams share information with administrators/teachers on the importance of strong student-teacher, student-student, teacher-family relationships and some general tips on how to improve them. [partial/1]

c. Teams gather data on the strength of these relationships in the school, and where needed lead efforts to strengthen them. [solid/2]

d. In addition to c), teams have an established process for gaining insights from teachers, students, parents and community members on how relationships can be strengthened. [strong/3]

How do student success teams work to spread student-centered mindsets in the school?

a. Teams do not focus on the importance of mindsets. [missing/0]

b. Teams share information with school on the value of being proactive and preventative rather than reactive and remedial, asset rather than deficit based, empathic rather than blaming and other key student centered mindsets. [partial/1]

c. Team collects data on the prevalence of student-centered mindsets, and helps organize efforts to create the conditions and experiences needed to make high priority shifts. [solid/2]

d. In addition to c), team has an established process for engaging administrators, teachers, students, parents, and community in co-creation of efforts to spread student centered mindsets. [strong/3]

Implementation Survey Responses

At least one survey response was received for 67 schools during the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years; multiple survey responses were received for 49 (73%) of the 67 schools. Table 5 shows the implementation level from the last survey response during the school's first implementation year. Two of the schools only provided survey responses during their second year of implementation, and are not included in Table 5.

# Records	# Schools	% of Schools
1	18	27%
2	28	42%
3	1	1%
4	20	30%
	67	100%

Forty-four schools had more than one entry over the course of two years of implementation. When comparing changes in schools' implementation levels, the last response during the first year of implementation was compared to the last response received during the second year of implementation.