

Building and Sustaining Student Success: The GRAD Partnership Year Three 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.

The final analytic sample included 138 observations/records collected from 72 unique schools. Not all records included both course failure and chronic absence data. Baseline to

year one (B-Y1) comparisons of course failures include 130 records from 63 schools, and baseline to year one (B-Y1) comparisons of chronic absenteeism include 121 records from 62. Baseline to year two (B-Y2) comparisons of course failures include 51 records from 31 schools, and baseline to year two (B-Y2) comparisons of chronic absenteeism include 43 records from 27 schools. Baseline to year three (B-Y3) comparisons of course failures include 15 records from 9 schools, and baseline to year three (B-Y3) comparisons of chronic absenteeism include 9 records from 6 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 Table 1 "All Grades," by individual grade or combinations of grades reported by the schools.

Grade Level	Course Failures			Chronic Absenteeism		
	B-Y1	B-Y2	B-Y3	B-Y1	B-Y2	B-Y3
6	13	3	0	13	4	0
7	11	3	0	11	3	0
8	14	6	0	13	5	0
9	40	18	3	37	14	2
10	14	5	2	13	4	1
11	15	5	2	14	4	1
12	15	5	2	14	4	1
6-12	1	0	0	1	0	0
7-12	3	2	3	1	1	1
9-12	3	3	3	3	3	3
9-10	1	1	0	1	1	0
Total	84	51	15	121	43	9

In Tables 1 and 2, course failures refers to the share of students with one or more course failures, and chronic absenteeism refers to the share of students missing 10% or more of class days. N size refers to student success teams, which can operate at a single grade level or school-wide.

One Year Course Failure Impact by Implementation Strength

	N	Baseline	Year 1	Percentage Point Change B0-Y1	Percent Change B0-Y1
Overall*	130	33%	30%	-3	-9%
Partial	29	32%	36%	+4	+13%
Solid	76	31%	26%	-6	-19%
Strong	14	39%	33%	-6	-15%
Solid or Strong	90	32%	27%	-5	-16%

*Includes schools missing implementation data

One Year Chronic Absence Impact by Implementation Strength

	N	Baseline	Year 1	Percentage Point Change B0-Y1	Percent Change B0-Y1
Overall*	121	31%	28%	-3	-10%
Partial	29	24%	28%	+4	+17%
Solid	68	31%	26%	-5	-16%
Strong	13	40%	32%	-8	-20%
Solid or Strong	81	32%	27%	-5	-16%

*Includes schools missing implementation data

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.

Some adjustments were made to the survey available toward the end of 2024-25 based on feedback from earlier use; these changes include minor word revisions of answer options as well as recoding of answers for some questions. As a result, some answers in questions are more likely to be coded as a lower implementation level than in previous reporting. Questions that could be impacted by this downcoding are indicated with a * below.

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 of the ABC's (attendance, behavior, or course performance) to identify individual students [partial/1]
- c. Teams use multiple predictive indicators at both the individual- and aggregate level, including by analyzing trends and distributions at the school, group (e.g. grade), and sub-group levels [solid/2]
- d. In addition to c) teams use predictive indicators for post-secondary readiness, school climate/survey data, and data on agency, belonging, and connectedness to gain a holistic understanding of student success and where support/improvements are needed [strong/3]

How frequently are student success data updated?*

- a. Annually [missing/0]
- b. Weekly or more frequently [partial/1]
- c. Monthly [solid/2]
- d. After each marking period [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. Limited [missing/0]
- b. Somewhat [partial/1]
- c. Mostly [strong/3]
- d. Completely/Almost completely [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 and/or the group has no authority to make decisions. [missing/0]
- b. The team is comprised of a small group of counselors or student support staff who meet regularly, sometimes supported by a teacher or administrator with authority to make decisions. [partial/1]
- c. There is one or more student success teams which include teachers and other student support staff and meets regularly throughout the school year, all members contribute, and the team's efforts and decisions 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. The student success team does not discuss the drivers of student actions, and assigns interventions based on pre-established data cut points. [missing/0]
- 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. [partial/1]
- c. Teachers and student support staff present at the meeting share what they know about the student(s) identified as

needing additional support, and a student success team member who has a relationship with the student(s) will talk with the student. [solid/3]

- d. The team has an established process to solicit input from teachers, school staff, students, and parents/guardians to gain a deeper understanding of root causes.. [strong/3]

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

- a. There is a pre-set intervention for each ABC and level of need and the team has little or no ability to customize interventions/actions. [missing/0]
- b. Nearly all interventions/actions are customized to individual students. [partial/1]
- c. While most interventions are customized to individual students, the team also considers and pursues strategic points of intervention/action where more students can be helped for a manageable level of effort. [solid/3]
- d. The team tries to identify the most strategic point of intervention/action where the most students will be helped for a manageable level of effort and there is a process to engage administrators, teachers, students, parents, & community members. [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. [partial/1]
- 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, & 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, empathetic rather than blaming and other key student-centered mindsets. [partial/1]
- c. Team collects data on 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 132 schools during the 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 school years. Multiple survey responses were received for 93 (70%) of the 132 schools. Where schools submitted multiple records for the same implementation year, the last response was used.

# Records	# Schools	% of Schools
1	39	30%
2	30	23%
3	22	17%
4	20	14%
5	1	1%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
8	20	15%
Total	132	100%

Table 3 reports data received for a school's year of implementation regardless of whether the school submitted data for another implementation year. 118 schools have data reflecting their 1st year of implementation, 66 schools have data reflecting their 2nd year of implementation, and 37 have data reflecting their third year of implementation. Some schools did not report data for all years of their implementation, for example only submitting data reflecting their 2nd year implementation data - so have one year of data that pertains to their 2nd year of implementation.

76 schools reported data for only one year; 23 schools reported data for two different years, and 33 schools provided data for three years.

Table 4 includes the 54 schools beginning implementation in 2022-23 or 2023-24 who reported both 1st and 2nd year implementation data. Table 5 includes the 35 schools beginning implementation in 2022-23 who reported both 2nd and 3rd year implementation data. The below tables include all schools beginning implementation in 2022-23, 2023-24, or 2024-25, regardless of which year(s) of implementation data they submitted.

1. What data do student success teams use?

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%
Partial	61	52%	23	35%	6	16%
Solid	40	34%	28	42%	13	35%
Strong	13	11%	15	23%	18	49%
Solid or Strong	53	45%	43	65%	31	84%

2. How frequently is student success data updated?

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	6	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Partial	16	14%	1	2%	6	16%
Solid	32	27%	13	20%	13	35%
Strong	64	54%	52	79%	18	49%
Solid or Strong	96	81%	65	98%	31	84%

3. How frequently are student success data analyzed?

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	9	8%	0	0%	0	0%
Partial	27	23%	10	15%	6	16%
Solid	43	36%	14	21%	15	41%
Strong	39	33%	42	64%	16	43%
Solid or Strong	82	69%	56	85%	31	84%

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

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	8	7%	0	0%	0	0%
Partial	54	46%	20	30%	10	27%
Solid	29	25%	11	17%	21	57%
Strong	27	23%	35	53%	6	16%
Solid or Strong	56	47%	46	70%	27	73%

5. 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?

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	11	9%	4	6%	2	5%
Partial	33	28%	12	18%	4	11%
Solid	64	54%	35	53%	21	57%
Strong	10	8%	15	23%	10	27%
Solid or Strong	74	63%	50	76%	31	84%

6. What steps are taken to understand what drives student actions?

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	9	8%	1	2%	2	5%
Partial	23	19%	3	5%	4	11%
Solid	46	39%	27	41%	22	59%
Strong	40	34%	35	53%	9	24%
Solid or Strong	86	73%	62	94%	31	84%

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

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	5	4%	2	3%	3	8%
Partial	28	24%	3	5%	6	16%
Solid	47	40%	24	36%	22	59%
Strong	38	32%	37	56%	6	16%
Solid or Strong	85	72%	61	92%	28	76%

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

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	14	12%	1	2%	0	0%
Partial	21	18%	8	12%	13	35%
Solid	51	43%	26	39%	16	43%
Strong	32	27%	31	47%	8	22%
Solid or Strong	83	70%	57	86%	24	65%

9. How do student success teams work to create supportive relationships?

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	5	4%	0	0%	0	0%
Partial	77	65%	34	52%	9	24%
Solid	25	21%	22	33%	21	57%
Strong	11	9%	10	15%	7	19%
Solid or Strong	36	31%	32	48%	28	76%

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

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
School Count	118		66		37	
Nothing	21	18%	3	5%	0	0%
Partial	82	69%	46	70%	18	49%
Solid	13	11%	16	24%	13	35%
Strong	2	2%	1	2%	6	16%
Solid or Strong	15	13%	17	26%	19	51%