

Outcomes and Demographics for Participants in the Ninth Grade Counts Programs: Summer 2010 to Summer 2014

Multnomah County Partnership for Education Research
University of Portland
Northwest Evaluation Association

October 2015



Table of Contents

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Ninth Grade Counts Participants by District.....	5
Summer 2010 Cohort – Graduation Rate	6
Summer 2012 Cohort – Attendance Rates & Credits Accumulated	7
Summer 2013 Cohort – Attendance Rates & Credits Accumulated	9
Summer 2012 Cohort – Demographics.....	11
Summer 2013 Cohort – Demographics.....	11
Summer 2014 Cohort – Demographics.....	13

Introduction

All Hands Raised sought to understand the impact of the Ninth Grade Counts program on student participants. The overarching goal of the Ninth Grade Counts initiative is to keep students engaged in school, with ancillary objectives of combatting the effects of summer learning loss, increasing students' attendance and graduation rates, providing exposure to high school life, and preparing adolescents for college and careers. Specifically, the stakeholders wanted to know whether *academic-priority* students, those students at greater risk of disengaging from school, who participate in the summer program prior to entering their freshman year are more engaged than non-participants throughout their high school careers.

Previous reports have included information on a number of different research questions (please see these prior reports for information on methodology, limitations, issues, etc.). However, this report addresses the following research questions:

- How many academic priority (ACP) Ninth Grade Counts (NGC) enrollees were there - by district - in 2012, 2013, and 2014?
- What were the 2013-14 graduation rates for the Summer 2010 NGC cohort?
- What were the attendance rates and average credits accumulated for NGC participants versus non-participants for the Summer 2012 and Summer 2013 cohorts?
- What were the demographics for NGC participants in the Summer 2012, 2013, and 2014 cohorts?

The data analysis attached to each research question is reported on subsequent pages in the order presented above. The data analysis in this report should be interpreted with caution due to the following limitations.

Limitations

- **Academic Priority Labeling:** *Academic Priority* is defined differently depending on the district and year of data collection. It is therefore difficult to confirm that students labeled ACP in the dataset used for these analyses were actually ACP students.
- **Non-Comparable Comparison Group:** The first bullet point issue is compounded due to the fact that data consistently show that the group of students who participated in NGC may have been inherently different than those who did not participate in NGC. For example, NGC participants tended to have higher attendance rates than non-NGC participants before participating in the program. This issue therefore limits the ability to draw any causal conclusions from the results presented in this report.
- **Non-Completers:** These data analyses did not include those NGC participants who started, but did not complete, an NGC program (or programs). This excludes an important subgroup with important implications, which may lead to results that are positively skewed. Further, completers and non-completers do not appear to be tracked in 2010. Future work should investigate differences in non-completers as well. Below is a summary of these non-completers:

- 2010: It is unknown for this year how many NGC participants did not complete the program
- 2012: 104 NGC participants (91 ACP) did not complete the program
- 2013: 108 NGC participants (92 ACP) did not complete the program
- 2014: 109 NGC participants (85 ACP) did not complete the program
- **Missing Data:** The database used for this report consistently faces missing data issues. Students have attendance and credit data in one year but not the next and vice versa. It is unknown if this is due to data entry issues, attrition, drop-outs, etc. Understanding the reason for the missing data (i.e., if it is a drop-out or not) is essential. There are also times when the missing data seems implausible, such as when students have 0.00 for attendance (instead of missing data), have 0.00 for attendance yet have credits earned, have high attendance yet have missing credits earned, etc. Efforts should be made toward complete datasets and rules to follow in every year of data analysis based on these issues.
- **Graduation Rates:** Twenty-nine different diploma types were reported in the dataset with no column indicating that the student had graduated. It was inferred that if there was a graduation date noted, the student did graduate. However, if there was no graduation date noted, it was inferred that the student did not graduate, despite having a diploma type noted. Further efforts should be made to ensure these interpretations are correct.
- **English Language Learner (ELL) Student Coding:** With regard to ELL students, there seem to be some obvious codes to identify the student, such as N (no), Y (yes), and M (monitored); however there are also codes like R and P that are missing a description for the code. It is also unclear if “Monitored” students should be included in the ELL number. The data for the 2014 year seem complete, but the data for 2012 and 2013 was especially unclear.

Data Rules Followed for This Analysis

- **Academic Priority Labeling:** Given that there was discrepancy in various Academic Priority indicators, the following variables were used to determine Academic Priority (versus other variables in the database):
 - 2010: APFg
 - 2012: InferredAPfrom1112data
 - 2013: Academic_Priority_Calculated
 - 2014: AP_Calculated
- **Non-Completers:** Only program completers were included in the analysis. Non-completers are completely eliminated.
- **Graduation Rates:** If students graduated after 9/1/2014, they were counted as not having graduated “on-time” and therefore were counted as non-graduates. In total, twenty-eight students graduated between 9/1/2014 and 1/31/2015.
- **ELL Student Coding:** Codes of ‘N’ for Not ELL and ‘Y’ for Yes ELL were used. Other codes were ignored; therefore the percentages may not add up to 100% in certain years.
- **Attendance:** Attendance of 0.00% was counted as missing data instead of as a 0.00% attendance rate.

Ninth Grade Counts Participants by District

- Table 1 reflects the number of ACP students in each district who participated in a NGC program compared to the total number of ACP students within each district, by year.
- This table includes data from three cohorts of students and shows what percentage of ACP students in each district participated in NGC programs the summer prior to entering high school.

Table 1: Academic Priority NGC Enrollment by District, Summer 2012, 2013, and 2014

District	Summer 2012			Summer 2013			Summer 2014		
	District Academic Priority NGC Enrollment	District Total Academic Priority Students	% of District Academic Priority Students Enrolled in NGC	District Academic Priority NGC Enrollment	District Total Academic Priority Students	% of District Academic Priority Students Enrolled in NGC	District Academic Priority NGC Enrollment	District Total Academic Priority Students	% of District Academic Priority Students Enrolled in NGC
Centennial	24	198	12%	36	291	12%	26	231	11%
David Douglas	116	448	26%	85	543	16%	61	418	15%
Gresham-Barlow	66	419	16%	45	511	9%	30	460	7%
Parkrose	5	129	4%	19	129	15%	6	64	9%
Portland	311	1,225	25%	283	1,362	21%	253	1,494	17%
Reynolds	66	467	14%	57	504	11%	64	506	13%

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary.

Summer 2010 Cohort – Graduation Rate

- Table 2 shows the on-time graduation rates for the 2010 cohort. This is the first group of NGC participants for whom graduation rates can be measured. “On-time graduation” is defined as a student who graduated on or before September 1, 2014.
- Table 2 includes the number ACP students who participated in a NGC program in 2010 compared to the number of ACP students who did not participate in an NGC program, as well as the number of on-time graduates from each group. The graduation rate for each group was also calculated.
- These data show that ACP students who participated in an NGC program had a slightly higher graduation rate compared to ACP students who did not participate in an NGC program, and this difference appears to be statistically significant.
- However, it is worth noting that both student groups fell below the 2013-14 state average of 76% for on-time graduation.

Table 2: 2013-14 On-Time Graduation Rates, Summer 2010 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Total Number of On-Time Graduates, 2013-14	On-Time Graduation Rates, 2013-14
Academic Priority NGC <u>Participants</u>, Summer 2010	407	204	50.1%
Academic Priority NGC <u>Non-Participants</u> , Summer 2010	2,052	918	44.7%
Difference			5.4%*

Note. 28 students (8 NGC) who graduated after 9/1/2014 were counted as non-graduates.

*Indicates statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Summer 2012 Cohort – Attendance Rates & Credits Accumulated

Student Attendance

- Table 3 shows the changes in attendance rates for ACP students from eighth to ninth grade, and compares that change between ACP NGC participants and non-participants. The attendance rates were based on the total days attended divided by total days accounted for. This provides some indication for how attendance rates changed in 2012-13 after some ACP students participated in an NGC program in the summer of 2012 compared to those ACP students who did not participate.
- Table 3 also shows the percentage of ACP students with an attendance rate of 90% or higher in both eighth and ninth grade (pre-NGC program and post-NGC program) and compares these percentages between ACP NGC participants and non-participants. Attendance rates of 90%+ are used to indicate if students are on track to graduate on time.
- The data indicate that overall attendance rates were higher for both student groups in the ninth grade when compared to eighth grade, with NGC participants having a significantly higher attendance rate at both time points. Both groups also demonstrated a higher percentage of students with 90%+ attendance rates in ninth grade as compared to eighth grade, with NGC participants having a significantly higher percentage of students with 90%+ attendance rates at both time points.

Table 3: Average Attendance Rates and Percentage of Students w/ Attendance of 90% or Above, Summer 2012 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Attendance Rate, 2011-12 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Attendance Rate, 2012-13 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate, 2011-12 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate, 2012-13 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2012	556	92.1%	92.8%	70.9%	76.1%
Academic Priority NGC Non-Participants, Summer 2012	2,028	90.7%	91.1%	64.6%	71.0%
Difference		1.4%*	1.7%*	6.3%*	5.1%*

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. The numbers for this analysis are smaller because students are only included if they have attendance rates for both years. Those with attendance rates of 0.00 were excluded as well.

*Indicates statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Credits Accumulated

- Table 4 shows the number of credits accumulated for ACP students in ninth grade. These results are presented with and without the total credits earned by students specifically for participating in an NGC program.
- Table 4 includes the credits accumulated by ACP NGC participants compared to the credits accumulated by ACP non-participants. The table also shows the percentage of students who earned 6+ credits during their ninth grade year, an indicator that signals that students are on track to graduate on time.
- The data show that ACP students who participated in a NGC program accumulated significantly more credits (0.60) than non-participants. However, once credits earned for NGC program participation were removed from student totals, ACP NGC participants only earned about 0.19 credits more than non-participants; this difference is not significantly different. With NGC participation credits included, a greater percentage of ACP participants earned six or more high school credits than ACP non-participants; however, there is no substantive difference between student groups when NGC participation credits are removed.

Table 4: Average Credits Accumulated and Percentage of Students Earning 6+ Credits, Summer 2012 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Credits Accumulated, 2012-13 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Percent of Students with 6+ Credits, 2012-13 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Credits Accumulated, 2012-13 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC) <u>NGC Credits Removed</u>	Percent of Students with 6+ Credits, 2012-13 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC) <u>NGC Credits Removed</u>
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2012	593	5.69	58.2%	5.28	52.8%
Academic Priority NGC Non-Participants, Summer 2012	2,227	5.09	52.0%	5.09	52.0%
Difference		0.60*	6.2%*	0.19	0.8%

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary.

*Indicates statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Summer 2013 Cohort – Attendance Rates & Credits Accumulated

Student Attendance

- Attendance data displayed in Table 5 for the Summer 2013 cohort were collected and analyzed in the same manner as reported for the Summer 2012 cohort.
- The data illustrate that overall attendance rates were lower for both groups in ninth grade when compared to eighth grade, with ACP NGC participants having a slightly higher attendance rate in both eighth and ninth grade. ACP NGC participants showed nearly an 11% decrease in students with 90%+ attendance rates in ninth grade, while the percentage for ACP non-participants remained approximately the same.

Table 5: Average Attendance Rates and Percentage of Students w/ Attendance of 90% or Above, Summer 2013 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Attendance Rate, 2012-13 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Attendance Rate, 2013-14 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate, 2012-13 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate, 2013-14 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2013	476	94.0%	91.1%	80.0%	69.3%
Academic Priority NGC Non-Participants, Summer 2013	2,195	91.1%	89.6%	65.3%	65.2%
Difference		2.9%*	1.5%*	14.7%*	4.1%

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. The numbers for this analysis are smaller because students are only included if they have attendance rates for both years. Those with attendance rates of 0.00 were excluded as well.

*Indicates statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Credits Accumulated

- Credits accumulated data displayed in Table 6 for the Summer 2013 cohort were collected and analyzed in the same manner as reported for the Summer 2012 cohort, with NGC participation credits included and removed.
- The results show that ACP students who participated in a NGC program accumulated significantly more credits on average (0.52) than ACP non-participants. The average credits accumulated for ACP NGC participants was greater than six credits, which demonstrates many students were on track for graduating on time. However, once NGC participation credits were removed, this difference disappears.

Table 6: Average Credits Accumulated and Percentage of Students Earning 6+ Credits, Summer 2013 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Credits Accumulated, 2013-14 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Percent of Students with 6+ Credits, 2013-14 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Credits Accumulated, 2013-14 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC) <u>NGC Credits Removed</u>	Percent of Students with 6+ Credits, 2013-14 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC) <u>NGC Credits Removed</u>
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2013	474	6.11	62.9%	5.71	57.6%
Academic Priority NGC <u>Non-Participants</u> , Summer 2013	2,167	5.59	56.0%	5.59	56.0%
Difference		0.52*	6.9%*	0.12	1.6%

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary.

*Indicates statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Summer 2012 Cohort – Demographics

- Table 7 shows a demographic breakdown for Summer 2012 ACP NGC participants, non-ACP NGC participants, all ACP students in Multnomah County, and the demographics for all ninth grade students throughout the county. The percentage of each group in the demographic categories of gender, race, district, and ELL identification is displayed. Of most interest are the demographics for the ACP NGC participants, and how they compare to the other subsets of student groups. The top row identifies the number of students in each group, while the remaining rows include percentages.

Table 7: Student Demographics, Summer 2012 Cohort

		Academic Priority NGC Participants	Non-Academic Priority NGC Participants	All Academic Priority Students, Multnomah County	All 9 th Grade Students, Multnomah County
Total	Number of Students	593	166	2,911	5960
Academic Priority	ACP – No	0%	100%	0%	51%
	ACP – Yes	100%	0%	100%	49%
English Language Learners	ELL – No	88%	96%	90%	95%
	ELL – Yes	6%	0%	4%	5%
Gender	Female	44%	61%	44%	48%
	Male	56%	39%	56%	52%
Race	American Indian/Alaskan Native	2%	0%	2%	1.07%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	5%	16%	7%	9.77%
	Black/African American	21%	25%	13%	8.76%
	Hispanic	36%	24%	28%	20.82%
	Multi/Other	5%	8%	6%	5.07%
	White	31%	27%	45%	54.51%
District	Centennial	4%	2%	7%	7.67%
	David Douglas	20%	27%	15%	12%
	Gresham-Barlow	11%	3%	14%	16.6%
	Parkrose	1%	4%	4%	3.6%
	Portland	52%	54%	42%	47.53%
	Reynolds	11%	10%	16%	12.5%

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. ELL demographics do not add to 100% because of coding discrepancies.

Summer 2013 Cohort – Demographics

- Table 8 shows a demographic breakdown for Summer 2013 ACP NGC participants, non-ACP NGC participants, all ACP students in Multnomah County, and the demographics for all ninth grade students throughout the county. The percentage of each group in the demographic categories of gender, race, district, and ELL identification is displayed. Of most interest are the demographics for the ACP NGC participants and how they compare to the other subsets of student groups. The top row identifies the number of students in each group, while the remaining rows include percentages.

Table 8: Student Demographics, Summer 2013 Cohort

		Academic Priority NGC Participants	Non-Academic Priority NGC Participants	All Academic Priority Students, Multnomah County	All 9 th Grade Students, Multnomah County
Total	Number of Students	512	159	3,355	6074
Academic Priority	ACP – No	0%	100%	0%	45%
	ACP – Yes	100%	0%	100%	55%
English Language Learners	ELL – No	86%	92%	90%	95.5%
	ELL – Yes	12%	6%	8%	4.5%
Gender	Female	46%	60%	43%	48.1%
	Male	54%	40%	57%	51.9%
Race	American Indian/Alaskan Native	1%	2%	1%	1.1%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	6%	16%	6%	10.4%
	Black/African American	25%	18%	14%	9.8%
	Hispanic	37%	39%	27%	20.5%
	Multi/Other	7%	3%	6%	6.4%
	White	24%	23%	45%	51.8%
District	Centennial	7%	7%	9%	8%
	David Douglas	17%	16%	16%	12.9%
	Gresham-Barlow	8%	4%	15%	16.1%
	Parkrose	4%	3%	4%	4.1%
	Portland	53%	59%	41%	47%
	Reynolds	11%	12%	15%	12%

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. ELL demographics do not add to 100% because of coding discrepancies.

Summer 2014 Cohort – Demographics

- Table 9 shows a demographic breakdown for Summer 2014 ACP NGC participants, non-ACP NGC participants, all ACP students in Multnomah County, and the demographics for all ninth grade students throughout the county. The percentage of each group in the demographic categories of gender, race, district, and ELL identification is displayed. Of most interest are the demographics for the ACP NGC participants and how they compare to the other subsets of student groups. The top row identifies the number of students in each group, while the remaining rows include percentages.

Table 9: Student Demographics, Summer 2014 Cohort

		Academic Priority NGC Participants	Non-Academic Priority NGC Participants	All Academic Priority Students, Multnomah County	All 9 th Grade Students, Multnomah County
Total	Number of Students	443	154	3,188	7020
Academic Priority	ACP – No	0%	100%	0%	54.6%
	ACP – Yes	100%	0%	100%	45.4%
English Language Learners	ELL – No	94%	95%	95%	93.9%
	ELL – Yes	6%	5%	5%	6.1%
Gender	Female	50%	60%	44%	48%
	Male	50%	40%	56%	52%
Race	American Indian/Alaskan Native	1%	2%	1%	1.1%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	8%	14%	7%	9.4%
	Black/African American	19%	16%	13%	9.9%
	Hispanic	44%	36%	28%	22.2%
	Multi/Other	7%	3%	7%	6.8%
	White	22%	29%	43%	49.7%
District	Centennial	6%	14%	7%	7.8%
	David Douglas	14%	15%	13%	13.4%
	Gresham-Barlow	7%	2%	14%	14.3%
	Parkrose	1%	9%	2%	3.9%
	Portland	57%	52%	47%	48.7%
	Reynolds	14%	8%	16%	11.9%

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. ACP data was missing for 24 participants.