

Outcomes and Demographics for Participants in the Ninth Grade Counts Programs: Summer 2011, Summer 2014 and 2015

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

July 2016

Copyright © 2016

Table of Contents

Contents

Introduction.....	4
Ninth Grade Counts Participants by District.....	6
Summer 2011 Cohort – Graduation Rate	7
Summer 2014 Cohort – Attendance Rates & Credits Accumulated	8
Summer 2015 Cohort – Attendance Rates for YTD as of January 31 st , 2016.. ..	10
Summer 2015 Cohort – Demographics.....	11

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 2015?
- What were the 2014-15 graduation rates for the Summer 2011 NGC cohort?
- What were the attendance rates and average credits accumulated for NGC participants versus non-participants for the Summer 2014 cohort?
- What were the demographics of NGC participants in the Summer 2015 cohort?

The data analysis attached to each research question is reported on subsequent pages in the order presented above. The data issues and limitations are noted below and throughout the report; because of them comparisons between students groups must be interpreted very cautiously.

Limitations

- **Academic Priority Labeling:** The implementation of the definition of *Academic Priority* has changed over time so year to year comparisons must be interpreted with caution.
- **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 a NGC program (or programs). This excludes an important subgroup with important implications, which may lead to results that are positively skewed. Future work should investigate differences in non-completers as well. Below is a summary of these non-completers:
 - 2011: 12% ($n = 110$) NGC participants (46 ACP) did not complete the program
 - 2014: 15% ($n = 105$) NGC participants (85 ACP) did not complete the program

- 2015: 21% ($n = 163$) NGC participants (96 ACP) did not complete the program
- **Key Pieces of Data Incorrect or Missing:**
 - 2014 9th grade attendance rates (2014-15 attendance) & 2015 8th grade attendance rates (2014-15 attendance): The transition to a new student data management system resulted in limited reliability for middle and high school attendance data, which resulted in data being omitted.
- **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 seem 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.

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):
 - 2011: Identified by either “Historic_AP” OR “AP_Flag” (all students with “AP_Flag” were also identified by “Historic_AP” but not vice versa)
 - 2014 & 2015: Calculated by being flagged by any of the three flags: Attendance (i.e., less than 90%), Core Course Performance (i.e., failing two or more core courses), or Discipline (i.e., receiving one or more out of school suspension), OR being flagged by either “Historic_AP” OR “AP_Flag”
 - Two school districts were not using the Core Course Performance criteria, so for these students only Attendance and Discipline were used as flags in addition to “Historic_AP” and “AP_Flag”.
- **Graduation Rates:** If students graduated after 9/1/2015, they were counted as not having graduated “on-time” and therefore were counted as non-graduates. In total, 36 students (5 who completed 9th Grade Counts) graduated between 9/1/2015 and 1/31/2016.
- **ELL Student Coding:** Codes of ‘M’ for Monitored and ‘Y’ for Yes ELL were used to identify ELL students. All other codes were counted as Not ELL.
- **Attendance:** Attendance rates of 0.00% were counted as missing data.
- **Credits:** Credits of 0.00 were counted as missing data. The “Cumulative_HS_Credits” variable was used to calculate credits instead of “HS_Credits_Earned_1415”
- **Duplicates:** Students who had moved between the six districts were flagged and the following rules were used to retain the appropriate student in the dataset.
 - **2011:** The entry with a graduation date (when possible)
 - **2014:** The entries were combined with the highest attendance rates and credits earned
 - **2015:** The entry with the higher attendance rate
- Students with program ID’s 200-402 ($n = 226$, 24%) were removed from the 2011 Cohort

Ninth Grade Counts Participants by District

- Table 1 reflects the number of Academic Priority (ACP) students in each district who participated in a 2015 NGC program compared to the total number of ACP students within each district.
- This table 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 2015

District	Summer 2015		
	District Academic Priority NGC Enrollment	District Total Academic Priority Students	% of District Academic Priority Students Enrolled in NGC
Centennial	16*	225*	7%*
David Douglas	44	252	17%
Gresham-Barlow	32	336	10%
Parkrose	8*	59*	14%*
Portland	135	883	15%
Reynolds	20	307	7%
TOTAL 6 Districts	255	2,062	12%

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

*Centennial and Parkrose did not calculate ACP based on core course performance, therefore the number of ACP students could be skewed downward for these two districts.

Summer 2011 Cohort – Graduation Rate

- Table 2 shows the on-time graduation rates for the 2011 cohort. These results include the second group of NGC participants for whom graduation rates could be measured. “On-time graduation” is defined as a student who graduated on or before September 1, 2015.
- Table 2 includes the number of ACP students who participated in a NGC program in 2011 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 graduation rates 3.5% lower than ACP students who did not participate in an NGC program.
- It is worth noting that these graduation rates are much higher than the 2013-14 graduation rates, which were 45% for ACP Non NGC Participants and 50% for ACP NGC Participants.

Table 2: 2014-15 Graduation Rates, Summer 2011 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Total Number of Graduates, 2014-15	Graduation Rates, 2014-15
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2011	475	319	67.16%
Academic Priority NGC <u>Non-Participants</u> , Summer 2011	2,637	1,864	70.69%
Difference			-3.53%

Note. 24 ACP students (4 NGC) who graduated after 9/1/2015 were counted as non-graduates. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. Not a statistically significant difference.

Summer 2014 Cohort – Attendance Rates & Credits Accumulated

Student Attendance

- Table 3 displays the attendance rates for ACP students in eighth grade and compares them between ACP NGC participants and non-participants. The attendance rates were based on the total days attended divided by total days accounted for.
- Table 3 also includes the percentage of ACP students with an attendance rate of 90% or higher in eighth grade (pre-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 NGC participants had significantly higher attendance in eighth grade (2013-14).

Table 3: Average Attendance Rates and Percentage of Students w/ Attendance of 90% or Above, Summer 2014 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Attendance Rate, 2013-14 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Attendance Rate, 2014-15 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate, 2013-14 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate, 2014-15 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2014	452	93.1%	(Reliable data not available) ¹	76.1%	(Reliable data not available) ¹
Academic Priority NGC <u>Non-Participants</u> , Summer 2014	2,586	90.6%	(Reliable data not available) ¹	66.1%	(Reliable data not available) ¹
Difference		2.5%*		10.1%*	

¹The transition to a new student data management system resulted in limited reliability for middle and high school attendance data.

Note. Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. Those with attendance rates of 0.00 were excluded.

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

Credits Accumulated

- Table 4 includes the credits accumulated by ACP NGC Summer 2014 participants compared to the credits accumulated by ACP non-participants. The table also displays the percentage of students who had accumulated 6+ credits by the end of their ninth grade year, an indicator that signals that students are on track to graduate on time. These results are presented with and without the total credits earned by students specifically for participating in an NGC program.
- The data show that ACP students who participated in a NGC program accumulated significantly more credits (0.44 more credits) than non-participants. However, once credits earned for NGC program participation were removed from student totals, ACP NGC participants only earned about 0.02 credits more than non-participants; this difference was not significantly different. With NGC participation credits included, a non-statistically significantly greater percentage of ACP participants earned six or more high school credits than ACP non-participants; however, there was no substantive difference between student groups when NGC participation credits were removed.

Table 4: Average Credits Accumulated and Percentage of Students Earning 6+ Credits, Summer 2014 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Credits Accumulated, 2014-15 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Percent of Students with 6+ Credits, 2014-15 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Credits Accumulated, 2014-15 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC) <u>NGC Credits Removed</u>	Percent of Students with 6+ Credits, 2014-15 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC) <u>NGC Credits Removed</u>
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2014	461	8.61	75.1%	8.19	72.0%
Academic Priority NGC Non-Participants, Summer 2014	2,824	8.17	72.1%	8.17	72.1%
Difference		0.44*	3.0%	0.02	-0.1%

Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. Those with credits of 0.00 were excluded.

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

Summer 2015 Cohort – Attendance Rates for YTD as of January 31st, 2016

Student Attendance

- Attendance data displayed in Table 5 for the Summer 2015 cohort were collected and analyzed in the same manner as reported for the Summer 2014 cohort.
- It appears that ACP NGC participants had a statistically significantly ($p < .05$) higher attendance rate in ninth grade.
- The data illustrate that ACP NGC participants have a statistically significantly ($p < .05$) higher number of students with 90%+ attendance in ninth grade than Non-NGC ACP students.

Table 5: Average Attendance Rates and Percentage of Students w/ Attendance of 90% or Above, Summer 2015 Academic Priority Ninth Grade Counts Participants and Non-Participants

	Total Number of Students	Attendance Rate, 2014-15 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Attendance Rate YTD, 2015-16 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate, 2014-15 (8 th Grade, Pre-NGC)	Percent of Students with 90%+ Attendance Rate YTD, 2015-16 (9 th Grade, Post-NGC)
Academic Priority NGC Participants, Summer 2015	253	(Reliable data not available) ¹	90.0%	(Reliable data not available) ¹	63.2%
Academic Priority NGC <u>Non-Participants</u> , Summer 2015	1,695	(Reliable data not available) ¹	87.3%	(Reliable data not available) ¹	54.9%
Difference			2.7%*		8.3%*

Note. ¹The transition to a new student data management system resulted in limited reliability for middle and high school attendance data.

Academic Priority NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary. Those with attendance rates of 0.00 were excluded.

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

Summer 2015 Cohort – Demographics

- Table 6 displays a demographic breakdown for Summer 2015 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 6: Student Demographics, Summer 2015 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	255	357	2,062	6,105
Academic Priority	ACP – No	0%	100%	0%	70%
	ACP – Yes	100%	0%	100%	30%
English Language Learners¹	ELL – No	95%	95%	95%	96%
	ELL – Yes	5%	5%	5%	4%
Gender	Female	40%	56%	42%	49%
	Male	60%	44%	58%	51%
Race	American Indian/Alaskan Native	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	4%	10%	5%	10%
	Black/African American	16%	19%	11%	9%
	Hispanic	47%	41%	30%	21%
	Multi/Other	6%	8%	8%	8%
	White	26%	21%	46%	52%
District	Centennial	6%	1%	11%	9%
	David Douglas	17%	21%	12%	14%
	Gresham-Barlow	13%	7%	16%	16%
	Parkrose	3%	2%	3%	4%
	Portland	53%	63%	43%	56%
	Reynolds	8%	6%	15%	13%

¹ Various codes were used to identify ELL status; only Monitored (M) and Active (Y) codes were used to identify ELL students.
Note. NGC participants who did not complete the NGC program were not included in this summary.