

## **Graduation & Dropout Indicator Tamer – Grad = 80%, Dropout = ≤8.0%**

**Region 3 Indicator Contact(s):**     ☐ Ann Walton  
                                                          ☐ Tim Voskuil

<b>Data Source(s):</b>	<b>Count/Report:</b>	<b>Online Resource:</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> GAD Report & Application	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">GAD Report</a>
	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 MSDS Counts	<input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">GAD Application - secure login</a>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Local's SIS	<input type="checkbox"/> See Graduation-Dropout Helpful Links document

**(Compliance Indicators Only) Possible source(s)/cause(s) of noncompliance (#15, VR, etc.):**

- ☐ 1 *(maybe need more clarification on what would be valuable to include here)*
- ☐ 2

**Linkage to Determinations (if any):**     ☐ Timely data  
                                                          ☐ Valid/Reliable data  
                                                          ☐ CAPs

**Gap Statement:**     ☐ Ex: Our 2009-10 district graduation rate for students with IEPs was 57%, which was significantly less than the district rate for all students at 76%, and less than the MDE target of 80%. *(this will show current &/or CIMS data for the specific indicator in relation to all students and the State target)*

**Root Cause****Hypotheses:**

- ☐ Accuracy of district-entered graduation and dropout data in Student Information System
- ☐ High percentage of transient student population
- ☐ Lack of student tracking by Case Manager (lack of use of EDP with IEP)
- ☐ Lack of Transition Coordinator services
- ☐ Lack of early warning signs for dropout from K through 12 (attendance, behavior, academic proficiency, etc.)
- ☐ Group foster home in the area brings in many students that are behind academically and behind in credits and are not able to graduate with their cohort
- ☐ Limited data for this cohort of students
- ☐ Co-teaching and inclusion models not in place for this group of students
- ☐ Alternative school students sometimes difficult to track upon dropping out.
- ☐ Alternative school staff need additional knowledge and practice in implementing differentiated instruction as proactive strategy to increase number of students with IEPs who graduate with cohort group
- ☐ EDPs are not utilized to inform student decision-making and instructional strategies at the secondary level for general education and special education staff
- ☐ High school staff are not utilizing 90 minute blocks to incorporate differentiated instruction
- ☐ Lack of special education services provided at alternative high school
- ☐ Lack of a consistent assessment process and grading protocol
- ☐ Difference in educational philosophy among the staff that all students can succeed and setting high expectations for students at appropriate levels.
- ☐ Need to identify power standards in the curriculum

**Activity**  
**Descriptions:**  
*(assembly  
of best  
practices)*

- ☐ Develop and implement a Pre-K through 12 tracking system for at-risk factors
- ☐ Develop, implement, and coordinate EDP with IEP
- ☐ Implement training for district data entry staff for proper coding for graduation and dropout
- ☐ Implement universal screening for RtI and for the Intake Process K-12
- ☐ Develop and implement RtI framework
- ☐ Develop a procedure for graduation plans
- ☐ Follow-up of students who leave/exit district
- ☐ Consistency with co-teaching partners
- ☐ Utilize differentiated instruction at all grade levels
- ☐ Identify Power Standards for the four core areas – ELA; Math; Science; Social Studies
- ☐ Create Common Assessments in the 4 core areas beginning with ELA and Math
- ☐ Begin to explore Grading Practices at each level to create a plan to develop a district wide belief system and policy on grading practices
- ☐ Continue to explore and incorporate best practices in RtI for reading K-5