Leading Equity Through Collaborative Teams

Michael Boraz, Fellow

Elizabeth Brown, Ally

Lincoln Park High School

2001 N. Orchard St.

Chicago, IL 60614

Lincolnparkhs.org

mjboraz@cps.edu

Eabrown@cps.edu

Cohort 16

Abstract

My project is to inquire into how we develop collaborative and accountable teams where each member contributes to the team equitably. By accountability, I mean that each team has authentic ownership of the process and outcomes that they are working toward. The question as it pertains to my leadership is how do I lead authentically accountable teams, and to what extent does my leadership facilitate or inhibit collaborative leadership.

Introduction

The focus of my project is to drive equitable outcomes, particularly for our African American students, through effective collaborative teaming.

Lincoln Park High School is a neighborhood school with magnet programs. About 40% of our students come from the attendance area, which results in us having some academic, racial, and socio-economic diversity. Part of our attendance area is predominantly white and affluent to middle class, and it includes 2 housing complexes that are low income and predominantly African American. We draw a diverse student body for our magnet programs. Some of our programs have relatively strict entry requirements based on grades and test scores, while others weight an audition more heavily than academic requirements. The outcome is that our current student body (2100 students) is about 35% LatinX, 25% White, 20% African American, 15% Asian, and 5% with no single racial identification. The incoming grades and test scores of our students vary widely, with significant numbers of students above the 80th percentile or below the 50th percentile on standardized tests. The types of elementary school attended, grades, and overall experience vary widely for our incoming students. When we look at our data, we see that there are patterns of performance that are predictable by race when students enter our school, and to some extent lower grades and test scores by African American students compared to their white and Asian counterparts gets worse as they continue through our school. African American students are also more likely to be suspended, be absent, and transfer out, and less likely to enroll in an AP or IB class than their peers of other racial groups. The on-track and graduation rates of African American students have improved in recent years, but they are still also lower than the on-track and graduation rates of their peers from other racial groups.

The outcomes of students of color are not improving, especially grades and standardized test scores. We have to ask ourselves what we must do differently to achieve different outcomes for our African American students.

We don't have a mission statement that organizes all work and behavior or something that everyone knows. However, we have a theory of action that we believe will become a mission once we develop teams that take responsibility for our results.

Special features that impact our culture, in both positive and negative ways, include our programs:

 IB Diploma Programme, Double Honors Magnet, Performing Arts (Drama, Instrumental Music, Vocal Music and now Visual Arts magnets. The programs imply an ability level and motivation on the part of the students that creates a mindset and expectations on the part of many adults. Those expectations are not always equal across programs. On the other hand, our staff does take ownership of the programs that they teach in, and that can drive improvements.

Our staff is predominantly white, and about 50% have 9 or more years of experience, and about 55% are women.

The community's view of our school is mixed. City wide, we are a popular choice, and despite declining enrollment in CPS over the last 5 years and an increase in the number of high school seats in charter and selective enrollment schools, our enrollment has remained steady. We had one intentionally small class that will be graduating this year, so our total enrollment should increase by about 100 students in the fall of 2019.

A good portion of our surrounding neighborhood is predominantly white and middle class to affluent. Some of the neighbors do not view our school as an option because they prefer selective enrollment or private schools. Some say it is because our IB Diploma Programme is too rigorous and our other programs are not rigorous enough. It is also often suggested that there is a drug problem at our school, but since there is no data to support that belief, especially in comparison to the neighboring private and selective enrollment schools, I suspect the issue is more about the socio-economic and racial composition of our student body.

Statement of the Problem

Our Problem of Practice is that our lack of culturally responsive teaching practices results in lower achievement in grades and test scores and less participation in AP and IB for students of color than their white and Asian peers. This problem has existed at Lincoln Park for many years. Because this is a longstanding and complex problem, we realize that we will not solve it for several years. The following describes our effort, through our Cahn Project, to make progress toward eliminating this problem.

Methods

My ally and I began studying equity before we began our Cahn project, because by looking at our data and working with a group of principals and assistant principals through NCS, it was evident to us that our African American male students in particular, and African American and LatinX students in general, were getting lower grades and lower scores on teacher created assessments than their white and Asian peers. Through NCS, we participated in a professional learning community which included visiting other CPS schools to view classes through an equity

lens and to study the text Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by Zaretta Hammond. As we learned from the text along with 6 teachers from our school, we thought that our entire faculty could benefit from studying equity together.

Our Instructional Leadership Team began an equity study a few months after my ally and I started ours. Together, they read a book called The Dream-Keepers by Gloria Ladson Billings about successful teachers of African American students. A key theme in the book was the importance of belief in and high expectations for African American students. This theme led to a discussion amongst the ILT about their own beliefs and biases about African Americans. As my ally and I discussed this work, we had several long conversations about the best way to start our equity work with the entire faculty.

I felt that focusing on strategy and pedagogy was the way to go, because even if teachers have a good mindset, if they don't have the technical skills to reach struggling learners, neither the learners not the teachers will not be successful. I also felt that for our majority white staff, discussing race and confronting their own biases would shut them down. My ally argued that until we address the staff's mindset and biases about race, we won't make any progress. Even technically expert teachers would not succeed teaching children of color without believing in them, having high expectations for them, and knowing what their own blind spots on race are. We deliberated over several weeks. All the while, my ally was sharing some of the work that the ILT was doing on race, and she was telling me that a critical mass was building.

I also attended a conference with our NCS partner and the National Equity Project and learned more about work NCS has done internally on race and equity. They are a small organization with more time to allocate to collaborative professional learning than our school, but I was impressed by the commitment they made to addressing race directly.

By the spring of 2018, I was admitted to Cahn and I was convinced that dealing with race directly would be the right approach for us. My ally convinced me with her consistent and passionate arguments over time. Deep down, I knew that was the way to go, but I have to admit that I was afraid of being the leader of a whole staff effort to address the impact of racism on our students. Fortunately, my ally and our ILT laid enough groundwork that they pushed me to make the right choice. We developed a Theory of Action that we hoped would focus our work:

In order to achieve equitable outcomes for all of our students – meaning a student's school experiences and academic achievement will not be predicted by his or her race, class or gender – we need to study equity together and strengthen our teams. We will wrestle with issues of equity, examine our beliefs and practices, engage in discourse, and learn together so that the

collective actions we take in our small teams, and equally important, in our whole team, have the best chance of improving outcomes for our least-reached students.

The Cahn program summer institute was a great resource for preparing my ally and I for our project. Coming into the institute we knew equity would a key part of our project, but that was all that we were sure about. After the institute, we knew that focusing on how we as leaders build our teams, especially how we build collaboration and authorize our teams to solve their own problems, was a critical take away, and would be a key driver of our project.

Since the start of the 18 19 school year, we have engaged in several learning activities with our teacher teams, which are our primary constituents for now. During the first 3 days of professional development, we did several team building activities with the purpose of laying the groundwork for open communication among our teams. One included a version of the communication styles activity we did during the summer institute. Staff made table tent name tags with their communication style/personality trait "colors" that they bring to each meeting to remind colleagues of what is the most effective way to interact with them. We also did a chalk talk protocol to solicit ideas from teachers about what a more equitable Lincoln Park High School would look like. We are using the ideas from the chalk talk to facilitate conversation about structural approaches that could drive improvements in equity. We have a group of teachers who meet bi-weekly to discuss these ideas.

The main action that we are taking to engage our teachers in learning about equity is reading Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by Zaretta Hammond and discussing the text in our teacher teams that we call study groups. So far, the text has covered a definition of culture, culturally responsive, and provided a framework to support students to become independent learners. The author argues that culturally responsive teachers will be successful if they teach dependent learners how to become independent, and if they learn to see the strengths of dependent learners rather than their deficits. We have also done an activity in our study groups about implicit bias and identity. The book also as a chapter on the brain's structures and how those structures influence culture and learning.

One other major learning activity we undertook with the staff was a 2.5 hour workshop on leading for equity led by 3 trainers from the National Equity Project. The focus on the workshop was identifying how our individual identity, including our racial identity and our school experiences, influence how we understand and interact with our students. We also explored constructivist listening as a culturally responsive tool. There was a lot of individual and small group work during the workshop, which we wanted to impact our team building efforts and have an equity focus.

Another important learning activity we did in our study groups was a data review by race and gender of our 1st quarter grades with attention paid to the percentage of students with a 3.0 or higher GPA. We also studied how students 8th grade attendance and grades may be predictive of their 9th grade performance. (see Appendix at the end of this report to view the data). In the context of the text that we are reading, we discussed trends in the data and steps we can take to improve course performance. We saw that most students, regardless of race, continue to do well in 9th grade if they were doing well in 8th grade. Conversely, students with less than 90% attendance and less than a 2.3 GPA in 8th grade appear to have a drop in their GPA and attendance when they reach high school. At LPHS, more African American students than any other racial group enter 9th grade having had relatively low 8th grade GPA and attendance compared to their peers at LPHS. For the rest of our project, one area of focus will be how to strengthen our teams' abilities to implement strategies to improve the course performance of our students with historically lower grades. The author of our Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain calls these students dependent learners.

Our plan was to use the Hammond text as an anchor text for the staff to learn about culturally responsive teaching and how it can result in equitable outcomes. We took engaged in some additional training and organized our teams not only for what we thought would be optimal learning, but to optimize collaboration and efficient of the teams. Our actions are described below:

> We purchased Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain by Zaretta Hammond for all staff. Reading together in study groups-each group has 4-7 members, is led by a teacher, and includes myself or one of assistant principals. The study groups are discussing each chapter using protocols from the National School Reform Faculty website and the study questions that accompany the text. Our inclination is to jump into action research right away, but we have made a concerted effort to do a thorough inquiry process into the text with the understanding that learning is action. Going forward, we have plans to take additional action steps as follows:

The Instructional Leadership Team led the creation of differentiated learning plans for our teams. These plans were created in collaboration with each study. We gathered data from the teams (study groups) and found that many of the study groups want to continue reading with an eye toward implementing Culturally Responsive strategies as they read. The outcome for the study groups was to attempt Culturally Responsive practices (as they define them from their reading/learning) in class by the end of the year. By allowing the study groups to determine their actions and timeline from a range of choices, we aligned the work to the goal of leading in a way that will allow more adults to take leadership on solving problems. We did not tell teachers what pathway to follow-there are many choices within Culturally Responsive

teaching. We asked teachers to interpret the aspect of the text that is most meaningful to them and base their actions on that rather than what I think that the teams should do.

The Study Groups are the key structure for our team building goals, and the key area for my ally and I to change our approach to leadership. The outcome that we wanted was to change our leadership from authoritative or directing to supportive, collaborative, and more like a coach than a supervisor. We believed that we would develop more collaborative leadership and accountability within the teams by leading less from the front.

We each work with 6 study groups, and it felt unwieldy to change our approach with all of them at once. Therefore, my ally and I collaborated on leading one study group, including attending the meetings together. We were open with the group about how we were trying to change how we led. I also met with several group members to ask how they would best like to be coached toward our equity goals. Once we set goals for our interaction and what they wanted to work for, we had individual check-ins to track our progress. Some examples of goal setting notes are below:

M.F.
Goal setting
3 1 19
Priority-collaboration, equity, engagement-sees the equity implications
Taps student feedback to structure collaboration
Wants to be aware of least reached students
What will work for quiet students when it comes to collaborating -equitable, accountability but not compliance
Safe environment to test your boundaries
Process goals development use as a formative or just a reflection tool
Learn transferable skills
Not always producing something but having good conversations.
Draft of observation tools

A.C.
2 19 19
Coaching project notes
Incorporate more project-based learning. Wants to get beyond performance tasks but looking for balance between project and coverage needs.
Wants it to be an authentic task and product/context, more of a work-related task
Engagement, buy in, meaningful skills not just Math, collaboration, teamwork for examples, presentation skills, those or the content skills are missing

Wants a PLC for planning project-based learning, but can be anyone, not just Math, but Math would help.
Interested in an interdisciplinary project, finding other teachers to do it w her.
PBL resources, training.
Working w curriculum team about doing something different
What does assessing a project mean, what does it reflect about student skills and knowledge v. traditional assessment
Community members-help w design-improving quality of life in community-
What problem are you trying to solve-give the project much more context, sustainable development
Starting w. research on community-what is the problem-what are you trying to solve.

March 12, 2019
Chris Nho-CPS Math specialist-knows Matt.
Looking at house-end of year project. Looking at schedule, discussion w. Geometry team.
Wants to study what is going on w. Lincoln Yards—its local, development is relevant
Essential questions:
        Who is Chicago for, who does it serve, benefits who, use of tax payer dollars, investment v. S and W side, questions about affordable housing. What are the precedents being set by this?
Wants kids to get more involved, thinking about how this impacts them.
Affordability, shared public space, green space for all to sue
Get ideas from people from neighborhood associations, Alderman's office
Teamwork and reflection as a process, feedback-developmentally how do you do it.

I asked my ally to observe and give feedback about how changed my role in the study group with an eye toward our goal of developing collaborative teams. This was a new approach for my ally and I because it is was not typical for her to give me feedback about how I am leading. This put her in a growth area of her own development. Later in this section I will reflect about how this progressed.

Just as we took more feedback from teachers about how they wanted to be coached and what is important to them, we wanted to incorporate student voice into our work so that we hear more about how students want to be taught and what makes them feel most connected to the work, their teachers, and their peers.

As our project progressed, I began to think about our theory of action in a slightly different way. It became by leading our equity focused teacher collaboration teams so that the teacher members would take more leadership over the inquiry and outcomes of the team's work, including their learning about equity, how their understanding of equity impacts their relationships with their students of color, our teams would take actions to create equitable

outcomes for their students of color. The results of our work for this year are summarized below.

Results

Some of our most important results were qualitative and anecdotal. We examined how my leadership of teams resulted in changes in teachers' awareness of equity, their belief systems about students, and how the two intersect to impact their relationships with their students of color and the actions they take to accelerate the learning of their students of color. Much of this work requires introspection-what we call holding up the mirror-and being vulnerable with me and other colleagues to share personal roadblocks to the work. This was difficult to measure. It was also difficult to measure how much collaborative leadership changed, because we did not have a baseline measure from last year to compare to. However, teacher reflections and anecdotes about actions resulting from our work do show alignment with our goals. These are shared below.

● A veteran teacher said unlike in the past, "I look forward to coming to these meetings. I felt pushed and supported by how you participated (referring to me)."
● Another veteran teacher said that unlike in prior years, when our teams felt evaluative, this year felt like collaborative learning. "It felt like a grad school class."
● A teacher who has some experience but is new to our school said that he is proud to tell his colleagues at other schools that he meets weekly with his principal and assistant principal to discuss equity. Our team makes him feel validated in his belief about the importance of this work and validated that my ally and I share this belief. He said the work gave him space and support to think about how he is implementing equitable practices in his classroom (so the impact of our work on students is being considered).
● Another teacher with a few years of experience but new to our school, who called herself the quiet member of our group, shared that although she did not participate in discussion as much as others, she often thought about what we discussed, and tried to impact her students in positive ways based on our discussion.

Many teachers have said that they are more conscious of their interactions with students of color, and that they make much more of an effort to make sure the interactions increase and are positive. Students' of color grades will likely not improve significantly this year based on where they were in our 30th week data. However, as Hammond points out, relationships based on trust are a critical element of culturally responsive teaching and are required if students are to allow teachers to push them. We have a long way to go, but this is starting to happen. For example:

- KS, a veteran teacher on one of my ally's teams, reported to her an instance where a white student and an African American student engaged in the same behavior at different times during a test, and he recognized that his response was more punitive to the African American student. He was upset about this, and after relating the story to my ally, he apologized to the African American student. KS's action was what Hammond describes in Chapter 5 as a trust generator-being vulnerable with students and sharing something that you are learning and struggling with. I do not know who the student was in this story, but I can imagine her surprise, in a good way, when a white male teacher apologized to her about something that he did that has to do with race. Race is a difficult topic to discuss, and it is even more difficult to admit when you take an action that can been seen as racially biased. That a veteran teacher apologized to a student of color for it *and* wanted to discuss the incident with a leader of color is a sign of progress.
- A shy second year teacher shared a reflection when we discussed chapter 5 about the importance of building trust as the foundation for strong relationships which will allow teachers to push students of color and students will be willing to be pushed. The teacher stated that she has been so worried about keeping her classes under control and productive that she has focused so much on content, activities, and classroom management that most of her one on one interactions with students of color are to redirect them back to a task or to admonish them for being off task. She admitted that she has almost no positive personal interaction with her students of color. She reflected that she did not want to take this approach but she felt that was what she had to do. Further, as an inexperienced teacher, she felt that she would lose control if she was not strict and focused totally on work. The teacher has shared with us that she is a socializing learner, so this approach felt unnatural to her. As she shared, our team encouraged her to be herself and have positive personal interactions with her students. As Hammond points out, generating trust is the most effective way to get students to engage and take risks, and having fun is an important part of building trust. I told the teacher that if she is not having fun, no one in her class will have fun, and that drudgery is an enemy of learning. Her willingness to share her doubts about her approach with her students of color allowed our team to share new ideas about the concern she raised, which for her will translate into small actionable steps of having warm non-instruction related interactions with her students of color, which over time will produce better learning partnerships and potentially better outcomes.

This team is learning that making room for non-technical aspects of teaching is very important to the success of our students of color. I have thought for years that our work in our teams was too technical, and it was preventing us from moving forward with our students. Now that we are exploring non-technical concepts together, we are sharing more of our emotional and

spiritual beliefs about our work. This is an important trust generator for us as colleagues and teammates. As I wrote earlier, I do not yet have a way to measure this change, but the reflections of the teachers shared in this section demonstrate an openness that previously did not exist in our teams. I believe this is anecdotal evidence of the development of trust.

- A teacher who admittedly feels comfortable with elements of an instrumental learner-rules, procedures, control, concreteness-began working with her students on a collaborative inquiry project about building structures earlier this year. She reflected that this work is out of her comfort zone, but in keeping with an important concept from the Hammond text, e.g. to capitalize on students' of color strengths rather than focus on their deficits, she looked for ways to engage her students in her Geometry class and see what strengths they brought to the collaborative process, rather than keep giving typical individual assignments that some of her students of color were not successfully engaging in. She surveyed students at the end of the project and found that they felt more confident in what they contributed to the project, and thus felt more engaged and valued their learning more than usual. Although the teacher still felt uncomfortable with the open-endedness of the project and worried that students were not learning enough of the written Geometry curriculum, she developed a much more complex and open ended project for students to work on this semester. This project incorporates learning about the economics and politics of real estate development in Chicago in addition to traditional Geometry curricula and skills. I have been coaching this teacher on the project, providing her with some ideas and resources, and supporting her to continue to step out of her comfort zone for her students of color. Listening to her hopes and fears about this project and learning more about her identity as we have worked together on our study team this year helped me understand how I could support her in more effective and responsive ways. I think the conditions on our team allowed her to take greater risks-e.g. the project-than she previously has.

These results show promise in several ways that are aligned with our goals and theory of action. Teachers consistently expressed appreciation for the opportunity to talk collectively and openly about equity, and to use our anchor text to support a sustained study of equity. They have expressed a desire to continue our study with our anchor text next year. Teachers also reported ways that our teams felt more collaborative and supportive than in previous years. These teacher reflections will help my ally and I plan to institutionalize the conditions on our teams that teachers said facilitated the improved collaboration. Although we are behind where we thought we would be in terms of implementing culturally responsive teaching practices, our improvements in awareness of equity and collaborative teams has us well positioned to advance our work next year.

Reflections

Participating in the Cahn Fellows Cohort 16 was the best learning experience of my career as a school leader, and I have had many high quality experiences, including an outstanding 13 year partnership with the University of Chicago's Network for College Success. What made Cahn the best experience was that it pushed me to hold up the mirror in ways that I was able to do with Cahn that I have not been able to do with other experiences. Cahn provided me with the combination of social emotional and technical learning that best met my needs as a learner. So, what did I learn?

Through the lens of Dr. Drago-Severson's Ways of Knowing, I am more comfortable and lead more effectively with socializing learners and to an extent self-authorizing learners, but I feel uncomfortable and I am much less effective with instrumental learners. This may be because I do not like to tell adults exactly what to do, or it may be because I judge instrumental learners as deficient compared to others. I have learned that understanding Ways of Knowing and listening for what people need to feel supported creates the conditions for effective teams, so I must improve my ability to support instrumental learners.

Dr. Young shared a quote from Heifetz early in the first session he led in SLI. To paraphrase, "people do not solve complex problems because they will not allow anyone to authorize them to solve these problems." It is also a trait and expectation of many leaders that they are the ones who are supposed to solve the problems. I know that I often did and still do fall into this unrealistic expectation. I made progress this year in creating conditions on the teams I lead to authorize people to solve their own problems, or put another way, to make leadership on the teams more collaborative. On the other hand, I still struggled with how explicit to be about my goals for the teams and how to share my expectations of what collaborative leadership should look like, especially as it needed to vary from team to team based on the type of learners on each team. In addition, I also have not been able to develop consistent and effective structures to facilitate collective problem solving. Some of those structures have begun to emerge at Lincoln Park, but I need to be more intentional about how to sustain them.

The first activity my ally and I engaged in together at SLI was led by Dr. Reihl about change theory. We were intrigued by the idea of analyzing how our various structures reproduce our inequitable outcomes. However, taking action around this concept seemed too complex at the outset of the project. We noticed later when discussing Appreciative Inquiry that we often focus on what is going wrong rather than what is going well. We decided, especially due to the difficulty of our equity problem and the challenge of confronting adult mindsets, using Appreciative Inquiry to reflect on the progress of our project would be a useful approach. We have fallen very short on this so far, although we have recently invited our staff to share what has gone well for them. We have also begun to plan our end of year professional learning around an Appreciative Inquiry protocol.

I believe falling short on Appreciative Inquiry is a result of an intersection in me as a leader of the three key concepts I have taken from Cahn as outlined above. Because I identify myself as a self-authoring learner, I believe I have the ability and independence to solve problems. Even though I know that solving problems through collaborative leadership is the best approach, I still find it hard to let go of the belief that the leader should be the one to solve the problems. As I result, I am finding it hard to be open to Appreciative Inquiry because I am blaming my shortcomings as a leader on our ongoing equity problem. However, the Cahn Fellows has given me new insights, concepts, and language to reframe how I interpret my leadership, and I feel well positioned to go into next year with a plan to grow my leadership in a way that aligns with my current theory of action on our equity challenge.

Reflecting on my work this year, especially in preparation for the presentation of our work led me to one final and most critical insight. I am a socializing learner. I have always told myself that I am self-authoring, and I do have self-authoring qualities, but this year has allowed me to admit that being accepted, being valued, being liked, fitting in, is what is most important to me. This often prevents me from being explicit or direct about what my goals and expectations are because I am somehow afraid that by doing that it will lead to me being rejected by my colleagues. This leads me to avoid or postpone conflict or talk myself out of my feelings because I don't want them to be a threat to me being liked or accepted. I am able to push myself to take on difficult situations where conflict is inherent, but I often repress what I really want to convey on those situations.

This is going to be the biggest leadership challenge for me going forward, but what I have learned from Cahn and my project is that by listening to people, creating the conditions for collaborative leadership, sharing my true thoughts, goals, and expectations, I am able to develop more trust with my colleagues and more confidence in myself, which furthers trust in my relationships. As I learn to share my feelings while listening for the feelings of others, I know that I can manage conflict in a way that can strengthen rather than threaten my sense of belonging. I can also accept feedback as an opportunity for growth rather than I threat to my standing in my role or among my colleagues.

This is something I have known about myself for some time, but again Cahn has provided me with the language, concepts, mental space, and confidence to come to terms with this. Having gone through the Cahn Fellows Program, I now feel equipped with tools to grow as a leader as it relates to my biggest growth areas. In addition, because my ally and I have shared this and she has identified a related growth area, we have each other for support and push going into the next year of our project.

In short, the next phase of our project is us-growing our capacity to lead our equity work by providing the push and support in our leadership team to create a more collaborative, accountable, and effective team. When we improve in this work for ourselves, we will be able to advance our equity work, which is our reason for being school leaders in the first place.

Data Appendix

Quarter 1 SY 18-19 Data Sample

LPHS 9th grade, Class of 2022

Week 10 On-track Data

	# of Ss (% of Ss in grade)	Asian (% of Ss in group)	Black (% of Ss in group)	Hispanic % of Ss in group)	Multicultural (% of Ss in group)	White % of Ss in group)	Female % of Ss in group)	Male % of Ss in group)	IEP (% of Ss in group)	Non-IEP (% of Ss in group)
3.0+	451 (72.39%)	56 (84.84%)	46 (35.38%)	177 (80.45%)	23 (85.19%)	144 (82.29%)	295 (80.16%)	156 (60.94%)	21 (33.33%)	430 (76.65%)
On-track	61 (9.79%)	4 (6.06%)	20 (15.38%)	17 (7.72%)	2 (7.41%)	18 (10.29%)	25 (6.79%)	36 (14.06%)	8 (12.70%)	53 (9.45%)
Some Failures	54 (8.67%)	3 (4.55%)	25 (19.23%)	15 (6.82%)	2 (7.41%)	8 (4.57%)	30 (8.15%)	24 (9.38%)	13 (20.63%)	41 (7.31%)
Off-track	57 (9.15%)	3 (4.55%)	39 (30.0%)	11 (5.0%)	0 (0%)	5 (2.86%)	18 (4.89%)	40 (15.63%)	21 (33.33%)	37 (6.60%)

> · **3.0+:** Student has no course failures and a 3.0 or better unweighted GPA in first quarter
>
> · **On-track:** Student has no course failures and below a 3.0 GPA in first quarter
>
> · **Some Failures:** Student has some amount of course failure, but not enough to be provisionally off-track in first quarter
>
> · **Off-track:** Student is failing more than one core course at the end of first quarter

Opportunity-Risk Data

	# of Ss % of Ss in grade)	Asian (% of Ss in group)	Black % of Ss in group)	Hispanic (% of Ss in group)	Multicultural (% of Ss in group)	White % of Ss in group)	Female % of Ss in group)	Male % of Ss in group)	IEP % of Ss in group)	Non-IEP % of Ss in group)
High Opportunity	271 (43.3%)	46 (69.70%)	34 (26.15%)	116 (52.73%)	10 (37.04%)	63 (36.0%)	175 (47.55%)	96 (37.50%)	10 (15.87%)	261 (46.52%)
Opportunity	138 (22.12%)	8 (12.12%)	26 (20.0%)	58 (26.36%)	5 (18.52%)	41 (23.43%)	97 (26.36%)	41 (16.02%)	14 (22.22%)	124 (22.10%)
Vulnerable	110 (17.63%)	5 (7.56%)	45 (31.62%)	27 (12.27%)	6 (22.22%)	26 (14.86%)	44 (11.96%)	66 (25.78%)	26 (41.27%)	84 (14.97%)
High Risk	31 (4.97%)	2 (3.03%)	18 (13.87%)	5 (2.27%)	2 (7.41%)	4 (2.29%)	10 (2.72%)	21 (8.20%)	11 (17.46%)	20 (3.57%)
No Grade 8 Data	74 (11.86%)	5 (7.56%)	7 (5.38%)	14 (6.36%)	4 (14.81%)	41 (23.43%)	42 (11.41%)	32 (12.5%)	2 (3.17%)	72 (12.83%)

High Opportunity	Opportunity	Vulnerable	High Risk
· Less than 10% chance of being off track · 3.5 Average 8th Grade GPA · 98% Average 8th Grade Attendance · System-wide, 31% of incoming Freshmen were in this category in 2012	· 10-24% chance of being off track · 2.8 Average 8th Grade GPA · 97% Average 8th Grade Attendance · System-wide, 19% of incoming Freshmen were in this category in 2012	· 25-49% chance of being off track · 2.3 Average 8th Grade GPA · 95% Average 8th Grade Attendance · System-wide, 34% of incoming Freshmen were in this category in 2012	· 50% or more chance of being off track · 1.6 Average 8th Grade GPA · 86% Average 8th Grade Attendance · System-wide, 16% of incoming Freshmen were in this category in 2012

LPHS 10th grade, Class of 2021

Week 10 GPA Ranges

	# of Ss (% of Ss in grade)	Asian (% of Ss in group)	Black (% of Ss in group)	Hispanic (% of Ss in group)	Multicultural (% of Ss in group)	White (% of Ss in group)	Female (% of Ss in group)	Male (% of Ss in group)	IEP (% of Ss in group)	Non-IEP (% of Ss in group)
3.5+	143 (24.28%)	26 (41.94%)	16 (12.12%)	39 (21.31%)	4 (15.38%)	57 (31.32%)	93 (30.29%)	50 (17.73%)	10 (20.0%)	133 (24.68%)
3.0-3.4	164 (27.84%)	22 (35.48%)	30 (22.73%)	54 (29.51%)	8 (30.77%)	49 (26.92%)	94 (30.62%)	70 (24.82%)	9 (18.0%)	155 (28.76%)
2.5-2.9	85 (14.43%)	5 (8.06%)	16 (12.12%)	34 (18.58%)	5 (19.23%)	25 (13.74%)	43 (14.01%)	42 (14.89%)	6 (12.0%)	79 (14.66%)
2.0-2.4	85 (14.43%)	5 (8.06%)	21 (15.91%)	26 (14.21%)	3 (11.54%)	28 (15.38%)	40 (13.03%)	45 (15.96%)	5 (10.0%)	80 (14.84%)
0-2.0	112 (19.02%)	4 (6.45%)	49 (37.12%)	30 (16.39%)	6 (23.08%)	23 (12.64%)	37 (12.05%)	75 (26.60%)	20 (40.0%)	92 (17.07%)

LPHS 11th grade, Class of 2020

Week 10 GPA Ranges

	# of Ss (% of Ss in grade)	Asian (% of Ss in group)	Black (% of Ss in group)	Hispanic (% of Ss in group)	Multicultural (% of Ss in group)	White (% of Ss in group)	Female (% of Ss in group)	Male (% of Ss in group)	IEP (% of Ss in group)	Non-IEP (% of Ss in group)
3.5+	130 (26.53%)	30 (41.67%)	14 (14.58%)	39 (22.67%)	4 (30.77%)	42 (32.31%)	78 (29.10%)	52 (23.42%)	3 (9.09%)	127 (27.79%)
3.0-3.4	151 (30.82%)	30 (41.67%)	15 (15.63%)	56 (32.56%)	2 (15.38%)	44 (33.85%)	94 (35.07%)	57 (25.68%)	2 (6.06%)	149 (32.60%)
2.5-2.9	71 (14.49%)	2 (2.78%)	13 (13.54%)	31 (18.02%)	4 (30.77%)	20 (15.38%)	38 (14.18%)	33 (14.86%)	6 (18.18%)	65 (14.22%)
2.0-2.4	67 (13.67%)	6 (8.33%)	26 (27.08%)	23 (13.37%)	2 (15.38%)	10 (7.69%)	30 (11.19%)	37 (16.67%)	14 (42.42%)	53 (11.60%)
0-2.0	71 (14.49%)	4 (5.56%)	28 (29.17%)	23 (13.37%)	1 (7.69%)	14 (10.77%)	28 (10.45%)	43 (19.37%)	8 (24.24%)	63 (13.79%)