

## At-a-Glance

### KEY ISSUES

- A disproportionate number of students with disabilities drop out of high school.
- To address dropout prevention effectively, schools and states must first reliably assess the true magnitude of the dropout problem.
- The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) makes it incumbent upon states to track the percentage of students with disabilities who drop out compared with the percentage of their nondisabled peers who drop out.
- Under the law, states must identify improved dropout rate targets and oversee the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) toward meeting this goal.
- The U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) uses these data to evaluate a state's performance in the area of dropout prevention.

## Dropout Prevention for Students With Disabilities: A Critical Issue for State Education Agencies

Prepared by the National High School Center

### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this issue brief is to provide information and guidance to state education agencies (SEAs) regarding their accountability for IDEA 2004 legislative mandates in the area of dropout prevention for students with disabilities.

### THE CHALLENGE

There are significant costs to individuals with disabilities who do not complete high school. These costs include unemployment, underemployment and higher rates of incarceration. There are also significant costs to society related to lost tax revenues and welfare expenditures. The extent of the problem is illustrated in the following statistics:

- Students with disabilities drop out of school at significantly higher rates than their peers who do not have disabilities.<sup>1</sup>
- In the 2001–02 school year, only 51 percent of students with disabilities exited school with a standard diploma.<sup>2</sup>
- Arrest rates are relatively high for students with disabilities who drop out. Overall, at least one-third of students with disabilities who drop out of high school have spent a night in jail; this rate is three times that of students with disabilities who have completed high school.<sup>3</sup>
- Of those who do not complete high school, about 61.2 percent are students with emotional/behavioral disabilities, and about 35 percent are students with learning disabilities.<sup>4</sup>

**TAKE - AWAYS***State Level*

- States need to implement a uniform and consistent method for tracking dropout data for all youth, including students with disabilities.
  - To manage dropout prevention effectively, states and their districts need to choose the same calculation methodology and implement uniform data collection procedures regarding dropouts so that the data are comparable across the state.

**Table 1. Percentage of Students With Disabilities, Ages 14 and Older, Who Dropped Out of School in 2001–2002 by Category of Disability**

Disability	Percentage Who Dropped Out, 2001–2002
Serious emotional disturbance	61.2%
Speech/language impairments	35.8%
Specific learning disabilities	35.4%
Other health impairments	32.7%
Mental retardation	31.2%
Deaf-blindness	27.3%
Multiple disabilities	25.9%
Traumatic brain injury	24.6%
Orthopedic impairments	24.3%
Hearing impairments	21.0%
Visual impairments	17.8%
Autism	17.6%
All disabilities	37.6%

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2006, April). *26th Annual (2004) Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Vol. 1*. Washington, DC: Author.

**Table 2. Students, Ages 14 and Older, With Disabilities Who Dropped Out by Race/Ethnicity**

Race/Ethnicity	Percentage of Group Who Dropped Out
American Indian/Alaska Native	52.2%
Black (not Hispanic)	44.5%
Hispanic	43.5%
White (not Hispanic)	33.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	28.0%

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2006, April). *26th Annual (2004) Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Vol. 1*. Washington, DC: Author. These data are for the 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico and the four outlying areas. This is based on a cumulative 12-month count.

## THE CONTEXT

### The Law

IDEA 2004 is a key national education law designed to ensure that students with disabilities achieve at high levels and are prepared for independent living, college, the workforce and beyond. This federal statute recognizes that to hold schools and states accountable for better outcomes for students with disabilities, reliable data about the percentage of students with disabilities who are dropping out of high school are critical to measuring and evaluating improvement efforts.

The mandates of IDEA 2004 have major implications for states, not only in the collecting, recording and reporting of data, but also in the use of data for program planning and evaluation purposes. The legislation includes increased accountability for preventing students with disabilities from dropping out. Accountability is measured through State Performance Plans (SPPs) and Annual Performance Reports (APRs).

Because most students with disabilities have Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), the law requires states to track the percentage of students with IEPs who leave school. This requirement is a way to gauge their progress, specifically requiring the following information:

- The percentage of youth with IEPs who drop out of high school compared to the percentage of all youth in the state who drop out of high school.<sup>5</sup>

The State Performance Plans are used to evaluate each state's efforts to implement IDEA requirements and to describe how the state will improve its implementation. Measurable and rigorous targets for these provisions are a key requirement in the law. The targets in the SPPs, based on December 2005 baseline data, are required to be used to analyze and report the performance of each LEA in the state by February 1, 2007, and annually thereafter.<sup>6</sup>

This information is critical to planning dropout prevention for all students, but particularly for students with disabilities who drop out at such high percentages compared with the general student population. In an era of high-stakes accountability around standardized test scores, it is particularly important to monitor the rate at which special needs students leave school in order to help ensure that they are not being encouraged to drop out by anyone intending to take shortcuts in raising a school's overall test scores.

Therefore, IDEA 2004 places special emphasis on the need to track data on dropouts. IDEA 2004 makes dropout rates a primary indicator under the law but allows states to choose from one of three different methods for calculating them: event rate, status rate and cohort rate.

- Event rates reflect the number of students who drop out in a single year without completing high school.
- Status rates reflect the percentage of the population in a given age range who have not finished high school or are not enrolled in school at one point in time.
- Cohort rates reflect the percentage of a single group of students who drop out over time.<sup>7</sup>

Of these three, the last method usually yields the highest dropout rate and is also the method that provides the most data for analyzing the dropout challenge. Although the cohort rate generally yields a higher rate than the event rate or status rate calculations, it can provide a more accurate picture of the nature of attrition over the course of four years than the other two methods. When the cohort rate is adjusted based on information gleaned from longitudinal data regarding individual student progress over time, the information can be relatively telling.<sup>8</sup>

Significant challenges remain, however, even when states use the cohort rate for determining dropout. The challenges begin with how to define “dropping out.” For example, some states and districts classify students as dropouts only if they leave school in grades 10 through 12, while others include grade nine. Some categorize a student as a dropout as soon as the student misses 15 days of school, whereas others wait for students to miss 45 days without an excuse. Variation also occurs in the accounting period during which dropout is calculated or in determining how old a student must be to qualify as a dropout. And, in some cases, students who receive special education services are excluded altogether from dropout rate calculations.

### **Progress in Meeting Requirements Under the Law**

According to the most recent Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of IDEA, all states have now managed to report some form of dropout data. This is a dramatic improvement over the number that did not report this data just a few years ago, although there is a lot of ground to cover before these data are as complete and optimally useful for the reasons discussed above.

The good news is that the National Longitudinal Transition Study 2 (NLTS2) showed that the number of states using evidence-based programs to improve dropout rates increased from four in 2004 to 15 in 2005, and the number of states developing initiatives using a combination of research-based strategies and activities that address individual risk factors related to dropout prevention increased from 18 in 2004 to 34 in 2005.<sup>9</sup> Among these activities are training and technical assistance for school districts in positive behavioral supports to reduce suspensions and behavioral infractions; service learning and mentoring; academic support for struggling adolescent readers; universal design for learning; cognitive behavioral interventions; parent training; and early efforts to improve instruction at the middle school level.<sup>10</sup>

It would appear that progress is being made in preventing students with disabilities from dropping out. From 1993–94 through 2001–02, the percentage of students with disabilities exiting school by dropping out decreased overall from 45.1 percent to 37.6 percent. The change in the dropout rate from 2000–01 to 2001–02 was the largest single year decrease (3.5 percentage points).<sup>11</sup>

### **Planning for the Future**

States are working hard to meet their obligations under IDEA 2004, but until relatively recently, dropout and graduation rates for students with disabilities had not been integrated into the national dropout database.<sup>12</sup> This information was integrated in 2004, and the fact that it can now be found in one place bodes well for the types of comparisons and analyses it will potentially afford in the future.

Despite these improvements, the greatest challenges facing states is not the recording and reporting of accurate and timely data for students with disabilities but more importantly, the capacity of states to use the data effectively for planning and program improvement. Accurate data will help meet accountability mandates as well as help schools to use data for early warning signs and to inform instructional approaches and interventions.

The National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities report on state performance plan data for Indicator 2 (the percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percentage of all youth in the state dropping out of high school) reveals that several states have structured activities to support the meeting of future targets in a capacity-building framework. These efforts include:

- Organizing an interagency task force that includes LEA personnel and parents to review literature, analyze district data, identify factors that encourage students to stay in school, and make recommendations on how to build local district capacity for improving the dropout rate.

- Collecting feedback on factors that influence students to remain in school and graduate. The feedback is gathered from focus groups of students with disabilities in middle and high school.
- Revising the monitoring system to develop key performance indicators and focused monitoring, as well as establishing triggers for causal analysis.
- Using products from the Technical Assistance & Dissemination Network specialty centers to develop technical assistance materials relevant to their populations and disseminating to LEAs.
- Training district-level teams on research-based programs and strategies for effective school completion dropout prevention.
- Identifying a small number of districts and offering extra supports, such as the creation of building-level dropout prevention models designed to reach students with disabilities.
- Evaluating the results of activities and determining the effectiveness of the efforts as well as the need for additional activities.<sup>13</sup>

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The accuracy and reliability of state data systems rely on data collected at the district and school levels. Without valid and reliable data, SEAs are hampered in their capacity to assist districts in addressing the issue of dropout and graduation rates. Unfortunately, LEA data collection systems often are not aligned with state and federal data needs and/or data are inaccurate or missing.

- The acquisition and use of valid and reliable data form the foundation of an effective dropout prevention program for all students. It must be the starting point for SEAs as they address the improvement of dropout and graduation rates for all students. By having a clear understanding of the types of data needed — a common formula and methodology for collecting, calculating and analyzing the data, and a consistent process for reporting the findings — administrators at the state, district and school levels will be in a better position to use the data for planning and decision-making purposes.<sup>14</sup>
- States should develop a database that tracks individual students as they move through high school (even if they move to another school or district). A longitudinal database allows the calculation of “adjusted” cohort rates of graduation and dropout. It provides a more accurate picture of what is happening.
- States should report exact calculation(s) used in determining dropout rates, as well as the source of data used in the all-student and special education rate calculations.<sup>15</sup>
- Once valid data is in place and accessible, states, districts and schools should be sure to use data for planning and decision-making as well as for compliance with federal law.

Some of the considerations when reviewing and using data include:

- Analyzing data for one or more indicators to see who is dropping out and why, and applying what is learned to reducing the dropout rate and increasing the graduation rate.
- Ensuring that the state’s data system is readily available to LEAs. It should be easily queried and updated regularly, and should allow for disaggregation of data.

The following are some guiding questions and considerations for SEAs to consider in their quest to meet accountability requirements mandated by IDEA 2004:

- All-student data and special education data need to be comparable. Ensure consistency in definitions, calculations, and methods used. Are the data collected at different times and/or by differing methods? Are there different definitions of what constitutes dropping out? Are there different calculations?<sup>16</sup>
- Are dropout data comparable from district to district? In order to make comparisons among districts possible, the manner in which dropout is defined and dropout rates are calculated must be standardized.

For more information on how to address the issue of dropout and graduation rates as it pertains to Indicator 2, please see the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities' piece, *An Analysis of State Performance Plan Data for Indicator 2 (Dropout)* ([http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator\\_2--Dropout.pdf](http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator_2--Dropout.pdf)).

## PROMISING PROGRAMS FOR DROPOUT PREVENTION

### Check and Connect

An important resource on dropout prevention programs for students with disabilities is "Increasing Rates of School Completion: Moving from Policy and Research to Practice," in the National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET)'s Essential Tools Series. This synthesis of research-based dropout prevention and intervention programs offers examples of interventions showing evidence of effectiveness.<sup>17</sup> An important intervention highlighted in the synthesis is Check and Connect.<sup>18</sup>

Check and Connect (<http://ici.umn.edu/checkandconnect/default.html>) is a dropout prevention program known for its results in turning around dropout rates for students with disabilities. The program uses a systematic method of checking for off-track indicators (such as course failures, tardiness, missed classes, absenteeism, detention and suspension) to determine which students are at risk of dropping out and then connecting with those students through academic support, by in-depth problem solving, and by coordinating with community services. There was significant evidence of treatment effects for students who participated in the program from middle grades through grade nine.<sup>19</sup>

Other program interventions with evidence of effectiveness include:

#### *Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program*

[http://www.idra.org/Valuing\\_Youth/](http://www.idra.org/Valuing_Youth/)

#### *Achievement for Latinos Through Academic Success (ALAS)*

Katherine Larson, [larson@education.ucsb.edu](mailto:larson@education.ucsb.edu)

#### *Project COFFEE (Co-Operative Federation For Educational Experience)*

Ed Sikonski, Director

<http://www.oxps.org/coffee/index.html>

#### Promising SEA Models include:

#### *APEX II (Achievement in Dropout Prevention and Excellence)*

Dr. Robert Wells, Project Director

<http://iod.unh.edu/projects/APEX.html>

#### *Iowa Behavioral Alliance*

Marion Panyan, Co-Director, [marion.panyan@drake.edu](mailto:marion.panyan@drake.edu)

<http://www.educ.drake.edu/rc/alliance.html>

## THE BOTTOM LINE

In recent years, all 50 states have implemented accountability measures in response to increasing concerns about the quality of American education. After decades of focusing on inputs, such as funding levels, curriculum offerings and resources, policymakers are now emphasizing student learning and achievement outcomes as the means of gauging the effectiveness of the education system. Substantial action has been taken by states to align special education policy with standards-based reform. States responded quickly to federal special education mandates by establishing an accountability infrastructure, and they took substantial action to support districts and schools in aligning special education policies with standards-based reform. For example, at least 96 percent of students with disabilities participated in statewide assessments; almost all states established the same content standards for students with disabilities as for students without disabilities; and almost all states reported publicly on the performance of students with disabilities on state- or districtwide assessments. By 2002–2003, the adoption of the same content standards for all students, including students with disabilities, had doubled in U.S. school districts compared to just three years earlier (from about 44 percent to about 91.5 percent).<sup>20</sup>

To effectively assess outcomes for all students with disabilities and to ensure that every student is being given the opportunity to succeed, each state's districts will need to adopt uniform data collection procedures and calculation methodology around dropout and graduation rates for students with disabilities.

### **"Bottom Line" for Part B Monitoring Priority Indicator 2: Dropout Rates<sup>21</sup>**

The following provides guidance on what states should consider when developing State Performance Plans related to Priority Indicator #2:

Part B Monitoring Priority Indicator #2:

**Percentage of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percentage of all youth in the state dropping out of high school.**

Measurement:

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

### WHAT CONTENT MUST EACH STATE INCLUDE IN ITS STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN?

- Provide an overview or description of the issue, process, system (i.e., dropout rates).
- Provide clear, quantifiable baseline data using the data source and measurement determined by the state.
- Indicate the federal fiscal year (FFY) in which data are being reported (i.e., FFY 2004 (2004–2005)).
- State must use state-level dropout data.
- If state uses 618 data, sampling is not allowed.<sup>22</sup>
- Provide a discussion of the baseline data, including any clarification needed in regard to the baseline data.
- Designate the desired level of performance to be reached for each specified FFY (measurable and rigorous targets).
- Describe how the state will improve performance, including activities, timelines and resources.

- A State must provide the following:
  - A narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain why.
  - The calculation used to determine dropout rates for youth with IEPs and all youth. Measurement for youth with disabilities should be the same measurement as for all youth. If not, indicate the difference and explain why there is a difference.

## END NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2006, April). *26th Annual (2004) Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Vol. 1*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 10, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2004/26th-vol-1-front.pdf>
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>3</sup> Wagner, M., Newman, L., Cameto, R., Levine, P., & Garza, N. (2006, August). *An Overview of Findings From Wave 2 of the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2)*. (NCSER 2006-3004). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, p. 11. Retrieved December 20, 2006, from [http://ies.ed.gov/ncser/pdf/NLTS2\\_W2\\_overview\\_082906.pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncser/pdf/NLTS2_W2_overview_082906.pdf)
- <sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2006, April). *26th Annual (2004) Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Vol. 1*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 10, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2004/26th-vol-1-front.pdf>
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid; specifically Indicator 2 which requires states to develop performance plans. For more information, please see <http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/.root,dynamic,TopicalBrief,24> (Retrieved December 20, 2006).
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>7</sup> Hollinger, D., & the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students. (1996, March). High School Dropout Rates. *Consumer Guide 16*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved December 20, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/OR/ConsumerGuides/dropout.html>
- <sup>8</sup> Education Week. (2006, June 22). *Diplomas Count: An Essential Guide to Graduation Policies and Rates*. Bethesda, MD: Author. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/toc/2006/06/22/index.html>
- <sup>9</sup> For more information on the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS 2), please see <http://www.nlts2.org/> (Retrieved December 20, 2006).
- <sup>10</sup> National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities. (2006, April). *An Analysis of State Performance Plan Data for Indicator 2 (Dropout)*. Clemson, SC: Author, p. 8. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from [http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator\\_2--Dropout.pdf](http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator_2--Dropout.pdf)

- <sup>11</sup> While the dropout rate declined for students in most disability categories, it increased for students with deaf-blindness or multiple disabilities.  
U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2006, April). *26th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Volume 1*. Washington, D.C.: Author. Retrieved October 10, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2004/26th-vol-1-front.pdf>
- <sup>12</sup> Cobb, B., Sample, P., Alwell, M., & Johns, N. (2005, June). *The Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions on Dropout for Youth with Disabilities*. Clemson, SC: The National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities. Retrieved October 10, 2006, from <http://www2.edc.org/ndpc-sd/cognitive/report.pdf>
- <sup>13</sup> National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities. (2006, April). *An Analysis of State Performance Plan Data for Indicator 2 (Dropout)*. Clemson, SC: Author, pp. 8–9. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from [http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator\\_2--Dropout.pdf](http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator_2--Dropout.pdf).
- <sup>14</sup> Departure classification method: The “departure classification definition” or “leaver rate” developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) measures the number of completers divided by the total number of completers plus dropouts. Therefore, this method relies mainly on a count of the number of students who are officially reported as having dropped out rather than a count of the number of enrolled students. By measuring in this way, states inflate their graduation rate figures, because collected dropout data exclude all the students who leave the educational system without officially notifying the school of their departure.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>16</sup> National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities. (2006, April). *An Analysis of State Performance Plan Data for Indicator 2 (Dropout)*. Clemson, SC: Author, p.10. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from [http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator\\_2--Dropout.pdf](http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator_2--Dropout.pdf)  
See Recommendation #2 — States should obtain all-student and special education data using comparable collection methods at comparable times of the year. Doing so may prove difficult, as the December 1 Child Count serves as the special education data and states’ total enrollment is collected earlier in the fall. The data cannot be reconciled accurately until the timing of the counts can be reconciled.
- <sup>17</sup> See <http://www.ncset.org/publications/essentialtools/dropout/part1.2.asp>
- <sup>18</sup> Check and Connect was recently found to have positive effects by the What Works Clearinghouse. For more information, please see <http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/Intervention.asp?iid=312&tid=06&pg=topic.asp> (Retrieved December 20, 2006).
- <sup>19</sup> Sinclair, M. F., Christenson, S., Evelo, D. L., & Hurley, C. M. (1998). Dropout Prevention for High Risk Youth with Disabilities: Efficacy of a Sustained School Engagement Procedure. *Exceptional Children*, 65(1), 7–21.
- <sup>20</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. (2006, April). *26th Annual (2004) Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Vol. 1*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved October 10, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/osep/2004/26th-vol-1-front.pdf>
- <sup>21</sup> Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2005, August). *“Bottom Line” for Part B Monitoring Priority Indicator 1: Graduation Rates*. Madison, WI: Author. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from <http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/cifms-bottom.doc>

<sup>22</sup> For more information on 618 data, please visit:  
<http://idea.ed.gov/explore/view/p/%2Croot%2Cstatute%2CI%2CB%2C618%2C> (Retrieved January 3, 2007).

#### ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

---

National High School Center. (2007). *Snapshot: New Hampshire's Multi-tiered Approach to Dropout Prevention*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.betterhighschools.org/pubs/>

Lehr, C., Johnson, D. R., Bremer, C. D., Cosio, A., & Thompson, M. (2004, May). Increasing rates of school completion: moving from policy and research to practice. A manual for policymakers, administrators and educators. *Essential Tools Series*. Minneapolis, MN: National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET). Retrieved October 4, 2006, from <http://www.ncset.org/publications/essentialtools/dropout/dropout.pdf>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006, November). *Dropout rates in the United States: 2004*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved December 20, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007024.pdf>

National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities: <http://www.ndpc-sd.org/>

National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities. (2006, April). *An Analysis of State Performance Plan Data for Indicator 2 (Dropout)*. Clemson, SC: Author. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from [http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator\\_2--Dropout.pdf](http://www.ndpc-sd.org/assistance/docs/Indicator_2--Dropout.pdf)

#### *TA Communities*

Funded by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

<http://www.ncset.org/tacomunities/default.asp>

Online forum: [http://www.tacomunities.org/ev\\_en.php](http://www.tacomunities.org/ev_en.php)

What Works Clearinghouse: <http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/>

What Works Clearinghouse Review of Dropout Prevention:

<http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/Topic.asp?tid=06&ReturnPage=default.asp>

This brief is offered by the National High School Center, a central source of information and expertise on high school improvement issues that does not endorse any interventions or conduct field studies. Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, the National High School Center serves Regional Comprehensive Centers in their work to build the capacity of states across the nation to effectively implement the goals of No Child Left Behind relating to high schools. The National High School Center is housed at the American Institutes for Research (AIR) and partners with other leading education research organizations such as Learning Point Associates, MDRC, the National Center for Educational Accountability (NCEA), and WestEd. *The contents of this brief were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.*