



National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities

Established in 2004 by OSEP to assist states in building capacity to improve school completion rates for students with disabilities

A CHECKLIST FOR IMPROVING YOUR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR INDICATORS 1 & 2 (GRADUATION AND DROPOUT)

Prepared by:

**The National Dropout Prevention Center
for Students with Disabilities**

August, 2007



Indicators 1 and 2 Data

1. Do the data provided represent the most recently ended school year, or are they for a prior year?	Yes	No
2. Did you use 618 data? (If so, sampling of these data is not allowed)	Yes	No
3. For Indicator 1, did you provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma? If there is a difference, did you explain why?	Yes	No
4. For Indicator 2, did you provide 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, did you explain why?	Yes	No
5. Did you include the exact equation employed in arriving at each dropout or graduation rate and did you include the exact data used in this calculation	Yes	No
6. Did you describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target?	Yes	No

FFY Measurable and Rigorous Target

7. Did you list the State's target for this year?	Yes	No
8. Are the State's targets for improvement clearly worded?	Yes	No
9. Are the targets stated in terms of improving the dropout or graduation rate by x% per year?	Yes	No

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/ Timelines/Resources

10. Were any revisions made to the State's measurement of the Indicator, baseline year, targets for improvement, improvement activities, or other aspects of the SPP?	Yes	No
11. If yes to Question 12, what are the implications of the changes (e.g., in terms of calculating trends, etc)?	Yes	No

Discussion of Improvement Activities and Explanation of Progress or Slippage

12. Did the State meet its targets?	Yes	No
13. Did you describe the improvement activities implemented during the FFY and progress on meeting the target?	Yes	No
14. Do the State's improvement activities appear to address perceived dropout/graduation-related needs?	Yes	No
15. Are the State's improvement activities coherent and coordinated, or are they unrelated?	Yes	No
16. Are the improvement activities coordinated across related Indicators, or are the Indicators treated individually (e.g., transition, academic performance, parental involvement, behavior support)?	Yes	No
17. Are the improvement activities strategically designed to build capacity in major areas related to the indicator (E.g., data activities, TA activities, Professional Development, Funding new initiatives, policy/procedures, etc), or are they weighted toward only a few areas?	Yes	No
18. Are the improvement activities research-based strategies and interventions that have been shown to be effective in improving school completion rates, decreasing dropout rates, or addressing school factors associated with increasing school engagement for students with disabilities?	Yes	No
19. Did you describe the methods that will be employed to evaluate the effectiveness of your State's improvement activities?	Yes	No
20. Did you present the information in a table format that reflects a progression of activities to be conducted including: strategies or approaches needed to carry out the designated activities; timelines for implementation; resources needed; and how effectiveness of improvement activities were measured?	Yes	No