

Part B Indicators 1 and 2 Graduation and Dropout Rates

Guidance for Writing the FFY 2011 APR

Prepared by the:

National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities

Clemson University

November 2012

The National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs Cooperative Agreement No. H326W080003. OSEP Project Officer, Selete Avoke. The content therein does not necessarily reflect views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of other organizations imply endorsement by those organizations or the U.S. government.

Information about Indicator B-1: Graduation Rate

Indicator B-1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source:

- ♦ Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement:

- ♦ States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.¹

Instructions:

- ♦ Sampling is not allowed.
- ♦ Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2011 APR, use data from 2010-2011), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.
- ♦ Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma. If there is a difference, explain why.
- ♦ Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets under Title I of the ESEA.
- ♦ States may report on one set of Improvement Activities covering Indicators 1 and 2 in cases where the improvement activities are the same or overlap.

From the OSEP Part B SPP/APR Indicator/Measurement Table

Indicator B-1: Checklist for Developing the APR

Description of graduation rate

Did you describe your state's requirements for graduation with a regular diploma?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe any / all alternative pathways available for graduation in your state?	Yes	No	NA

Data and calculation

Did your state calculate the graduation rate using the use the adjusted cohort rate formula?	Yes	No	
Did you describe whether your state is calculating the graduation rate using the same data and equation as are reported to the Department under Title I of the ESEA?	Yes	No	NA
a) If the process differs from the ESEA process, did you describe the reason for this?	Yes	No	NA
b) If the process differs from the ESEA process, did you say when the state anticipates that the two will be brought into parity?	Yes	No	NA

¹ Unless they have obtained an extension from the U.S. Department of Education on implementing the new rate.

Did you describe whether your state lags its graduation data by one year so it represents the same year's data as were reported under ESEA (e.g., for the FFY 2011 APR, use data from 2010-2011)?	Yes	No	NA
a) If this is not done, did you include the reasons for this?	Yes	No	NA
b) If this is not done, did you include detail about when lagging of the data is anticipated to begin?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe who is included in the graduation rate calculation (i.e., who comprises the graduation cohort)?	Yes	No	NA
Did you include in your report the exact equation and numbers that were used to calculate the graduation rate?	Yes	No	NA
If this is the first year your state used this calculation, did you note this in your report, and whether the year of this report should be considered baseline data?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe whether your state applied for and/or received permission from the US Department of Education to report on one or more extended-year cohorts?	Yes	No	NA
a) If so, did you list the cohort(s)?	Yes	No	NA

Comparison to SPP target and previous year

Did you include whether your state used the same graduation rate targets for students with disabilities and all students?	Yes	No	NA
a) If the targets are not the same, did you describe why this is the case?	Yes	No	NA
b) If the targets are not the same, did you say when the state anticipates that the two will be brought into parity?	Yes	No	NA
Did you compare your calculated graduation rate to the target for the same year's worth of data (remember the data lag...)?	Yes	No	NA
a) Did you indicate whether the state achieved the target?	Yes	No	NA
b) Did you indicate possible reasons for this?	Yes	No	NA
c) If the target was missed, did you describe how this issue will be addressed in the coming year(s)?	Yes	No	NA
Did you list the graduation rate for the previous year and, if appropriate (i.e., nothing changed in the measurement), compare it to the rate for the year you are currently reporting?	Yes	No	NA
Did you indicate whether the state made progress or slippage from the previous year's rate?	Yes	No	NA
a) Did you indicate possible reasons for this progress or slippage?	Yes	No	NA
b) If slippage occurred, did you describe how this issue will be addressed in the coming year(s)?	Yes	No	NA

Improvement activities and connections among indicators

Did you indicate whether the improvement activities were the same for Graduation and Dropout (Inds. B-1 and B-2)?	Yes	No	
Did you include whether your state linked its improvement activities for Graduation Dropout with other transition-related indicators (e.g., Inds. B-3 (Assessment), B-4 (Suspension/Expulsion), B-8 (Parental Involvement), B-13 (Transition), and/or B-14 (Post School Outcomes)?	Yes	No	NA
a) If your state does not currently link some or all of these indicators, did you describe any plans to do this in the future?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe the process the state used to identify appropriate improvement activities to increase school completion rates?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe the level at which the activities were implemented (e.g., state-wide, regional, or local implementation)?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe the monitoring and evaluation activities your state used to determine the impact of SPP improvement activities for school completion as well as the results of the evaluation?	Yes	No	NA
a) If evaluation of activities did not occur last year, did you describe when this might be anticipated to begin?	Yes	No	NA

Revisions to targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources

Did you provide information on revised targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources?	Yes	No	NA
a) If yes, did you justify your revisions?	Yes	No	NA
b) If yes, did you make corresponding changes in your SPP?	Yes	No	NA

Information about Indicator B-2: Dropout Rate*

*From the OSEP Part B SPP/APR Indicator/Measurement Table

Indicator B-2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source:

- ♦ Same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618.

Measurement:

- ♦ States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions:

- ♦ Sampling is not allowed.
- ♦ Use 618 exiting data reported to the Department via EDFacts in file specification N009 or via DANS using Part B Exiting Table 4.

- ♦ EDFacts file specifications N009: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/sy-10-11-nonxml.html>)
- ♦ Part B Exiting: <https://www.ideadata.org/PartBForms.asp#y201011>
- ♦ States should use the definitions specified in EDFacts file specification 009 (and also in Table 4).
- ♦ Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma, (b) received a certificate, (c) reached maximum age, (d) dropped out, or (e) died.
- ♦ Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to (a) transferring to regular education or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in education.
- ♦ States may choose to reset baseline and reestablish targets through FFY 2012.
- ♦ States may report on one set of Improvement Activities covering Indicators 1 and 2 in cases where the improvement activities are the same or overlap.

Additional Guidance on Reporting on Indicator B-2

OSEP is providing additional flexibility for this indicator. In addition to reporting as specified in the Part B Measurement Table, States may continue to calculate their dropout rates using the same methods and calculations that were employed for the FFY 2010 APR. This will ensure continuity in States' data and eliminate the need to develop additional improvement activities and convene stakeholder groups to reset targets for improvement.

Indicator B-2: Checklist for Developing the APR

Description of dropout rate

Did you include your state's definition of a dropout and who is included in the dropout rate calculation (i.e., what grades are included, whether GED recipients are considered dropouts, etc.)?	Yes	No	NA
--	-----	----	----

Data and calculation

Did you describe the source of your state's dropout data and when the data were collected (e.g., from the IDEA Exiting data (EDFacts file specification C009, previously known as Table 4) end-of-year enrollment counts, etc.)?	Yes	No	
Did you include in your report the exact equation and numbers that were used to calculate the dropout rate?	Yes	No	NA
If this is the first year your state used this calculation, did you note this fact in your report, and whether the data in this report should be considered baseline data?	Yes	No	NA
Did your state calculate and report its dropout rate using any other method(s) of calculation? If so, did you describe them and provide data?	Yes	No	NA

Comparison to SPP target and previous year

Did you indicate whether your state has dropout targets for ESEA or	Yes	No	NA
---	-----	----	----

whether the dropout targets are just for students with disabilities?			
a) If the state has targets for ESEA, did you say whether the same targets are applied to students with disabilities?	Yes	No	NA
Did you compare your calculated dropout rate to the target for the same year's worth of data (remember the data lag...)?	Yes	No	NA
a) Did you indicate whether the state achieved the target?	Yes	No	NA
b) Did you indicate possible reasons for this?	Yes	No	NA
c) If the target was missed, did you describe how this issue will be addressed in the coming year(s)	Yes	No	NA
Did you list the dropout rate for the previous year and, if appropriate (i.e., nothing changed in the measurement), compare it to the current rate?	Yes	No	NA
a) Did you indicate whether the state made progress or slippage?	Yes	No	NA
b) Did you indicate possible reasons for this progress or slippage?	Yes	No	NA
c) If slippage occurred, did you describe how this issue will be addressed in the coming year(s)?	Yes	No	NA

Improvement activities and connections among indicators

Did you indicate whether the improvement activities were the same for Graduation and Dropout (Inds. B-1 and B-2)?	Yes	No	
Did you include whether your state linked its improvement activities for Graduation Dropout with other transition-related indicators (e.g., Inds. B-3 (Assessment), B-4 (Suspension/Expulsion), B-8 (Parental Involvement), B-13 (Transition), and/or B-14 (Post School Outcomes)?	Yes	No	NA
b) If your state does not currently link some or all of these indicators, did you describe any plans to do this in the future?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe the process the state used to identify appropriate improvement activities to increase school completion rates?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe the level at which the activities were implemented (e.g., state-wide, regional, or local implementation)?	Yes	No	NA
Did you include whether your state linked its improvement activities for Dropout with those for Graduation (Ind. B-1), Transition (Ind. B-13) and/or Post-School Outcomes (Ind. B-14)?	Yes	No	NA
a) If the indicators are not currently linked, did you describe any plans to do this in the future?	Yes	No	NA
Did you describe the monitoring and evaluation activities your state used to determine the impact of SPP improvement activities for school completion as well as the results of the evaluation?	Yes	No	NA
a) If evaluation of activities did not occur last year, did you describe when this might be anticipated to begin?	Yes	No	NA

Revisions to targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources

Did you provide information on revised targets, improvement activities, timelines, or resources?	Yes	No	NA
a) If yes, did you justify your revisions?	Yes	No	NA
b) If yes, did you make corresponding changes in your SPP?	Yes	No	NA

Example of a Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2011 on Indicators B-1 and B-2

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

Per direction from OSEP and the SPP/APR measurement table, data for Indicator 1 are lagged one year. Data reported are the graduation rates from **2010-11**. The data reported align with the 2010-11 graduation rates reported for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)/Title I.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source: Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). State now calculates graduation rates using the four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate.

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA.

State requirements to graduate with a regular diploma

Requirements for the High School (HS) Diploma for the graduating classes of 2010 and years prior included 22 credits: 4 credits each in English and Social Studies; 3 credits each in Mathematics and Science, 1 credit in Physical Education, ½ credit each in Health and Personal Transition Plan, and 6 elective credits in any subject. An Advanced Diploma is awarded a student who earns a grade point average of 3.0 or higher, and recognizes three levels of student performance: Cum Laude, Magnum Cum Laude, and Summa Cum Laude. Requirements for the HS Diploma increased for all students with the graduating class of 2011 from 22 to 24 credits.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target*
2011	73.0%

* Graduation rate target set for ESEA by State Department of Education, Office of Federal Programs.

Actual Rate for FFY 2011 (calculated using data from the 2010-11 school year): 67.0%

State achieved the graduation rate target.

Calculation

The graduation rate for FFY 2011 is calculated based on students who were eligible for special education at any time during high school, not based on the student's eligibility status on date of exit.

Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate = # students with disabilities graduating within four or fewer years with a regular high school diploma ÷ (first-time CWD entering ninth grade four years earlier + transfers in - transfers out - deceased) * 100

(5,855 CWD graduates ÷ 8,739 in adjusted CWD cohort) * 100 = 67.0%

Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred for FFY 2011

The FFY 2011 graduation rate of 67.0% represents an improvement over the previous year's rate of 64.8%. The improvement is attributable to ongoing technical assistance to school districts around school completion and transition assessment and planning.

Discussion of Improvement Activities for Graduation and Dropout

Activity	Timeline	Results / Progress
Continuing to implement and grow statewide program that supports academic achievement and prosocial behavior.	FFY 2008-12	FFY 2008: Pilot testing of program in 5 schools across 3 districts. Trained staff and put infrastructure in place to support the initiative. FFY 2009: Full implementation in the pilot schools. Added 5 districts for 14 additional schools. FFY 2010: Added one large urban district with 20 high schools to the program. Disciplinary infractions decreased by 10% in participating schools compared to similar non-participating schools. FFY 2011: Added 20 high schools to the program.
Develop a statewide School completion initiative to support all students. Emphasis is on graduation, dropout and reentry into State-approved educational programs. Using data-driven approach to needs identification and prescription of improvement strategies and interventions.	FFY 2009-12	FFY 2009: successfully piloted in 4 school districts Contracted with and trained 5 graduation coaches to support the initiative FFY 2010: began implementation in 15 districts by training school teams in analysis of local data and identification of needs to support development of a local intervention plan. FFY 2011: ongoing implementation in Cohort I districts and added 12 more districts as Cohort II.
Evaluation of impact of improvement activities	FFY 2009-12	Regular collection of attendance, academic, and discipline data in districts participating in the graduation initiative. Regular evaluation of training and technical assistance.
Train and monitor for effective transition services, including appropriate transition planning, assessment and supports.	FFY 2009-12	FFY 2011: ongoing training is being delivered statewide, regionally, and individually, as requested by school districts. 246 district/school staff participated in the trainings in FFY 2011
Identify and implement effective family and engagement strategies	FFY 2011-12	Hired parent liaison and formed a taskforce to study family engagement strategies and programs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities /Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011

The same set of improvement activities supports the State's work on Indicators B-1 and B-2, and is closely linked with Indicators B-3, B-4, B-8, B-13 and B-14.

Revised graduation rate targets have been set by the State Office of Consolidated Federal Programs with input from the Title I Community of Practice, the Exceptional Student Services Unit, the Office of School and District Improvement and the Office of Dropout Prevention.

Beginning in FFY 2012, State will report 4-, 5-, and 6-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for all students.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2011	67%
2012	80% using 4-, 5-, or 6-year adjusted cohort calculation

• Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618 or the same data source as used in FFY 2010.

Measurement:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator or States may continue using the calculation that was used in FFY 2010.

State definition of dropping out:

State defines dropout rate as the percentage of students dropping out of school in grades 9 through 12 in a single year. The number and percentage of students who leave school for any reason, except death, before graduation or completion of a State-approved educational program and who are not known to enroll in another school or State approved program during the current school year. The year is defined as July through June and includes students dropping out over the summer and students dropping out of evening high school and other alternative programs. The event dropout rate is computed by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of students in grades 9 – 12 served by the school. Students who re-enter school during the same school year in which they dropped out of school are not counted as dropouts. The same measure is used for all students, including students with IEPs.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target*
2011	6.0%

* State dropout target set by State Department of Education, Office of Federal Programs.

Actual Rate for FFY 2011 (calculated using data from the 2010-11 school year): 5.1%
State achieved the dropout rate target.

Calculation

State is reporting using the same calculation as was used in the previous year's APR.

Event dropout rate = (# CWD dropping out ÷ # CWD enrolled in Grades 9 – 12) * 100

1,722 CWD dropouts ÷ 33,784 adjusted CWD enrollment * 100 = 5.1%

Explanation of progress or slippage:

State exceeded the dropout rate target of 6.0% by 0.9%. This represents progress from FFY 2010, when State's dropout rate for youth with disabilities was 6.2%. Improvement is most likely attributable to the State's ongoing technical assistance to school districts around dropout prevention and transition assessment and planning. Additionally, the State contracted with five itinerant graduation coaches, who support graduation and dropout related activities throughout the five regions of State.

Discussion of Improvement Activities for Graduation and Dropout

The same set of activities reported in Indicator B-1 supports the State's work on the dropout rate. Please see Indicator B-1.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities /Timelines / Resources for FFY 2011

At this time, there are no proposed changes to the Targets for Improvement, Improvement Activities, Timelines, or Resources to support the State's work on this indicator.

The National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities provides technical assistance to states and their LEAs to support the design, implementation and sustainability of research- and evidence-based school completion initiatives.

Contact us for assistance with this document or questions about school completion.

Loujeania Bost
lbost@clermson.edu

Matthew Klare
mklare@clermson.edu

Sandra Smith
sandras@clermson.edu

Julia Wilkins
Wilkin6@clermson.edu

Visit our website for additional information:
<http://www.ndpc-sd.org>

