

A Working Paper



A Project of
The Annie E. Casey
Foundation

**Assessing the Educational
Indicators in the KIDS COUNT
Data Book**

Convened at Child Trends
on August 24, 2006

August, 2006



The Annie E. Casey Foundation

KIDS COUNT Education Indicators Panel Meeting

August 24, 2006

Executive Summary

At the request of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Child Trends convened a meeting of experts on August 24, 2006 to advise the Foundation on the current education indicators in the KIDS COUNT Data Book. The experts were asked to consider whether the current indicators should be changed, dropped, replaced with other indicators, or remain the same. The participants were asked for input on indicators of high school dropout or completion, educational achievement, and other potential education indicators. They were instructed that the measures they recommended had to be 1) consistently available for all states; 2) available now and back to the year 2000 so that the measures can be used in the next Spring 2007 edition of the Data Book; 3) produced in the future so that a trend can be maintained; and 4) understandable to the public.

The panel considered measures of high school dropout, graduation, and completion. An important distinction was made between population-based measures of child well-being, such as the status dropout rate for 16-19 year-olds currently used in the Data Book, and measures of school performance, such as measures of “on-time” high school graduation, which are widely used for school accountability purposes. The panel considered the strengths and limitations of sources for the potential indicators, including the American Community Survey (ACS) and the Common Core of Data (CCD), an administrative school-based data system, and variations in the measures, such as various age groups and credentials that would be included.

The majority of expert panel recommended retaining the current dropout rate for 16-19 year-olds, since it is a measure of well-being for youth, it is a negative indicator like other indicators in the book, and it describes a risk that can motivate people to intervene. Several attendees advocated for an older age group, to exclude those who are typically still enrolled in school. It was suggested that supplemental tables could be presented on the KIDS COUNT website to show dropout rates as part of a continuum of school attainment. Others on the panel recommended that the National Center for Education Statistics’ (NCES) Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate be presented in addition to the dropout rate since it is a recommended measure of “on-time” graduation.

NAEP proficiency scores were recommended as indicators of achievement. Repetition of reporting over two consecutive years could be avoided by either alternating math and reading every year, or presenting one grade (fourth or eighth) each year. The panel differed in the level of proficiency to present, with some arguing to retain “below basic” and others arguing for either “basic and below” or “proficient”.

Other education indicators recommended by the panel included indicators on immigrants, English-proficiency or linguistic isolation, and correlates to achievement. The panel

suggested that the idle teens indicator should be dropped from the Data Book since it is duplicative of the dropout indicator.

Background

At the request of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Child Trends convened a meeting of experts on August 24, 2006 to advise the Foundation on the current education indicators in the KIDS COUNT Data Book. The experts were asked to consider whether the current indicators should be changed, dropped, replaced with another indicator, or whether they should remain the same. Participants were asked to give their recommendations to the Foundation.

Bill O'Hare gave a brief history of the KIDS COUNT Data Book and the dropout indicator included in the book. The Data Book has been published every year since 1990, and it has always included an education measure because it is considered to be an important measure of child well-being. There is a two-page layout for each state. Trends in key indicators of child well-being are displayed on the right-hand page, by which states are ranked. The High School Dropout rate is important because it is used by KIDS Count to rank states. On the left page are background indicators, which include NAEP results in mathematics and reading for 4th and 8th grade students. Supplemental data are also presented on the KIDS COUNT website.

Originally the education indicator in the Data Book measured the percent of students graduating from high school on time, and was based on the U.S. Department of Education's "Annual Wall Chart of State Education Statistics." When the wall chart stopped being produced, KIDS COUNT tried to replicate the methodology in the wall chart to still report the percentage of students graduating from high school on time. In 1995, KIDS COUNT started to use the Current Population Survey (CPS), calculating dropouts as the three-year average percentage of teens between ages 16 and 19 who were not enrolled in high school and not high school graduates. These rolling three-year averages of data were used because of small sample sizes in the CPS at the state level. The American Community Survey (ACS) was used as the data source beginning in 2005 and the indicator as calculated remained the same—the percentage of teens between ages 16 and 19 who were not enrolled in high school and not high school graduates. The survey question used to measure dropouts is the same as that in the CPS, and three-year averages were no longer necessary because of adequate state sample sizes in the ACS.

High School Dropout, Graduation, and Completion Rates

In the last couple of years, KIDS COUNT has received more press and comments about their dropout rate, which has been related to the availability of new measures in the public domain, and due to the increased scrutiny of the education system that has accompanied the No Child Left Behind Act. The participants were asked for input on other ways to measure dropout rates or even graduation rates, and were reminded that whatever measure they recommended should have the following characteristics: 1) the measure had to be consistently available for all states; 2) data must be available now and back to the year 2000 so that the measure can be used in the next edition of the Data

Book, published in Spring 2007; 3) there is a reasonable expectation that the data will be produced in the future, so that a trend can be maintained; and 4) the measure must be understandable to the public.

Ms. Lippman presented the range of dropout, graduation and completion rates currently available for states. There are two variations of dropout rates. First is the status dropout rate currently used by KIDS COUNT. This rate uses American Community Survey (ACS) data on the number of young adults age 16 to 19 who are not enrolled in school and have not received a high school diploma divided by the total number of civilian, non-institutionalized 16- to 19-year-olds. The second rate available is the event dropout rate, which uses the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) school administrative data system called the Common Core of Data (CCD), on the number of students enrolled in 9th through 12th grade one year but who were not enrolled the next, and who have not earned a diploma or completed a state or district approved high school program. This latter measure is not available for 5 states or for the U.S. total, so it does not meet the criteria outlined above.

There are a number of different high school graduation and completion rates available, which also use data from the CCD or the ACS. A graduation leaver rate counts students who leave high school with a regular diploma only. NCES uses the CCD to calculate their Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR), which is a type of graduation leaver rate. The AFGR is calculated by dividing the number of diplomas issued in one year by the estimated size of the freshman class four years earlier. The estimated freshman class size is calculated by summing 8th grade, 9th grade, and 10th grade enrollment and dividing by three. This rate is recommended by NCES as the best proxy measure available for an on-time graduation rate required by the No Child Left Behind Act. Jay Greene of the Manhattan Institute calculates a graduation leaver rate slightly differently, by applying a measure of population change for children between the ages of 14 and 17. A second rate is the completion leaver rate. Completion leaver rates measure the number of regular and other diplomas, but exclude GED recipients. Rob Warren of the University of Minnesota developed a completion leaver rate based on CCD data which he named the Estimated Completion Rate (ECR). The ECR is calculated by dividing the number of high school completers in one year by the estimated number of first-time 9th graders (for which he uses 8th graders) three years earlier, adjusting for migration.

A status completion rate is available from the ACS, which measures the highest degree a person (typically aged 25 and over) has obtained. The rate is calculated based on a response to a survey question on the highest educational degree completed. Those who respond that they have completed high school or higher are included. GED completers are included as high school completers.

Another simple graduation rate that NCES has published in the Digest of Education Statistics for years is a graduation ratio, which uses CCD data on public school diplomas from CCD and population data from the CPS (ACS for states) to estimate the percentage of high school graduates in the population at the expected age of graduation. It divides

the number of high school graduates with regular diplomas in any one year by the number of 17-year-olds in the population.

The group commented that none of the measures will produce a clean number because there is always noise affecting the data. Even population estimates from census data have noise, because there can be undercounts and miscounts. So while there are many possible measures, each will have a source of error. Since the indicators in KIDS COUNT have to be understandable to the general public, the fundamental challenge is how to come up with an estimate that is defensible but also understandable, considering its flaws and deficiencies.

The group discussed possible public data sets which could be used to measure graduation or dropout rates. It was stated that according to the final report issued by the National Institute of Statistical Sciences/Education Statistics Services Institute Task Force on Graduation, Completion, and Dropout Indicators, the best source of data for determining how many public school students graduated high school on-time with a regular diploma would be databases comprised of student panel-data that would track students as they progress by grade. The task force recommended that NCES work with states to help develop a student-level data system to determine where a child is at any point in time on the school continuum, and recommended that cross-sectional data not be used to estimate on-time public graduation rates.

Until states are able to implement the recommendations of the NISS/ESSI Task Force for a student level tracking system, the Common Core of Data (CCD), an administrative school-based data system collected by NCES, is typically considered the best existing data source that can produce such measures of on-time graduation. However it was noted that student-level data are not currently available, that data are only available for public schools, and that NCES does not independently audit CCD data; it is a voluntary system, and states are only asked to verify data if something looks odd. Also, the NCES AFGR rates for some states using CCD data vary greatly from one year to another. For example, between 2002-03 and 2003-04, the rates in Arizona and Nevada changed by at least 10 percentage points. It was also noted that NCES does not have a consistent way of requiring states to report diploma counts in CCD data, and that with questionnaires being filled out in 50 different states, there could be differences in the way diplomas are counted from state to state.

One attendee commented that there are a couple of questions that need to be answered before the discussion could continue: 1) Is the measure in question intended to be a measure of the population, and if so, which population? Or is it intended to be a school performance measure? 2) Should the measure be framed in terms of dropping out as the outcome, or high school completion as the outcome? If completion is the outcome, then what credentials should be included, just regular diplomas, or other diplomas from alternative programs, or GEDs? 3) Another consideration is whether there is a desire to replicate the rates at the district level. The attendee said that in response to the first question, if a measure of public school performance is desired, then CCD would be the

best data source. However if a broader population-based measure is desired, then ACS or another Census-based dataset would be best.

Bill O'Hare stated that since KIDS COUNT is a report on the well-being of children, their interest is in presenting a measure that reflects outcomes for children, rather than a public school system performance measure. He also stated that since all of the other indicators in the Data Book are population focused and they measure negative outcomes, where higher numbers mean well-being is worse, it may make sense to continue measuring dropout rates, which go in the same direction as other measures.

A clarification of on-time graduation rates was made. Published "on-time" graduation rates do not exactly measure those who completed high school on time, they are a count of all diplomas issued in a certain year, which includes early and late diplomas, and could also include some from people who have gone through alternative completion programs. Bill O'Hare stated that use of an on-time graduation rate would be a dilemma for KIDS COUNT because people would ultimately interpret it as an evaluation of the performance of schools, when what is desired is a measure of child well-being.

Another consideration raised was whether the indicator should measure whether students are leaving school with the certification that they need in order to compete in the working world. If so, a participant suggested that consideration be given to whether to include people who receive a GED, in addition to those who receive a regular diploma. Past research has shown that employment and earnings outcomes for GED recipients are more similar to dropouts, but it was suggested that this may not still be the case with new GED recipients since the creation of a new test, which is more rigorous.

Age Group

The group addressed the age group that should be used in measuring dropout or graduation rates. The current age group used by KIDS COUNT to measure dropout rate is ages 16-19. This age group has been used for many years and by many government agencies, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics still publishes it that way. A historical reason for the inclusion of 16 year-olds was that age 16 is the legal age in most states at which students can drop out of school. However, having the age group include 16-year-olds could be confusing, because normal graduating age is usually between 17 and 19, and 16-year-olds are not expected to be high school graduates. One attendee explained that part of the reason why rates that use 16 to 19-year olds look so low is because the denominator of the equation includes all kids who are still in school. It was suggested that if the 16 to 19 age group is used, the currently enrolled students should be removed from the denominator. Tabulations could be done which subtract those in school from the denominator. Increasing the upper age limit would be possible, but it would no longer be an indicator of the status of children, per se. One consideration however in raising the age is that if a measure of high school graduation is used with a higher upper age limit, then the issue of cross-state migration comes into play because people could be measured in one state as being a high school graduate when they in fact graduated from high school in another state.

Data Limitations

A problem with the ACS survey data on educational attainment was raised, e.g., that parents or household members can misreport whether their child is enrolled in school, or their educational attainment. One attendee stated that in a study that they participated in, when parents were interviewed after a child dropped out of school, about 25% misreported their child's enrollment status. While that study did not address misreporting school completion, one could assume that if there is a tendency to misreport school enrollment, then there could possibly be misreport on school completion and attaining a diploma. Another attendee said that education level completed is something that is open to a person's own interpretation when completing a survey. The survey question has a response list, a person has to fit themselves into a category, and they want to have the time that they spent in school count for something. A person could drop out of high school, not obtain a GED, and enroll in community college and thus say they have completed "some college", which would make data analysts assume that they had graduated from high school. Another example was given from the Current Population Survey, where they found that approximately 40% of people who answered the October and the March surveys changed their answer between the two regarding whether they had graduated from high school or its equivalent. It was not necessarily because they lied, but because the question wording and phrasing was confusing. One attendee pointed out that both CPS and ACS datasets have an issue with undercounting young minority males, however this is less of a problem with ACS than it is with CPS.

The group then considered the Common Core of Data (CCD) to determine if that dataset would be useful. One drawback raised is that it collects data for public schools only, and data on private schools are not included. Private school dropouts are not usually measured because private schools do not have the staff to keep track of children who leave private school, so they just assume that those who leave go back to public school. One attendee indicated that the quality of the CCD has improved through the efforts of NCES, and it is being used more widely in indicator reports, but that it is still a voluntary system and NCES cannot force states to comply with its standards. Data are not available for New York and Wisconsin from 2003-04. In general, the data are available to go back to the year 2000 and will continue to be collected in the future.

The graduation rates which use CCD vary in how they treat the problem of the "ninth grade bulge." Ninth grade enrollment is typically larger than other grades, thus deflating graduation rates which use 9th grade enrollment as the denominator, because it is common for students to move from private to public schools in 9th grade, and because more and more children are being retained in 9th grade. An average of 8th, 9th, and 10th grade enrollment is the preferred method to deal with this issue, and it is used by NCES for their Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate (AFGR). Other research by Rob Warren reviewed by the group makes a strong case for using 8th grade counts as the best estimate for 9th grade, but it was suggested that there is a face validity issue with that because

people do not think of graduation of 8th grade students. Another attendee said that being retained is not a problem just for 9th grade students, but that more and more children are below the normal grade for their age.

A concern among the KIDS COUNT grantees in attendance was being able to explain how dropout rates and graduation rates relate to each other. One stated that in their state, they show a graduation rate based on 9th grade enrollment, but they also show a dropout rate. They stated that some reporters want to match up the numbers, but the numbers do not match because the dropout rate is less than 5%, while the graduation rate is around 70%. Another attendee cautioned that the two rates cannot be matched up, because they measure completely different things.

Recommendations on Dropout, Graduation, and Completion Rates

Each attendee was asked to give his or her recommendation on what KIDS COUNT should use to measure high school dropouts, graduations, or completions. The majority of the attendees said that a population-based estimate should continue to be used, and that the ACS would probably be the best data source. Many suggested keeping the dropout rate as it appears currently in KIDS COUNT, since it is a measure of well-being for youth not adults, since it is a negative indicator as are other indicators in the book, and it describes a risk that can motivate people to intervene on today. One source of difference among the attendees was the age group that should be used to measure the dropout rate. A number of attendees advocated for increasing the age range to something like 19 to 21 or 22, and suggested that this should be determined empirically by looking at the data. Others said that the age range should not be increased too much, in order to keep its relevance as an indicator for youth. Several participants supported the suggestion to remove those still enrolled in school from the denominator. One attendee said that the Data Book could retain the traditional measure of 16 to 19 year olds, and then present a supplemental table on the KIDS COUNT website that shows dropout rates as part of a continuum of school attainment, with those still enrolled in school, high school graduates and college attendees included. Such a table would present a distribution of the entire population and would sum to 100 percent. The table could be presented for two age groups, those 16 to 18, since those ages are the ones most likely to still be in school, and those 19 to 20. After that was suggested, a number of other attendees agreed that such a presentation would be a good compromise and would work for KIDS COUNT.

Several present recommended that the AFGR high school graduation be used in addition to the dropout rate, without calling it an “on-time graduation rate,” and the advantages include that is the current official rate produced by NCES, it is available back to 2000 and annually in the future, and the averaging of 8th, 9th, and 10th grade enrollment takes care of the 9th grade “bulge” issue. Others suggested using 8th graders in the denominator rather than the average of three grades, since it was the best proxy to estimate the population of 9th graders. There was a suggestion to use all completions of any high school program from the CCD in the numerator, not just regular diplomas, which still would exclude GEDs, and to correct for migration. These suggestions are in line with the ECD rate developed by Rob Warren. Some participants expressed the need for additional

information to be posted on the web if only one indicator goes into the data book. For example, the AFGR could be used in the book, but ACS-based data could be posted on the web. Several participants urged KIDS COUNT to present simple text in the book to describe major differences between the two rates, and declared that there needed to be transparency about whatever measure and data source was used to ease public understanding, for example, that the ACS includes all types of diplomas and GEDs, whereas the AFGR only includes regular diplomas from public schools. Several participants noted the need to disaggregate the data by race, but others cautioned about disaggregating too much and thus compromising data reliability.

Achievement Indicators

The next area for consideration was education achievement indicators that are available and could be used in the Data Book. Bill O'Hare again gave a brief summary of the achievement indicator currently used in the Data Book. KIDS COUNT has used various NAEP scores, showing the percentage of students in a particular grade who score below the basic proficiency level on the assessments. The NAEP scores are not used to rank states. The dilemma for Kids Count is that there is not one NAEP score overall with which to measure student achievement; rather, there are progressive proficiency levels and multiple subjects from which to choose. He said that they are open to changing measures, and also to changing the proficiency level reported to either proficient or basic. The disadvantage to using NAEP is that it is not a measure that changes annually because reading and math scores are released every two years and in the same year rather than alternate years. On the KIDS COUNT website, all of the NAEP scores at the state level are reported back to the mid-1990's.

One attendee said that NAEP scores only mean something if they can be examined as trend data, so the recommendation would be to keep the current "below basic" level that is measured and tracked in KIDS COUNT. Another attendee said that a problem with looking at only those scoring below basic is that you miss other trends such as children moving from the basic level to proficient. One of the KIDS COUNT grantees said that all of the other indicators in the Data Book show what is wanted for kids, and the achievement level that we should want for kids would be proficient, and not basic or below basic. Another attendee agreed, and said that children should be proficient, and while the children who score below basic should have attention paid to them, the use of "proficient" would be a better measure. A third attendee said that while everyone understands what proficient would mean, NAEP purposefully sets the proficient level as a very high bar and something to achieve, rather than to demonstrate who is doing well, so the percentages who are proficient are very low, which is problematic. There was also support for using "Basic or below", which is being used more often, so that those who have achieved a basic level of proficiency are included, and the measure would not just represent those at bottom end of the distribution. There was also the suggestion to present average scale scores that can show improvement anywhere in the distribution.

The discussion then turned to which NAEP assessment would be the best to use for an indicator of achievement – reading, math, or science? Some attendees argued for math,

because after the first few years of school, reading is no longer specifically taught, while math continues to be taught through 12th grade. One attendee said that since the measure is of school achievement, it would make sense to measure what is being taught in school, and in that case, it would be math. Others countered that while reading is not specifically taught to older students, it is highly associated with success in school and beyond. In discussing which grade level would be best used in the Data Book, one attendee said that 8th grade scores would be more indicative of how students will fare as adults, while another attendee said that 4th grade scores speak to early risk factors and would provide a measure for young children, and may be more in line with what KIDS COUNT is looking for.

Additional Indicators

Bill O'Hare asked if there were any other potential education indicators that could be considered for inclusion in the Data Book. He reminded the group that for indicators to be included in the book, the data have to be available for all states and available annually, while for additional indicators presented on the internet, there is more flexibility. The group focused on correlates to achievement, such as reading to young children, and watching too much television. The need to provide an indicator for younger children was raised, since there are more data in the book on older youth than younger children. An indicator could be presented on the proportion of 3 to 5-year-olds who are enrolled in preschool. A concern was raised about preschool enrollment, however, since there is no indication of the quality or content of the program, which research suggests is key. Another suggestion that was met with approval around the table was a measure of English language proficiency, or speaking a language other than English, or to somehow include a measure related to increasing numbers of immigrant students in the schools. While there may not be much research that ties these to broader outcomes in child well-being, immigration is an issue that many states are facing.

The moderator asked the KIDS COUNT grantees in attendance whether there were any indicators that they would like to see included. One stated that people ask about graduation data, and are also interested in looking at the achievement gap by race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Another stated that their state was interested in special education and immigration topics, such as how immigration relates to poverty and education, what barriers immigrant children face, and so on. Another stated that it would be interesting to be able to examine documented versus undocumented immigrants, however the latter category would always be greatly underreported.

Many of the attendees agreed that it would be useful to be able to measure issues related to the immigrant population. One attendee said decennial census data show that the high school completion rate of those who immigrated at age 18 was about 33%. Another said that the census data are available for foreign-born persons, native-born persons, and year of entry, and that there are a high proportion of children who have at least one foreign-born parent, which brings the language issue into play. A lot of children live in homes where nobody speaks English very well and they are considered to be linguistically

isolated. Indicators relating to speaking English well or linguistic isolation were supported by group.

In addition, mobility was raised as an important issue that affects education outcomes. Census data can address the number of moves students made in the last year, and the percentage that have moved could be tracked over time. Level of parental educational attainment was also suggested as an important correlate to achievement.

Recommendations on Achievement and Other Indicators

All of the attendees were again asked to give their recommendations on achievement or other education indicators which could be included in the Data Book, and they were asked to include data source recommendations. Most of the attendees responded that NAEP scores are the best measure of achievement, and many suggested including both math and reading scores, alternating subjects reported in the annual Data Book. For example, in 2006 provide math scores from 2005, and in 2007 provide the reading scores from 2005. There was not a consensus on whether the below basic level should be retained, or whether a higher level such as proficient should be used. Some attendees advocated for it to remain the same at below basic, while some stated that proficient would be better. One suggested basic and below to capture a higher proportion of children who have basic skills, rather than just the tail that are below basic. There was support for including 4th and 8th grade NAEP scores, with some participants arguing for one or the other, and some for both. One suggestion for the timing of the NAEP data was that both math and reading scores for 4th graders could be presented one year, and 8th graders the next. Several participants suggested the need for a longer time trend than what is currently presented in the Data Book because the time period is not right for the measures currently reported.

For additional indicators, attendees stated that they would like to see more immigrant-related data, such as achievement data for immigrants, or a measure of English proficiency, and there was agreement that the idle teens indicator could be dropped from the report, since it is duplicative of the dropout indicator.

Bill O'Hare and Laura Lippman thanked the participants, and the meeting adjourned.

Attendees:

Paul Barton, Consultant

Andrew Brodsky, Colorado Children's Campaign

Chris Chapman, National Center for Education Statistics

Jean D'Amico, Population Reference Bureau

Emerson Elliott, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education

Andrew Halpern-Manners, University of Minnesota

Brian Harris-Kojetin, Office of Management and Budget

Cindy Hetzel, Voices for Virginia's Children

Robert Kominski, U.S. Census Bureau

Barbara Lucas, Indiana Youth Institute

Lawrence Mishel, Economic Policy Institute
Kelvin Pollard, Population Reference Bureau
Chris Swanson, Education Week Research Center
Katherine Wallman, Office of Management and Budget
Jonathan Zaff, America's Promise- The Alliance for Youth
Bill O'Hare, Consultant, The Annie E. Casey Foundation
Laura Beavers, The Annie E. Casey Foundation
Facilitator: Laura Lippman, Child Trends

Location:

Child Trends
4301 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 350
Washington, DC 20008

APPENDIX

[KIDS COUNT Education Indicators Meeting Background Materials](#)

- 1) Dropout Rates in the United States: 2002 and 2003 E.D. Tab :
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006062>
- 2) Public High School Graduation and College-Readiness Rates: 1991-2002 :
http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ewp_08.htm
- 3) State-Level High School Completion Rates: Concepts, Measures, and Trends :
<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n51/>
- 4) Is the Glass Emptying or Filling Up? Reconciling Divergent Trends in High School Completion and Dropout : <http://www.soc.umn.edu/~warren/WarrenHalpernManners.pdf>
- 5) One-Third of a Nation: Rising Dropout Rates and Declining Opportunities :
<http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICONETHIRD.pdf>
- 6) High School Graduation, Completion, and Dropout (GCD) Indicators: A Primer and Catalog :
<http://www.urban.org/publications/411116.html>
- 7) National Institute of Statistical Sciences/Education Statistics Services Institute Task Force on Graduation, Completion, and Dropout Indicators: Final Report :
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2005105>
- 8) ECS State Notes: State Graduation Rate Goals for High School Accountability :
<http://www.ecs.org/html/Document.asp?chouseid=6805>
- 9) The Education Trust Graduation Rates at a Glance :
<http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/2AA4F718-034B-483A-A3FB-BFD9ABADBB56/0/GradRatesataGlance.pdf>



The Annie E. Casey Foundation

701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410.547.6600
www.aecf.org