This policy brief looks at the problem of dropouts. The first report, by Todd Fennimore, from the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, provides a national perspective, focusing on dropout incidence and specific factors associated with dropping out of school. Strategies for dropout prevention are presented from both literature reviews and descriptions from dropout prevention programs. Finally, brief recommendations are given for state and district policymakers. A guest commentary by Gary G. Wehlage of the National Center for Effective Secondary Schools suggests a comprehensive approach to dropout prevention that can serve as the foundation for policy initiatives. A section on regional action and agendas lists information on legislation by state for Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. References and resources are included.
Dropouts: Strategies for Prevention

A National Perspective

by Todd Fennimore, NCREL

Distressingly large numbers of youth today are showing signs of alienation and having difficulty making the transition into a productive adult life. Dropping out of school, substance abuse, truancy, depression, delinquency, and teenage pregnancy all are symptoms of the alienation. The nation's leaders, educators, parents, the media, and the business community have expressed great concern about this alienation and its manifestations.

Dropping out is especially problematic because the sectors that once employed dropouts (small farms and smokeshack industries) can no longer absorb them. As our economy continues its move from goods production to information processing, more jobs will require higher levels of education. Dropouts will be shut out of tomorrow's high technology workplace and excluded from active participation in a complex democracy as well (U.S. Department of Labor, 1988).

A disproportionate number of those already marginal in our society, the poor and minority, leave school before graduation. School dropout rates for students from poor families are almost twice those reported for the population average (Catterall & Cota-Robles, 1988). Demographic trends indicate the increase of minority populations that have traditionally had high dropout rates (Hodgkinson, 1985).

The factors associated with dropping out include conditions inside and outside of school. Some of the circumstances outside of school include limited English proficiency, substance abuse, early parenting, learning disability, poverty, broken families, low academic expectations of the family and community, and general feelings of exclusion from the school life of high school. Educators have responded to conditions inside and outside of school by creating strategies that improve the chances that students stay in school.

A content analysis of the dropout prevention literature and descriptions of dropout prevention programs from national, state, and local agencies reveals that educators use any combination of eight strategies when forging a dropout prevention effort (Fennimore, 1988; Hamby, 1989). From a building-level perspective, they include:

- Using non-punitive approaches to attendance monitoring, outreach, and improvement;
- Providing alternative school schedules (e.g., evening high schools, summer programs);
- Modifying or rescinding policies that "push out" students (e.g., grade retention, out-of-school suspension, inadequate social support services);
- Improving the school climate by incorporating elements of school effectiveness and by building partnerships with the community;
- Designing curriculum to link the academic, psychosocial, and vocational domains of adolescent experience;
- Expanding the teacher's role from dispenser of knowledge to mentor, collaborator, and coach;
- Using instructional strategies that actively engage students in learning, such as cooperative or experiential learning or applied problem solving; and
- Assessing the integrity of the school environment by measuring how frequent and how participatory interactions are that occurring within the school and beyond.

While most traditional dropout prevention efforts are designed as pull-out programs with a narrow focus on basic skills remediation and individualization, some researchers have called for greater emphasis on higher-order thinking and group process skills and more movement toward restructuring schools as a whole, instead of adding programs or alternative schools (Presscience, 1988; Oakes, 1987).

State-level or district-level policies can encourage or discourage these changes by expanding alternative schools, supporting experimentation with restructuring school models, calling for a greater curricular focus on higher-order thinking, and taking a position on tracking. How these issues are addressed frames much of the current debate on dropout prevention.

Leading policymakers recommend that states define "dropout," and build an indicator system that provides common data on all students and holds schools accountable for their dropout rates. To encourage the experimentation required for developing effective restructured or alternative models, state and local policies should allow for more building-level autonomy and support curricular and instructional innovation. Finally, states and districts should encourage districts to develop strong partnerships with the community in forming a dropout prevention effort (Wehlage, 1988). These policies will support schools as they implement dropout prevention strategies.
Regional Action & Agendas

Illinois

Illinois' commitment to reducing the number of school dropouts is reflected in its goal "to adopt, strengthen, and/or expand policies, procedures, and programs which address the problems of at-risk children and youth," and in its funding of special and educational reform programs. These programs include Hispanic Student Dropout Prevention (FY'89 funding level: $360,300); Truants' Alternative and Option Educational Program (FY'89 funding level: $13,073,000); Preschool Education (FY'89 funding level: $23,900,000).

Legislation

No additional legislation is expected.

Future

Depending on available funding, Illinois plans to expand existing programs and practice to include all children at risk of school failure.

Indiana

Beginning with the 1988-89 school year, the legislature appropriated $20 million per year for school-based programs to assist with the educational development of at-risk students. How each school district spends its appropriation is discretionary, providing the program fits into one of the nine categories set by law: preschool, full-day kindergarten, parental and community involvement, transitional programs, tutoring, remediation, extended school counseling, individualized programs, and model alternative education. Of Indiana's 766 programs, 280 are for counseling, and a large percentage of the others contain some aspect of counseling in conjunction with other programs such as parental and community involvement. By the end of the school year, 211,118 students will have been directly served by the program, and 38 percent of the funding will have been provided by voluntary local contributions. Educational professionals, state legislators, and the Governor will support the program.

Legislation

The original proposal was for $20 million. By the 1990-91 school year, funding is expected to increase by $10-20 million. The Department of Education (DOE) has requested a slight increase in the first year of the next fiscal biennium to evaluate the first year's programs. In the second year, the DOE has requested a $10 million increase.

Future

Bills to establish a commission on drug-free schools, to set a "Just Say No Day," and to create a celebrities task force for drug-free schools are moving rapidly through the legislature.

Iowa

Dropouts are of high interest due to increased dropout rate and new state standards for Local Education Agencies (LEAs), K-14, to develop plans to serve at-risk students. The Alternative Education Association assists LEAs in developing and implementing programs.

Legislation

Under 1984 legislation, districts may file plans for additional allowable growth to provide for returning dropouts and dropout prevention. Effective July 1, 1989, under Iowa's new Educational Standards, programs are to be established to identify and serve at-risk students.

Future

Future objectives are to develop and disseminate a planning format for use in reviewing policies and practices that contribute to student failure and dropout, and to develop program strategies to serve larger geographic areas and include services for small rural districts, including Area Community Colleges and support service agencies.

Michigan

Dropout prevention remains a top priority in Michigan. Initiatives from the Governor's Office, the State Board of Education, and other departments include an emphasis on early childhood education, school improvement, and job placement.

Legislation

Funding is currently available for increased Department staffing and pilot projects. Proposed programs would provide local school financial incentives for improving student achievement and attendance including schools of choice as an alternative.

Future

Future plans include funding to integrate the Governor's Human Investment initiatives and enhance the coordination and assessment of employability skills education and job training services.

Minnesota

Because Minnesota has a flexible state funding system that supports a variety of mainstream, postsecondary (while in high school) and alternative programs, categorical and special funding has not been needed for new programs. Current dropout prevention programs are strongly supported by the Governor, Senate, House, Department of Education, and private sector groups.

Current Legislation

- Adult Diploma Program (1988)
- Area Learning Centers (1987, amended 1988)
- Minor Parent/Pregnant Legislation (1988)
- Sliding Scale Child Care Funds (1987)
- Postsecondary Enrollment Options (1985)
- Metro Open Enrollment (1988)
- Other Prevention Laws and Policies including: Early Childhood Screening, AIDS Prevention, and Risk Reduction

Proposed Legislation

- Amendment to HSG1-funding to private alternatives
- Interagency Adult Basic Education Initiative
- Amendment to Human Service Welfare Reform for 18- & 19-Year-Olds, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) custodial parents
- Transportation for children of custodial parents
- Learner outcomes and individualized learning for alternative programs
- Early childhood screening for 3-year-olds

Future

The Legislature and the Governor are directing additional attention to these issues and will be refining dropout program initiatives.

Ohio

Dropout prevention is a major priority of the Ohio Department of Education. Ohio's Formula for Educational Success, published by the Department in 1988, defined 14 factors associated with the at-risk student. Pilot projects were selected for 1988-89; 80 state and federally-funded programs were identified to address some of these factors. The goals are to reach at-risk students, keep them in school, and ensure they graduate with skills.
Legislation
The State Board of Education’s legislative recommendations included proposals such as full-day kindergarten, adolescent pregnancy programs, urban demonstration projects, additional Reading Recovery Programs, and summer education/job programs so that by the year 2000, all students who enter high school will graduate. Legislative consideration also is being given to driver’s license revocation for dropouts.

Future
The Department has established a Dropout Prevention Section within the Educational Services Division to serve as a clearinghouse of information and as a coordinator of Department dropout prevention efforts. Regional and district meetings are planned to gather information and input concerning the dropout problem.

Wisconsin
An aggressive statewide public policy and programmatic thrust is underway focusing on educational standards, school age parents, education for employment, the Job Training Partnership Act, preschool children and education, welfare reform, youth suicide and alcohol and other drug abuse prevention, and pupil services. Constraints include the lack of sufficient resources to implement and integrate programs; limited funding for interagency cooperation; and inflexibility of systems.

Legislation
Legislation is extensive in the areas of:
- Children at risk
- School District Educational Standards
- Compulsory attendance to 18 years
- Truancy Prevention
- Learnfare
- Alcohol and other drug abuse prevention education
- School age parents
- Education for employment

Future
Statutory language affecting children at risk, preschool-12th grade, will be refined and prototypes for effective resource networking and program models will be provided.

These indicators would serve two purposes. First, they would allow states, communities, and school districts to measure change over time on key, commonly defined variables as programs are implemented to improve schools for at-risk youth. These indicators would inform policymakers, educators, and the public as to whether conditions are improving as a result of policy initiatives. Second, data from these indicators would allow schools to assess the extent and severity of certain problems in their schools. Data would provide a basis for making judgments about what interventions and which policy changes are needed. For some schools, information on the various indicators might suggest that relatively minor problems exist, and that a few improvements can provide a safety net for those at risk of dropping out. This safety net might include a variety of supplementary programs that provide remediation, counseling, and incentives to reach graduation. Where a high dropout rate exists, the indicators might suggest a need to review and modify school policies governing matters such as course failures, retention in grade, and suspension. Also, the data might lead educators to conclude that there is a need for alternatives which offer a substantially different school structure, climate, and curriculum if at-risk students are to succeed in school.

Finally, the indicators can serve to galvanize whole communities that are concerned about the quality of community life and the opportunities that exist for young people. It may be that in some communities young people experience serious social problems and perceive little opportunity for a better life. In such situations, schools need to unite with other community institutions to provide services and create a climate of hope about the future that makes engagement in school seem worthwhile. State policy could encourage the formation of community collaboratives that bring together the schools, social service agencies, the business community, private organizations such as churches and service clubs, the legal system, the city council, and institutions of higher education. Collaboratives provide the basis for community planning and coordination of resources in attacking the broad array of conditions that place young people at risk.