

**A Report and Plan
Addressing a Zero Dropout Rate
by the Year 2000**

Required under 256.9(44)

Submitted to the Iowa State Board of Education

April, 1993

Prepared by

Dr. Raymond Morley

**Office of Educational Services for
Children, Families, and Communities**

Iowa Department of Education

INTRODUCTION

A continuous initiative is needed to minimize dropping out of high school and maximize the productivity of our youth. The sheer complexity of the issue of dropping out of school demands broad-based cooperative work among all our citizenry to reduce its impact on the lives of those who experience it. This report is considered to be a beginning that should be supplemented by legislative action to provide the resources necessary to explore issues in greater depth and spur improvement in the delivery of education and other services where necessary.

Iowa's high school dropout population remains a product of our schools as well as a product of other social and biological conditions. It is true that some students attending our schools need but do not obtain proper medical care and other necessities to satisfy basic human needs. As well, some students experience family and social dilemmas which undermine constructive behavior patterns that contribute to productivity and the constructive work of school and other professional institutions. Moreover, they are not served well within the limitations of our schools and what they experience in school is overwhelming failure or disgust rather than success or satisfaction. In short, the high school dropout phenomena is complex, requiring the attention of a myriad of service agency resources and the community at large. Dropping out of school is not a school phenomena independent of other influences and cannot be solved as only a school issue.

DIMENSIONS OF THE DROPOUT PHENOMENA

Numbers, Geographic Distribution, Gender and Ethnic Makeup, and Age

Over the past 23 years, Iowa schools reported 161,725 dropouts (average number per year equalling 7031 students). In any given year the percent of dropouts never exceeded 4% of the Basic Education Data Survey (BEDS) enrollment and, for the most part, dropouts represented approximately 2.6% of our reported (BEDS) annual enrollments. Most of our dropouts left school between grades 9 and 12, with our heaviest dropout rates being in grades 10 and 11. Presently we can expect annually nearly five thousand students to drop out of Iowa schools, heavily represented in grades 9-12. Few students (less than 100) will drop out in grades 7 and 8.

Dropouts are more highly represented in large school districts within Iowa and within specific counties within the state. Generally speaking, the higher the K-12 enrollment within a district, the greater the probability of a high dropout rate. Nearly forty eight percent (48%) of our dropouts come from districts with K-12 enrollments over 7,500. Another 37% come from districts with K-12 enrollments over 1,000. Therefore, 85% of our dropouts come from 119 districts (48% from nine districts, K-12 enrollments of 7500 and over, and 37% from 110 districts, K-12 enrollments of 1000 and over). Collectively, these districts represent nearly 67% of Iowa's total school enrollments (Iowa Guidance Surveys, Iowa Department of Education-1992). Seventy percent (297) of Iowa school districts have achieved a 90% completion rate. One hundred twenty-nine districts (30%) exceed a 1.5% dropout rate and seventy-four (17%) exceed the state average dropout rate (see Appendix A - 1991-92 Dropout File). Twenty districts

(5%) exceed a 4% annual dropout rate - 1.7% beyond the state average, and nine districts (2%) exceed a 5% annual dropout rate - 2.7% beyond the state average. The twenty most involved districts in rank order by percentage of dropout include: Waterloo, Malvern, Perry, Hancock-Avoca, Davenport, Saydel, Des Moines, Newell-Providence, Clinton, Olin, Ottumwa, Keokuk, Washington, Mar-Mac, Denison, Centerville, LDF, Missouri Valley, Cardinal, and Belle Plaine. These districts are not all large and the data illustrates that high rates are not just a characteristic of large districts.

Every merged area (Area Education Agency - Community College boundary) within Iowa reports dropouts. Merged areas 7, 9, and 11 report over 3% of the school enrollments as dropouts and area 12 over 2.8%. The remaining merged areas report percentages below the state rate of 2.49% for 1991 with areas 3, 4, 10 and 14 being below 1.5%.* Merged areas 3, 4, and 10 also have no counties near (2%) or over the state average dropout rate (2.49%). However, merged area 15 contains 6 counties with dropout rates exceeding or nearing the state average. No other merged area has as many counties in that situation. Merged area 9, however, has 4 counties over or near the state average, three of which are over the state average. Overall we have 11 of 15 merged areas reporting dropout rates at or above the state average. Five areas (7, 9, 11, 12, and 15) report higher and more significant involvement compared to other areas of the state.

Iowa has 50 counties not meeting a 90% completion rate (1.5% dropout rate or lower). The following 15 counties have dropout rates beyond the state average: Adams, Appanoose, Black Hawk, Cerro Gordo, Clinton, Lee, Muscatine, Page, Polk, Pottawattamie, Poweshiek, Scott, Wayne, Webster, and Woodbury. Fifteen additional counties are represented by dropout rates nearing the state average (2% or better). They are: Allamakee, Buena Vista, Dallas, Davis, Decatur, Des Moines, Dubuque, Fayette, Franklin, Jasper, Louisa, Mahaska, Marshall, Monroe, and Wapello. Consequently, we have 30 counties within the state either exceeding or near the state average annual dropout percentage (2.49%), (Guidance Surveys, Department of Education, 1992). Six of the 30 are located in merged area 15. Twenty-four of the 30 counties exceed the state average low income percent (11.2% - 1990 census). Therefore, Iowa has 30 counties who do not now meet nor are near meeting the 90% high school success rate established as a national and Iowa goal for the year 2000.

Iowa's dropout population includes males (54%) and females (46%), (Guidance Surveys, 1992). Males are more highly represented in the dropout population than they are in the total population (54% dropout, 48% total population). Females are underrepresented in the dropout population (46% dropout, 52% total population). Minorities represent 15% of the total dropouts reported in 1992 (734 minority students within 4783 total dropout population). Blacks represent 8.5% (411) of the total dropout, Hispanics represent 2.9% (141), Asians represent 2.8% (133), and American Indian represent 1.0% (49). Minority representation in Iowa's total population is as follows: Black = 1.73%, Hispanic (all races) = 1.17%, Asian/Pacific Islander = .91%, American Indian = .26%. Therefore, every minority group is represented in the dropout statistics at a greater percentage rate than their representation in Iowa's population. Iowa's minority populations are growing and reflect the following increases since 1980: Black = 15%, Hispanic = 28%, Asian = 120%, American Indian = 35%. Although the white population represents over 86% of the dropout statistic, whites represent 95.47% of the Iowa population (1990 census). School districts

experiencing significant minority enrollment and high representation in dropout statistics include: Davenport, Des Moines, Sioux City, South Tama, Clinton, Mason City, Fort Dodge, Lewis Central, Muscatine, Cedar Rapids, Dubuque, Burlington, Bettendorf, Fort Madison, West Des Moines, Marshalltown, and Waterloo (see Appendix A).

The percent of Iowa's population aged 18 and over lacking a high school diploma or its equivalent has been dropping since 1960. Since 1960 this population was reduced from 47% to 19% in 1990 (1960, 1970, 1980, 1990 census). Year-end reports from local school districts involved in

* [Note: If a school district or area reaches and maintains a 1.5% annual dropout rate as presently computed (total dropouts divided by total student enrollment in grades seven through twelve) a 91% completion rate or better will be established, i.e. 1.5% times 6 (the number of years it takes for a given 7th grade class to graduate). The statements regarding the 90% completion rate are based accordingly.]

dropout prevention programs supported via increased allowable growth indicate reductions in dropouts at the rate of .15% to .3% per year. This reduction is also indicated in the 1990 and 1991 Iowa Guidance Surveys publications and the 1992 Dropout File (Appendix A). Therefore, we appear to be continuing to reduce our percentages of dropouts, but our rate of decrease is slow. We continue to do this with increasing numbers of minority populations evident within the state and increased social problems.

An analysis of Iowa's dropouts with regard to disabilities has never been completed. We simply don't know how many dropouts have been or are disabled when they drop out of high school. Past guidance surveys indicate that the disabled are dropping out. For instance, in 1990 they represented approximately 3.5% of the total dropouts. However, our data are scarce in this area. It needs to be explored to identify the proper role of special education in dropout prevention and services for dropouts. It also needs to be explored to determine the proportion of our population for which high school completion in the traditional/academic sense is impossible or improbable due to their existing disability/disabilities.

High school aged homeless youth represent 36% (3219) of our total homeless children count, many of which are believed to be on the streets or in quasi-living conditions. Coordination between schools, shelters, community action agencies, and other service organizations serving the homeless has dramatically improved over the past two years with the development of Chapter 33, Iowa School Rules and Initiatives related to the Federal McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. However, a 1992 survey of our homeless in Iowa indicates that approximately 84% of the homeless school age children are now attending school (16% of our homeless remain out of school). Over 90% of our reported pre-school homeless children are in some type of pre-school education experience (note that this figure is highly representative of Head Start initiatives in Community Action Agencies who are also serving shelters and transition housing projects).

Iowa remains in the top 5 states in the country with the lowest dropout rates (status rates*) for persons age 16 through 19 (U.S. Department of Education, 1992). The five states with the lowest dropout rates include: North Dakota (4.3), Minnesota (6.1), Wyoming (6.3), Iowa (6.5) and Nebraska (6.6). Nationally, the incidence of dropping out has fallen over the past decades, just as it has in Iowa. Nationally, students in grades 10-12 living in low-income families are more likely to drop out than their suburban counterparts. However, the majority of dropouts nationally are now white (as in Iowa), and come from middle and high income families (57% white, 59% from suburban or non-metropolitan areas, 64% from middle or high income households). The status dropout rates for Hispanics range from 2 to 5 times those of whites and blacks in the nation as a whole and within regions. The high school completion rate for 21 and 22 year olds in the nation in 1991 was 85.7% and 95% of those students held a regular diploma; the remaining 5% of the high school completers received some type of alternative credential (Adult Education programs, public and private alternative schools).

Iowa serves many of its dropouts via alternative schools and adult education programs (Beginning Adult Basic Education, Intermediate Adult Basic Education, GED/Adult Secondary Education, English As A Second Language, Workplace Literacy, and programs in institutionalized settings - corrections, Job Corps Center, Sheltered Workshops). In the calendar year 1992, one thousand three hundred fourteen (1314) students aged 16 to 19 were GED candidates. As well, another 1601 adults (aged 21-60+) were GED candidates (Iowa Department of Education, January 20,

* [Note: Status rates represent how many individuals share the status of dropout regardless of when they dropped out.]

1993). In the same year, 2483 dropouts were served in alternative schools supported by increased allowable growth. These numbers total 3797 for the age group 16-19, representing over 75% of the 1991 Iowa dropouts (5030). Since the numbers indicated do not include dropouts served in programs other than those supported by increased allowable growth, it is assumed that nearly 85% of Iowa dropouts are being contacted and served via some existing resources. Not all students are successful however (approximately 60% in alternative schools and 91% in GED testing including re-testing). As well, we have a backlog of individuals who have not completed a high school education. Therefore, 1990 census indicates that approximately 19% of Iowa's adult population 18 years of age and older lack high school diplomas or its equivalent (1990 census). The majority of our population without a high school education are aged 25 or older (353,800 or 17% of the total population). Those aged 16 to 19 not enrolled in school and not having a high school diploma or its equivalent represent .5% (10,631) and those aged 20 to 24 represent 1.5% (30,861). (1990 Census Summary Tape, file 3A, State of Iowa). Given the present level of services and support within adult education and existing growth in support for potential dropouts (programs for at-risk youth pre K-14) the 90% completion rate (statewide goal for the year 2000) may be accomplished with most but not all of our existing school districts and not with our population as a whole. Moreover, given our present adult population without a high school diploma (384,661) and existing service support (serving 8,350 per year), it will take adult education 46 years of GED program preparation and testing to

catch up with everyone or 21 years to reach the 90% level with perhaps our most critical adult population (those of work force age 16-60). Resources would have to be increased at least 2 times existing levels to achieve our 90% objective with all by the year 2000.

Cost of Dropping Out

The costs of dropping out of school include a reduction in personal income, increased welfare burdens due to higher unemployment rates (over 2 times that of graduates), increased risk of incarceration, deceleration in human growth and potential, and reduced sense of control over one's life (Veale, James R., 1990). Iowa dropouts can expect significantly reduced incomes amounting to at least \$340,000 over their lifetime and approximately a 13-15 thousand dollar annual income. Accordingly, the state treasury loses tax dollars amounting to 1.2 million annually for each group of dropouts (total annual dropouts) which is compounded as the number of dropouts increases. The increase in welfare burden due to higher unemployment amounts to approximately 2.4 million per year for any given group of dropouts. Increased risk of incarceration appears to be at least 3 times that of graduates. At least 50% of our inmates have not completed high school or its equivalent. The cost for keeping a person incarcerated for one year in Iowa is 18-19 thousand dollars. The deceleration of human growth and potential is reflected in lower cognitive skill levels, reduced options for economic progress and restricted social networks. Those with the least amount of education or ability (math or reading) are often passed up or discounted as new opportunities arise in the workplace (Iowa Department of Education, Proclamations of the First Adult Literacy Congress, Sept. 7, 1990, Des Moines, Iowa). Reduced sense of control of one's life is reflected in the feelings of dropouts, indicating that luck rather than hard work is more important in obtaining success in life. Therefore they are less likely to participate in volunteer activities, take initiative in the workplace or participate in the political process.

The costs of failing to educate our youth to high school completion are awesome (up to six times the cost for education). The costs can be turned into savings in state revenues with appropriate and effective social programs. If viewed over the lifetime of a student, the savings can be quite impressive -- both in quantitative and human terms. [NOTE: The information on cost is taken from Veale, James R., "The Costs of Dropping Out of School and The Productivity Benefits of Returning and Graduating: A Survey of Iowa's Alternative School Graduates from 1987-89," November, 1990, and the November 1990 executive summary of the same.]

Potential Dropouts

Our most recent study of 285 rural Iowa schools representing 81,740 students indicates that 10 to 25% of in-school youth are at risk of not succeeding (Potential Dropouts, Licklider, Barbara L., "Effectiveness of Rural Iowa Middle and High School Programs for Students At Risk," Research Report, September, 1992). Other projections based on dropout surveys indicate that up to 30% of our in-school youth are potential dropouts and need additional support to succeed. This 30% figure does not include special education populations which constitute 10.17% of our in-school students aged 6 to 22 (see Appendix B). These projections are considered very conservative because they concentrate only on academic failure criteria. If criteria beyond academic failure were used, the statistics would be much higher.

Basic Human Needs

Our data indicate that the basic needs of our children are not being satisfied and these needs will have to be addressed in order for education to be effective. Our fact sheet on education (see Appendix B) indicates over 4,500 children in foster care, increased child abuse to over 7,000 cases in 1992, child poverty at 14% statewide, 1 in 5 families headed by a single parent and increased out-of-wedlock births. Each of these social phenomena re-present threats to the basic needs of our students, in particular that of poverty.

Primary and preventive health services are one of three top requests of our students for help (Veale, James and Morley, Raymond, "School Based Youth Services Program: Year End Report, 1991-92," February 1993). The top three include health services, individual help with school responsibilities, and human services including mental health assistance. Requests for health services equals or exceeds requests for help with school responsibilities. Requests for health care vary widely but are primarily represented by reproductive care, exams and screening, and acute illness. The ability of our schools and agencies to handle the number and complexity of our requests is judged as inadequate (needing to be doubled at minimum) and is developing into the need for increased person power to do case management (connecting children and families to services so help is provided) and to deliver services. This phenomena of high request and inadequate help appears to have the potential to get worse as schools expand existing school nurse responsibilities and nurse/pupil ratios and receive minimum support from school social workers employed in area education agencies to primarily serve disabled youth. However, our existing data indicate that as we increase support for school health and case management to attend to basic human needs, school performance increases, dropouts decrease, and attendance improves (Veale and Morley, 1993).

Statewide statistics such as these are sobering and very serious, indicating social costs of at least six times the annual cost of educating our students. They represent the basis for instituting total community collaboration for the future with respect and acknowledgement of our goal to reduce dropouts.

Policies and Practices in Local Schools

What is being provided for students in our present arrangement of schooling is not all good. Our major delivery systems (instruction, discipline, support services, student activities, school/community relations) contain policies and practices that, in some cases, contribute to school failure rather than success (Department of Education, Inventory of Policies and Practices Related to Student Failure and Dropping Out - 1989). We have isolated ten top concerns of students that have definite implications for school improvement/restructuring. These ten represent the top concerns of over 50 possible practices that do contribute to student failure. They are as follow: lecturing, no adjustments to learning style, lack of interest in student attendance, lack of being helped to establish a feeling of belonging, overwhelming homework assignments, lack of rewards/success,

lack of caring about student work, little or no individual help, overwhelming full schedule of classes, and unfair/inequitable discipline and punishment. Seven of these top ten concerns as documented by over 500 dropouts and a professional task force relate directly to classroom/instructional experiences which implies that a primary power of reducing school dropouts remains with the classroom teacher and the environment created within classrooms.

Major reports and studies emphasizing educational reform in the early 1980's (1981-1983) cited a need for increasing academic requirements. Iowa schools did so accordingly (1982-1988) by increasing the number of courses/credits needed for graduation in math, science, social studies, and language. The increased requirements were paralleled by a gradual increase in dropouts in Iowa from 1983-1989. The concern regarding increased requirements was that the increased demand would push more students out of school unless support services were provided to assist potential dropouts. Research did verify that there was a statistically significant relationship between increased dropout rate in Iowa and increased number of math, science, English and social studies units required for high school graduation (Morley, Connie A., Dropouts and Educational Reforms, August, 1991). This same research also verified that changing the organizational structure (3 to 4 year high school) of a school accounts for some of the increase in male dropouts in Iowa and "change in organizational structure" interacts with increased requirements and other factors to increase dropout rates. Therefore, this research further verifies that the overall organization and delivery of education in each district in Iowa does somewhat, and in some cases significantly, contribute to students dropping out. It specifically implies that districts should be examined independently to identify what organization and delivery factors are truly contributing to dropouts.

Iowa students (elementary, middle school and high school; including at-risk youth) have identified what makes a good day for them in school and what gives them a sense of achievement and power. There is unprecedented agreement between students at all levels (elementary -secondary, low achievers-high achievers) that they want cooperative learning, increased interaction, problem-solving experiences, leadership responsibilities, mentoring relationships, conflict resolution responsibilities, and other school improvement initiatives now being implemented. Over all, students support school improvement initiatives and have indicated that these initiatives help them to perform better and motivate them to attend rather than reject school (Morley, Raymond, "Restructuring Education Through Listening to and Involving Our Children," January, 1993).

A 1992 Iowa research study involving 700 teachers indicates that the vast majority of teachers and administrators agree that policies and practices should be constantly examined to determine if they need to be changed. Over 75% agree that scheduling and teaching methods should be examined and changed where needed to help meet student needs. There is some support for examining and considering grading practices, grouping practices, educational programs/requirements, and course offerings and content to help meet the needs of students (Licklider, Barb, 1992 - see Appendix C).

In short, our information on policies and practices and input from students indicate that broad-based school improvement initiatives can make a difference in improving student success and positive feelings toward schooling. If negative policies and practices are reviewed in each district

and changed, our dropout rates can be reduced. Moreover, teachers and administrators do believe change in policies and practices is needed and should be expected.

Summary

Every area in the state represented by Area Education or Community College boundaries experiences dropouts from high schools. The dropout is primarily a phenomena of grades 9-12 and includes all economic levels, ethnic populations, and genders. Minority populations are more highly represented than the white majority. The heaviest magnitude of dropouts can be isolated to 30 counties, 74 school districts and 5 merged areas (Area Education/Community College Boundaries) in the state. Our minority populations are growing and are disproportionately more highly represented in our dropout population.

Existing and projected future social problems such as reduced health services and increased child abuse will place more pressure on schools to attend to basic human needs and in-school support services for up to 30% of the future school populations, not counting our 10% disabled school population. The resulting cost for support services for dropouts can exceed 6 times what Iowa now provides to educate its youth. Support for community collaboration will be a “must” to reach our 90% completion goal. Policies and practices within schools continue to contribute to student failure requiring school restructuring and newly developed teacher training initiatives.

The goal to reach a 90% high school completion rate by the year 2000 is now being achieved by 50% of our counties, 27% of our merged areas and 70% of our school districts. The likelihood of reaching the goal for all areas of the state for future elementary and secondary students will require intensive independent and area wide planning within targeted districts, counties, and merged areas. Our backlog of adults who have not achieved a high school education is high and the probability of reaching the 90% goal with all Iowans by the year 2000 is not likely unless resources are increased dramatically (2 times existing levels) for adult education.

The goal of reaching a zero dropout rate needs further study especially with respect to the ability of our dropouts. We simply do not have research that gives us a realistic perspective of the competitive ability of all our dropouts, their need for special education and non-competitive working environments, and other support. This type of research will be needed to seriously consider the implications and suggestion of a 100% completion rate or zero dropout.

PROGRAMS - STUDENT OUTCOMES AND EXISTING SUPPORT

At-Risk Standard

All Iowa school districts must now have a plan in place to provide support services for at-risk students K-12 (281--12.5(13) Provisions for At Risk Students). The plan should include nine components at each education level (elementary, middle, high school). The nine components include: strategies for identification, special instructional assistance, school-based support services, appropriate counseling services, coordination with community-based support services agencies, strategies for involving parents, involvement of and in-service for all school personnel,

compliance with federal and state nondiscrimination legislation, and provisions for monitoring behavioral, social, and academic improvements. The nine components represent the structure that is used for local planning and compliance reviews. The standard is consistent with current research and supports comprehensive and consistent support services over time which is needed to produce productive and successful students and reduce dropouts.

MOA (Methods of Administration) reviews across 30 school districts in Iowa in 1991 indicated that over 90% of our districts now have a written plan but the plans do not include all nine components at all levels. Local administrators, for the most part, do not assume direct leadership responsibility but pass it on to teachers and counselors who have no authority to exercise influence across all levels within a district. Moreover, many administrators have not instituted initiatives to study and create in-depth awareness of the at-risk standard and have not developed evaluation systems to monitor activity within the district. Consequently, planning and implementation remain fragmented with emphasis on one level or another depending on the teacher or counselor assigned, their knowledge of the standard and guidelines, the amount of time they get to plan and coordinate, and the resources assigned. In many situations, administrators and others do not indicate that they have knowledge that comprehensive guidelines exist. In most instances, an overall evaluation of what is occurring and what effect it is having on at-risk students is nonexistent -- review and reflection on a comprehensive basis does not occur in an organized fashion. Sporadic evaluation is occurring. Time and technical assistance to establish organized monitoring and implementation is needed in the majority of our districts and would particularly be reasonable in our 74 targeted districts with dropout rates exceeding the state average.

A 1992 Iowa research report (Licklider, 1992) conducted across 700 teachers and 292 principals indicates that only 25% of our teachers agreed that they know how to teach at-risk students. Only 19% of the teachers reported that they have adequate training and preparation to work effectively with students at-risk and only 16% agreed they had the ability to help a student overcome home circumstances that put him/her at risk. Only 54% of the teachers indicated that they believe every student is reachable. However, 93% of our teachers indicate a willingness to learn more about what puts students at risk and that they need to learn and apply strategies to meet the needs of students at risk. Over 85% indicate that they can be counted on to help students achieve, even if it inconveniences them.

Overall, teachers expect district leaders to address the issue of students at risk. A strong majority (77%) agree that district administrators should lead efforts to develop programs for at-risk students and provide the resources necessary to help students.

Despite the flaws we have in implementing the at-risk standard and the deficiencies we have in staff development and teacher training, many support services have been implemented K-12. For instance, support and care teams have been established in the majority of school districts at varying levels which focuses individualized attention on students who need assistance to succeed. All districts who have been monitored identify at-risk children and do attempt to provide some assistance. Our most common input is that the resources we have both in school and out (community agencies such as public health) are not enough to even begin to address student and family difficulties. We have no data to comprehensively substantiate the magnitude

of this dilemma. Specific instances where data are available indicate for example that mental health assistance needs to be doubled (Veale, 1993). The impact of the standard needs to be further studied in both rural and urban settings especially with regard to the impact of restricted resources. The main point here is that our existing standard is resulting in additional support for at-risk students and does serve as a major baseline for motivating local communities to act and for guiding local professionals. The resulting existing services are contributing to a lower dropout rate and increased student success.

Increased Allowable Growth

Iowa has allowed its public school districts to develop supplemental programs and support services under increased allowable growth, Chapter 257, Iowa Code. This source of support has assisted over 130 school districts since 1984 to develop and improve programs for dropouts and potential dropouts. This process is or has been used by the majority of districts with significant dropout problems and is identified as contributing to reduced dropouts, improved achievement and social development, and improved career development for Iowa's dropouts and potential dropouts (since 1980 our dropout rates have been reduced from a 3.13 to a 2.3 annual percentage rate in 1992). Presently, one hundred five districts are seeking assistance under this process to serve dropouts and potential dropouts. They will serve nearly 12,000 students. Nearly 9,000 students will be provided supplementary assistance to succeed in ongoing programs and 3,000 will be served via alternative high schools. Basically, the cost for supplemental assistance will approximate the equivalent of 1.4 the district cost per pupil. In 1991, dropout rates were reduced in districts with prevention programs by .76 percent. Forty-three percent of the students served increased their grade point average. Forty-three percent improved their attendance rates and forty-seven percent of the students identified as having truancy problems decreased their truancy. Approximately 45 percent of the alternative school graduates pursued post-secondary training. Therefore, this financial support system (increased allowable growth) is perceived as helping to reduce student failure and has allowed Iowa to be in the top 5 states in the nation with low dropout rates. The support system is unique in that it is not competitive and allows all districts to develop comprehensive flexible programming needed to address the complex problems of our at-risk youth including contractual services from community service agencies to satisfy basic human needs, staff development to improve the capacities of teachers to provide help and the resources necessary to assist teachers in their work. No other state in the nation has a system as complete (non-competitive and comprehensive) as Iowa that allows everyone the opportunity to address student needs -- if wanted. This opportunity is rare and dynamic because it naturally encourages the potential of all Iowans to be involved rather than a select few. Within it lies a good deal of the solution to our future success with dropouts and students demonstrating low performance. It represents our best bet for resources to reach our goal of a 90% graduation success rate for all districts by the year 2000 and to maintain the rate. All Iowa citizens need to realize this however, to allow district administrators to exercise the option (support is largely generated via property taxes and programs require local school board approval).

Supplemental Weighting and Regionalization

Small communities with small school districts in Iowa have a less pronounced dropout rate but still experience students dropping out (.79 to 1.34 dropout rate for schools under 250 up to K-12

enrollment of 999). They do not individually afford the comprehensive services and programs required to serve dropouts. Shared programs on a regional basis allow them this service and are provided for via supplemental weighting (257.11, Iowa Code) and cooperative agreements (Chapter 28-E, Iowa Code). Five programs for dropouts have developed under this system in the past four years between four community colleges (Iowa Lakes, Iowa Valley, Iowa Western, and Des Moines Area) and school districts within the community college boundaries. Des Moines community college and related districts represents the most broad based initiative with two program centers (Newton and Indianola) serving 205 students from 15 districts within area 11 (I-35, Winterset, Pleasantville, Carlisle, Indianola, Martensdale-St. Mary's, Norwalk, Southeast Warren, Baxter, Colfax, Lynnville-Sully, Newton, PCM, Knoxville and Pella). This regionalization utilizing a shared program is allowing districts to cut dropout rates by serving potential dropouts and pulling students back into school who otherwise would not return. It represents an option that smaller districts never would have on their own and constitutes a quality strategy for future service planning considering the geographic location of our dropouts, existing reorganization of school districts, strategic plans for the delivery of services from area education agencies, and the marked need for increased vocational education opportunities (the number one need reported by local districts serving dropouts is assistance to improve vocational education opportunities - "Making a Difference: A Report on Program Implementation and Student Outcomes for Dropout and Dropout Prevention Programs 1990-91 School Years, March 1992). Supplemental weighting is considered vital to starting programs, providing the necessary resources needed for quality services, and providing a solution for transportation needs. Linkages between community colleges and local schools is also vital to emphasize maximum options for vocational education. Existing shared programs do utilize the 1.48 weighting presently allowed and some may need additional assistance to assure all the necessary support students require such as day care for teenage mothers and vocational training. The 1.48 funding level is needed at least for the first three years of program development. Further research is needed to determine if the level can be dropped to a lower level after three years.

Consortiums

Area 11 has formed a consortium of districts (21) supported via shared funding and planning from all member districts. The consortium serves as a support network between districts to address dropouts and other at-risk students. It also supports staff to do outreach contacts with dropouts to facilitate continuing their education via linking them to community services and schools within the area. The consortium also plans regional staff development programs to improve the capacity of teachers and administrators to serve dropouts and potential dropouts. The consortium serves to continue to focus member schools on the dropout problem and other issues such as low student performance. This continuous focus and review process is needed to maintain a constant service delivery which will be needed to achieve a 90% or better high school graduation success rate within all areas of the state. Incentives to develop similar initiatives in other areas such as area 15 (six counties exceeding or nearing the state average dropout rate) deserves consideration for future impact.

Existing Attendance Expectations and Our Tragic Education Timeline

Our expectation for compulsory school attendance to the age of 16 communicates a false message and encourages false hopes for many unwary, disenchanted, poorly directed, unsuccessful youth. It implies that students can quit school at age 16 and expect to do OK because they are old enough. If they are employed, they are more likely to be earning less than 2/3 of that of a high school graduate. Dropouts are also six to nine times more likely to be incarcerated.

Administrators across Iowa who are letting students know that they cannot quit school until they are 16 because its against the law are indicating that it helps students rethink their thoughts regarding quitting or dropping out of high school. Dropout statistics also indicate that the number of ninth grade dropouts has declined over the past two years. Apparently, if its against the law to quit, it helps some students to stay in school and gives the school some more time to help the students.

This information implies that, perhaps, we should expect students to stay in school until they complete and set our compulsory school attendance at graduation age, be that at age 16 or beyond 21. In other words, compulsory attendance could be guided more by successful completion rather than age with exceptions due to health or other uncontrollable situations. This position would communicate to our students that education is important and complete individual control is achieved by graduation rather than age.

Without question, research verifies that each individual's development is dependent on inherited characteristics and environmental experiences. The time scale of development varies tremendously and can be as much as five years difference in early years. Research also verifies that learning potential continues to death (Caine, Renate Nummela. Caine, Geoffrey. 1991). Nevertheless, the timeline for education in Iowa remains rigid in that students must perform and be promoted from grade to grade and should complete high school by the age of 17 or 18, therefore schedules have been established and required accordingly, regardless of the ability and readiness of our students. Moreover, no state aid is realized for students beyond the age of 21. Therefore, students have been encouraged to leave and pursue adult education if possible. In short, our timeline within policy, practice and legislation naturally causes student failure, lack of high school completion and deflated self-esteem. It also has sent a consistent message to students and families that schooling is available, but exceptions to the schedule for the individual are not encouraged nor positively accepted. In addition, it has set the expectations of business and industry personnel leading them not to accept the lagger or late bloomer with a GED with the same enthusiasm.

The passage of House File 646 - an act to permit school districts to provide educational programs to persons who are beyond the age prescribed as school age - will help to establish a new timeline for education in Iowa -- a timeline that is forgiving, realistic, and more consistent with research implications. Iowa will need time to adjust its education program accordingly as we move toward the year 2000. In the meantime, we can be quite confident that House File 646 will contribute to reduced dropouts and greater opportunity for student success.

Choices for Alternative Education

Research in alternative education supports choice. If students and parents are given alternatives (i.e. different ways to accomplish the same goal) to pursuing a high school education, positive results occur: decreased dropouts, increased attendance, decreased truancy, fewer behavior problems, positive attitudes toward school, increased parent involvement, and improved achievement (Young, Timothy, 1990). Iowa legislation and rules are supporting school districts and parents in providing many possibilities and options which include but are not limited to: home schooling, open enrollment, alternative schools, private schooling, talented and gifted programs, special schools for the disabled, Adult Education-GED, Job Corps, shared programs and teachers, lab schools on a college campus, 2 x 2 and other vocational program linkages, post-secondary enrollment options, summer schools, and special means for school districts to waive standards to experiment with schooling. Choice within Iowa schools is growing and has contributed to our ability to stabilize the dropout situation. Choice in particular is allowing us to serve a diverse population with diverse interests and abilities. If we eliminated just two of our choices, alternative schools and GED, we would annually put nearly 15,000 students of high school age on the street with little hope. Therefore, the magnitude of the impact that choice offers our students and families appears incredible and highly significant.

Corrections

We are reaching into adult and youth correctional and detention facilities to provide remedial reading and math instruction (Chapter 1), continuation of schooling (282.30), preparation for GED and career development and training (280A), and completion of college credits leading toward advanced post-secondary degrees (two and four year colleges). Chapter 1, GED preparation and the continuation programs under 282.30 in particular contribute to the high school completion of our corrections and detention facilities populations. Nevertheless, the services provided are limited and not equal across facilities. For instance, Chapter 1 funds are limited via federal guidelines, do not get channeled into all facilities (serves six facilities - three adult and three juvenile) and affect approximately 34% of the eligible populations in adult corrections and 70% in juvenile corrections. In addition, inherent difficulties in placement and release of clients in corrections and detention facilities interfere with the continuation of education services (completion of education experiences is not a priority factor in releasing clients). Assessing and tracking the educational development of clients make education cumbersome and represent primary barriers to our ability to provide effective services that lead to completion of a high school education program. Moreover, follow-up support for clients to continue their education remains minimal upon release from juvenile facilities.

Productivity Outcome

Although Iowa and the nation have identified the goal of a 90% high school completion rate by the year 2000, the productivity of our students remains the major issue by business, industry, labor, community governments, and community citizens at large. Assumed within our goal, at least for dropouts, is that completion of high school will increase productivity or at least provide the potential to do so. However, research verifies that graduation from high school can occur without enough preparation to become productive (SCANS, 1991). Therefore, "increasing the capacity to be productive" is identified as a major objective for programs for potential dropouts and dropouts and "being productive" is the primary outcome suggested for all students involved.

This suggestion allows for all students to be recognized as valuable regardless of graduation status, provides students a purpose for continuing their education to high school completion and beyond, focuses the intent of creating alternatives for students -- to increase their capacity to be productive upon leaving school -- naturally incorporates the concept of career/vocational preparation in all education planning, and facilitates individual educational planning within a competency-based/outcomes-based agenda allowing flexibility for broad based interests and varying abilities. "Productivity" is the state of being engaged in activities that benefit the individual and others in the community and can be measured utilizing at least eight specific indicators:

- 1) employment (competitive or non-competitive), income generated by employment, personal satisfaction from employment
- 2) post-secondary education (high school graduation, advanced training)
- 3) volunteer activity
- 4) participation in the political process
- 5) homemaking/child rearing
- 6) talents and skills used in job/leisure (propensity of the individual to be productive)
- 7) public assistance participation
- 8) penal system involvement

The eight indicators include positive indicators (1-6) and negative indicators (7-8) associated with productivity. They are considered to provide an informative and complete picture of a person's or population's ability and are useful in broad based planning and structuring Iowa's future as well as in guiding educational programs.

The following specific behaviors are determined critical in assessing the productive propensity of individuals:

- 1) ability to learn
- 2) verbal communication skill
- 3) numerical computation skill
- 4) written communication skill
- 5) nonverbal performance skill (physical, musical, spacial, kinesthetic)
- 6) intrapersonal skills: punctuality, attendance, initiative, responsible, follow through
- 7) interpersonal skills: cooperation, flexibility, approach behavior
- 8) quantity of work
- 9) quality of work

These behaviors are guideposts for directing and developing school curriculum that will propel students to being productive. [NOTE: The productivity definitions and indicators identified here are based on Veale, James, "The Costs of Dropping Out of School and The Productivity Benefits of Returning and Graduating," November, 1990. Modifications were made based on current Brain Based Education, Alternative Education, and Vocational Education research.]

The productivity indicators and behaviors identified above were developed through research in Iowa involving alternative schools for dropouts over two years (see Appendix D). The indicators represent the state of the art in baseline data for future research to monitor student development.

As well, the indicators are being incorporated into evaluation guidelines for local schools to build systems for student monitoring and reporting. For the past two years personnel from thirty-two different school districts have devoted their time to refining a reporting process that incorporates indicators of productivity. Their efforts have resulted in a flexible evaluation format that accommodates multiple means of reporting and is now being used for year-end reporting for schools involved in the increased allowable growth process serving dropouts and potential dropouts. More research and effort is needed to realize a statewide consensus on productivity as being our primary goal and everyone collecting and reporting consistent reliable information on student development. Nevertheless, a structure has been developed and alternative schools are monitoring and reporting academic, personal/social and career/vocational student performance via identified outcomes -- productivity being the primary purpose. This work should continue to be used and refined within alternative education programs and schools in Iowa and may function as a base of information for school improvement initiatives across the board. As stated earlier, research in this area needs to be conducted accordingly.

A PLAN ADDRESSING A ZERO DROPOUT RATE BY THE YEAR 2000

Introduction

This report and plan is based on current research and practice not including the potential impact of existing pre-school, early elementary and middle school programs designed to impact at-risk youth. Iowa has invested heavily in establishing model pre-school and early elementary programs and the development and implementation of these programs should impact future dropout rates. The number of special support activities generated in local districts via the state standard for at-risk, model pre-school and elementary programs (279, Iowa Code) and other influences is unknown although believed to be substantial (in the thousands based on analysis of existing programs applying for increased allowable growth under 257.38-41 and other sources). As well, the impact of these activities on future dropout rates is not known Existing dropout trends indicate that rates are being affected positively by the activities and are being reduced. Consequently, the costs projected in this plan may be affected accordingly and require lower appropriations than projected for supplemental weighting and increased allowable growth at the secondary level. However, lower appropriations at the secondary level may be offset by increased appropriations at the early elementary level.

A definite pattern now exists in funding support services for at-risk youth, i.e. schools are requesting assistance for support at all levels, pre-k to 12. This pattern will continue into the future since students become at risk of failure at different times in their development and school experiences. The pattern implies the need for a means of funding for support assistance at all levels.

This report is considered a beginning in responding to 256.9(44). Considerable information regarding the dropout problem in Iowa has been assembled in its contents. However, broad-based consideration by all Iowa professional educational organizations, support service agencies, and business and industry groups needs to occur in the immediate future. As well, the issues

brought forth in 256.9(44) deserve to be revisited every three to five years to assure that the issue is being addressed comprehensively and consistently. In the meantime, the existing recommendations need to be considered seriously and resources provided accordingly.

Plan

1. We must maintain the ability of local districts to increase allowable growth (257.38-41) to provide support services to assist at-risk students to succeed. If we do not maintain the increased allowable growth option, then it must be replaced by another plan which provides districts the resources to serve up to 30% of our student enrollment with support services. Failure to do this will result in an increased dropout rate and reversing the progress we have made up to now reaching a 90% graduation success rate in 70% of our districts and 50% of our counties and being among the top five states in the nation with the lowest dropout rates.

Continuation of increased allowable growth under 257.38-41, Iowa Code and Chapter 61, Iowa School Rules provides the following:

- * a plan for use of competency-based outcomes and measures including academic, personal-social, and career/vocational development
- * the flexibility of local communities to individually and/or collectively provide a variety of programs or separate schools for students to satisfy graduation requirements
- * requires individual plans for all students and no less than an annual review of the plans
- * requires a student identification process utilizing multiple criteria at all education levels (K-12)
- * gives districts the opportunity to develop materials to use to guide students who consider dropping out or choose to dropout
- * requires support services including family support services and treatment or counseling for social needs
- * requires an assessment of the student's employment skills and plans to improve those skills
- * requires a plan for serving potential dropouts (at-risk children and youth) and dropouts (those returning and those not returning to the same school)
- * requires interagency and business, industry and labor cooperation including representation of services agencies and business, industry and labor on advisory and planning committees/boards
- * requires an analysis of local policies and practices that may be contributing to student failure
- * requires a local analysis of local programs and services to identify needs
- * requires an annual written evaluation of programs and student outcomes based on academic, personal/social and career/vocational development
- * provides students the opportunity to return to school and graduate after dropping out

Currently a part-time consultant support position within the Department of Education is provided to operationalize the continuation of increased allowable growth for dropouts and potential dropouts. It would be necessary to increase this position to full-time support to reach our goal of 0% based dropout as well as our ability to continue the research needed to support our efforts.

2. Regionalization and/or shared programming must be continued to adequately provide alternative programs and support services for small school districts and other districts with low dropout rates. Supplemental weighting (257.11) now provides districts additional funds (up to 1.48) to cover the excess costs of sharing. Failure to continue supplemental weighting will minimize services for dropouts from rural schools (43% of our dropout population) who cannot afford separate schools or programs. Likewise, it will discourage area wide planning and coordination with community colleges which will be needed to maximize the career development of our dropouts. Moreover, it will discourage and minimize the capacity of local districts to do area wide planning and programming between school districts.

Supplemental weighting, if maintained for dropouts, represents an incentive we will need to target high dropout areas and refine programs and services for minority and disabled populations in particular. If we do not maintain the supplemental weighting option for shared programs for dropouts, we will have to develop another means to develop regionalized/shared programs and specific services for our minority dropout population. The continuation of supplemental weighting for shared programs for dropouts must carry with it the requirement of local districts to spend the state funds generated (by the re-enrollment of dropouts) on the shared program that will benefit the dropouts and/or on related services carried on within the district that contribute directly to the success of the students in the shared program. This requirement will help guarantee that funding is used properly and will help direct local audits as a means of accountability. This requirement will also necessitate an amendment to 257.11 and/or to corresponding guidelines for implementation.*

3. We must promote smaller support units and personal interaction within the delivery of education in districts. National research supports that smaller support units make a big difference especially when combined with techniques to improve teacher/pupil interaction (Wehlage,G., 1990). Smaller support units provide for a greater opportunity to express and show concern for the whole student, providing a more supportive environment, and instituting a sense of community and shared responsibility. All of these characteristics represent the things that Iowa children say makes a good day for them with a teacher and classmates and gives them a feeling of achievement and sense of purpose for wanting to go to school (Morley, 1993). The impetus to create smaller support units may not require additional appropriations beyond what is now provided for restructuring. Models now exist to provide some of the leadership necessary to create smaller support units (personal mentorships, big brother and sister programs, family clusters within grade levels, etc. represent good examples). However, resources for restructuring must be directed accordingly.
4. Model program development should be encouraged in districts and areas not now meeting the 90% high school completion rate and particularly in districts with high minority representation

in their enrollments and dropout statistics. Iowa's minority population is growing and the representation of minorities in dropout statistics exceeds minority representation in the general population for every population except Caucasian. Our success rate with minorities in existing alternative schools is considered poor and needing attention. We have at least eight districts

* [Note: Supplemental weighting for shared programs for dropouts could lose its effect in districts experiencing deficits in the general budget. Deficits in the general budget cause general program weaknesses which contribute to higher dropout rates. Therefore, in effect, special programs for dropouts can be undermined.]

with minority enrollments over 3,000 and with high minority representation in their dropout statistics that represent prime districts for model development. They need assistance in addressing the minority dropout issue and represent a primary resource for helping at least 89 Iowa districts with minority enrollments over 500 to explore how to reduce dropouts within specific minority populations. A special appropriation of no less than 1.6 million for each of four years would allow the development of special model programs in at least six districts (\$200,000 per year per district) to search for means to reduce dropouts in large districts, specifically reduce dropouts within minority populations and demonstrate how to create smallness within large schools. As well, the appropriation would provide for two area-wide models (\$200,000) involving community colleges and local districts in an "area high school" endeavor including multiple counties (particularly needed in Areas 9 and 15). These model programs would also establish outcomes-based education utilizing productivity as the primary goal and establishing methods of assessment for the indicators mentioned previously (productivity section of this paper).

5. The coordination of resources for research must be completed to allow the following:
 - a) a complete study of the limitations of our dropout populations to assess their ability to learn and to realistically complete a high school education. This will provide information regarding the realism of a zero dropout rate by the year 2000.
 - b) a study of disabilities within our dropout population and the magnitude of dropouts from existing special education programs and separate schools. This will solidify the extent of the problem and provide baseline information for improving programs for the disabled.
 - c) a comprehensive study of services for dropouts in corrections and detention facilities to accurately assess what will be needed to reach a 90% high school completion rate within these facilities and/or with this population.
 - d) an analysis of policies and practices within our 74 districts with dropout rates exceeding the state average and completion rates below the 90% high school completion goal. This will assist our most troubled districts to refine initiatives to improve student success.
 - e) a productivity study to refine outcomes within alternative schools for dropouts and evaluation methods to measure success. This will refine the process already started via

the increased allowable growth system and perhaps provide direction to outcomes-based education for all schools.

- f) an assessment of the ability of community service agencies to serve all the public school children and their families who need assistance. This will provide a baseline picture of the practicality of linking schools with support service agencies in all areas of the state and the gaps that exist that contribute to being unable to provide support.
- g) a comprehensive study of model programs designed to reduce dropouts from minority populations. This would provide Iowa a baseline of information to create and test methods within model programs to reduce minority dropout representation--a growing concern and future dilemma.
- h) a study of the need for career/vocational technical assistance and resources for serving dropouts in all regions of the state and specifically in Areas 7, 9, 11, 12, and 15.

Each of the above studies is needed to refine our education services and reduce dropouts. Collectively, they represent no less than a \$1,865,000 research agenda which allows \$55,000 for each of seven studies and \$20,000 per district for 74 districts to do policy and practices analysis. Some of these studies can probably be completed through doctoral dissertations and other resources such as the FINE Foundation. However, the completion of the studies should not be left to chance and could be solidified through a special research appropriation for reducing Iowa's dropout rate and/or coordination of existing administrative budgets within education and other state agencies.

- 6. We should test the following assumption: "compulsory school attendance to graduation will decrease dropouts by first assessing the impact on school districts and the state in terms of liability, obligation, and finances, followed by changing our compulsory school attendance law, if warranted, for a minimum of five years to assess its impact on convincing students to stay in school and also test the dilemma it may cause in enforcement." The law could be revisited in five years to assess its impact.
- 7. We must provide for the development of pre-service and inservice training for school personnel and regional support to implement Chapter 281--12.5(13), Iowa Administrative Code provisions for At-Risk Students. Our teachers and administrators indicate that they are not being prepared to meet the needs of our at-risk students. Our area education agencies are receiving no financial support incentives to provide staff development related to serving at-risk youth beyond the pre-school/early elementary level and no funding has been made available to teacher training institutions to do local needs assessments and structure courses to satisfy local staff needs beyond the pre-school/early elementary level. In short, we have great needs and we have created a standard and guidelines that are the very best in the country and offer great promise to increasing student success, but we are providing minimal training to operationalize our standard. At minimum, we should provide 15 AEA's with \$15,000 annually up to the year 2000 to assist districts with staff development and create consortiums for supporting each other. This will increase momentum in each area of the state to reduce dropouts and support the tracking and follow-up of students and require an annual appropriation of \$225,000. Moreover, we should develop incentives (\$100,000 per institution) for creating model training programs in our regent's institutions that are

consistent with and educate professionals on state standards guidelines and legislation as well as satisfy professional needs related to serving our at-risk students. This would require an appropriation of no less than \$300,000 annually for no less than four years.

8. We should expand model School-Based Youth Services Programs to rural areas via continuing the provisions under 279.51(c), Programs for At-Risk Children, Iowa Code. School-Based Youth Services Programs in existing model sites are demonstrating that increased primary health care, mental health care and job training and employment services will increase student achievement and school attendance and will reduce dropouts and encourage dropouts to return to school. Therefore, SBYSP demonstrates promise for future implementation in districts of the size being modeled. However, our existing models do not include our most rural communities. By continuing 279.51(c) we will not increase spending and can expand our model program development in different size districts, in regions of the state not now involved and address provisions for basic human needs within the delivery of education programs. Extended time for expansion of SBYSP will also allow time for developing broad-based community support to continue SBYSP.
9. We should encourage choice for our students and families and encourage the further development of options and alternatives to complete high school such as open enrollment, home schooling, school attendance beyond age 21, etc. Increased choice should reduce our dropouts and increase our chances of success with our at-risk students.
10. We must increase the level of technical assistance given to existing districts to improve career/vocational preparation and encourage districts to engage more fully in this area.
Career/
vocational technical assistance remains the number one concern of alternative schools and programs serving dropouts in Iowa. At minimum, all schools applying for increased allowable growth and supplemental weighting should be encouraged to use their funds for staff development and contractual assistance accordingly. Significant study should be undertaken to identify the magnitude of this concern for the purpose of increasing local support for services accordingly.
11. If we expect to reach the goal of having 90% of Iowa's population as high school graduates or its equivalent by the year 2000, we will have to expand existing person power for adult preparation and testing for the GED and high school equivalency certificates from now to the year 2000. This will result in a temporary expansion cost to the state approximating twice the existing professional person power.* With this projection, existing instructor and management resources would have to handle twice as many students and expansion would include approximately one half again as many instructors and an equal number of outreach persons. The dollar cost would approximate \$5.4 million total or 2.8 million in additional funding from now to the year 2000.

* [Note: Extensive outreach in addition to teaching would have to occur to move reluctant individuals into learning centers for instruction. This projection realizes that many individuals who have not completed a high school education or its equivalent need to be contacted, encouraged, and assisted with enabling plans to move them into a learning experience. As well, many may not have the learning ability to be able to complete a GED as presently designed.]

TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND
FUTURE PLAN APPROPRIATIONS

Recommendation	Additional Annual Cost	No Additional State Appropriation
Continued Increased Allowable Growth 257.38-41		X
Continued Supplemental Weighting for Dropout Programs	3 million (based on a projection involving 30 counties at \$100,000 per program/per county)	
Promoting Smaller Support Units in Restructuring		X
Model Program Development	1.865 million for four years	
Research (7 studies and 74 Policy Analyses)	\$240,000 for each of 8 years, 1993 to the year 2000	
Compulsory School Attendance - 5 year trial		X
Pre-Service and In-Service Training	\$300,000 annually for each of 4 years for Teacher Training Institutions, \$225,000 annually for AEA Staff Development to the year 2000	
Expansion of SBYSP		X
Encourage Choice		X
Increase Technical Assistance in Career/Vocational Development		X
Expand Adult Education	2.8 million annually from now to the year 2000	

TOTALS: This plan would require an immediate annual appropriation of \$2,405,000 to initiate research, model program development and local district policy analysis. Additional appropriations (3 million) realized via supplemental weighting would be needed as new areawide programs are established over an 8 year period. Expanded adult education would require an added 2.8 million.

REFERENCES

- U.S. Department of Labor. "Skills and Tasks for Jobs: A SCANS Report for America 2000." U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992.
- Iowa Department of Education. "What Has Happened to Iowa's GED Graduates: Executive Summary." March, 1992.
- Iowa Association of Alternative Education. "Alternative Education - A Guide to Program Development." August, 1991.
- Morley, Raymond. "Alternative Education." Dropout Prevention Research Reports, National Dropout Prevention Center, April, 1992.
- Morley, Raymond and Veale, James. "Administrative Summary: The Costs of Dropping Out of School and the Productivity Benefits of Returning and Graduating." Iowa Department of Education, November, 1990.
- Stilwill, Ted. "Iowa Education Agencies Statewide AEA Strategic Planning: Proposed Action Plan Activities." Iowa Department of Education, February, 1993.
- Veale, James. "The Costs of Dropping Out of School and the Productivity Benefits of Returning and Graduating: A Survey of Iowa's Alternative School Graduates from 1987 to 1989." Iowa Department of Education, November, 1990.
- Morley, Raymond. "Homeless and At-Risk Information." Iowa Department of Education, 1991.
- Morley, Raymond. "Inventory of Policies and Practices Related to Student Failure and Dropping Out." Iowa Department of Education, 1989.
- Iowa Kids Count. "World Class Futures: Trends in the Well-Being of Iowa Children." Iowa Kids Count, 1991.
- Iowa Department of Education. "The Annual Condition of Education Report." Iowa Department of Education, 1992.
- Morley, Connie A. "Dropouts and Educational Reforms." A Doctoral Dissertation, Drake University, August, 1991.
- Iowa Department of Education. "GED Statistical Reports for Calendar Year 1992." Bureau of Educational and Student Services, January 20, 1993.
- Iowa Department of Education - Steve Boal. "1990 Census Data Reports and Profiles." 1992-93.

- Helvick, Donald A. "Open Enrollment: Report for the 1991-92 School Year." Iowa Department of Education, December, 1992.
- Collins, Kathy. "Assistance in Interpreting HF 455, Iowa's New Compulsory Attendance Law." Iowa Department of Education, August, 1991.
- State of Iowa. "Iowa Code, Chapter 31: Competent Private Instruction and Dual Enrollment." April, 1992.
- Ghan, Guy. "Iowa School Reorganization: Principles and Practices of Reorganization." Iowa Department of Education, 1992.
- Morley, Raymond. "Dropouts and Dropout Prevention Guidelines Including K-3 At-Risk Children." Iowa Department of Education, August, 1991, 1992.
- Iowa Department of Education. "Iowa School Health Services: Results of the 1990 Survey." Iowa Department of Education, July, 1991.
- Wright, Dean and Wright, Susan. "Homelessness in Iowa: the 1992 Summary." Drake University and Iowa Department of Education, 1993.
- Iowa Department of Education. "Public School Dropouts by Race by District." Iowa Department of Education, February, 1993.
- Iowa Department of Education. "Iowa Code 256.9(44)." Iowa Department of Education, 1990.
- Morley, Raymond. "Percentage of At-Risk Students in Iowa Schools." Iowa Department of Education, January, 1993.
- Licklider, Barbara. "Effectiveness of Rural Iowa Middle and High School Programs for Students At Risk." Iowa Department of Education, September, 1992.
- Written communications from Noel Koranda, Southeastern Community College and Dennis Brown, AEA 14. January, 1993.
- State of Iowa. "1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape File 3A." Iowa Department of Education, 1993.
- State of Iowa. "Census Data Center: Iowa Poverty Count Remains Near Decade Low." Iowa Department of Education, 1993.
- Iowa Department of Education. "A Comparison of Iowa's Population Age 18+ Years of Age Lacking a High School Diploma or its Equivalent from 1960-2000." Iowa Department of Education, 1992.

Iowa Department of Education. "School Laws of Iowa." Iowa Department of Education, 1990.

Morley, Raymond. "Restructuring Education through Listening To and Involving Our Children." Iowa Department of Education, 1993.

Caine, Renate Nummela and Caine, Geoffrey. "Teaching and The Human Brain." Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Virginia, 1991.

Ranney, Edward. "Iowa Guidance Surveys." Iowa Department of Education, 1992.

U.S. Department of Education. "Dropout Rates in the United States: 1991." NCES 92-129, U.S. Government Printing Office, September, 1992.

Morley, Raymond and Olson, Sue. "Making a Difference: A Report on Program Implementation and Student Outcomes for Dropout and Dropout Prevention Programs: 1990-91 School Year." Iowa Department of Education, March, 1992, March, 1993.

Veale, James and Morley, Raymond. "School-Based Youth Services Program: Year-End Development Report for 1991-92." Iowa Department of Education, February, 1993.

Personal communications with Eric Sage - Department of Human Services, Donald Wederquist - Iowa Department of Education, James Gould - Iowa Department of Education, Edward Ranney - Iowa Department of Education, Charlotte Burt - Iowa Department of Education, Susan Olson - Iowa Department of Education, February, 1993.

Young, Timothy. 1990. "Public Alternative Education." Teachers College Press.

Gould, James. "Dropouts by Race and Sex: Public Schools - State Totals, 1991-92 Dropout File." Iowa Department of Education, March, 1993.

Wehlage, G., Rutter, R., Smith, G., Lesko, N., and Fernandez, Ricardo. "Reducing the Risk: Schools as Communities of Support." Falmer Press, 1990.

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: 1991-92 Dropout File
- Appendix B: Percentage of At-Risk Students in Iowa Schools
- Appendix C: Research Report: Effectiveness of Rural Iowa Middle and High School Programs for Students at Risk
- Appendix D: Administrative Summary: The Costs of Dropping Out of School and The Productivity Benefits of Returning and Graduating

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ron McGauvran, President, Clinton
Betty L. Dexter, Vice President, Davenport
C. W. Callison, Burlington
Marcia Dudden, Reinbeck
Thomas M. Glenn, Des Moines
Corine A. Hadley, Newton
Francis N. Kenkel, Defiance
Gregory D. McClain, Cedar Falls
Ann W. Wickman, Atlantic

ADMINISTRATION

William L. Lepley, Director and Executive Officer of the
State Board of Education
Mavis Kelley, Special Assistant

**Office of Educational Services for
Children, Families, and Communities**

Sue Donielson, Administrator
Raymond E. Morley, Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability. The Department provides civil rights technical assistance to public school districts, nonpublic schools, area education agencies, and community colleges to help them eliminate discrimination in their educational programs, activities, or employment. For assistance, contact the Bureau of School Administration and Accreditation, Iowa Department of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
DIMENSIONS OF THE DROPOUT PHENOMENA	1
Numbers, Geographic Distribution, Gender and Ethnic Makeup, and Age	1
Dropout Statistics for Iowa Counties and Merged Areas (map)	3
Cost of Dropping Out	5
Potential Dropouts	6
Basic Human Needs	6
Policies and Practices in Local Schools	6
Summary	7
PROGRAMS - STUDENT OUTCOMES AND EXISTING SUPPORT	8
At-Risk Standard	8
Increased Allowable Growth	9
Supplemental Weighting and Regionalization	10
Consortiums	10
Existing Attendance Expectations and Our Tragic Timeline	11
Choices for Alternative Education	12

Corrections	12
Productivity Outcome	12
A PLAN ADDRESSING A ZERO DROPOUT RATE BY YEAR 2000	14
Introduction	14
Plan	15
TABLE OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE PLAN APPROPRIATIONS	20
REFERENCES	21
LIST OF APPENDICES	24