In May of 2007, the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network and Communities In Schools released a major research report, *Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs: A Technical Report*. This newsletter is going to highlight some of the lessons learned from this report, including the major findings; the identified individual risk factors; and some of the exemplary programs that address these risk factors. In this first report, individual and family risk factors have been analyzed; however, in this issue of the newsletter we are focusing on the individual risk factors. In addition, there will be insights into how schools and school districts can use such information as they strive to meet the needs of all children in their schools.

This report was authored by Cathy Hammond, Jay Smink, and Sam Drew of the National Dropout Prevention Center, and Dan Linton of Communities In Schools.

The major findings from *Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs* are summarized here:

- Dropping out of school is related to a variety of factors that can be classified in four areas or domains: individual, family, school, and community factors.
- There is no single risk factor that can be used to accurately predict who is at risk of dropping out.
- The accuracy of dropout predictions increases when combinations of multiple risk factors are considered.
- Dropouts are not a homogeneous group. Many subgroups of students can be identified based on when risk factors emerge, the combinations of risk factors experienced, and how the factors influence them.
- Students who drop out often cite factors across multiple domains, and there are complex interactions among risk factors.
- Dropping out of school is often the result of a long process of disenagement that may begin before a child enters school.
- Dropping out is often described as a process, not an event, with factors building and compounding over time.

As we focus on individual risk factors (see page 2), we can begin the process of identification of students who are more likely to drop out. One of the interesting features of this report is the fact that even with multiple risk factors, most of these students identified do NOT drop out of school. This is compelling because it tells us that there are other things going on in children’s lives that ensure that they do make it through school successfully, graduate, and become productive citizens. It is important to know this so we can collectively design solutions to alleviate the impact that so many risk factors may have on these students.

What are some of those other things? These are found embedded in the family, the school, and the community. The model programs found in the report, 50 in all, have a research base that shows their effectiveness. Using data to make informed decisions about allocation of school and school district resources should be based on what has been shown to work for the population your school or district serves. We have found several of these model programs that have been shown to effectively address some of the specific individual risk factors and have excerpted these for you in the Program Profiles.

We also discuss the ideas behind the development of Dropout Early Warning Systems and how this information can increase your graduation rates.

Knowledge is power, and when we understand what the specific issues are that we are dealing with and the potential of effective solutions to solve them, then we can truly make a difference.

Individual Risk Factors

Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs is the result of a thoroughly researched study undertaken by the National Dropout Prevention Center and Communities In Schools. Led by researcher Dr. Cathy Hammond, this initial report looks at both individual and family risk factors; however, this newsletter is going to focus only on the individual domain.

Listed below are the research-based factors found for individuals.

**Individual Background Characteristics: Learning Disability or Emotional Disturbance**

The individual background characteristic of students found in this review to be a significant predictor of dropping out of school was whether or not the student had a learning disability or emotional disturbance.

Findings from the High School and Beyond survey of the sophomore class of 1980 indicate that putting in more than 15 hours a week on a job increases the likelihood that a student will drop out of school.

**Early Adult Responsibilities: High Number of Work Hours**

Researchers have found that affiliating with high-risk peers who drop out or engage in various types of antisocial behavior increases the risk of dropping out.

**School Engagement: Low Educational Expectations**

Regardless of other behaviors, attitudes, or characteristics, students with low expectations for school attainment in the eighth grade were twice as likely as other students to drop out.

**School Engagement: Lack of Effort**

Students surveyed who reported doing no homework per week were eight times more likely to drop out between the eighth and tenth grades as students doing at least some homework. Students whose teachers reported that they rarely completed homework were six times as likely to drop out.

**School Engagement: Low Commitment to School**

General dislike of school is one of the primary indicators of low commitment to school that has been linked to school dropout.

**School Engagement: No Extracurricular Participation**

In the National Education Longitudinal Study, researchers found that students who reported participating in extracurricular activities in the eighth grade had a dropout rate of 6% as compared to 18% for those who reported not participating in these activities.

**School Behavior: Misbehavior**

School misbehavior was found to be a major predictor of dropout in five of the 12 data sources.

**School Behavior: Early Aggression**

Two studies in this review found that early aggression was a major factor in predicting dropout. In both studies, it was measured by teacher or principal ratings and was collected in either first or seventh grade.

The full report is found on both the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network (www.dropoutprevention.org) and Communities In Schools (www.cisnet.org) Web sites.
NDPC/N Loses a Friend and Supporter

The National Dropout Prevention Center/Network, along with the nation, mourns the loss of Mrs. Ann “Tunky” Riley, wife of the former U.S. Secretary of Education and SC Governor, Richard W. Riley. Mrs. Riley became involved in the National Dropout Prevention Center back in 1987. She chaired the South Carolina Dropout Prevention Network, a group of educators and key community leaders formed to identify those programs currently working with youth in at-risk situations in her home state.

In 2002, the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network established The Governor and Mrs. Richard W. Riley Award of Excellence in Dropout Prevention. Each year at the At-Risk Youth National FORUM, an outstanding South Carolinian is recognized for significant contributions to the advancement of dropout prevention initiatives in the state of South Carolina.

This year’s recipient, Frank E. White, Jr., has served the citizens of this state in the South Carolina Department of Education since 1978. In the late 1980s, Mr. White assisted in the development of and was an original consultant to the agency’s At-Risk Youth Program Section. As a consultant for the Target 2000 Dropout Prevention and Retrieval Programs, Mr. White managed 35 dropout prevention pilot programs with a combined budget of $5.3 million. He is known throughout the state and nation for his in-service programs on dropout prevention, attendance, alternative-education, homelessness, and truancy to community groups, college and university groups, school districts, and schools. He has coordinated efforts to establish, manage, and evaluate 82 alternative education programs and alternative schools.

The Network congratulates Frank on this well-deserved recognition of his work over the past 30 years.

Save the Date!

Once again, the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network will be hosting the Summer Institute on Service-Learning here at Clemson University. Mark your calendars now for June 23-25, 2008, and better yet, go online today to register!

This annual event is always a stimulating three days, and all participants will return home with a wealth of ideas and enthusiasm for the role service-learning can play in dropout prevention.

2008 Richard W. Riley Award

The purpose of the Governor and Mrs. Richard W. Riley Award of Excellence in Dropout Prevention is to identify and bring recognition to an outstanding individual who has made significant contributions to the advancement of dropout prevention initiatives in the state of South Carolina.

This year’s recipient, Frank E. White, Jr., has served the citizens of this state in the South Carolina Department of Education since 1978. In the late 1980s, Mr. White assisted in the development of and was an original consultant to the agency’s At-Risk Youth Program Section. As a consultant for the Target 2000 Dropout Prevention and Retrieval Programs, Mr. White managed 35 dropout prevention pilot programs with a combined budget of $5.3 million. He is known throughout the state and nation for his in-service programs on dropout prevention, attendance, alternative-education, homelessness, and truancy to community groups, college and university groups, school districts, and schools. He has coordinated efforts to establish, manage, and evaluate 82 alternative education programs and alternative schools.

The Network congratulates Frank on this well-deserved recognition of his work over the past 30 years.

Radio Webcast Launched

Solutions to the Dropout Crisis

Solutions to the Dropout Crisis is the name of the new radio Webcast hosted by the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network. The first program was broadcast live on February 26, 2008, and our guest was Dr. Steven Edwards, co-author of the book, The Principal’s Role in Dropout Prevention: Seven Key Principles, (available from the National Dropout Prevention Center).

This program was very well received with questions coming from all over the country. This Webcast, as will all future such programs, is archived in its entirety on the National Dropout Prevention Center Web site and available through iTunes.

Each month on the 4th Tuesday at 3:30 P.M. Eastern Time, the NDPC/N will host another broadcast. On March 25, we will feature Dr. Ray Morley, past winner of the Network Distinguished Leadership and Service Award. Dr. Morley will speak on “Policies and Practices Related to Student Failure and Dropping Out: Tools and Resources.” On April 22, Franklin Schargel will discuss the topic, “From At-Risk To Academic Excellence: What Successful Leaders Do.”

Listeners to the live broadcast have the opportunity to call in and ask questions of our guests. In addition, the information about each Webcast will be on the Web site two weeks prior to the broadcast, so you may send in your questions via email up until noon of the broadcast, to ndpc@clemson.edu.

Watch for future programs on such topics as leadership, bullying, and service-learning, always with a focus on solutions!
Program Profiles

On these pages, the Newsletter will highlight some of the model programs that the NDPC/N – CIS Study reviewed that were shown to be effective. Individual risk factors that are affected by these programs are also included in the descriptions on these pages.

A number of lessons can be gleaned from the research on risk factors and evidence-based programs for practitioners implementing either existing programs or developing new ones. First, multiple risk factors should be addressed wherever possible to increase the likelihood that the program will produce positive results. Research clearly shows that the likelihood of dropping out increases with multiple risk factors and that the effects of these factors may snowball over time. Programs should take this into account and target as many factors as possible.

Second, multiple strategies should also be used to help assure program impact.

Third, when adopting an existing exemplary program, research points to the need for these programs to be fully implemented and to be implemented as they were designed.

Fourth, program planners who develop their own strategies need to use evidence-based strategies proven to impact the risk factors they are addressing and develop strategies based on best practice.

Finally, whether adopting an existing program or developing a new one, practitioners need to use evidence-based strategies to evaluate programs to assure effectiveness.

Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs: A Technical Report spotlights 50 programs that each target multiple risk factors, thus ensuring more effectiveness in preventing dropouts. The programs we have included here will address at least four individual risk factors.

Across Ages

The Across Ages program uses older adults as mentors for youth. Originally designed solely as a school-based program, the program’s design now uses a wide-ranging prevention strategy suitable for a variety of settings during both school time and out-of-school time. The program targets its supports to five domains: the individual, the family, the school, the peer group, and the community. By acting as advocates, challengers, nurturers, role models, and friends, older (age 55 and over) mentors help “at-risk” youth develop awareness, self-confidence, and skills to help resist drugs and overcome obstacles.

Strategies. After-school; Family Engagement; Life Skills Development; Mentoring; Structured Extracurricular Activities

Components. The program includes four primary activities: (1) weekly mentoring of youth by elder mentors; (2) biweekly youth community service activities to residents in nursing homes; (3) classroom-based life skills, problem solving, and substance abuse curricula; and (4) monthly family, cultural, and recreational activities.

Targeted Risk Factors/Groups. Targeted youth are between the ages of 9 and 13 and reside in communities with no opportunities for positive free-time activities and few positive adult role models. They may be in kinship care due to the inability of their birth parents to care for them, often because of incarceration or substance use. They also have poor school performance and attendance.

Individual Risk Factors. (1) high-risk social behavior; (2) poor attendance, (3) low commitment to school, and (4) no extracurricular participation.

Students participating in the full program showed: Decreased alcohol and tobacco use; increased school attendance; and increased positive attitudes toward school and the future.

Contact: Andrea Taylor, PhD, Across Ages Developer, Center for Intergenerational Learning, Temple University, 1601 North Broad Street, USB 206, Philadelphia, PA 19122, Phone: 215.204.6708, Fax: 215.204.3195, Email: ataylor@temple.edu, http://templecil.org/acrossageshome.htm

CASASTART

CASASTART (Striving Together to Achieve Rewarding Tomorrows) is a community-based, school-centered program designed to keep high-risk 8- to 13-year-old youth free of substance abuse and criminal involvement. It seeks to improve communication between children and their families, improve parents’ abilities to manage their children’s behavior, and cultivate the involvement of families with schools and social service agencies. CASASTART promotes collaboration among the key stakeholders in a community or neighborhood and provides case managers to work daily with high-risk children and youth. Parents and students are both primary target populations.

Strategies. Academic Support; Case Management; Court Advocacy/Probation/Transition; Family Strengthening; Family Therapy; Life Skills Development; Mentoring; Structured Extracurricular Activities; Other: Community-Enhanced Policing and Incentives

Components. Each CASASTART program is managed locally; in deference to local culture and setting, but all programs organize around eight basic core areas: (1) community-enhanced policing, (2) case management, (3) criminal/teen justice
intervention, (4) family services, (5) after-school and summer activities, (6) education services for targeted students, (7) mentoring, and (8) incentives.

Targeted Risk Factors/Groups. This program targets students between the ages of 8 and 13 who have at least four risk factors—at least two individual school-related risk factors, one family risk factor, and one community risk factor.

Individual Risk Factors: (1) high-risk peer group, (2) high-risk social behavior, (3) retention/overage for grade, and (4) no extracurricular participation.

Contact: Lawrence F. Murray, Program Manager, National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, 633 Third Avenue, 19th Floor New York, NY 10017, Phone: 212.841.5208, Fax: 212.956.8020, Email: lmurray@casa.columbia.edu, http://www.casacolumbia.org

LA’s BEST

The LA’s Better Educated Students for Tomorrow (LA’s BEST) Program is an after-school education and enrichment program created as a partnership between the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the private sector.

The program has five goals: (1) a safe environment, (2) enhanced opportunities through the integration of an educational support structure, (3) educational enrichment activities to supplement and deepen the regular program, (4) recreational activities, and (5) interpersonal skills and self-esteem development.

Strategies. Academic Support; After-school, Family Engagement, Life Skills Development; Structured Extracurricular Activities; Other: Safe Environment

LA’s BEST students receive tutoring in a variety of subjects; participate in library, recreational, cultural, and enrichment activities; take occasional field trips; and participate in other activities in a safe environment. The program sponsors family-oriented events with activities and parent workshops.

Components. LA’s BEST: (1) is available from the end of the school day until 6 p.m., five days per week; (2) is offered at no cost; (3) admits students on a first-come, first-served basis: (4) requires students to maintain minimum attendance; and (5) is staffed by a full-time program director, playground workers, small-group leaders, high school student workers, and volunteers.

Targeted Risk Factors/Groups. LA’s BEST schools are inner-city elementary schools with low academic achievement in low socioeconomic and high gang or crime rate neighborhoods.

Individual Risk Factors: (1) low achievement, (2) poor attendance, (3) low educational expectations, (4) low commitment to school, and (5) no extracurricular participation.

Contact: Carla Sanger, President and CEO, LA’s BEST, Office of the Mayor, 200 N. Spring Street, M-120 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Phone: 213 978.0801, Fax: 213 978.0800, Email: Carla.Sanger@lacity.org, http://www.lasbest.org

STEP

The School Transitional Environmental Program (STEP) is based on the transitional life events model, which theorizes that stressful life events, such as making transitions between schools, places children at risk for maladaptive behavior. Research has shown that, for many students, changing schools can lead to a host of academic, behavioral, and social problems and may lead to dropping out of school. STEP redesigns the high school environment to make school transitions less threatening for students and aims to increase peer and teacher support, decrease student anonymity, increase student accountability, and enhance students’ abilities to learn school rules and exceptions.

Strategies. School/Classroom Environment

STEP creates small “cohorts” of transitioning students who remain together for core classes and homeroom, creates smaller “learning communities” within the larger school, and redefines the role of the homeroom teacher and counselors to provide greater support to students.

Components. Key program components include: (1) subgroups of 65-100 STEP students take all primary classes together, (2) STEP classrooms are located close together, (3) homeroom teachers serve as the primary link between student and school and school and home, (4) students receive individual 15- to 20-minute monthly counseling sessions, and (5) STEP teachers meet once or twice weekly.

Targeted Risk Factors/Groups. The program targets students in transition from elementary and middle schools who are in large urban junior high and high schools with multiple feeders serving predominantly non-White lower income youths.

Individual Risk Factors: (1) high-risk social behavior, (2) low achievement, (3) poor attendance, (4) low educational expectations, (5) low commitment to school, and (6) misbehavior.

Contact: Robert D. Felner, School of Education, University of Rhode Island, 609 Chafee Hall, Kingston, RI 02881, Phone: 401.874.2564, Fax: 401.874.5471, email: rfelner@uri.edu.

Individual Risk Factors
February once again brought hundreds of concerned educators to Myrtle Beach, SC—educators who are concerned about the students in their communities who are in danger of becoming dropout statistics and all that this entails. Solutions were found in the many workshops and carousel sessions, as well as the general sessions with our fine keynote speakers, Mr. Bill Milliken, Dr. Rossi Ray-Taylor, and Mrs. Doris Settles.

Here are some photos from this always special winter professional development event.

Dr. Jay Smink, Executive Director of the National Dropout Prevention Center/Network, welcomed the FORUM participants coming from 37 states from as far away as Alaska, as well as four attendees from overseas.

Pam Brogdon (third from right) was involved in the coordination and implementation of the first several At-Risk FORUMs when they were held in Charleston, SC. This photo shows some of the other early pioneers who have been involved with this annual FORUM over the past 20 years. From left to right, John Peters, Sam Drew, Marty Duckenfield, Pam Brogdon, Linda Shirley, and Frank White.

The Awards Luncheon on Tuesday honored many schools in South Carolina with service-learning awards. State Farm representative, Bruce White, came to the luncheon to honor these South Carolinians. Pictured here with Bruce White are Karen Horne of the S.C. Department of Education, Jackie Fudge-Law of Brewington Academy, Sumter, SC, who manages a service-learning program based on Youth Organized for Disaster Assistance (YODA) and her husband, Joan Liptrot, the director of the Institute for Global Education and Service-Learning which manages YODA; and Melissa Hawkins of NDPC, who coordinates the southern grantees in YODA.

Beverly Hiott (center) of Richland School District Two in South Carolina with her colleagues Rebecca Flood (left) and Karen Horne, as they held a meeting with South Carolina Department of Education grantees at the FORUM.

Events
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How can we benefit from all this research on risk factors for dropout? How can we take the next steps and apply this knowledge to help children succeed in school? Dropout Early Warning Systems (DEWS) would be a good next step.

Among the many goals set forth by our nation’s schools, highest on the priority list are efforts to increase school attendance, academic achievement, and graduation rates. School districts that analyze multiple sources of data and then utilize the most pertinent data tend to meet their goals more frequently and with greater intensity. These school districts have learned the value of data-based decision making and the power of making resources align where the highest need is evident. Yet, across the nation most school districts struggle with high school dropout rates that are appalling and not acceptable to state and local decision makers, local school practitioners, civic and business leaders, parents, or any other group of stakeholders.

One of the major education focus points gaining the attention of all stakeholder groups is the critically high dropout rate. Therefore, it seems appropriate to wonder why we have not used student- and school-based data and other information as the basis for planning dropout prevention programs.

Part of the reason lies in the varied mix of individual and school data, the accuracy of the data, the magnitude of the collection process, and the analytical processes applied to the data. These reasons are among many stumbling blocks associated with a failure to efficiently use data for planning dropout prevention programs. However, there is an increasing trend in many local schools to begin to use data-driven processes to identify high-risk students using information points clearly identified in the research as factors contributing to the high dropout rates. These processes tend to be very costly in terms of collection times and errors. Many processes are also highly suspect in respect to how to use the information for program planning with individual students or groups of high-risk students having similar characteristics. Furthermore, it is not practical for each school district to invest in the development of such a system.

Several organizations, including the National Dropout Prevention Center (NDPC), have been examining a variety of student identification methods using information based on factors related to school dropout to identify potential students at risk of not graduating from high school. There is a growing body of credible indicators (see page 2) and other related pertinent information to use in identification methods. However, the use of the data for making program implementation decisions has not yet reached the level of acceptance by most school practitioners.

The preliminary work completed by the NDPC suggests that a viable Dropout Early Warning System consists of two major components. The first major component is designed to address the “identification of the students at risk of school failure.” It is important that this component utilizes the research-based factors related to dropouts and includes an accurate analysis of the data with careful and harmless procedures in place to identify individual students, clusters or groups of students, grade levels, or even schools with a large concentration of high-risk students.

The final output of this analysis will provide a score or index of needs for each student. Further analysis will display in-depth student needs in several areas including: (1) academic achievement in specific subjects; (2) behavioral interventions such as attendance patterns or discipline; or (3) social relationships with peers, family, or other groups. These needs can be seen in individual or clusters of students, grade levels within a school; schoolwide; or districtwide.

The second component, and perhaps the most important, must be carefully designed to address the “utilization of the data for selection and implementation of intervention programs for high-risk students.”

The identification of solutions is highly dependent on the clarity of the student(s) needs. However, solutions will vary from making a selection of an existing evidenced-based program to the need to carefully develop a new intervention program using research-based strategies to accommodate some very specific needs of students. It may also be appropriate to use existing programs with minor modifications to the current program structures or procedures.

Each DEWS process in every district or school will be different, and the process is very dynamic each time the DEWS process is initiated. Therefore, any districtwide or school-based dropout prevention plan will have a degree of flexibility each year and perhaps as frequent as twice a year or at intervals common to district reporting periods. It will all depend on how the district uses the DEWS process.

Nevertheless, the DEWS process will afford each student or group of students an opportunity to be successful dependent upon the plans prepared for the student or for the school where the student is located.

Dropout Early Warning Systems are in the infant stage of development. As experience accumulates in a variety of school and community settings, the system will be refined with more precision.
In many ways, there are striking similarities between social epidemics and public health epidemics. When examining the widespread level of incidence, the determination to find a solution, and the universal access to preventive measures, there’s much to be learned from what has worked well in public health.

Born out of indignation that children’s futures were being limited by polio, this nation set out to eradicate it. During the 1950s, thousands of young people were victims of this epidemic that threatened to rob them of their childhoods—or even their lives. Before Jonas Salk could develop a solution, researchers uncovered the nature of the virus—how it entered the body, how it moved into the brain, and how it could be kept alive outside of human tissue.

The vaccine only came about once researchers better understood the virus.

Like polio, the dropout epidemic insidiously afflicts thousands of young people. More students will drop out this year than were struck by polio at its height. Dropping out of school is likely to lead to social, emotional, physical, and economic hardship—and limited education contributes to the persistent cycle of poverty.

Like polio, dropping out of school is preventable. The nature of the problem is no longer a mystery. We have learned a great deal about what’s been called the “silent” epidemic. We know that dropping out of school is a process, not a single event. The risk factors, based on individual, family, school, or community conditions, are identifiable as early as kindergarten. Through an evidence-based approach to integrated service provision, students from the most challenging circumstances can achieve.

It is our moral duty to understand the nature of this epidemic, with the goal of finding solutions to inoculate all our young people. We cannot afford the costs of ignoring what we know—as practitioners who must also be scientists, and as educators who must be activists. Outrage often precedes change.

Just as this nation became outraged at the height of the polio epidemic, we must now demand that all children have access to their birthright—an opportunity to succeed in school and in life.

—Daniel J. Cardinali
President
Communities In Schools

David G. Handy, Ph.D.
Director of State and Field Support
Communities In Schools

Learn more about Communities In Schools at their Web site located at www.cisnet.org

The purpose of Viewpoint is to allow professionals to express their opinions about issues related to dropout prevention. The opinions expressed by these authors do not necessarily reflect those of the National Dropout Prevention Network.