



## The Sobering Truth about High School Dropouts in South Carolina

David G. Handy, Ph.D.

For South Carolina's class of 2005, the high school graduation rate was **55.6%**. If this rate continues, **over 28,000 of South Carolina's class of 2009 will not graduate with their peers – this means that we lose about 158 students each school day** (EPE Research Center, 2008).

### How are dropouts impacting us?

- Annual losses in federal and state income taxes for America's estimated 23,000,000 high school dropouts aged 20-67 **probably exceed \$50 billion – an amount equal to the U.S. Department of Education's annual discretionary expenditures.** If lost Social Security contributions are added, the loss rises to **\$80 billion** (Rouse, 2005).
- **75%** of State prisoners across the country do not have a high school diploma (Harlow, 2003).
- While one in 30 men between the ages of 20 and 34 is behind bars, the figure is **one in nine** for black males in that age group (Warren, 2008).
- According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008), **55%** of adult dropouts are not employed.

The nature of the dropout problem is no longer a mystery. We have learned a great deal about what has been called the "silent" epidemic. Research is readily available to show us **WHO** drops out of school and **WHY**. We know that dropping out of school is a process rather than a single event. Children live in families, go to school in communities and spend time with their peers – all of these people may influence the process of dropping out AND all may be meaningful partners for intervening to promote academic success.

The appropriate question now is whether or not we have the collective **WILL** to invest in the solutions. Through an evidence-based approach to integrated

service provision, students from even the most challenging of circumstances can achieve.

### 6th Grade Suspensions Are Good Predictors of Not Graduating

- Of the 829 of Philadelphia 6th graders who received one or more out-of-school suspensions, only 20% graduated on time or one year late.
- Of the 222 6th graders who received in-school suspensions, only 17% graduated on time or one year late. (Balfanz & Legters, 2008)

This paper examines the scope of the problem and presents evidence-based solutions. Many of the resources needed are *already in place* and available to support students and schools in crisis.

### The Scope of the Dropout Problem

According to the EPE Research Center (2008), just over one-half of South Carolina's public high school students graduated with their peers in 2005: 55.6% of all students. Estimates produced by multiple researchers suggested that male students were worse off than their female counterparts and that black and Hispanic students were often worse off than their peers. Unfortunately, the state of South Carolina does not report graduation data by student demographic characteristics.

Failing to graduate from high school impacts outcomes across domains, including health, employment, economic well-being, and dependence on social assistance. The dropout problem is expensive to corporations and community members, and it is not new. Our nation has been experiencing a crisis in education for over 20 years (Sum & Harrington, 2003).

On the surface, things may have appeared better than they were. The National Center for Education Statistics, or NCES, reported that 87% of students graduated in 2001 (Kaufman, Alt, & Chapman, 2004). This estimate may not accurately reflect actual graduates. NCES estimates blended public and private school graduates, while completely excluding institutionalized populations.

The definition of a "high school completer" has varied widely – states have included GED completers, other certificate completers, and students who reported the intention to pursue a GED in the future (Greene & Winters, 2005). Research has illuminated that, based on expected earnings and future economic success, completing a regular high school diploma is more

rewarding than dropping out and obtaining a GED (Cameron & Heckman, 1993; Murnane, Willett, & Boudett, 1995; Ou, 2008; Rouse, 2005; and Tyler, 2003).

### More Reliable Estimates of Completion

Concerns about the accuracy of NCES estimates motivated researchers to scrutinize the graduation estimates. Researchers at the Urban Institute and Manhattan Institute developed variations of the Cumulative Promotion Index (CPI). In essence, the CPI is applied by (1) estimating the number of students entering 9th Grade for the first time in a given year, (2) accounting for that cohort's single-year promotion rates across each of the subsequent 3 years of high school, and (3) using the number of regular diploma recipients to derive an estimate of 4-year graduates (See EPE Research Center, 2007; Greene, 2002; and Swanson, 2004 for further details).

Researchers have adapted the CPI to account for population shifts and the apparent "bulge" in 9<sup>th</sup> grade enrollment reflecting non-promoted students (Haney, Madaus, Abrams, Wheelock, Miao, & Gruia, 2004). These variations of the CPI have produced similar findings (Greene & Winters, 2006; Orfield, Losen, Wald, & Swanson, 2004; and Swanson, 2004).

In 2005, governors in all 50 states signed the Graduation Counts Compact – agreeing to a common method for calculating high school graduation rates (NGA, 2006). NCES now estimates the "Averaged Freshman Graduation Rates," which reflects that percentage of high school students who graduate on time by dividing the number of who graduate with regular diplomas by the number of students in the incoming freshman class 4 years earlier (Seastrom, Hoffman, Chapman, & Stillwell, 2007).

### US High School Completion Estimates:

- **75%** 2004 Avg. Freshman Graduation Rate, NCES (Seastrom, Hoffman, Chapman, & Stillwell, 2007)
- **70.6%** 2005 CPI Graduation Rate (EPE Research Center, 2008)
- **70%** 2003 CPI Graduation Rate, Manhattan Institute (Greene & Winters, 2006)

**Bottom Line: Between one-quarter and one-third of US public school students can expect to miss graduating with their peers.**

All students are not alike. To better understand disparities in educational attainment, researchers examined completion rates by background and racial characteristics. The picture is particularly bleak for minority and marginalized students.

**Table 1. US Graduation Rates by Race or Ethnicity**

| Student Ethnicity         | EPE Research Center (Class of 2005) <sup>1</sup> | Manhattan Institute (Class of 2004) <sup>2</sup> | Harvard Civil Rights Project (Class of 2001) <sup>3</sup> |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|
| All Races                 | 70.6%  | 70%  | 68%   |
| Asian/Pacific Islander    | 81.3%  | 72%  | 76.8%   |
| White, Non-Hispanic       | 77.6%  | 78%  | 74.9%   |
| Black, non-Hispanic       | 55.3%  | 55%  | 50.2%   |
| American Indian/AK Native | 50.6%  | N/A  | 51.1%   |
| Hispanic                  | 57.8%  | 53%  | 53.2%   |

Sources: <sup>1</sup>EPE Research Center, 2008; <sup>2</sup>Greene & Winters, 2006; <sup>3</sup>Swanson, 2004.

Students who live in families with the most limited access to tangible resources or who experience few strong, supportive relationships with caring adults are among those most likely to drop out of traditional academic settings (NCES, 1999).

Balfanz and Legters (2004 & 2007) analyzed the effectiveness of high schools by estimating high school promoting power – twelfth grade enrollment divided by 9<sup>th</sup> grade enrollment three years earlier. High schools having promoting power of 60% or less were deemed "Dropout Factories."

**Nearly 80% of US high schools that produce the highest number of dropouts, or have the lowest promoting power, can be found in just 15 states:**

- Arizona
- California
- Georgia
- Florida
- Illinois
- Louisiana
- Michigan
- Mississippi
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- Ohio
- Pennsylvania
- South Carolina
- Texas

(Balfanz & Legters, 2004)

Graduation rates for students who attend school in high poverty, racially segregated, and urban school districts lag 15%-18% behind (Swanson, 2004). Districts far more likely to have low HS graduation rates (Orfield, Losen, Wald, & Swanson, 2004):

- are characterized by high poverty,
- are located in central cities, or
- have high percentages of minority students, students with disabilities, or English language learners.

## Educational Success is Related to Better Health

According to the National Center for Health Statistics (2004), dropouts have worse health than graduates:

- The death rate (all causes) for adults with less than 12 years of education was more than 2.5 times higher than the rate for those with at least 13 years of education.
- Adults with less than 12 years of education were nearly 5 times more likely to die of HIV-related diseases than those with at least 13 years of education

The Centers for Disease Control reported that teen girls performing at the lowest levels in basic reading and math were 5 times more likely to give birth over a 2-year high school period than high performing teen girls (Grunbaum et al., 2004). Higher levels of parents' educational attainment have been positively related to better health outcomes for their children, including a lower rate of infant mortality and fewer low birth weight babies (Wolfe & Haveman, 2002).

## Education Leads to Less Government Assistance

According to Adair (2001), government assistance goes to:

- **About 25%** of adults with no HS diploma
- **10%** of adults with a HS diploma, and
- **5%** of adults with some college

Welfare costs per person drop sharply as educational attainment increases, and the largest boost in welfare savings "occurs when educational attainment increases from high school dropout to high school graduate" (Vernez, Krop, & Rydell, 1999, p. 22). These researchers calculated that helping a female student stay in high school created estimated annual welfare savings of:

- **\$422** for a non-Hispanic white woman
- **\$627** for her Mexican counterpart, and
- **\$835** for a native-born black woman

## Educational Success and Employment Success

Educational attainment is closely related to employment. Completing a high school diploma increases employment opportunities.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008):

- **57%** of adult dropouts are not employed, while
- **40%** of adults who completed high school and
- **23%** of those with a bachelor's degree are not employed

The BLS (2006) reported the 2005 *Unemployment Rate* for African American high school dropouts aged

25 and older was 14.4%, compared to 3.5% for African Americans with at least a bachelor's degree. Perhaps more staggering is the fact that fewer than 40% of African American dropouts were in the labor force – compared to 82% of African Americans with at least a Bachelor's degree (BLS, 2006).

## Educational Success and Economic Success

As educational attainment increases, average yearly earnings increase. In 2000, the median earnings for African American females with a high school diploma and no college was \$20,000 less than the median earnings for their peers with a bachelor's degree or higher (NCES, 2003). Donald (2001) estimated that the difference in annual earnings between high school diploma recipients and non recipients was \$9,425 per year. Greene (2002) suggested the difference in median annual income between HS diploma earners and dropouts was closer to \$14,000.

Over the course of a lifetime, earning gains for completing a high school diploma compared to dropping out total about \$300,000 (Employment Policy Foundation, 2004). Each of these non-completers contributes about \$60,000 less in state and federal income taxes (Rouse, 2005).

**Annual losses in federal and state income taxes for America's estimated 23,000,000 high school dropouts aged 20-67 probably exceed \$50 billion – an amount equal to the U.S. Department of Education's annual discretionary expenditures.**

**If lost Social Security contributions are added, the loss rises to \$80 billion** (Rouse, 2005).

Education is critical to secure America's future global competitive edge. An educated workforce positions communities and corporations for economic vitality. US businesses spend more than \$60 billion annually on training, much of that on remedial reading, writing, and math (National Association of Manufacturers, 2001).

## More Education leads to Fewer Criminal Arrests

High school dropouts are 3.5 times more likely than graduates to be arrested in their lifetimes (Catterall, 1987). Dropouts are over-represented in US Prisons.

**Prisoners who did not complete high school represent** (Harlow, 2003):

- **75% of state prisoners**
- **59% of federal prisoners**
- **69% of local jail inmates**
- **83% of state inmates 24 or younger**
- **Nearly 50% of drug offenders in state prisons**

Annual state prison operating costs per inmate average \$22,650 nationally, and South Carolina pays over \$16,500 per inmate per year (Stephan, 2004). With over 972,000 dropouts (75% of all state prisoners in 2003) in state prisons:

**US tax payers pay over \$22,000,000,000 to incarcerate dropouts in state prisons each year.**

**If 75% of South Carolina's 22,200 inmates are dropouts (16,650), SC tax payers pay over \$274,725,000 to keep dropouts in prison annually (Stephan, 2004).**

These estimates do not account for other related costs, such as costs of these crimes to victims and their families or associated court costs.

### The Problem In South Carolina

For the 2005-2006 school year, the South Carolina Department of Education reported an annual high school dropout rate of 4.0% (SC DOE, 2008a), though the reported high school graduation rate was 73.9% (SC DOE, 2007). Most estimates of South Carolina's high school completion rates are below national averages, indicating that a significant proportion of students do not graduate with their peers:

- **73.9%** 2005-2006 Graduation Rate (SC DOE, 2007)
- **55.6%** 2005 Graduation Rate (EPE, 2008)
- **60.1%** 2005 (Laird, Cataldi, KewalRamani, & Chapman, 2008)

Older estimates of South Carolina High School Graduation Rates reflect similar proportions:

- **54%** 2002-2003 Graduation Rate (Greene & Winters, 2006)
- **50.4%** 1999-2000 High School Completion Rate (Warren, 2005)
- **51%** 2000-2001 Graduation Rate (Haney et al., 2004)
- **50.7%** 2001 Graduation Rate (Swanson, 2004; Orfield, et al, 2004)

Disparities across student subgroups evident across the nation are present in South Carolina. Under-represented populations are over-represented among dropouts and non-completers.

**Table 2. SC Graduation Rates by Ethnicity**

| Student Ethnicity       | Class of 2005 | Class of 2006 | Class of 2007 |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| All                     | 77.1%         | 73.9%         | 70.9%         |
| White, Non-Hispanic     | 83.2%         | 79.8%         | 76.9%         |
| Asian/Pacific Islander  | 83.8%         | 84.1%         | 74.6%         |
| Amer. Indian/ AK Native | 67.6%         | NA            | N/A           |
| Black, non-Hispanic     | 68.7%         | 67.4%         | 64.6%         |
| Hispanic                | 67.4%         | 60.0%         | 58.2%         |

**Source:** South Carolina Department of Education, (2006, 2007, and 2008b), Annual State Report Cards - No Child Left Behind - Adequate Yearly Progress. **Note:** The absence of adequate data in the US Department of Education's Common Core of Data prevented analysis by independent researchers who calculate these data across the nation (including the Manhattan Institute, the EPE Research Center, and the Urban Institute.

As sobering as these statistics appear, most researchers estimate that high school graduation rates were significantly worse for male students.

### According to the SC DOE (2008):

- **While about 78% of female students graduated on-time with their peers,**
- **Just under 66% of male students graduated with their peers in the class of 2007**

Though data breaking these rates out by sex *and* ethnicity were not available, male students of color are particularly at risk for not graduating. The challenges faced by our students most at-risk for dropping out are complex. A comprehensive and developmental lifespan approach to supporting school success and youth development must be sensitive to individual differences among students, while sufficiently effective to promote success – there are no “cookie-cutter” approaches for addressing all student needs across South Carolina's vastly distinct communities.

### The Magnitude of Realizing the CIS Mission

**Who's At Risk?** All students are vulnerable to some factors and stresses that increase their risk for dropping out of school. Researchers (EPE Research Center, 2006) estimated that about 44% of South Carolina's public school students can expect not to graduate with their peers. If these estimates are correct and conditions remain as they are, we can expect that

**Each day, about 158 of South Carolina's students will fall off the path to graduating – this equates to more than 28,000 students over the course of a year (EPE, 2008).**

Promoting academic success and healthy youth development seems a wise and cost-effective alternative to continuing to pay the higher costs of allowing at-risk youth to leave school poorly equipped. Increasing our capacity to serve more of South Carolina's severely at-risk youth is a challenge we must face. The future of South Carolina depends on our success.

---

### The Communities In Schools Model

With more than 30 years of success, the Communities In Schools Model for Community-Based Integrated Student Services was developed to integrate community and school resources in a coordinated manner. Key components of the CIS Model include:

- Site Coordinator:** presence of a dedicated on-site coordinator who implements a comprehensive dropout prevention plan
- School and Students Assessments:**
  - Comprehensive school and student-level needs assessment
  - Community asset assessment and identification of potential partners
- Service Plan:** Annual service plans for school-level prevention and individual intervention strategies
- Mix of Effective Prevention & Intervention Strategies:**
  - Appropriate combinations of widely accessible prevention services and resources for the entire school population and coordinated, targeted and sustained intervention services and resources for individual students with identified risk factors
  - Brokered and direct service provision
- Evaluation and Refinement of Services:** Data Collection, Monitoring and Adjusting service

These components have been applied and refined in the field for over 30 years (and most recently clarified in our Total Quality System standards – based on a mix of internal data analysis and organizational development research).

**The Greatest Proximate Cause [for a high school to become a dropout factory] is that there is a fundamental Miss-Match between the Number of Students in Need of Academic and Social Supports in a High School and the Human Resources and Know How Available to Help**  
(Belfanz & Letgers, 2007)

CIS connects students in need with those resources needed through a mix of prevention and intervention derived from the Public Health model. Belfanz and Letgers (2007) adapted this model to dropout prevention – indicating that School-wide **Prevention** efforts should reach 75% or so of the problem behaviors including poor attendance AND **Intensive Intervention** efforts involving specialists (counselors, social workers, tutors) should target the 5% to 10% who need more clinical types of support. These numbers correlate to the proportions defined by the CIS Total Quality System for fully implemented CIS sites.

**Evidence-Based Practice:** Communities In Schools contracted with the National Dropout Prevention Center to clarify Risk Factors (by grade and by domain [individual, family, school, and community] and Effective Programs/Practices for reducing the Dropout Problem (full report is available from our website). Risk Factors are central to Needs Assessments. Effective Programs and Practices are essential to Service Planning and Implementation.

### Third Party Evaluation: Preliminary Findings:

Though still in the early stages, preliminary findings from an independent 3rd-party rigorous evaluation of the CIS model for Community-Based Integrated Student Services (CBISS) are robust:

- Communities In Schools** is one of a small number of dropout prevention programs **proven to keep kids in school.**
- Communities In Schools** is the ***only*** dropout prevention program in the nation **proven to increase graduation rates,** graduating students on time with a regular diploma.
- The ***CIS Model for integrated student support services correlates more strongly with school level outcomes*** than service provided without integrated student supports.
- When implemented with fidelity, ***the CIS Model results in a higher percentage of students reaching proficiency in 4th and 8th grade math and in 4th and 8th grade reading.***

At the local level, Communities In Schools Affiliates cultivate the model to be recognized as CIS. Local Affiliates are responsible for six core functions

- Community Partnerships
- Resource Development/Fund Raising
- Marketing and Public Relations
- Managing and Developing CIS Sites
- Providing and/or Brokering Quality Youth Programming and Services
- Data Collection, Evaluation and Reporting

The effective execution of these core functions establishes CIS affiliates as **the** provider of the

highest quality community-based integrated student services with stable operational infrastructures for long-term sustainability.

---

## Communities In Schools of South Carolina

Communities In Schools affiliates in South Carolina are positioned to promote community-based efforts to combat the dropout crisis. These affiliates have proven to be effective conduits for connecting child-serving agencies, businesses, institutions of higher learning, and families with students in the schools and communities across the state.

In 2006-07, the CIS of SC network included:

- 13 operational local affiliates
- 98 school sites
- 52,546 students are enrolled in schools in which CIS has a presence and have access to services
- 11,402 are directly connected with services through CIS

CIS of South Carolina local affiliates mobilize a variety of resources to promote student academic success across the state, including:

- tutoring or academic support
- mentoring services
- literacy training
- social supports

Effective collaboration at the state and community levels is the core mission of CIS. Supporting students in setting and achieving high expectations cannot be overemphasized. CIS affiliates promote healthy youth development, including resilience, despite risk factors, through the following strategies:

- delinquency or violence prevention,
- career development or employment training services,
- leadership skills training,
- college exploration, application, scholarship or other support for secondary education.

**How could we more powerfully serve middle and high school students with research-based strategies and have a more effective impact on the graduation rate? We need:**

- More public awareness of the problem of high school dropouts
- More corporate partnerships working in the arena of funding workforce development
- More state dollars to support CIS operations at the local level
- More school-based site coordinators
- More paid Full-time and Part-Time CIS staff to build the sustainability of effective local affiliates

**What limits us from serving more students at more schools in South Carolina?** The CIS local affiliates in South Carolina need more funding and greater staff capacity to effectively execute our mission. Now is the time to invest in the Communities In Schools mission – to promote success in school and in life for all of South Carolina’s young people.

**The CIS of SC Network includes 13 local affiliates:**

- CIS of Barnwell County
- CIS of Charleston
- CIS of Cherokee County
- CIS of Chester County, Inc.
- CIS of Clarendon County
- CIS of Dillon County
- CIS of Dorchester County
- CIS of Greenville County
- CIS of Kershaw County
- CIS of Lancaster County
- CIS of Lee County
- CIS of Saluda County
- CIS of the Midlands

---

**For information on Communities In Schools, contact:**

### Communities In Schools National Office

David G. Handy, Ph.D.,  
Director of State and Field Support, CIS National  
277 South Washington Street, Suite 210  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone: (850) 877-2378  
Email: [handyd@cisnet.org](mailto:handyd@cisnet.org)  
Website: [www.cisnet.org](http://www.cisnet.org)

---

## References

- Adair, V.C. (2001) Poverty and the (Broken) Promise of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(2), 217-239.
- Balfanz, R., & Legters, N. (2007). *Locating the Dropout Crisis: How to Target and Transform High Schools Which Produce The Nation's Dropouts*. Presentation to the Communities In Schools State Directors Meeting, June 13, 2007. Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University.
- Balfanz, R., & Legters, N. (2004). *Locating the Dropout Crisis*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University. Retrieved September 2004 from: [http://www.csos.jhu.edu/tdhs/rsch/Locating\\_Dropouts.pdf](http://www.csos.jhu.edu/tdhs/rsch/Locating_Dropouts.pdf).
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2008). *The Employment Situation: February 2008*. (see Table A-4. Employment status of the civilian population 25 years and over by educational attainment; "Employment-Population Ratio Feb 2008). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved March 2008 from: <http://www.bls.gov/>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2006). *Household Data Annual Averages* (see Table 7. Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population 25 years and over by educational attainment, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latin ethnicity). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved August 2006 from: <http://www.bls.gov/>.

- Cameron, S.V. & Heckman, J.J. (1993). The Nonequivalence of High School Equivalents. *Journal of Labor Economics* 11(1): 1-47.
- Catterall, J.S. (1987). On The Social Costs of Dropping Out of School. *The High School Journal*, 71(1), October-November, 19-30.
- Donald, E. (2001). *Give yourself the gift of a degree*. Washington, DC: Employment Policy Foundation. [www.epf.org](http://www.epf.org).
- Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2008). "Diplomas Count 2008: South Carolina — State Highlights 2008." A Special Supplement to Education Week's *Diplomas Count 2008*. Retrieved July 2008 from: [www.edweek.org](http://www.edweek.org).
- Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2007). "Diplomas Count 2007: Ready for what?," *Education Week* 26(40). Retrieved March 2008 from: [www.edweek.org](http://www.edweek.org).
- Employment Policy Foundation. (2004). *Issue Background, Education Pays: Stay in School*. Washington, DC: Author. [www.epf.org](http://www.epf.org).
- Greene, J.P. (2002). *High school graduation rates in the United States (Revised)*. New York, NY: Center for the Study of Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research. Retrieved June 2003 from: <http://www.manhattan-institute.org>.
- Greene, J.P. & Winters, M.A. (2006). *Leaving Boys Behind: Public High School Graduation Rates* (Civic Report No.48). New York, NY: Center for the Study of Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research. Retrieved August 2006 from: <http://www.manhattan-institute.org>.
- Greene, J.P. & Winters, M.A. (2005) *Public High School Graduation and College-Readiness Rates: 1991–2002* (Educational Working Paper No.8). New York, NY: Center for the Study of Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research. Retrieved March 2005 from: <http://www.manhattan-institute.org>.
- Greenberg, M.T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. (1999). *Preventing Mental Disorders in School-Age Children: A Review of the Effectiveness of Prevention Programs*. University Park, PA: Prevention Research Center for the Promotion of Human Development, College of Health and Human Development, Pennsylvania State University. <http://www.prevention.psu.edu>.
- Haney, W., Madaus, G., Abrams, L., Wheelock, A., Miao, J., & Gruiia, I. (2004). *The education pipeline in the United States, 1970-2000*. Chestnut Hill, MA: National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy, Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, Lynch School of Education, Boston College. Retrieved January 2004 from: <http://www.bc.edu>.
- Harlow, C. W. (2003). *Education and correctional populations. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Kaufman, P., Alt, M.N., & Chapman, C.D. (2004). *Dropout Rates in the United States: 2001* (NCES 2005-046). U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved March 2005 from <http://nces.ed.gov>.
- Laird, J., Cataldi, E.F., KewalRamani, A., and Chapman, C. (2008). Dropout and Completion Rates in the United States: 2006 (NCES 2008-053; See Appendix 1, Supplemental Table 21-1). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 2008 from <http://nces.ed.gov>
- Murnane, R.J., Willett, J.B., and Boudett, K.P. "Do High School Dropouts Benefit from Obtaining a GED?" *Education Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 1995, 17:2.
- National Association of Manufacturers. (2001). *The Skills Gap 2001*. Report Produced through a partnership between NAM, The Manufacturing Institute's Center for Workforce Success and Andersen. Washington, DC: NAM. Retrieved May 2005 from: <http://www.nam.org>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2003). *Status and Trends in the Education of Blacks, 2003*. U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Available on-line at: <http://nces.ed.gov>.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (1999). *Dropout rates in the United States: 1998*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Available on-line at: <http://nces.ed.gov>.
- National Center for Health Statistics. (2004). *Health, United States, 2004: With Chartbook on Trends in the Health of Americans* (Library of Congress Catalog Number 76–641496). (Note: See pages 163-164). Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved March 2005 from: [www.cdc.gov](http://www.cdc.gov).
- National Governor's Association. (2006). *Implementing Graduation Counts: State Progress to date*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved August 2006 from: [www.nga.org](http://www.nga.org).
- Orfield, G., Losen, D., Wald, J., & Swanson, C.B. (2004). *Losing our future: How minority youth are being left behind by the graduation rate crisis*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University. Contributors: Advocates for Children of New York, The Civil Society Institute. Retrieved May 2005 from: <http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu>.
- Ou, Suh-Ruu. (2008). Do GED Recipients Differ From Graduates and School Dropouts?: Findings From an Inner-City Cohort. *Urban Education*, January 2008; 43: 83 - 117.
- Rouse, C.E. (2005). *The Labor Market Consequences of an Inadequate Education*. Paper Presented at the Equity Symposium on "The Social Costs of Inadequate Education" at Teachers' College, Columbia University. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University and NBER. Retrieved August 2006 from: <http://www.tc.edu>.
- Seastrom, M., Hoffman, L., Chapman, C. and Stillwell, R. (2007). *The Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate for Public High Schools From the Common Core of Data: School Years 2002–03 and 2003–04* (NCES 2006–606rev). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC.. Retrieved March 2008 from: <http://nces.ed.gov>.
- Seastrom, M., Hoffman, L., and Chapman, C. (2006). The Averaged Freshman Graduation Rate for Public High Schools From the Common Core of Data: School Years 2002–03 and 2003–04 (NCES 2006-606rev).
- Stephan, J.J. (2004). *State Prison Expenditures, 2001* (NCJ 202949). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved March 2005 from: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs>.
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2008a). *Report on Student Dropout Rates 2005–06*. Columbia, SC: Author. Available at: <http://www.ed.sc.gov>
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2008b). *2007 State Report Card - No Child Left Behind: Adequate Yearly Progress*. Columbia, SC: Author. Available at: <http://www.ed.sc.gov>
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2007). *2006 State Report Card - No Child Left Behind: Adequate Yearly Progress*. Columbia, SC: Author. Available at: <http://www.ed.sc.gov>
- South Carolina Department of Education. (2006). *2005 State Report Card - No Child Left Behind: Adequate Yearly Progress*. Columbia, SC: Author. Available at: <http://www.ed.sc.gov>

Sum, A., & Harrington, P. (2003). *The Hidden Crisis in the High School Dropout Problems of Young Adults in the U.S.: Recent Trends in Overall School Dropout Rates and Gender Differences in Dropout Behavior*. A Report Prepared for The Business Roundtable (Washington, D.C.). Boston, MA: Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University.

Swanson, C.B. (2004). *Who Graduates? Who Doesn't? A Statistical Portrait of Public High School Graduation, Class of 2001*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved February 2004 from: <http://www.urban.org>.

Tyler, J.H. (2003). "The Economic Benefits of the GED: Lessons from Recent Research." *Review of Educational Research* 73(3): 369-403.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education," 1986-87 through 2005-06. Author. Available on-line at: <http://nces.ed.gov>.

Vernez, G., Krop, R., & Rydell, C. (1999) *Closing the Education Gap: Benefits and Costs*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation (pp. 25-45). Retrieved March 2005 from: [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org).

Warren, J. (2008). *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*. Washington, D.C.: The Pew Center on the States. Retrieved March 2008 from [www.pewcenteronthestates.org](http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org).

Warren, J. R. (2005). State-level high school completion rates: Concepts, measures, and trends. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(51). Retrieved August 2006 from: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n51/>.

Wolfe, B.L., & Haveman, R.H. (2002) Social and Nonmarket Benefits from Education in an Advanced Economy. *Education in the 21st Century: Meeting the Challenges of a Changing World*, 47: 97-142.

© Communities In Schools, Inc., 2009.